

# MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

The following document is provided by the  
**LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DIGITAL LIBRARY**  
at the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library  
<http://legislature.maine.gov/lawlib>



Reproduced from scanned originals with text recognition applied  
(searchable text may contain some errors and/or omissions)

SMY  
12/19/15

L.D. 522

Date: 6/19/15

(Filing No. S-316 )

**APPROPRIATIONS AND FINANCIAL AFFAIRS**

Reproduced and distributed under the direction of the Secretary of the Senate.

**STATE OF MAINE  
SENATE  
127TH LEGISLATURE  
FIRST REGULAR SESSION**

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" to S.P. 191, L.D. 522, Bill, "An Act To Clarify  
a Recently Enacted Law Designed To Expand the Number of Qualified Educators"

Amend the bill by incorporating the attached fiscal note.

**SUMMARY**

This amendment incorporates a fiscal note.



Approved: 06/18/15 *MRC*

# 127th MAINE LEGISLATURE

LD 522

LR 1457(02)

**An Act To Clarify a Recently Enacted Law Designed To Expand the Number of Qualified Educators**

**Fiscal Note for Bill as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-310)**  
**Committee: Appropriations and Financial Affairs**  
**Fiscal Note Required: Yes**

---

## Fiscal Note

No net fiscal impact - Unorganized Territory

### Fiscal Detail and Notes

Allowing certain teachers in the unorganized territory who meet the definition of classroom-based employee pursuant to Title 5, §17959, sub-§1-A, who have reached normal retirement age and who retired after September 1, 2011 to be restored to service as classroom-based employees at 100% of the compensation established for the position to be filled for up to a maximum of 5 years will have no net fiscal impact on the Education in the Unorganized Territory program within the Department of Education or the taxpayers in the unorganized territory.

When limitations on conditions of restoration to service after retirement were enacted in 2011 no costs or savings were budgeted. It was assumed that limiting compensation to 75% would deter some retirees from returning to work and those positions would have to be filled by replacement workers. The State would have to pay health insurance costs and retirement costs for new replacement workers, which would offset the savings from the 25% reduction in compensation for those who would return at the lower pay.