

Taxation Committee Takes Up Tax Reform Challenge

The legislative session is moving into its final few weeks. The major tax reform proposals have been discussed all session and were given their formal public hearing on April 15th. What follows is a review of the Tax Committee's work since the public hearing. The newspaper reporters are inquiring whether the Legislature will be able to enact a tax reform proposal in 2003. What do you think?

At the tail end of last week and during the school vacation week the Taxation Committee has been devoting quality time to the challenge of developing a comprehensive tax reform proposal. The preliminary attempts of the Committee to move forward on this most important project can be divided into four general categories: (1) establishing the rules of negotiation; (2) gathering information necessary to make decisions; (3) getting its arms around the current education funding system; and (4) scouting out the full range of legislative options as it choreographs around the citizen initiated *School Finance and Tax Reform Act of 2003* which will be before the voters on November 4th.

Negotiation protocols and how to craft a bill. Soon after the public hearings on April 15th, the Committee settled down to a procedural discussion of how to build a tax reform package. One of the Committee's first exercises was to go through all of the 162 tax bills given public hearing this legislative session to identify those that had been earmarked for some element of the tax reform discussion. The result was the identification of 82 bills, each of which

contain a germ of an idea that at least one Committee member would like to see advanced in a tax reform proposal.

Some Committee members suggested setting aside the 82 bills and leading with one of the four major proposals in front of them (the citizen initiated *School Finance and Tax Reform Act* and the three sweeping tax proposals sponsored, respectively, by Rep. Barney McGowan (Pittsfield), Rep. Peter Mills (Cornville) and Representative Ben Dudley (Portland).

Senators Richard Nass (York Cty.) and Ethan Strimling (Cumberland

Cty.), who tend to look at tax reform through different lenses, both suggested that the Committee should first focus on the major components of tax reform rather than getting side-tracked with the smaller ornaments of reform that may or may not remain necessary after a truly comprehensive tax proposal is developed. Sen. Nass suggested a process of moving toward building consensus by choosing not to focus on a particular bill and aiming the focus, instead, directly on the major taxes that need to be reformed. For example, Sen. Nass suggested the Committee approach the property tax issue and make some big-picture decisions about the direction it wants to take in that area. When that debate gets as far as it can and begins to reach animapasse,

(continued on page 2)

Home Rule Center of Committee Debates

On Friday of last week, the State and Local Government Committee held work sessions on three bills of municipal interest: LD 389, *An Act to Amend the Laws Governing Municipal Citizen Initiatives and Referenda*; LD 719, *An Act to Protect and Encourage Firearms Shooting Ranges Throughout the State*; and LD 1063, *An Act Concerning Municipal Firearms Discharge Ordinances*.

Although the bills address three different issues, at the center of debate on each bill was the need to preserve home rule authority. Throughout the debates, Sen. Peggy Rotundo (Androscoggin Cty.) emerged as an advocate of some core home rule authority principles. On each bill, Sen. Rotundo continuously urged her colleagues to seriously consider the impacts their decisions would have on the abilities of municipal officials (in some cases) and

residents (in others) to determine what is best for their communities.

Firearms Shooting Ranges. From the municipal perspective, LD 719, sponsored by Rep. Matt Dunlap (Old Town), takes the biggest swipe at municipal home rule authority. As proposed, LD 719 would exempt all existing and future shooting ranges from adhering to municipal noise ordinances.

After surprisingly little debate on the issue, the Committee voted 7 to 5 in favor of the bill. Municipal officials oppose LD 719 because it preempts the future actions of the local legislative body to enact reasonable land use standards. Maine law already provides that any municipal land use standard, including noise standards has to have a rational basis, be reasonably established and equitably applied to protect

(continued on page 6)

TAX REFORM (cont'd)

Sen. Nass suggested moving as a Committee into the income tax area or the sales tax area or the issue of revenue neutrality and spending control, and then recycle back to the property tax issues, working through each of the major elements of the reform package as a Committee, setting aside the obstacles and coming back to them, working them, and not letting the political obstacles win the day.

Representative Jon Courtney (Sanford) said that he thought that there should be a general understanding among all of the Committee members that no element of the tax reform package is agreed to by any member of the Committee until the entire package is agreed to by all the Committee members. Rep. Courtney, Sen. Nass and other Committee members offered a variety of negotiating strategies that they found helpful in other consensus-building assignments to work around the impasses that will inevitably crop up as the Committee tries to accomplish its difficult work.

Although some panelists admitted to an initial assumption that negotiations would ultimately break down into majority and minority reports, there was early agreement among all Committee members that they should strive for a unanimous report on this issue, recognizing that successful tax reform is completely dependent on political consensus, and the trade-offs that consensus requires.

Information requests. The following is a list of the data or information reports that the Committee has requested from either the Department of



Taxation Committee House Chair David Lemoine (Old Orchard Beach) and Senate Chair Stephen Stanley (Penobscot County)

Education, Maine Revenue Services or the Office of Fiscal and Program Review.

- The aggregate state and local costs of implementing the Essential Programs and Services (EPS) school funding model with no other changes to law, trended over time.
- The school unit-by-school unit distribution of implementing EPS compared to the distribution under the current system.
- The aggregate state costs of school funding under EPS with the 4 mill/12 mill property tax cap for education as proposed by Rep. McGowan.
- The aggregate state costs of school funding under EPS if the municipal mill rate for education was capped at 10 mills.
- A spreadsheet showing how much funding is provided to each school unit under the current General Purpose Aid to Education (GPA) disbursement system compared to how much would be received if the voters adopt the *School Funding and Tax Reform Act of 2003*; that is, the distribution amounts if the state was paying 55% of the cost of education (including within that 55% obligation a full 100% reimbursement for special education mandates).
- The costs to the state of expanding the Circuit Breaker property tax and rent rebate program in a variety of ways, including showing how much of that

expansion could be financed by partially or totally eliminating the Homestead Exemption.

- The cost to the state of eliminating the income tax on dividends, capital gains and interest, and the revenue generated by creating a new high-end 10% income tax bracket.
- A municipality by municipality breakdown of redesigning the Revenue Sharing system as proposed by Rep. Mills (in LD 1395) which would split all Revenue Sharing funds down the middle and distribute 50% according to the traditional Revenue Sharing distribution formula and distribute the other 50% according to a new "Revenue Sharing III" formula which would subtract the first 15 mills from every municipality's property tax burden, thus concentrating the distribution to just the highest mill rate communities.
- The complete list of all sales and income tax "expenditures", which is the statutory term for all tax exemptions, exclusions, credits or other similar exceptions to the general rule of sales or income taxation.
- Data showing the revenue generated with the adoption of a local option sales tax in the various communities with appreciable amounts of retail sales activity, breaking down that data according to sales on personal consumption, sales on automobiles and sales on meals and lodging.

(continued on page 3)

Legislative Bulletin

A weekly publication of the Maine Municipal Association throughout sessions of the Maine State Legislature.

Subscriptions to the *Bulletin* are available at a rate of \$20 per calendar year. Inquiries regarding subscriptions or opinions expressed in this publication should be addressed to: *Legislative Bulletin*, Maine Municipal Association, 60 Community Drive, Augusta, ME 04330. Tel: 623-8428. Website: www.memun.org

Editorial Staff: Geoffrey Herman, Kate Dufour, Jeff Austin, and Laura Veilleux of the State & Federal Relations staff.

TAX REFORM (cont'd)

- Finally, the request from some Committee members for property tax exemption data did not get very far. The Committee was told the assessed values of tax exempt entities were not accurate enough to provide reliable data to the Committee, so estimates of the revenue generated if some sort of service fee was levied on the basis of assessed value could not be provided.

Education funding. A central goal of tax reform from the municipal perspective is getting the state to commit to responsibly funding its extremely expensive educational mandates and committing to a fixed share of the cost of public education.

To get its arms around those issues, the Committee entertained presentations on the Essential Programs and Services (EPS) school funding model from the Department of Education's Director of Planning, Jim Rier (formerly of the State Board of Education). Rier's presentation, available as a powerpoint presentation, clearly lays out how the EPS model would move the state to a school funding system based on rational, experience-based information rather than the expenditure driven, deeply underfunded GPA model that the state is struggling with.

Of special emphasis in the Rier presentation is the sensitivity of the EPS model to each school system's particular needs and circumstances. In essence, EPS tailors (and makes honest) what is now referred to as the "per pupil guarantee" for each school system based on a number of educational challenges and circumstances the school system is facing, but in all cases defining the reasonable amount of funding each school system should have to educate its students to the mandated "Learning Results" performance level. Rier stressed the point that EPS, in itself, does not change the state funding distribution system. It merely defines what the state and local governments should reasonably understand to be the total educational expenditure that is adequate and appropriate.

In short, EPS represents a "zero-based" rather than "incremental" approach to school funding.

But both the clarity and rationality of the Rier presentation was shattered at the next Tax Committee meeting, which included a discussion about the current school funding distribution system by Rep. Peter Mills (Cornville) and several members of the Education Committee (Sen. Mike Brennan (Cumberland Cty.), and Reps. Glenn Cummings (Portland) and Tom Murphy (Kennebunk). That discussion was punctuated by sharp disagreements over nearly every aspect of the state's policy of distributing educational subsidy, from the historical development of elements of the formula, to the equity (or perceived lack thereof) of the current distribution system.

Also present during the discussion was Dr. David Silvernail, the Director of the Maine Educational Policy Research Institute, who has been a principal researcher and architect of the EPS model. Dr. Silvernail's input confused the Tax Committee tremendously when he said that the implementation of EPS, which is designed to fully recognize the costs of the Learning Results system, will add \$213 million (in today's dollars) to the annual cost of education when fully implemented in five years. What was not made clear in the presentation was whether the \$213 million was an additive cost to the \$1.7 billion that is currently spent (state and local) on operating the public schools, or whether it represented only a proposed financial restructuring of the current, poorly understood "allocation" system. The GPA "allocation" system has become an arbitrary, functionally bank-

rupt subset of the full cost of K-12 education. Unfortunately, based only on its name and long-abandoned purpose, some legislators regard the "allocation" system as an accurate measure of the "required" costs of education.

On that issue, the following day the Tax Committee spent a good deal of time wondering why the \$237 million that is currently raised through property taxation to fund K-12 education outside of the school funding formula's dwarfish "allocation" system should not be considered purely optional local spending – and perhaps even excessive or uncontrolled in nature.

The citizens' initiative and legislative options. The fourth broad area of the Tax Committee's inquiry is to identify the Legislature's strategic options to move forward on the issue of tax reform with one citizen-initiated approach in the hopper (*The School Funding and Tax Reform Act of 2003*) and potentially two more citizen initiated actions on the way (Carol Palesky's "Proposition 13" proposal and the "Colorado" tax cap proposal).

During the school funding discussion, Rep. Peter Mills goaded the Tax panel into the strategic inquiry when he advised the Committee that its first and top priority goal should be to defeat the citizen initiated *School Finance and Tax Reform Act of 2003* in November. To achieve that goal, Rep. Mills advised the Committee to develop a so-called "wrap-around" proposal and send that out to the voters as a competing measure to the citizen



File photo from 2002 of Senator (then Representative) Richard Nass (York Cty.) on the left and Representative (then Senator) Peter Mills (Somerset Cty.) on the right.

(continued on page 4)

TAX REFORM (cont'd)

initiated proposal.

Sen. Nass volunteered that the legislative sentiment appeared to be to create a competing measure for the citizen initiative and Rep. Tom Murphy said that he also believed that the citizen initiative would be rejected by the voters if a competing measure such as the one that Rep. Mills was proposing were attached to the ballot.

This interchange caused the Committee to ask a series of questions to its legislative analyst as to the ins-and-outs of competing and non-competing measures. Staff Analyst Julie Jones provided the following thoughts as a starting point:

- The general principle of a competing measure is that it is an alternative proposal to the measure proposed by the citizens' initiative *and* it conflicts with the initiative in such a way that both the initiative and the alternative proposal could not both be adopted into law;
- Any alternative proposal that the Legislature may want to send out to the

voters could be labeled by the Legislature as a "competing measure";

- The Legislature could also send out an alternative, supplementary or advisory tax reform proposal to the voters that would not directly compete with the citizen initiative but would be considered alongside the citizen initiative on a separate ballot;
- Proposed constitutional amendments must be sent out to the voters on separate ballots and could not be a competing measure;
- There is a 60 year old decision handed down by Maine's Law Court that suggests that a package of legislation which includes a proposed constitutional amendment as well as implementing statutory changes cannot be enacted into law in a simultaneous fashion. Specifically, the 1941 decision holds that the Legislature cannot enact an unconstitutional statute even if that enactment is contingent on the voters subsequently enacting or adopting a constitutional amendment that would make the statutory enactment constitutional. According to Jones, a strict interpretation of this Law Court deci-

sion would suggest that the proposals of Rep. Barney McGowan, for example, or the Maine Land Bank program offered by Rep. Leila Percy (Harpwell), could not be fully enacted in 2003. The most that could be accomplished this year would be to send the constitutional elements of those bills out to the voters in 2003 and then, if approved by the voters, the statutory enactments could follow in 2004;

- The Taxation Committee would be well advised to seek more clarifying information from the Attorney General's Office, but more specific legal information will be difficult to provide until the Taxation Committee identifies specific proposals for the AG's analysis; and
- The ultimate authority on what is and is not a competing measure (and whether a statutory element of a tax reform proposal could be enacted in advance of its constitutional underpinnings) is Maine's Supreme Court, which the Legislature has access to through certain procedures to obtain an "Opinion of the Justices".

Citizen Initiative Gets Fiscal Analysis

The School Finance and Tax Reform Act of 2003, now before the Legislature as LD 1372, has been analyzed for its fiscal impacts by the Legislature's Office of Fiscal and Program Review (OFPR), which is responsible for preparing all legislative fiscal notes.

As has long been claimed by MMA and other proponents of the initiative,

if the state were fulfilling its longstanding promise to pay for 55% of the cost of K-12 education, over \$200 million of property tax relief would be provided.

Specifically, the OFPR analysis says that if the state were to meet its 55% "intention" for the next fiscal year (FY 04), \$206.4 million in financial burden of education would be shifted

from property taxes to the state's broad-based tax system.

Because the initiative requires the state to pay for 100% of the special education mandate as part of the 55% obligation, \$95 million of the \$206.4 million relief package would be distributed to the school systems as direct special education cost reimbursement, and the remaining \$111.4 million would be added to the GPA distribution.

For FY 05, the first year of implementing the citizen-initiated reform if it is adopted by the voters in November, the increased state support for schools over current projections would be \$278.5 million, \$102.4 million of which would be earmarked to cover the special education mandate and \$176 million would go to additional GPA.

Sources of Revenue for K-12 Education		School Finance & Tax Reform Act of 2003	
	Current Law	FY	
State Share	732,126,121	04	938,502,915
Local Share	974,242,815	04	767,866,021
Total	1,706,368,936	04	1,706,368,936
State Share	725,817,941	05	1,004,318,295
Local Share	1,100,215,323	05	821,714,969
Total	1,826,033,264	05	1,826,033,264

Building a Better Code?

There has been no shortage of bills this session dealing one way or another with the issue of building codes. The Business Research and Economic Development Committee (BRED) has taken action on three bills already and will hear testimony on a fourth next week. One bill, LD 401, *An Act to Require the Plumbers' Examining Board to Adopt the Uniform Plumbing Code* would establish the Uniform Plumbing Code as the statewide plumbing code. LD 688 *An Act to Provide Incentives for Municipalities To Adopt a Building Rehabilitation Code*, provides economic incentives to municipalities which adopt any of the three major rehabilitation codes. Finally, LD 1025 *An Act to Ensure Uniform Code Compliance and Efficient Oversight of Construction in the State*, establishes a State Board that would require all buildings to be inspected for compliance with "applicable local or state building and energy codes."

All three of these bills were recommended to be carried over, but none has been reported out of committee. Further, the BRED Committee has indicated that it would like to hear from an ad hoc working group that is discussing this issue. MMA is participating in that working group.

On Tuesday, April 29, the Committee will hear testimony on LD 1551, *An Act to License Home Building and Improvement Contractors*. This bill was proposed by the Attorney General's Office in response to the high number of complaints it receives each year in this area. The bill has four main provisions: (i) the adoption of the International Residential Code (IRC) as the state building code, (ii) preemption of locally adopted codes to the extent they are 'less stringent' than the IRC, (iii) a requirement that contractors be licensed where the primary licensing condition is demonstrating knowledge of the IRC and (iv) that the state, not municipalities, shall be the enforcer of the statewide code. The MMA's Legislative Policy Committee took a 'neither for nor against' position on this

bill. Support appears to exist for statewide licensing. However, concern was raised about the preemption of local codes that have been developed over a long period of time and are well known. Further, there was skepticism that the state would not be able to enforce the code and that municipalities would end up being the enforcement agent.

The Utilities and Energy Committee also took testimony on several bills that seek energy-efficient or "green" building codes. The bills are:

- LD 540 *Resolve, to Ensure Optimal Energy Efficiency in State-funded Construction*,
- LD 799 *Resolve, To Improve Energy Efficiency in New School Buildings*,
- LD 1157 *An Act To Promote Clean and Efficient Energy*, and,
- LD 1261 *An Act To Support Clean and Efficient Energy for the Future of Maine's Economy and Environment*.

LD 540 directs the Department of Administrative and Financial Services to adopt rules requiring all state buildings and state-funded construction to exceed current energy efficiency standards by at least 30%. A more narrowly focused, LD 799 requires new and renovated state-funded schools exceed current standards by at least 20% and requires more efficiency analysis at the planning stage. This bill places the rulemaking obligation on the Department of Education.

LD 1157, a 'concept' bill, would adopt the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Green Building Rating System as a pseudo-code for both State-funded construction and all new residential construction. LEED is not actually a building code, but instead a scoring system that rates buildings on a number of criteria including energy efficiency, air quality and water savings. To have a building LEED certified would essentially require following a "green" building code. Finally, LD 1261, section 6, has the Energy Resources Council, the Department of Economic and Community Development and the Public Utili-

ties Commission review existing building codes and make recommendations with an eye toward making the codes more stringent for State buildings.

Testimony at the public hearing for these bills was generally supportive, especially from members of the "green" construction community, from architects to materials manufacturers. The supporters quite confidently assured the Committee that cost-effective energy-efficient design and construction is possible now. Cost-effectiveness though was not to be measured only by up-front costs (i.e. construction costs). Instead, cost efficiency results from longer-term operating expense savings in areas such as lower energy bills and increased worker productivity due to healthier work environments.

The Committee met this testimony with a fair amount of curiosity. Many members wanted to know why "green" construction was not more common if its benefits were as certain as the proponents made them seem. Some reasonable answers for this were offered - the builders who pay the construction costs for apartments, commercial office buildings and even public buildings are often not the same parties that pay the long-term operating expenses. Yet almost all of the supporters attributed 'green's' unpopularity to a lack of knowledge in the market. Several Committee members seemed to balk at bills designed to out-smart the market.

Nevertheless, there was interest on the part of the Committee to continue to explore ways to increase energy efficiency in public buildings. Accordingly, the Committee carried over concept-draft LD 1157 until next session in order to have a vehicle if any acceptable ideas were developed. LD 1261, which dealt with much more than just the building code study, was tabled until the work-session on April 28.

The most action came in connection with LDs 540 and 799. LD 799 was recommended 'ought not to pass' so that the Committee could focus its school construction decisions on LD 540. At the hearing, the State Board of Education offered an amended version

(continued on page 6)

HOME RULE (cont'd)

public health, safety and welfare of residents, and may not be "arbitrary or capricious". Although under Title 30-A, Section 3011, shooting ranges that exist prior to the enactment of a local noise ordinance are automatically "grandfathered" from the ordinance, members of the Sportsmen Alliance of Maine (SAM) believe that an expansion of the law is necessary to allow new shooting ranges to be created regardless of a municipal noise ordinance.

Firearms Discharge Ordinances.

The Committee then voted 10 to 2 in favor of an amended version of a second SAM initiated bill. As originally drafted LD 1063, also sponsored by Rep. Dunlap, would have accomplished three goals. First, the bill would have required communities to consult with the Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife (IF&W) throughout the process of adopting or amending a firearm discharge ordinance. Second, the bill would have required municipalities with firearm discharge ordinances to prepare wildlife management plans. Third, the bill would have required municipalities to describe the area in which the discharge of firearms is prohibited by using clearly defined physical boundaries.

Of the three provisions in the bill, municipal officials opposed two on the grounds that those provisions placed vague and inappropriate mandates on municipalities. The first mandate in the bill would have required municipal officials to consult with the IF&W "throughout" the process of developing or amending a firearm discharge ordinance. Municipal officials raised concerns with this provision because it is entirely unclear what it means to consult "throughout a process of consideration". Municipalities do not want to be put in a position of having the enforceability of their ordinances challenged by allegations of failing to adhere to some sort of vague ordinance adoption requirement.

The second mandate in LD 1063 would require municipalities with fire-

arm discharge ordinances to prepare wildlife management plans. The wildlife management plan would have been required in every circumstance where there is a firearm discharge ordinance as though the limitation on the discharge of firearms in every urban or village area creates a wildlife management problem.

Since the bill sponsor and several members of the Committee were concerned with the mandates in the bill, an amendment prepared by SAM director George Smith was presented to the Committee. As amended, the bill eliminates the requirement that a municipality develop a wildlife management plan and clarifies that communities are to consult with the Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife when developing, adopting or amending a firearm discharge ordinance in order to get information and feedback from the Department. The bill also retains the provision in the original bill that would prospectively require municipalities to use clearly defined physical boundaries to describe the area where the discharge of firearms is prohibited.

Citizen Initiatives and Referendum. On Friday the Committee also worked LD 389. Similar to a bill submitted two years ago, LD 389, sponsored by Rep. Edward Suslovic (Portland) would prohibit municipal ordinances or bylaws enacted by citizen initiative or referendum from containing retroactive provisions impacting a land-use development permit that was issued before the enactment of that ordinance or bylaw.

Municipal officials support LD 389 because they believe this change brings a better level of predictability to the land use regulatory system. At times municipalities find it difficult to attract new development into a community when existing land use or zoning ordinances can be changed in such a way as to impact development proposals that have already been approved and financed according to the existing body of local regulation.

Committee members in support of the bill argued that without the limitation on citizen initiatives, new busi-

nesses may be reluctant to invest in a community because it is possible for the citizens to overturn the rules upon which a development plan was based and approved.

Committee members opposed to the bill argued that in order to protect the rights of citizens to challenge the decisions of elected municipal officials, the bill had to be defeated. Sen. Rotundo, the most vocal opponent of the bill, argued that citizens' access to the referendum process should not be complicated or confused by the use of the limitation being proposed in LD 389, and that the local voters are capable of sorting out good ideas from bad ideas without limiting access to the citizen initiative process. She further questioned why the Committee would want to limit the residents of a community from enacting retroactive policies particularly when municipal officers, under home rule authority, can enact ordinances with retroactive impacts, as can the Legislature.

In the end, Sen. Rotundo's message struck a cord with a majority of the State and Local Government Committee as it voted 7-5 in opposition to LD 389.

BUILDING CODES (cont'd)

of LD 540 which was ultimately recommended as 'ought to pass.' The amended version establishes a target of 20% efficiency for all school buildings, including school construction that is financed entirely with local dollars.

Lastly, the Criminal Justice Committee reviewed LD 529, *An Act To Clearly Define the State Fire Marshal's Power*. This bill directs the State Fire Marshall to adopt a national building code, plumbing code and a fire code. The recommended codes were each from different 'families' (BOCA for the building code, ICC for the plumbing code and NFPA for the fire code). The Committee has reported out its recommendation that LD 529 "ought not to pass."

LEGISLATIVE HEARINGS

Note: You should check your newspapers for Legal Notices as there may be changes in the hearing schedule. Weekly schedules and supplements are available at the Senate Office at the State House and the Legislature's web site at <http://www.state.me.us/legis/senate/Documents/hearing/ANPHFrame.htm>. If you wish to have updates to the Hearing Schedules e-mailed directly to you, sign up on the ANPH homepage listed above. Work Session schedules and hearing updates are available at the Legislative Information page at <http://janus.state.me.us/legis/lio/>.

Monday, April 28

Criminal Justice & Public Safety

Room 211, Cross State Office Building, 1:00 p.m.

Tel: 287-1122

LD 1546 – An Act To Amend Certain Provisions Relating to a Permit To Carry Concealed Firearms To Be Consistent with Changes to the Statute Relating to Possession of Firearms by Prohibited Persons. (Sponsored by Rep. Carr of Lincoln; additional cosponsor)

LD 1573 – An Act To Make Minor Changes to the Required Law Enforcement Policies. (Sponsored by Sen. Strimling of Cumberland County; additional cosponsor)

Labor

Room 220, Cross State Office Building, 1:00 p.m.

Tel: 287-1122

LD 1544 – An Act To Revise the Standards for Reporting Public Sector Workplace Deaths and Serious Injuries. (Sponsored by Sen. Edmonds of Cumberland Cty.; additional cosponsors)

Tuesday, April 29

Business, Research & Economic Development

Room 208, Cross State Office Building, 1:45 p.m.

Tel: 287-1331

LD 1551 – An Act To License Home Building and Improvement Contractors. (Sponsored by Rep. Cowger of Hallowell; additional cosponsors)

LD 1554 – An Act Regarding Eligibility under the Municipal Investment Trust Fund. (Sponsored by Sen. Bromley of Cumberland Cty.; additional cosponsors) (Governor's Bill)

LD 1560 – Resolve, Regarding Legislative Review of Chapter 1: Community Industrial Building Program, a Major Substantive Rule of the Maine Rural Development Authority. (Emergency) (Reported by Rep. Sullivan of Biddeford or the Maine Rural Development Authority pursuant to the Maine Revised Statutes, Title 5, section 8072)

Education & Cultural Affairs

Room 214, Cross State Office Building, 1:00 p.m.

Tel: 287-3125

LD 1344 – An Act To Give Teachers a Greater Voice in School Improvement. (Sponsored by Rep. Norton of Bangor; additional cosponsors)

Legal & Veterans Affairs

Room 436, State House, 1:00 p.m.

Tel: 287-1310

LD 1548 – An Act To Amend the Election Laws. (Sponsored by Rep. Clark of Millinocket; additional cosponsors)

Natural Resources

Room 437, State House, 2:00 p.m.

Tel: 287-4149

LD 1547 – An Act To Amend Certain Laws Administered by the Department of Environmental Protection. (Sponsored by Rep. Koffman of Bar Harbor; additional cosponsor)

LD 1549 – An Act To Fund Municipal Collection of Household Hazardous Waste. (Reported by Rep. Koffman of Bar Harbor for the Joint Standing Committee on Natural Resources pursuant to Resolve 2001, chapter 93)

LD 1570 – An Act Concerning Stormwater Management. (Sponsored by Sen. Martin of Aroostook County; additional cosponsor)

Taxation

Room 127, State House, 1:00 p.m.

Tel: 287-1552

LD 1044 – An Act Regarding Taxation inside the Passamaquoddy Indian Territory. (Sponsored by Rep. Moore of the Passamaquoddy Tribe)

LD 1433 – An Act To Establish Municipal Cost Components for Unorganized Territory Services To Be Rendered in Fiscal Year 2003-04. (Emergency) (Reported by Rep. Lemoine of Old Orchard Beach for the Dept. of Audit pursuant to Maine Revised Statutes, Title 36, section 1604)

Transportation

Room 126, State House, 1:00 p.m.

Tel: 287-4148

LD 1565 – An Act To Authorize a Pilot Project To Allow Commercial Vehicles at Canadian Weight Limits Access to the Woodland Commercial Park in Baileyville. (Sponsored by Rep. Usher of Westbrook; additional cosponsors)

Wednesday, April 30

Education & Cultural Affairs

Room 214, Cross State Office Building, 1:30 p.m.

Tel: 287-3125

LD 1577 – An Act To Amend and Improve the Education Laws. (Sponsored by Sen. Douglass of Androscoggin County; additional cosponsors)