

# 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 electronic originals  
(may include minor formatting differences from printed original)

ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-SECOND LEGISLATURE  
FIRST SPECIAL SESSION  
22nd Legislative Day  
Thursday, May 29, 2025

The Speaker resumed the Chair.  
The House met according to adjournment and was called to order by the Speaker.  
Prayer by Pastor Roland Wortman, Fort Kent Assembly of God.  
National Anthem by Sharon Hood, Pittsfield.  
Pledge of Allegiance.  
Medical Provider of the Day, Patrick Connolly, MD, Falmouth.  
The Journal of yesterday was read and approved.

---

**SENATE PAPERS**

The following Joint Resolution: (S.P. 785)  
**JOINT RESOLUTION RECOGNIZING MAY 18, 2025 AS  
ASIAN AMERICAN AND PACIFIC ISLANDER DAY  
AGAINST BULLYING AND HATE**

WHEREAS, May is Asian American and Pacific Islander Heritage Month; and

WHEREAS, observed annually on May 18th, the birthday of Vincent Chin, who was brutally murdered in a hate crime, Asian American and Pacific Islander Day Against Bullying and Hate provides an opportunity for all Mainers to pursue empathy, promote civility and stand up against bigotry; and

WHEREAS, since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic, there has been a rise in bullying, discrimination and hate crimes against the Asian American and Pacific Islander community; and

WHEREAS, eighty percent of Asian American youth report being bullied, online or in school; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That We, the Members of the One Hundred and Thirty-second Legislature now assembled in the First Special Session, on behalf of the people we represent, take this opportunity to recognize, in memory of Vincent Chin, May 18, 2025 as Asian American and Pacific Islander Day Against Bullying and Hate; and be it further

RESOLVED: That We join all Mainers in denouncing violence, discrimination, bullying and hate in all forms and reaffirm our commitment to ensuring that every Mainer is safe, welcomed and empowered to stand proud in identity.

Came from the Senate, **READ** and **ADOPTED**.  
**READ** and **ADOPTED** in concurrence.

---

**Non-Concurrent Matter**

Bill "An Act to Include Possession of Compounds, Mixtures or Substances Containing a Detectable Amount of Certain Scheduled Drugs to Prove the Offense of Unlawful Trafficking of Scheduled Drugs"

(S.P. 329) (L.D. 771)

**PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED** in the House on May 22, 2025.

Came from the Senate with that Body having **INSISTED** on its former action whereby the Bill **FAILED OF PASSAGE TO BE ENGROSSED** in **NON-CONCURRENCE**.

The House voted to **INSIST**.

---

**Non-Concurrent Matter**

Bill "An Act to Increase the Sales Commission of Retailers Selling Lottery Tickets"

(H.P. 136) (L.D. 213)

Majority (11) **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED** Report of the Committee on **VETERANS AND LEGAL AFFAIRS READ** and **ACCEPTED** and the Bill **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (H-184)** in the House on May 20, 2025.

Came from the Senate with the Minority (2) **OUGHT NOT TO PASS** Report of the Committee on **VETERANS AND LEGAL AFFAIRS READ** and **ACCEPTED** in **NON-CONCURRENCE**.

The House voted to **INSIST**.

---

**Non-Concurrent Matter**

Bill "An Act to Establish Separate Prosecutorial Districts in Downeast Maine"

(S.P. 63) (L.D. 16)

Majority (9) **OUGHT NOT TO PASS** Report of the Committee on **JUDICIARY READ** and **ACCEPTED** in the House on May 22, 2025.

Came from the Senate with that Body having **INSISTED** on its former action whereby the Minority (4) **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED** Report of the Committee on **JUDICIARY** was **READ** and **ACCEPTED** and the Bill **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (S-81)** in **NON-CONCURRENCE**.

The House voted to **INSIST**.

---

**Non-Concurrent Matter**

Resolve, to Direct the Governor's Energy Office to Conduct a Study Regarding the Future of Electric Transmission Infrastructure in the State (EMERGENCY)

(S.P. 84) (L.D. 197)

(C. "A" S-126)

**FAILED** of **FINAL PASSAGE** in the House on May 27, 2025.

Came from the Senate **FINALLY PASSED** in **NON-CONCURRENCE**.

Speaker FECTEAU of Biddeford moved that the House **INSIST**.

Representative FOSTER of Dexter moved that the House **RECEDE AND CONCUR**.

The same Representative **REQUESTED** a roll call on his motion to **RECEDE AND CONCUR**.

More than one-fifth of the members present expressed a desire for a roll call which was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Dexter, Representative Foster.

Representative **FOSTER**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I apologize, I was remiss in not recognizing how the vote was going on this the other day and not asking for Roll Call then and speaking to it, so that everyone understood what this bill actually does.

If you recall, we have a bill in; and actually, the PUC is now putting out requests for proposals; for a Northern Maine transmission line. When this proposal first came about, citizens from the northern end of where this line was proposed to go to the southern end, both in Republican- and Democrat-represented districts; were alarmed to receive letters in their mail showing them where the line was going to traverse and, in fact, some of them; many of them; it was going to go across their

property and would require eminent domain. As a result, there was a great outpouring of citizenry opposed to that entire line, and eventually, without going into a long story about it, the PUC and the power company that had the successful bid withdrew for reasons that the cost went up and so on and so forth.

This bill was put forward by a citizens' group, along with Senator Cyrway, and has support of both Democrats and Republicans that would put together a group to look at; and, again, the Governor's Energy Office was involved with this as well; to put together this group of stakeholders, if you will, to look at the future and how we will handle such projects. There's currently an RFP out of that line; again, the reason for the emergency on this bill; and I would just suggest, if you wish to vote against this bill, please consider how you will answer to your constituents when a line in the future is going through their backyard.

I request that you follow my light and vote to Recede and Concur. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is to Recede and Concur. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

This being an emergency measure, a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a total was taken.

**ROLL CALL NO. 225**

YEA - Adams, Albert, Arata, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Caruso, Cimino, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Cray, Daigle, Dodge, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eder, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Frost, Geiger, Gifford, Greenwood, Griffin, Guerrette, Haggan, Henderson, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Lavigne, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, McIntyre, Mingo, Morris, Nutting, O'Halloran, Olsen, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Pluecker, Poirier, Pomerleau, Quint, Rudnicki, Sachs, Schmearsal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, Walker, Warren, Webb, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S.

NAY - Abdi, Ankeles, Archer, Arford, Beck, Bell, Boyer M, Brennan, Bridgeo, Bunker, Cloutier, Cluchey, Crafts, Crockett, Dhalac, Dill, Eaton, Faircloth, Friedmann, Gattine, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Hepler, Julia, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lee, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Milliken, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, Osher, Pugh, Rana, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Salisbury, Sargent, Sato, Sayre, Shagoury, Sinclair, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

ABSENT - Campbell, Carlow, Chapman, Copeland, DeBrito, Doudera, Farrin, Hall, Kessler, Lance, Lanigan, Runte, Underwood, Woodsome.

Yes, 73; No, 64; Absent, 14; Vacant, 0; Excused, 0.

73 having voted in the affirmative and 64 voted in the negative, with 14 being absent, and accordingly the motion to **RECEDE AND CONCUR FAILED.**

Subsequently, the House voted to **INSIST.**

**COMMUNICATIONS**

The Following Communication: (H.C. 184)

**STATE OF MAINE  
CLERK'S OFFICE**

**2 STATE HOUSE STATION  
AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0002**

May 29, 2025

Honorable Ryan D. Fecteau

Speaker of the House

2 State House Station

Augusta, Maine 04333

Dear Speaker Fecteau:

Pursuant to Joint Rule 310, the following Joint Standing Committees have voted unanimously to report the following bills out "Ought Not to Pass:"

Health and Human Services

L.D. 1001 An Act to Prohibit Medical Providers and Certain Others from Reporting Prescribed Medication-assisted Treatment of Parents to Child Protective Services

L.D. 1442 Resolve, Regarding Personal Care Agency Licensing Rules

L.D. 1509 Resolve, to Maintain Access to Home and Community-based Services for Adults with Intellectual Disabilities, Autism Spectrum Disorder or Brain Injury (EMERGENCY)

Housing and Economic Development

L.D. 1907 An Act to Protect Consumers from Unfair Dynamic Pricing in Grocery Stores

Inland Fisheries and Wildlife

L.D. 1095 An Act to Restrict Removal of Common Loons for Relocation in Maine from Bodies of Water of 500 Acres or Less

L.D. 1692 An Act Regarding Antlerless Deer Permits for Certain Agricultural Landowners (EMERGENCY)

Labor

L.D. 1839 An Act to Strengthen the So-called Maine Hire-a-Vet Program

State and Local Government

L.D. 914 An Act Regarding Employees in the Office of the State Auditor

L.D. 1090 Resolve, to Form a Working Group to Address Vacancies in Municipal Government Management Positions (EMERGENCY)

L.D. 1161 RESOLUTION, Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution of Maine Providing for the Popular Election of the Attorney General

L.D. 1196 Resolve, to Require the Towns of Kittery and York to Develop a Boundary Description

L.D. 1556 Resolve, Regarding Increasing the Number of Kennebec County Commissioners

L.D. 1628 An Act to Allow Municipalities to Regulate Exterior Lights

Taxation

L.D. 1841 An Act to Modify the Process of Selling Tax-acquired Properties

L.D. 1869 An Act to Lower Property Taxes by Allowing a Local Option Sales Tax on Recreational Cannabis Sales

Sincerely,

S/Robert B. Hunt

Clerk of the House

**READ and with accompanying papers ORDERED  
PLACED ON FILE.**

Representative FAULKINGHAM of Winter Harbor moved that the House **RECONSIDER** its action whereby the House voted to **INSIST** on Resolve, to Direct the Governor's Energy Office to Conduct a Study Regarding the Future of Electric Transmission Infrastructure in the State (EMERGENCY)

(S.P. 84) (L.D. 197)  
(C. "A" S-126)

Representative MOONEN of Portland **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **RECONSIDER** the House's action whereby the House voted to **INSIST**.

More than one-fifth of the members present expressed a desire for a roll call which was ordered.

The **SPEAKER**: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is to Reconsider the House's action whereby the House voted to Insist. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

**ROLL CALL NO. 226**

YEA - Adams, Albert, Arata, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Carlow, Caruso, Cimino, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Cray, Daigle, Dill, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eder, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Gifford, Greenwood, Griffin, Guerrette, Haggan, Henderson, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Lavigne, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, McIntyre, Mingo, Montell, Morris, Nutting, Olsen, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Pomerleau, Quint, Rudnicki, Schmersal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, Walker, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S.

NAY - Abdi, Ankeles, Archer, Arford, Beck, Bell, Boyer M, Brennan, Bridgeo, Bunker, Cloutier, Cluchey, Crafts, Crockett, Dhalac, Dodge, Eaton, Faircloth, Farrin, Friedmann, Frost, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Hepler, Julia, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lee, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Milliken, Mitchell, Moonen, Murphy, O'Halloran, Osher, Pluecker, Pugh, Rana, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sato, Sayre, Shagoury, Sinclair, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Warren, Webb, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

ABSENT - Campbell, Chapman, Copeland, DeBrito, Doudera, Hall, Lance, Lanigan, Underwood, Woodsome.

Yes, 68; No, 73; Absent, 10; Vacant, 0; Excused, 0.

68 having voted in the affirmative and 73 voted in the negative, with 10 being absent, and accordingly the motion to **RECONSIDER** the House's action whereby it voted to **INSIST** **FAILED**.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH** with the exception of matters being held.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Fairfield, Representative Rudnicki, who wishes to address the House on the record.

Representative **RUDNICKI**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, it's that time of week again. We're on week number 10 of a Special Session, and I'm still hearing people say 'statutory adjournment.' Well, we've already done that. That's kind of the only thing that will change from statutory adjournment is we get more pay. So, once again, I'm going to ask somebody to tell me what the emergency is that we got called back for. And we're on week 10 and still no official emergency. Thank you.

The Following Communication: (S.C. 490)

**MAINE SENATE  
132ND LEGISLATURE  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

May 28, 2025

Honorable Robert B. Hunt  
Clerk of the House  
2 State House Station  
Augusta, ME 04333

Dear Clerk Hunt:

Please be advised the Senate today insisted to its previous action whereby it accepted the Minority Ought Not to Pass Report from the Committee on State and Local Government on Bill "An Act to Establish the November General Election Day as a State Holiday" (H.P. 17) (L.D. 53) in non-concurrence.

Best Regards,  
S/Darek M. Grant  
Secretary of the Senate

**READ and ORDERED PLACED ON FILE.**

**ORDERS**

On motion of Representative HEPLER of Woolwich, the following Joint Resolution: (H.P. 1329) (Cosponsored by Senator TEPLER of Sagadahoc and Representatives: EATON of Deer Isle, FARRIN of Jefferson, GIFFORD of Lincoln, GOLEK of Harpswell, SIMMONS of Waldoboro, STROUT of Harrington, THORNE of Carmel, Senator: MOORE of Washington)

**JOINT RESOLUTION TO EXPRESS  
THE LEGISLATURE'S OPPOSITION TO  
THE REMOVAL OF NAVIGATIONAL BUOYS**

WHEREAS, on May 8, 2025, the Joint Standing Committee on Marine Resources voted unanimously to send a letter expressing the committee's concern about the proposed removal of dozens of United States Coast Guard navigational buoys along the Maine coast; and

WHEREAS, according to the United States Coast Guard, most if not all buoys would be removed to modernize the system of navigational aids and limit vessel transit risk to an acceptable level at an acceptable cost; and

WHEREAS, buoys are essential tools along Maine's highly irregular coast, where rocky outcroppings are common and tides can be strong, especially in eastern Maine, and are especially critical in areas prone to dense fog, strong currents or hidden hazards; and

WHEREAS, the buoys targeted for removal are used by mariners to navigate their vessels at harbor entrances and around ledges and other hazards; and

WHEREAS, in its letter, the Joint Standing Committee on Marine Resources expressed its strong opposition to the proposed removal of these buoys because of its concern that removing these physical aids will create hazards for the State's fishing communities; and

WHEREAS, most commercial fishermen use physical aids, including the buoys, as well as newer technology, but current electronic navigation charts and charting systems and smartphone navigation apps are not always reliable and, if they were to fail and no alternative navigational tools are available, lives may be put at risk; and

WHEREAS, small boaters, including kayakers and recreational fishermen, do not always have the capacity to purchase these electronic systems and keep up with associated subscriptions and must rely on physical aids by necessity; and

WHEREAS, the people of our State are tied to the ocean through fishing and recreation and the proposal to remove the buoys is shortsighted and even dangerous; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED: That We, the members of the One Hundred and Thirty-second Legislature now assembled in the First Special Session, on behalf of the people we represent, take this opportunity to express its strong opposition to the United States Coast Guard's plan to remove the navigational buoys.

**READ.**

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Deer Isle, Representative Eaton.

Representative **EATON**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today in support of this Joint Resolution and in strong opposition to the proposed removal of navigational buoys along our coast.

This isn't just a policy decision, it's a deeply personal one for many of us who live and work on the water. I represent House District 15, which includes Stonington, Vinalhaven, part of Mount Desert Island and some of the most active lobster ports in Maine. But beyond the numbers, I represent a way of life, a way of life that depends on these buoys. I learned how to navigate on the water from my grandfather and from my father. They didn't have GPS, they had charts, compass headings, local knowledge and buoys. I remember being on the water with my grandfather as a kid, watching him point to the markers and explain exactly what they meant. These buoys weren't just tools; they were teachers, they were safety, they were trust. That's still true today.

Lobstermen in my district have reached out to me concerned and frustrated by this proposal. These buoys are critical. Not only for safety and navigation in fog, storms and darkness, but also for training the next generation. They help us pass down the knowledge that has kept our coastal families safe and afloat for generations. Technology is useful, but it is not infallible. Systems fail, signals drop, batteries die. When that happens, it's the physical aids to navigation; the buoys; that guide you home. Removing them would be a disservice to the very communities and industries that define our coastline. It would undermine safety, tradition and is one of the most practical, acceptable tools we have.

I want to thank my colleagues for supporting this Resolution. While not every name is listed on the document, I want to acknowledge that this effort reflects the voices and concerns of the entire Marine Resources Committee. We may represent different regions and perspectives, but we are united in understanding how this essential system works and that it is a safety, tradition and lifeline for Maine's working waterfront. I urge mariners across the State to share their feedback directly with the Coast Guard. The deadline for public comment is June 13th, and I hope the voices of Maine's coastal communities will be heard loud and clear. These buoys are not relics. They are relevant; they are worth protecting. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Harrington, Representative Strout.

Representative **STROUT**: I guess I'll rise. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. That was a great talk, you know, about the buoys and the importance, and I just wanted to recognize that we do use those as lifelines along the coast. They're needed, they're used for generations. In rural Maine and on the coast, we often don't have service for some of these electronics that work. So, keeping these buoys active and protecting the fishermen that are out there, even those that aren't there commercially, is very important. So, I hope you guys will submit some comments and help support keeping the buoys in the water. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Wells, Representative Foley.

Representative **FOLEY**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish I had known that this Resolution was coming, because I certainly would've signed onto it. Wells Harbor is a very important harbor along the southern Maine coastline. The buoy there has been chosen to be removed, we are fighting that and I will be very happy to send this Resolution along to the Coast Guard with my full support. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from East Machias, Representative Tuell.

Representative **TUELL**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also rise in support of this Resolution and want to compliment the Representative from Woolwich for putting it forward at the suggestion of several Members from on the Committee and from off the Committee, the peanut gallery who sits in the audience on occasion as well.

I think this is an extremely important Resolution to be moving forward for our fishermen, especially; and not solely because of, but especially; in recent months with the number of fishermen who have lost their lives. Granted, the buoys would not have played a difference in several of those instances, but the water is a dangerous place even for folks that know what they're doing out there, and to not have these buoys would not be good and would only increase the risk to people on the water, to friends; our friends and family and constituents. And even as one of my constituents who used to be a Coast Guard member in the '70s and '80s had said, these are essential, and we need to be standing up for our Maine coastline, and I wholeheartedly support the Resolution before us. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Subsequently, the Joint Resolution was **ADOPTED** and sent for concurrence.

---

On motion of Representative LAJOIE of Lewiston, the following House Order: (H.O. 30)

ORDERED, that Representative Victoria W. Doudera of Camden be excused May 6, 7, 13 and 14 for personal reasons.

AND BE IT FURTHER ORDERED, that Representative Marc G. Malon II of Biddeford be excused May 27 for personal reasons.

**READ and PASSED.**

---

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH** with the exception of matters being held.

---

Under suspension of the rules, members were allowed to remove their jackets.

---

**REPORTS OF COMMITTEE**

**Divided Reports**

Majority Report of the Committee on **CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND PUBLIC SAFETY** reporting **Ought Not to Pass** on Bill "An Act to Amend the Laws Governing Bail"

(S.P. 620) (L.D. 1536)

Signed:

Senators:

BEEBE-CENTER of Knox  
CURRY of Waldo

Representatives:

HASENFUS of Readfield  
ABDI of Lewiston  
BUNKER of Farmington  
LAJOIE of Lewiston  
LOOKNER of Portland  
MILLIKEN of Blue Hill

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought to Pass** on same Bill.

Signed:

Senator:

CYRWAY of Kennebec

Representatives:

ARDELL of Monticello  
MCINTYRE of Lowell  
NUTTING of Oakland  
PERKINS of Dover-Foxcroft

Came from the Senate with the Majority **OUGHT NOT TO PASS** Report **READ** and **ACCEPTED**.

**READ.**

Representative HASENFUS of Readfield moved that the House **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report.

Representative NUTTING of Oakland **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report.

More than one-fifth of the members present expressed a desire for a roll call which was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Dover-Foxcroft, Representative Perkins.

Representative **PERKINS**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. LD 1536 would reverse the changes that were made to the Bail Code back in 2021.

So, you might want to ask yourself; self, why would we want to do that? And the answer is pretty simple; is since we have made those changes in the Bail Code, people that are out there, normal citizens who are obeying the law and trying to live a peaceful life, have suffered because of that. We have heard testimony from law enforcement that since these Bail Codes were changed, there are multiple instances where people are going in, getting arrested, being released and then immediately going out and reoffending. It got so bad that at one point; I believe it was about a year and a half ago; the City of Brewer City Council actually released a letter as a Council, a resolution, stating that they were opposed to these changes. We heard one instance where there was one person, a citizen of Maine, that, when they were rearrested the last time, they had 12 existing sets of Bail Codes or bail conditions, because they kept getting arrested, released; arrested, released and arrested, released. And in about half of the instances we heard about in front of our Committee, the people that were going out and reoffending were actually going out and targeting specific victims.

So, even though the original intents of the changing the Bail Code might have been well intentioned, it has a negative impact on the welfare and safety of everyday Mainers who are

just trying to live their life and obey the law, and I ask that we change the Bail Code back to what it was prior to 2021 for the sake of our citizens. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Readfield, Representative Hasenfus.

Representative **HASENFUS**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First, let me speak to the point of somebody being re-arrested. So, under the current Bail Code that, as the Good Representative mentioned, was amended in the 130th, that if that person is out on bail and commits a new offense, that person can be re-arrested and held without bail if the bail commissioner or judge determines that to be so. So, being arrested, re-arrested, released, re-arrested, released, re-arrested, released has nothing to do with the law, because the law allows for that individual to be held on bail if there's a threat to public safety or even if they just simply violate a condition of their previous release.

But I think more importantly, going back to the original change in the 130th, so, that was an 11-2 Report that then passed easily both Chambers of the House, and it provided that an individual who is otherwise eligible to be released on personal recognizance; which 'personal recognizance' is the typical standard of release, which says you don't have to pay any money, but you need to come back for your court appearances; you need to refrain from further criminal conduct and make sure you abide by all of those conditions. So, if that individual who would otherwise be released on personal recognizance cannot afford to pay the \$60 bail commissioner fee, prior to the 130th, they would just sit in county jail, because they couldn't pay that \$60 fee. Subsequent to the 130th, they now will not sit there just because they can't pay that fee. Now, if they're re-arrested because they committed a new crime, that is not applicable, and they can be held on cash bail or because of the mere fact that they violated a condition of their release.

Further, I'd like to point to the testimony from the Criminal Law Advisory Commission; which is a commission made up of prosecutors, defense attorneys; and they give guidance to our Committee on, you know, how to proceed on certain bills. And their testimony was that the Criminal Law Advisory Commission "is opposed to reversing the changes the Legislature made in Public Law 2021, Chapter 397. Members recall that the Bail Code was amended in 2021 after input from multiple stakeholders," and CLAC is "not aware of any adverse consequences being reported by practitioners as a result of these changes. More specifically, considerations such as the health care needs, caretaking responsibility and maintaining employment (which would be eliminated by Section 5) are factors that can relate to an individual's likelihood of abiding with conditions of release, refraining from new criminal conduct and appearing as required, as well as to public safety, and thus are appropriate for consideration when setting bail. Eliminating the language regarding inability to pay the bail commissioner's fee could result in some people remaining in custody. CLAC members also noted that restoring the provisions that defendants are required to report to their counsel as a condition of bail has the potential to create ethical conflicts for defense counsel."

All of these issues were addressed in 2021, those issues were addressed well and going backwards, I do not think is a good direction for this State to move, and with that, I ask that the House follow the Ought Not to Pass motion.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Dover-Foxcroft, Representative Perkins.

Representative **PERKINS**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for allowing me to rise again. Just a slight rebuttal.

We heard from multiple law enforcement agencies and departments that the effect that we're seeing with these people getting released and reoffending is a direct result of that change in legislation back in 2021. And it shouldn't be any surprise; I mean, other states passed those laws and the exact same thing happened. They did in Chicago, it happens; they do it in New York, it happens and it's no surprise that when we do it in Maine, it's going to happen here as well.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to put the rest of the; you know, there seems to be some notion among some people in the State of Maine that every time someone commits a crime or has an interaction with a law enforcement officer, that the first thing we want to do is take them to jail. And that's simply not the case. And I want to speak from my own experience. I used to have a thing I would call a civil solution to a criminal problem. And we would almost always try to do everything we could to keep them out of going to jail, and we only actually try to get them into jail when we specifically wanted conditions on them. And, you know, because of the amount of the population in the jail and the fact that we didn't want to overcrowd the jails, because we understand that these people had real lives, most law enforcement officers actually work to try not to take someone to jail. So, when we're taking someone to jail, they had to do something that we feel that's an actual threat to public safety. And that's the problem we're trying to address, is that these people that should be incarcerated pre-trial are not incarcerated pre-trial as a direct result of the change of law in 2021, and that is what is causing a threat to the public safety to the people of Maine today. So, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is Acceptance of the Majority Ought Not to Pass Report. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

**ROLL CALL NO. 227**

YEA - Abdi, Ankeles, Archer, Arford, Beck, Bell, Boyer M, Brennan, Bridgeo, Bunker, Cloutier, Cluchey, Crafts, Crockett, Dhalac, Dill, Dodge, Eaton, Faircloth, Farrin, Friedmann, Frost, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Hepler, Julia, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lee, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Milliken, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, Osher, Pluecker, Pugh, Rana, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sato, Sayre, Shagoury, Sinclair, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Warren, Webb, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Adams, Albert, Arata, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Campbell, Carlow, Caruso, Cimino, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Cray, Daigle, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eder, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Gifford, Greenwood, Griffin, Guerrette, Haggan, Henderson, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Lavigne, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, McIntyre, Mingo, Morris, Nutting, O'Halloran, Olsen, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Pomerleau, Quint, Rudnicki, Schmearsal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, Walker, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S.

ABSENT - Chapman, Copeland, DeBrito, Doudera, Hall, Lance, Lanigan, Underwood, Woodsome.

Yes, 74; No, 68; Absent, 9; Vacant, 0; Excused, 0.

74 having voted in the affirmative and 68 voted in the negative, with 9 being absent, and accordingly the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report was **ACCEPTED** in concurrence.

Majority Report of the Committee on **EDUCATION AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-154)** on Bill "An Act to Extend the Maximum Time Period for Certain School Construction Bonds"

(S.P. 108) (L.D. 242)

Signed:

Senators:

RAFFERTY of York  
PIERCE of Cumberland

Representatives:

MURPHY of Scarborough  
BRENNAN of Portland  
CARLOW of Buxton  
CROCKETT of Portland  
DODGE of Belfast  
HAGGAN of Hampden  
LYMAN of Livermore Falls  
MITCHELL of Cumberland  
SARGENT of York

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought Not to Pass** on same Bill.

Signed:

Senator:

LIBBY of Cumberland

Representative:

BAGSHAW of Windham

Came from the Senate with the Majority **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED** Report **READ** and **ACCEPTED** and the Bill **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (S-154)**.

**READ.**

On motion of Representative MURPHY of Scarborough, the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report was **ACCEPTED**.

The Bill was **READ ONCE**. **Committee Amendment "A" (S-154)** was **READ** by the Clerk and **ADOPTED**.

Under suspension of the rules the Bill was given its **SECOND READING WITHOUT REFERENCE** to the Committee on **Bills in the Second Reading**.

Under further suspension of the rules the Bill was **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-154)** in concurrence.

Majority Report of the Committee on **EDUCATION AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-155)** on Bill "An Act to Prevent Student Homelessness"

(S.P. 150) (L.D. 384)

Signed:

Senators:

RAFFERTY of York  
PIERCE of Cumberland

Representatives:

MURPHY of Scarborough  
BRENNAN of Portland  
CROCKETT of Portland  
DODGE of Belfast  
MITCHELL of Cumberland  
SARGENT of York

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought Not to Pass** on same Bill.

Signed:

Senator:

LIBBY of Cumberland

Representatives:

BAGSHAW of Windham

CARLOW of Buxton

HAGGAN of Hampden

LYMAN of Livermore Falls

Came from the Senate with the Majority **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED** Report **READ** and **ACCEPTED** and the Bill **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (S-155)**.

**READ.**

Representative MURPHY of Scarborough moved that the House **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report.

Representative LYMAN of Livermore Falls **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report.

More than one-fifth of the members present expressed a desire for a roll call which was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Windham, Representative Bagshaw.

Representative **BAGSHAW**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House. I rise today in opposition to this bill.

The bill proposes \$1.5 million in ongoing annual funding to provide emergency financial assistance of up to \$750 per student to help prevent homelessness. While this intent is noble, the implication raises serious concerns. First, how do we truly prevent homelessness with one-time payment of \$750? If a family is already on the brink, this amount is unlikely to provide lasting stability. We're offering a temporary fix to a systematic problem without addressing the root causes.

Second, the criteria and oversight are vague. The Department of Education would empower liaisons to identify at-risk students, but the bill lacks clear measurable standards for how these determinations are made. This creates a potential for inconsistent application and misuse of funds, while placing an added burden on already overextended school districts.

Third, this is fiscally irresponsible. With the State resources already strained, we're allocating \$1.5 million annually to a program that lacks sufficient data, definition and accountability. This concern is compounded by the fact that just yesterday, this Body enacted LD 641 and LD 747, both titled An Act to Support Diversion Efforts to Address Homelessness in Maine. LD 641 allocates \$750,000 annually, LD 747 allocates an additional \$2 million annually, all to address homelessness statewide. These commitments are already invest substantial funding in homelessness prevention efforts. Adding LD 384 to the top of those appropriations creates duplication, raises serious questions about coordination and risks inefficient use of taxpayer dollars.

Lastly, one must ask: how will fairness be ensured? Without transparent distribution protocols or clear oversight, we risk helping some, while leaving others behind. For these reasons, I urge you to vote no.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Scarborough, Representative Murphy.

Representative **MURPHY**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is perhaps one of the most impactful bills that the Education Committee heard this session.

The McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act is a federal law that establishes provisions related to the education of homeless youth. McKinney-Vento protections apply to all public school students pre-K to 12th grade who lack a fixed, regular and adequate nighttime residence. Each school district is required to designate an employee in their schools, ensuring that those students have a full and equal opportunity to succeed in school, connecting unhoused students and families with appropriate services. The Act also provides for school stability for students, and students do not have to transfer between school districts.

Lacking a fixed, regular and adequate nighttime residence includes sharing housing due to loss of housing or economic hardship; living in motels, hotels, trailer parks or camping grounds due to lack of alternative housing; living in emergency or transitional housing; students abandoned in hospitals; having a primary nighttime residence that is a public or private place not designated for or ordinarily used as regular sleeping accommodations; living in cars, parks, public spaces, abandoned buildings, substandard housing, bus or train stations or migratory students meeting any of the parts above.

The important thing to know about McKinney-Vento funds, Mr. Speaker, is that these funds are only available once a student is already deemed as homeless. There is no money involved to prevent homelessness. In 2021-2022 school year, there were 2,317 students identified as unhoused. In '22-'23; 3,269. In '23-'24; over 5,000. We don't have the numbers from this school year yet, but we expect the number to exceed the 5,000. A two-year pilot program established in the 131st Legislature was very successful, and the money was used across 149 school administrative units in all 16 counties and helped 844 individual students. Families of these children receive financial support in an effort to keep children in safe, stable and permanent living conditions. Some of the funds were provided to families to help pay rent, utilities, mental health support, other wraparound services. Other allowable expenses are critical home repairs, fixing broken windows, roof repair, floor repair, a working kitchen, plumbing, electrical or other health and safety repairs. It also helps defray the cost of transportation. When a student is displaced from their home district and is temporarily staying in a different district, transportation becomes the responsibility of the family and/or the district, and so, these funds help defray that cost and can be quite extraordinary depending on the distance that the student is having; in the far away from their home district. There are also extraordinary or emergency assistances provided to enable students to fully participate in school activities which otherwise they would be unavailable to them.

This legislation makes the fund permanent to provide resources for families in need up to \$750 per student. It's not a lot of money, but it oftentimes, when we've reached a crisis situation in these families, \$750 does make the difference between being evicted or having your utility shut off. It also pays for hotel stays beyond the two nights that schools can already provide. These funds would be continued to be used by schools to provide resources to support students when their family is experiencing a serious crisis situation caused by housing instability. This is one way to prevent student homelessness and to ensure that all students have the opportunity to succeed. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Raymond, Representative Olsen.

Representative **OLSEN**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I may be off on my math, but if I take 5,000 students times \$750, that's \$3.75 million, not \$1.5 million.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is Acceptance of the Majority Ought to Pass as Amended Report. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

**ROLL CALL NO. 228**

YEA - Abdi, Ankeles, Archer, Arford, Beck, Bell, Boyer M, Brennan, Bridgeo, Bunker, Cloutier, Cluchey, Crafts, Cray, Crockett, DeBrito, Dhalac, Dill, Dodge, Eaton, Eder, Faircloth, Farrin, Foley, Friedmann, Frost, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Hepler, Jackson, Julia, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lee, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Milliken, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, O'Halloran, Osher, Pluecker, Pugh, Rana, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sato, Sayre, Shagoury, Simmons, Sinclair, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Warren, Webb, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Adams, Albert, Arata, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Campbell, Carlow, Caruso, Cimino, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Daigle, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Gifford, Greenwood, Griffin, Guerrette, Haggan, Henderson, Hymes, Javner, Lavigne, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, McIntyre, Mingo, Morris, Nutting, Olsen, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Pomerleau, Quint, Rudnicki, Schmursal-Burgess, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, Walker, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S.

ABSENT - Chapman, Copeland, Doudera, Hall, Lance, Lanigan, Underwood, Woodsome.

Yes, 81; No, 62; Absent, 8; Vacant, 0; Excused, 0.

81 having voted in the affirmative and 62 voted in the negative, with 8 being absent, and accordingly the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report was **ACCEPTED**.

The Bill was **READ ONCE**. **Committee Amendment "A" (S-155)** was **READ** by the Clerk and **ADOPTED**.

Under suspension of the rules the Bill was given its **SECOND READING WITHOUT REFERENCE** to the Committee on **Bills in the Second Reading**.

Under further suspension of the rules the Bill was **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-155)** in concurrence.

Majority Report of the Committee on **ENERGY, UTILITIES AND TECHNOLOGY** reporting **Ought Not to Pass** on Bill "An Act to Provide Funds to Reduce the Debt of the Vassalboro Sanitary District"

(S.P. 364) (L.D. 832)

Signed:

Senators:

LAWRENCE of York  
GROHOSKI of Hancock

Representatives:

SACHS of Freeport  
GEIGER of Rockland  
KESSLER of South Portland  
MCINTYRE of Lowell  
PAUL of Winterport  
RUNTE of York  
WARREN of Scarborough  
WEBB of Durham

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-156)** on same Bill.

Signed:

Senator:

HARRINGTON of York

Representatives:

FOSTER of Dexter

WADSWORTH of Hiram

Came from the Senate with the Majority **OUGHT NOT TO PASS** Report **READ** and **ACCEPTED**.

**READ.**

Representative SACHS of Freeport moved that the House **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report.

Representative FOSTER of Dexter **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report.

More than one-fifth of the members present expressed a desire for a roll call which was ordered.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is Acceptance of the Majority Ought Not to Pass Report. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

**ROLL CALL NO. 229**

YEA - Abdi, Adams, Albert, Ankeles, Archer, Ardell, Arford, Babin, Bagshaw, Beck, Bell, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Boyer M, Brennan, Bridgeo, Bunker, Campbell, Carlow, Cimino, Cloutier, Cluchey, Collamore, Crafts, Cray, Crockett, Daigle, DeBrito, Dhalac, Dill, Dodge, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eaton, Faircloth, Farrin, Faulkingham, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Friedmann, Frost, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Gifford, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Greenwood, Griffin, Guerrette, Hall, Hasenfus, Henderson, Hepler, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Julia, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lavigne, Lee, Lemelin, Libby, Lookner, Lyman, Macias, Malon, Mason, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, McIntyre, Meyer, Milliken, Mingo, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Morris, Murphy, Nutting, O'Halloran, Olsen, Osher, Parry, Paul, Pluecker, Poirier, Pomerleau, Pugh, Quint, Rana, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sato, Sayre, Schmursal-Burgess, Shagoury, Simmons, Sinclair, Skold, Soboleski, Stover, Strout, Supica, Swallow, Terry, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, Walker, Warren, Webb, White R, Wood P, Wood S, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Arata, Caruso, Collins, Cooper, Eder, Flynn, Haggan, Rudnicki, Smith.

ABSENT - Chapman, Copeland, Doudera, Lance, Lanigan, Perkins, Underwood, White J, Woodsome.

Yes, 133; No, 9; Absent, 9; Vacant, 0; Excused, 0.

133 having voted in the affirmative and 9 voted in the negative, with 9 being absent, and accordingly the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report was **ACCEPTED** in concurrence.

Majority Report of the Committee on **ENERGY, UTILITIES AND TECHNOLOGY** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-157)** on Resolve, to Establish the Commission to Ensure a Just and Equitable Energy Transition for Maine's Workforce

(S.P. 576) (L.D. 1420)

Signed:

Senators:

LAWRENCE of York  
GROHOSKI of Hancock  
HARRINGTON of York

Representatives:

SACHS of Freeport  
GEIGER of Rockland  
KESSLER of South Portland  
MCINTYRE of Lowell  
RUNTE of York  
WARREN of Scarborough  
WEBB of Durham

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought Not to Pass** on same Resolve.

Signed:

Representatives:

FOSTER of Dexter  
PAUL of Winterport  
WADSWORTH of Hiram

Came from the Senate with the Majority **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED** Report **READ** and **ACCEPTED** and the Resolve **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (S-157)**.

**READ.**

Representative SACHS of Freeport moved that the House **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report.

Representative FOSTER of Dexter **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report.

More than one-fifth of the members present expressed a desire for a roll call which was ordered.

The **SPEAKER**: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is Acceptance of the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

**ROLL CALL NO. 230**

**YEA** - Abdi, Ankeles, Archer, Arford, Beck, Bell, Boyer M, Brennan, Bridgeo, Bunker, Cloutier, Cluchey, Crafts, Crockett, DeBrito, Dhalac, Dill, Dodge, Eaton, Faircloth, Farrin, Friedmann, Frost, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Hepler, Julia, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lee, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Milliken, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, O'Halloran, Osher, Pluecker, Pugh, Rana, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sato, Sayre, Shagoury, Sinclair, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Warren, Webb, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

**NAY** - Adams, Albert, Arata, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Campbell, Carlow, Caruso, Cimino, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Cray, Daigle, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eder, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Gifford, Greenwood, Griffin, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Lavigne, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, McIntyre, Mingo, Morris, Nutting, Olsen, Parry, Paul, Poirier, Pomerleau, Quint, Rudnicki, Schmursal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith, Soboleski, Strout,

Swallow, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, Walker, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S.

**ABSENT** - Chapman, Copeland, Doudera, Lance, Lanigan, Perkins, Underwood, Woodsome.

Yes, 76; No, 67; Absent, 8; Vacant, 0; Excused, 0.

76 having voted in the affirmative and 67 voted in the negative, with 8 being absent, and accordingly the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report was **ACCEPTED**.

The Resolve was **READ ONCE**. **Committee Amendment "A" (S-157)** was **READ** by the Clerk and **ADOPTED**.

Under suspension of the rules the Resolve was given its **SECOND READING WITHOUT REFERENCE** to the Committee on **Bills in the Second Reading**.

Under further suspension of the rules the Resolve was **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-157)** in concurrence.

---

Majority Report of the Committee on **ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES** reporting **Ought Not to Pass** on Bill "An Act to Facilitate the Consolidation of the Department of Environmental Protection and the Maine Land Use Planning Commission into a Single Combined Entity"

(S.P. 149) (L.D. 383)

Signed:

Senators:

TEPLER of Sagadahoc  
BRENNER of Cumberland

Representatives:

DOUDERA of Camden  
ANKELES of Brunswick  
BELL of Yarmouth  
BRIDGEO of Augusta  
CAMPBELL of Orrington  
OSHER of Orono  
RIELLY of Westbrook  
SCHMERSAL-BURGESS of Mexico  
SOBOLESKI of Phillips  
WOODSOME of Waterboro

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-170)** on same Bill.

Signed:

Senator:

MARTIN of Oxford

Came from the Senate with the Majority **OUGHT NOT TO PASS** Report **READ** and **ACCEPTED**.

**READ.**

On motion of Representative GRAMLICH of Old Orchard Beach, the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report was **ACCEPTED** in concurrence.

Majority Report of the Committee on **ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES** reporting **Ought Not to Pass** on Bill "An Act Regarding Compensation Fees and Related Conservation Efforts for Solar and Wind Energy Development and High-impact Electric Transmission Lines Under the Site Location of Development Laws"

(S.P. 599) (L.D. 1458)

Signed:

Senators:

TEPLER of Sagadahoc  
BRENNER of Cumberland

Representatives:

GRAMLICH of Old Orchard Beach  
ANKELES of Brunswick  
BELL of Yarmouth  
BRIDGEO of Augusta  
OSHER of Orono  
RIELLY of Westbrook

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-171)** on same Bill.

Signed:

Senator:

MARTIN of Oxford

Representatives:

CAMPBELL of Orrington  
SCHMERSAL-BURGESS of Mexico  
WOODSOME of Waterboro

Came from the Senate with the Majority **OUGHT NOT TO PASS** Report **READ** and **ACCEPTED**.

**READ.**

On motion of Representative GRAMLICH of Old Orchard Beach, the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report was **ACCEPTED** in concurrence.

Majority Report of the Committee on **TAXATION** reporting **Ought Not to Pass** on Bill "An Act to Eliminate the Tobacco Products Tax on Certain Products That Contain Nicotine"

(S.P. 128) (L.D. 278)

Signed:

Senators:

GROHOSKI of Hancock  
TIPPING of Penobscot

Representatives:

CLOUTIER of Lewiston  
CROCKETT of Portland  
FRIEDMANN of Bar Harbor  
MATLACK of St. George  
SAYRE of Kennebunk

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-136)** on same Bill.

Signed:

Senator:

BICKFORD of Androscoggin

Representatives:

QUINT of Hodgdon  
RUDNICKI of Fairfield  
SWALLOW of Houlton  
WHITE of Ellsworth

Came from the Senate with the Majority **OUGHT NOT TO PASS** Report **READ** and **ACCEPTED**.

**READ.**

On motion of Representative CLOUTIER of Lewiston, the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report was **ACCEPTED** in concurrence.

Majority Report of the Committee on **TRANSPORTATION** reporting **Ought Not to Pass** on Bill "An Act to Codify the Maine Turnpike Authority's Contributions to the Highway Fund with Regard to the Sensible Transportation Policy Act"

(S.P. 522) (L.D. 1292)

Signed:

Senators:

NANGLE of Cumberland  
FARRIN of Somerset  
PIERCE of Cumberland

Representatives:

CRAFTS of Newcastle  
ALBERT of Madawaska  
ANKELES of Brunswick  
BISHOP of Bucksport  
EATON of Deer Isle  
MASON of Lisbon  
PARRY of Arundel  
RAY of Lincolnville  
WHITE of Guilford

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-165)** on same Bill.

Signed:

Representative:

MONTELL of Gardiner

Came from the Senate with the Majority **OUGHT NOT TO PASS** Report **READ** and **ACCEPTED**.

**READ.**

Representative CRAFTS of Newcastle moved that the House **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report.

Representative LOOKNER of Portland **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report.

More than one-fifth of the members present expressed a desire for a roll call which was ordered.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Portland, Representative Lookner.

Representative **LOOKNER**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand here before you in strong support of LD 1292; a bill that seeks to correct a glaring inequity in how we fund Maine's transportation system; and in opposition to the pending motion.

Most people here, I think, are under the illusion that the tolls that we pay on a daily basis to the Maine Turnpike Authority are shared with the entire State. Unfortunately, that's not exactly how it works, and that's what this bill seeks to remedy. The Department of Transportation has testified that the current arrangement with the Maine Turnpike Authority is, quote, "working well." And why wouldn't they say that? The MTA is sitting on what amounts to basically \$40 million a year in pure profit; money that could be used to fix our roads, bridges and transit system, but instead stays locked away in Turnpike reserves.

Let's be clear, the Maine Turnpike Authority is not a private corporation, it's a State-owned monopoly that exists to serve the people of Maine, yet it operates like a business, hoarding its profits while the rest of our State transportation system crumbles. The highway fund is \$150 million short; towns are

drowning under \$300 million in local road costs. Meanwhile, the MTA is planning another round of unnecessary expansions; widening the Turnpike to six lanes in Falmouth, where there's no congestion; while critical projects like the Machias Dike Bridge and the North Windham safety improvements go underfunded. Let's not forget about the floundering Gorham Connection Project. The MTA seems to be grasping randomly for projects to throw money at and swaths of Maine to pave. Instead of investing in smarter transportation options for the future of our State, we seem to be stuck in a 1950s mentality. The MTA claims it already contributes five percent of its revenue to the Highway Fund, but here's the catch: that money doesn't exactly go to the Highway Fund, it stays within MTA's own projects, projects they choose, not the ones that Maine needs most.

And let's talk about fairness. Right now, if you're driving from Portland, from Sebago or Poland or Lewiston, you pay a toll. But if you're coming from Falmouth or Cumberland or Yarmouth, some of the wealthiest towns in the State, you pay nothing. That's not just unfair, it's outdated policy that benefits a privileged few. The MTA will argue that toll payers shouldn't fund non-Turnpike projects, but nearly half of the Turnpike revenue comes from out-of-state drivers. Why wouldn't they help maintain the roads they use beyond the Turnpike? This bill is about balance. It's about saying if the MTA is going to make \$40 million a year in profit, it's time they shared that bounty with the rest of Maine.

The Department of Transportation may say the system is working, but it's only working for the MTA. It's not working for the rural towns struggling to fix potholes, it's not working for commuters stuck in traffic on underfunded roads and it's certainly not working for taxpayers who are footing the bill for MTA's unchecked spending. LD 1292 seeks to fix that. It ensures real cash transfers to the Highway Fund, money that can be used for urgent repairs, safety improvements and projects that actually align with the Sensible Transportation Policy Act.

I urge my colleagues to stand for fairness, fiscal responsibility and a transportation system that works for all of Maine, not just the Turnpike Authority. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Please follow my light.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Newcastle, Representative Crafts.

Representative **CRAFTS**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate my Good Colleague from Portland's remarks about the importance of our investment in transportation in the State of Maine. I want to clarify a couple of things.

One, this Body and the Joint Standing Committee on Transportation and in fact legislated the Gorham Connector as an initiative that we put forward back in 2017, that project has now shifted back to the Department of Transportation for reassessment. This bill intends to form a working group to integrate the Maine Turnpike Authority into the Department of Transportation. The Maine Turnpike Authority has existed since 1941, beginning service in 1947 and stretches 109 miles northward in the State.

The Good Representative from Portland mentioned out-of-state toll payers, which is in fact true, but to fund the rest of our State roads, as many in this Body understand, folks contribute via the gas tax. There are significant looming budgetary issues for our Department of Transportation in maintaining Maine's infrastructure, including both roads, bridges, highways and multimodal transportation looking ahead. The \$40 million he references in quote-unquote 'profit' is, in fact, capital reinvestment that maintains the Turnpike Authority, as it's a

quasi-governmental agency that manages and funds itself. This bill would undo the five-percent sharing that currently exists in Statute between the Department of Transportation and, as the Representative from Portland mentioned, the Department of Transportation is not currently interested in making a change to that, as it's sufficient in sharing some of the toll revenue that comes in.

Thank you, and I encourage the Body to follow my light.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Brunswick, Representative Ankeles.

Representative **ANKELES**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to stand and echo what my colleague from Newcastle said, but also just to defend the bipartisan work of the Transportation Committee that we've done with respect to the Maine Turnpike Authority.

One thing that's really important is that the Turnpike Authority was present for some hearings on bills that were critical to the transportation funding discussion that they did not have to be at, and that was able to facilitate some conversations around that five percent and around some of our discomfort with the geographic locations of where this five percent revenue sharing is taking place in terms of projects. And I think the new director, Director Briere, signaled an openness to increase the five percent to something bigger in the future and to also broaden the geographic scope of the projects and move away from this idea that the projects that the MTA assists with have to necessarily physically connect to something that the DOT already works on.

So, I think we are actually making progress with a culture change here, and rather than go forward with this pretty drastic step, I think we should stick with what we have now and continue to make the progress that I think we're beginning to make in the Transportation Committee on this issue. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is Acceptance of the Majority Ought Not to Pass Report. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

**ROLL CALL NO. 231**

YEA - Adams, Albert, Ankeles, Arata, Archer, Ardell, Arford, Babin, Bagshaw, Beck, Bell, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Boyer M, Brennan, Bunker, Campbell, Carlow, Caruso, Cimino, Cloutier, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Crafts, Cray, Crockett, Daigle, DeBrito, Dhalac, Dill, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eaton, Eder, Faircloth, Farrin, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Gattine, Gere, Gifford, Graham, Greenwood, Griffin, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Hasenfus, Henderson, Hepler, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lavigne, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Malon, Mason, Mastraccio, McIntyre, Meyer, Mingo, Mitchell, Morris, Murphy, Nutting, O'Halloran, Olsen, Osher, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Pluecker, Poirier, Pomerleau, Quint, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Rollins, Rudnicki, Runte, Salisbury, Sargent, Sayre, Schmersal-Burgess, Shagoury, Simmons, Sinclair, Smith, Soboleski, Stover, Strout, Swallow, Terry, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, Walker, Webb, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Abdi, Bridgeo, Cluchey, Dodge, Friedmann, Frost, Geiger, Golek, Gramlich, Julia, Lee, Lookner, Macias, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Milliken, Montell, Moonen, Pugh, Rana, Roeder, Sachs, Sato, Skold, Supica, Warren.

ABSENT - Chapman, Copeland, Doudera, Lance, Lanigan, Underwood, Woodsome.

Yes, 117; No, 27; Absent, 7; Vacant, 0; Excused, 0.

117 having voted in the affirmative and 27 voted in the negative, with 7 being absent, and accordingly the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report was **ACCEPTED** in concurrence.

Eight Members of the Committee on **CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND PUBLIC SAFETY** report in Report "A" **Ought Not to Pass** on Bill "An Act to Expand the List of Crimes That Do Not Qualify for Immunity Under Maine's Good Samaritan Laws Concerning Drug-related Medical Assistance"

(S.P. 442) (L.D. 1024)

Signed:  
Senators:

BEEBE-CENTER of Knox  
CURRY of Waldo

Representatives:

HASENFUS of Readfield  
ABDI of Lewiston  
BUNKER of Farmington  
LAJOIE of Lewiston  
LOOKNER of Portland  
MILLIKEN of Blue Hill

Four Members of the same Committee report in Report "B" **Ought to Pass** on same Bill.

Signed:  
Senator:

CYRWAY of Kennebec

Representatives:

ARDELL of Monticello  
MCINTYRE of Lowell  
PERKINS of Dover-Foxcroft

One Member of the same Committee reports in Report "C" **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-172)** on same Bill.

Signed:  
Representative:

NUTTING of Oakland

Came from the Senate with Report "A" **OUGHT NOT TO PASS READ** and **ACCEPTED**.

**READ.**

On motion of Representative HASENFUS of Readfield, Report "A" **Ought Not to Pass** was **ACCEPTED** in concurrence.

Majority Report of the Committee on **AGRICULTURE, CONSERVATION AND FORESTRY** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-327)** on Bill "An Act Regarding the Membership of the Maine Land Use Planning Commission"

(H.P. 556) (L.D. 870)

Signed:  
Senators:

TALBOT ROSS of Cumberland  
INGWERTSEN of York

Representatives:

PLUECKER of Warren  
BUNKER of Farmington  
DILL of Old Town  
FROST of Belgrade  
HEPLER of Woolwich

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought Not to Pass** on same Bill.

Signed:  
Senator:

BLACK of Franklin

Representatives:

COOPER of Windham  
CRAY of Palmyra  
GUERRETTE of Caribou  
JACKSON of Oxford

**READ.**

Representative PLUECKER of Warren moved that the House **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report.

Representative FAULKINGHAM of Winter Harbor **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report.

More than one-fifth of the members present expressed a desire for a roll call which was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Caratunk, Representative Caruso.

Representative **CARUSO**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to respectfully oppose the motion.

This bill would weaken Home Rule in Maine's vast unorganized territories by diluting the voice of residents and businesses that the Land Use Planning Commission is supposed to serve. There are many here and many on the Committee who don't represent the UT, but unorganized townships and plantations lack local municipal government, and they depend on the LUPC. This bill seeks to give a seat at the table and a vote to special interests from away to determine local planning and zoning decisions.

My husband and I have made a career out of helping people from away to love Maine's beautiful natural resources and remote places. I understand that Maine's unorganized, privately owned landscape is of statewide value and interest. But as a Representative for many plantations and unorganized townships, I fundamentally disagree with the premise of this bill; that rural communities lack the passion, vision and expertise to best guide decisions which effectively plan for their future.

To be frank, this bill is causing a problem where there wasn't one to begin with. It expands the size and scope of the LUPC without cause and without identifying or articulating any problems with the current LUPC process or structure. There is no lack of skills or knowledge nor any issues with the status quo. This Amendment was presented by a special interest group. It increases the size of the Commission to accommodate for two additional appointments, one of which is an at-large appointee that no longer must reside, work or be a former resident of the Commission's jurisdiction, but simply has scientific or technical background; a.k.a. a special interest group or lobbyist. In other words, the person is not directly impacted by the voting decisions of the Commission. Imagine your town being required to reserve positions in your Town Council by experts from away to have a seat at your table and a vote on decisions that directly impact the economic and environmental health of your local community, but not theirs. Remember, these experts can still participate in the public process. They can provide expert testimony; they can consult LUPC staff and the Commissioners. But lobbyists and technical voices from away don't represent unorganized territory constituents and shouldn't be voting on the laws that dictate vast amounts of land in our State.

We don't need to expand the Land Use Planning Commission and dilute the voices or the vote of UT residents and businesses. I believe it's just wrong. As lawmakers, we get it. Many of us lack certain training and backgrounds in the issues that we decide, but we put a lot of work into listening to experts who testify during public hearings and work sessions before we arrive at our decisions. The LUPC operates the same. The DEP provides guidance, the public input is guiding them and the staff has background knowledge that is critical to the Commission's mission. The bottom line is that local decisions are best made by those who call the UT home. This bill would dilute the unorganized territory voices on the LUPC and would essentially disenfranchise and marginalize Maine's most rural constituents.

For these reasons, I request and urge this Body to vote Ought Not to Pass.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Warren, Representative Pluecker.

Representative **PLUECKER**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To be clear, this bill expands the LUPC to 11 members. Eight of those are still appointed by the eight counties with the most acreage in the unorganized territories. They still have the large majority vote on that committee.

This Committee also adds a tribal representative to the LUPC based on joint recommendation of the federally recognized nations, tribes and bands of the State. The Wabanaki Alliance supports LD 870, which will help ensure that perspectives of tribes in Maine are included in those deliberations. I don't think they fall under the idea of 'special interests' or 'folks from away.' It does add the ability for there to be an at-large member of the LUPC jointly appointed by the Senate President and the House Speaker, who must have life or work experience related to the unorganized territories and scientific or technical expertise in critical areas such as forestry, land use and planning.

And to be clear, what we're dealing with is in the LUPC, there's increased development pressure both from residences as well as industry, and Maine's Land Use Planning Commission is the planning and zoning authority for more than half of the State of Maine. The jurisdiction is 10.4 million acres of unorganized territories and includes natural resources of local, statewide, regional, national and even global significance. The North Woods are the largest relatively undeveloped forest in the U.S. east of the Mississippi. The size of the region with its forests, lakes, rivers, wildlife and ecosystems in their natural condition makes it unique. While there are blocks of undeveloped land in southern Maine and throughout the eastern U.S., Maine's North Woods include the largest area with a combination of natural ecosystems, including: alpine, forest, wetland, riparian and river ecosystems. The size of the area is critical for allowing natural processes to continue and help sustainable populations of wildlife to thrive, both which are essential for the long-term conservation of biodiversity, which itself is the key to maintaining all life. Biodiversity within the UT is especially important to its character. In addition to recreational hunting and fishing and the guiding economy, protecting biodiversity is part of the area's natural character. Maine is the only state in the Northeast with a nearly full complement of predators, including weasels, otters, martins, foxes, bobcats, coyotes and lynx, precisely because we have such expansive, relatively unfragmented forest and habitat for them to meet all of their needs. These animals have large home ranges and need even larger spaces to become healthy; enable healthy populations to survive. And this bill ensures the diversity of perspectives from the Commissioners who have direct

experience in unorganized territories and continued strength of the Commission in light of evolving threats to its economic and environmental future. Thank you so much.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Hodgdon, Representative Quint.

Representative **QUINT**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am strongly opposed to this measure. I have a lot of unorganized territories within my district, and I can assure you that the people in these communities already feel disenfranchised by those in other parts of the State making decisions for them and feeling as though their voices aren't heard. This is an encroachment on local control, and I'm absolutely opposed to it. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is Acceptance of the Majority Ought to Pass as Amended Report. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

**ROLL CALL NO. 232**

YEA - Abdi, Ankeles, Archer, Arford, Beck, Bell, Boyer M, Brennan, Bridgeo, Bunker, Cloutier, Cluchey, Crafts, Crockett, DeBrito, Dhalac, Dill, Dodge, Eaton, Faircloth, Farrin, Friedmann, Frost, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Hepler, Julia, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lee, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Milliken, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, O'Halloran, Osher, Pluecker, Pugh, Rana, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sato, Sayre, Shagoury, Sinclair, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Warren, Webb, Yusuf, Zager.

NAY - Adams, Albert, Arata, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Campbell, Carlow, Caruso, Cimino, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Cray, Daigle, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eder, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Gifford, Greenwood, Griffin, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Lavigne, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, McIntyre, Mingo, Morris, Nutting, Olsen, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Pomerleau, Quint, Rudnicki, Schmersal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, Walker, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S, Mr. Speaker.

ABSENT - Chapman, Copeland, Doudera, Lance, Lanigan, Underwood, Woodsome.

Yes, 75; No, 69; Absent, 7; Vacant, 0; Excused, 0.

75 having voted in the affirmative and 69 voted in the negative, with 7 being absent, and accordingly the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended Report was ACCEPTED.**

The Bill was **READ ONCE. Committee Amendment "A" (H-327)** was **READ** by the Clerk and **ADOPTED.**

Under suspension of the rules the Bill was given its **SECOND READING WITHOUT REFERENCE** to the Committee on **Bills in the Second Reading.**

Under further suspension of the rules the Bill was **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-327)** and sent for concurrence.

Majority Report of the Committee on **EDUCATION AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-316)** on Resolve, to Provide Funds to the Maine Indian Education School District to Develop a Wabanaki-centered Curriculum

(H.P. 239) (L.D. 339)

Signed:

Senators:

RAFFERTY of York  
PIERCE of Cumberland

Representatives:

MURPHY of Scarborough  
BRENNAN of Portland  
CROCKETT of Portland  
DODGE of Belfast  
MITCHELL of Cumberland  
SARGENT of York

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought Not to Pass** on same Resolve.

Signed:

Senator:

LIBBY of Cumberland

Representatives:

BAGSHAW of Windham  
CARLOW of Buxton  
HAGGAN of Hampden  
LYMAN of Livermore Falls

**READ.**

Representative MURPHY of Scarborough moved that the House **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report.

Representative SATO of Gorham **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report.

More than one-fifth of the members present expressed a desire for a roll call which was ordered.

The **SPEAKER**: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is Acceptance of the Majority Ought to Pass as Amended Report. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

**ROLL CALL NO. 233**

**YEA** - Albert, Ankeles, Archer, Arford, Bell, Boyer M, Brennan, Bridgeo, Bunker, Cloutier, Crafts, Daigle, Dill, Dodge, Drinkwater, Eaton, Farrin, Frost, Gattine, Gere, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Hepler, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lee, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, Meyer, Mingo, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, O'Halloran, Pluecker, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sayre, Shagoury, Stover, Supica, Terry, Webb, Wood S, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

**NAY** - Abdi, Adams, Arata, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Beck, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Campbell, Carlow, Caruso, Cimino, Cluchey, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Cray, DeBrito, Dhalac, Ducharme, Eder, Faircloth, Faulkingham, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Friedmann, Geiger, Gifford, Golek, Greenwood, Griffin, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Julia, Lavigne, Lemelin, Libby, Lookner, Lyman, Macias, Mason, McCabe, McIntyre, Milliken, Morris, Nutting, Olsen, Osher, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Pomerleau, Pugh, Quint, Rana, Rudnicki, Sato, Schmersal-Burgess, Simmons, Sinclair, Skold, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, Walker, Warren, White J, White R, Wood P.

**ABSENT** - Chapman, Copeland, Crockett, Doudera, Flynn, Lance, Lanigan, Underwood, Woodsome.

Yes, 59; No, 83; Absent, 9; Vacant, 0; Excused, 0.

59 having voted in the affirmative and 83 voted in the negative, with 9 being absent, and accordingly the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report was **NOT ACCEPTED**.

Subsequently, on motion of Representative MURPHY of Scarborough, the Minority **Ought Not to Pass** Report was **ACCEPTED** and sent for concurrence.

Majority Report of the Committee on **EDUCATION AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS** reporting **Ought Not to Pass** on Bill "An Act to Require the Approval of Superintendent Agreements Regarding Transfers of Students Between School Administrative Units"

(H.P. 375) (L.D. 607)

Signed:

Senators:

RAFFERTY of York  
PIERCE of Cumberland

Representatives:

MURPHY of Scarborough  
BRENNAN of Portland  
CARLOW of Buxton  
CROCKETT of Portland  
DODGE of Belfast  
MITCHELL of Cumberland  
SARGENT of York

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought to Pass** on same Bill.

Signed:

Senator:

LIBBY of Cumberland

Representatives:

BAGSHAW of Windham  
HAGGAN of Hampden  
LYMAN of Livermore Falls

**READ.**

Representative MURPHY of Scarborough moved that the House **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report.

Representative LYMAN of Livermore Falls **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report.

More than one-fifth of the members present expressed a desire for a roll call which was ordered.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Livermore Falls, Representative Lyman.

Representative **LYMAN**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I'm speaking on behalf of the sponsor, the Good Representative from Auburn, who has been banned from speaking on behalf of her constituents.

I rise today in strong support of LD 607, because every student in Maine deserves access to the educational environment that best supports their growth, success and well-being, not just the ones they happen to be assigned to by ZIP Code. This bill is about fairness, flexibility and putting students, not bureaucracy, at the center of our education system.

Under current law, school superintendents hold broad authority to approve or deny a student transfer request, and that authority is being applied inconsistently and, too often, arbitrarily, with no requirement to explain why and no obligation to consider what's best for the student. Let's be honest, that's not a system built on fairness; it's built on administrative

convenience. LD 607 offers a simple, student-focused reform. When a student and their family determine that a transfer is clearly in the best interest of a student, the family is willing to provide transportation to the alternate district and the receiving school has physical capacity without hiring additional staff, the transfer should be approved. That's it. No politics, no power games, no red tape standing between a child and the education they need to thrive.

Consider the case of a student who excels in a small class environment, but is assigned to a district where class sizes are double what they can handle. If a neighboring school has space and that smaller environment will help the student succeed, why should a bureaucratic gatekeeper stand in the way? LD 607 ensures that these decisions are made on the merits, not on arbitrary administrative policy.

Opponents of reforms like this often claim that school choice benefits only the privileged, but here's the truth: it's the families with the fewest resources who need this bill the most. Wealthier families already have options. They can move to a different district, pay for private school or hire tutors. Many working class and lower-income families can't. When the local school isn't working for their child, they don't have the means to simply, quote, 'shop around.' LD 607 gives those families a fair chance; a lifeline. It gives their children a fighting shot at success, and it does so without forcing schools to take students they can't support. This bill respects local capacity. It's a balanced, responsible approach to reform.

LD 607 also promotes transparency. Right now, families are left in the dark. They don't know how decisions are made. They don't know why one child's transfer is approved and another's is denied. This bill provides a clear, consistent standard, one that removes the guesswork and restores trust in the process.

Mr. Speaker, LD 607 is reasonable, it is student-focused and it is long overdue. Let's pass this bill and make it clear that in Maine, our public education system exists to serve the best interests of students and families, not bureaucracies. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Scarborough, Representative Murphy.

Representative **MURPHY**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. According to the Department of Education, right now in Maine, there are 4,000 superintendent agreements that have been approved by local districts and are serving students right now. The vast majority of superintendent agreements between two SAUs are approved. There were only 100 transfer appeals denied across the entire State last year.

This bill would eliminate superintendents' ability to deny those requests for any reason, with the exception of space restraints, rather than looking at the student's entire educational picture before determining if a transfer is in the student's best interests. There would also be financial impacts. Some districts would lose students, threatening the viability and stability of smaller, often rural schools. This is also an issue of local control, where the superintendent of a student in that is trying to move to another district would lose all say in whether or not the tax dollars of that community would follow the student to another district. This also eliminates parents' ability to appeal whatsoever. Currently, there are two levels of appeal available to parents: there's a first level of appeal to the Commissioner of Education, and then, if that doesn't satisfy, there is another level of appeal available to families through the Maine State Board of Education. The current law allows SAUs to maintain local control and allows superintendents to act with the best interests

of students and their local districts in mind. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is Acceptance of the Majority Ought Not to Pass Report. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

**ROLL CALL NO. 234**

YEA - Abdi, Ankeles, Archer, Arford, Beck, Bell, Bishop, Boyer M, Brennan, Bridgeo, Bunker, Carlow, Cloutier, Cluchey, Crafts, Crockett, DeBrito, Dhalac, Dill, Dodge, Eaton, Faircloth, Farrin, Friedmann, Frost, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Hepler, Julia, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lee, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Milliken, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, O'Halloran, Osher, Pluecker, Pugh, Rana, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sato, Sayre, Shagoury, Sinclair, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Warren, Webb, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Adams, Albert, Arata, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Blier, Boyer D, Campbell, Caruso, Cimino, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Cray, Daigle, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eder, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Gifford, Greenwood, Griffin, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, McIntyre, Mingo, Morris, Nutting, Olsen, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Pomerleau, Quint, Rudnicki, Schmursal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, Walker, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S.

ABSENT - Chapman, Copeland, Doudera, Lance, Lanigan, Lavigne, Underwood, Woodsome.

Yes, 78; No, 65; Absent, 8; Vacant, 0; Excused, 0.

78 having voted in the affirmative and 65 voted in the negative, with 8 being absent, and accordingly the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report was **ACCEPTED** and sent for concurrence.

---

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH** with the exception of matters being held.

---

Majority Report of the Committee on **EDUCATION AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-309)** on Bill "An Act Regarding Eligibility to Apply for a Department of Education Diploma"

(H.P. 396) (L.D. 628)

Signed:

Senators:

RAFFERTY of York  
LIBBY of Cumberland  
PIERCE of Cumberland

Representatives:

MURPHY of Scarborough  
BRENNAN of Portland  
CROCKETT of Portland  
DODGE of Belfast  
LYMAN of Livermore Falls  
MITCHELL of Cumberland  
SARGENT of York

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought Not to Pass** on same Bill.

Signed:

Representatives:

BAGSHAW of Windham

CARLOW of Buxton

HAGGAN of Hampden

**READ.**

On motion of Representative MURPHY of Scarborough, the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report was **ACCEPTED**.

The Bill was **READ ONCE**. **Committee Amendment "A" (H-309)** was **READ** by the Clerk and **ADOPTED**.

Under suspension of the rules the Bill was given its **SECOND READING WITHOUT REFERENCE** to the Committee on **Bills in the Second Reading**.

Under further suspension of the rules the Bill was **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-309)** and sent for concurrence.

---

Majority Report of the Committee on **EDUCATION AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS** reporting **Ought Not to Pass** on Bill "An Act to Require Parental Permission for Certain Surveys and Questionnaires Administered to Minors in Schools" (H.P. 584) (L.D. 919)

Signed:

Senators:

RAFFERTY of York

PIERCE of Cumberland

Representatives:

MURPHY of Scarborough

BRENNAN of Portland

CROCKETT of Portland

DODGE of Belfast

MITCHELL of Cumberland

SARGENT of York

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-311)** on same Bill.

Signed:

Senator:

LIBBY of Cumberland

Representatives:

BAGSHAW of Windham

CARLOW of Buxton

HAGGAN of Hampden

LYMAN of Livermore Falls

**READ.**

Representative MURPHY of Scarborough moved that the House **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report.

Representative LYMAN of Livermore Falls **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report.

More than one-fifth of the members present expressed a desire for a roll call which was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Livermore Falls, Representative Lyman.

Representative **LYMAN**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. This is my fifth year, I've never said it; I didn't intend to speak; now I am, because I know the words I will share will not impact a change on anyone's vote. I witness this every day I'm in this Chamber. But then I decided that I needed to speak, that my message is for the educators that stand on that line between educator and parenting and for the children and for all the parents.

This bill embraces family and honors parental rights. The responsibility of a child's upbringing lies with their parents or guardians. No other opinion or decision matters more. It's time to protect and embrace the family unit. I know all too well the amazing influence and impact a teacher has on the lives of students. I also know the line between educator and parent is very clear. We need to respect it and always work collaboratively with parents and guardians in order to get the best outcomes for the students we are educating. The public school is not a child's home. Its job is not to parent. This bill puts the decision-making in regards to a child's education and upbringing into the hands of the parents, exactly where it should be.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is Acceptance of the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

**ROLL CALL NO. 235**

YEA - Abdi, Ankeles, Archer, Arford, Beck, Bell, Boyer M, Brennan, Bridgeo, Bunker, Cloutier, Cluchey, Crafts, Crockett, DeBrito, Dhalac, Dill, Dodge, Eaton, Faircloth, Farrin, Friedmann, Frost, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Hepler, Julia, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lee, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Milliken, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, O'Halloran, Osher, Pluecker, Pugh, Rana, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sato, Sayre, Shagoury, Sinclair, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Warren, Webb, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Adams, Albert, Arata, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Campbell, Carlow, Caruso, Cimino, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Cray, Daigle, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eder, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Gifford, Greenwood, Griffin, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, McIntyre, Mingo, Morris, Nutting, Olsen, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Pomerleau, Quint, Rudnicki, Schmersal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, Walker, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S.

ABSENT - Chapman, Copeland, Doudera, Lance, Lanigan, Lavigne, Underwood, Woodsome.

Yes, 76; No, 67; Absent, 8; Vacant, 0; Excused, 0.

76 having voted in the affirmative and 67 voted in the negative, with 8 being absent, and accordingly the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report was **ACCEPTED** and sent for concurrence.

Majority Report of the Committee on **EDUCATION AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-313)** on Bill "An Act to Provide De-escalation and Behavior Intervention Training for School Personnel"

(H.P. 719) (L.D. 1097)

Signed:

Senators:

RAFFERTY of York  
PIERCE of Cumberland

Representatives:

MURPHY of Scarborough  
BRENNAN of Portland  
CROCKETT of Portland  
DODGE of Belfast  
MITCHELL of Cumberland  
SARGENT of York

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought Not to Pass** on same Bill.

Signed:

Senator:

LIBBY of Cumberland

Representatives:

BAGSHAW of Windham  
HAGGAN of Hampden  
LYMAN of Livermore Falls

**READ.**

Representative MURPHY of Scarborough moved that the House **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report.

Representative LYMAN of Livermore Falls **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report.

More than one-fifth of the members present expressed a desire for a roll call which was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Hampden, Representative Haggan.

Representative **HAGGAN**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today in opposition of this motion. While the intent behind providing de-escalation behavioral intervention training is commendable, the bill imposes an unfunded or under-funded mandate on our local school districts.

This should be a local control issue. It should be based on need within the district, not being a mandated thing, especially many of the schools are already providing this training. The bill requires at least four hours of training for every administrator, teacher and ed tech, with a follow-up training every three years and onboarding within 60 days for new hires. These requirements will place a moderate but significant financial and logistical burden on school districts across our State. Furthermore, our own Department of Education already provides de-escalation training through existing partnerships with the Maine Criminal Justice Academy and the Maine School Safety Center. These programs are Maine-specific, trauma-informed and cost-effective. Rather than duplicating or complicating these efforts, we should maybe look upstream at our teacher preparation programs and certification standards to embed the training before teachers even enter the classroom.

Let us strengthen and fund what already exists. Let us support teachers without burdening local taxpayers. For these reasons, I urge a no vote on this bill. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Scarborough, Representative Murphy.

Representative **MURPHY**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Throughout this Session, educators have appeared before the Education Committee on several occasions expressing their deep concerns about the overall well-being of Maine students. We've heard educators speak of the challenging and sometimes dangerous behaviors they face in the classroom, the disruption this causes for the other students and for the school community and the need for the State to prioritize this issue.

Like the Good Representative from Hampden said, this is requiring training for teachers, ed techs and administrators in behavioral de-escalation and positive intervention training. It also requires the Department to maintain a list of suitable programs and vendors, and requires the Department to convene educators in the field for a discussion of best practices. The issue of negative student behaviors and dysregulated students in classrooms is going to require a multi-pronged approach, and this is one of those prongs. Behavior intervention training can avoid future conflicts in schools. In addition, the right training can help reduce and altogether avoid further escalation of challenging behaviors from students.

Ultimately, this bill gets back to what we most want in this State. We want to ensure that our teachers are able to teach and that increased training of educators will produce better outcomes for teachers, staff and students alike. I fully understand that this bill will have a big Fiscal Note and funding is unlikely, but this is a commitment to getting our educators the tools they need to succeed. High-quality de-escalation and behavior intervention training can be one solution for the multi-pronged strategy to address the issues we have repeatedly heard about during this Session from our State's educators. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is Acceptance of the Majority Ought to Pass as Amended Report. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

**ROLL CALL NO. 236**

YEA - Abdi, Ankeles, Arata, Archer, Arford, Beck, Bell, Boyer M, Brennan, Bridgeo, Bunker, Cloutier, Cluchey, Crafts, Crockett, DeBrito, Dhalac, Dill, Dodge, Eaton, Faircloth, Farrin, Friedmann, Frost, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Hepler, Julia, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lee, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Milliken, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, O'Halloran, Osher, Pluecker, Pugh, Rana, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sato, Sayre, Shagoury, Sinclair, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Warren, Webb, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Adams, Albert, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Campbell, Carlow, Caruso, Cimino, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Cray, Daigle, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eder, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Gifford, Greenwood, Griffin, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Lanigan, Lavigne, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, McIntyre, Mingo, Morris, Nutting, Olsen, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Pomerleau, Quint, Rudnicki, Schmursal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, Walker, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S, Woodsome.

ABSENT - Chapman, Copeland, Doudera, Gattine, Lance, Underwood.

Yes, 76; No, 69; Absent, 6; Vacant, 0; Excused, 0.

76 having voted in the affirmative and 69 voted in the negative, with 6 being absent, and accordingly the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended Report was ACCEPTED.**

The Bill was **READ ONCE. Committee Amendment "A" (H-313) was READ** by the Clerk and **ADOPTED.**

Under suspension of the rules the Bill was given its **SECOND READING WITHOUT REFERENCE** to the Committee on **Bills in the Second Reading.**

Under further suspension of the rules the Bill was **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-313)** and sent for concurrence.

---

Majority Report of the Committee on **EDUCATION AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-317)** on Bill "An Act to Ban Cellular Telephones from Public School Classrooms" (H.P. 809) (L.D. 1234)

Signed:

Senators:

RAFFERTY of York  
LIBBY of Cumberland  
PIERCE of Cumberland

Representatives:

MURPHY of Scarborough  
BRENNAN of Portland  
CARLOW of Buxton  
CROCKETT of Portland  
DODGE of Belfast  
LYMAN of Livermore Falls  
MITCHELL of Cumberland  
SARGENT of York

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought Not to Pass** on same Bill.

Signed:

Representatives:

BAGSHAW of Windham  
HAGGAN of Hampden

**READ.**

On motion of Representative MURPHY of Scarborough, the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended Report was ACCEPTED.**

The Bill was **READ ONCE. Committee Amendment "A" (H-317) was READ** by the Clerk and **ADOPTED.**

Under suspension of the rules the Bill was given its **SECOND READING WITHOUT REFERENCE** to the Committee on **Bills in the Second Reading.**

Under further suspension of the rules the Bill was **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-317)** and sent for concurrence.

Majority Report of the Committee on **EDUCATION AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS** reporting **Ought Not to Pass** on Bill "An Act to Ensure In-state Tuition for Postsecondary Students Who Are Registered to Vote in the State and to Amend Eligibility Requirements for the Free Community College Tuition Program" (H.P. 830) (L.D. 1255)

Signed:

Senators:

RAFFERTY of York  
PIERCE of Cumberland

Representatives:

MURPHY of Scarborough  
BRENNAN of Portland  
CROCKETT of Portland  
DODGE of Belfast  
MITCHELL of Cumberland  
SARGENT of York

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-310)** on same Bill.

Signed:

Senator:

LIBBY of Cumberland

Representatives:

BAGSHAW of Windham  
CARLOW of Buxton  
HAGGAN of Hampden  
LYMAN of Livermore Falls

**READ.**

Representative MURPHY of Scarborough moved that the House **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought Not to Pass Report.**

Representative LYMAN of Livermore Falls **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought Not to Pass Report.**

More than one-fifth of the members present expressed a desire for a roll call which was ordered.

The **SPEAKER:** The Chair recognizes the Representative from Fairfield, Representative Rudnicki.

Representative **RUDNICKI:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And just to let you know, there was pizza in the other room and after no lunch yesterday, I think that's where everybody's headed. Just so you know.

This particular bill has; if you look at the Amendment that the Minority put forward; basically strips this bill of everything but one thing, and that's what I want folks to focus on. The one piece in that was a guardrail around the free college. And the only thing it says is you've got to live in Maine for one year before you get free college.

Now, if we're going to be good stewards of taxpayer dollars, that makes sense to me, because it does keep the it keeps out-of-staters from coming in and just taking advantage of our free college that we as taxpayers have been paying our tax dollars for years.

So, I'm just going to read the summary of the bill; of what the Amendment is now, so that you know that; which this was part of the bill, but everything's been stripped except for this. The summary says, "this Amendment, which is the Minority Report of the Committee, reduces a person's residence requirement in the State prior to enrollment in a community college in order to be eligible for free tuition in the Maine Community College System from at least two years;" which is what I originally asked for in the bill; "to at least one year. The Amendment also;" and it removes everything else, so, I'll skip all that.

So, that's the one thing that I wanted to tell you, and I want to remind you that you can't even get in-state tuition at the University of Maine unless you've been here one year. So, why shouldn't we do the same thing for free education for our community college? Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Scarborough, Representative Murphy.

Representative **MURPHY**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We saw testimony from the Maine Community College System in regard to this legislation, and right in their testimony, they said that this is a workforce issue, that every industry in Maine is facing a worker shortage across the spectrum. Between medical, educational, trades, every industry is lacking the sufficient staff to do the work. And so, free college is intentional to encourage young people to move to Maine. Simple as that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Arundel, Representative Parry.

Representative **PARRY**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I guess I have a question, kind of rhetorically. Are we giving free college to every senior in the United States, and the way that, if we don't have some residency, we could literally be paying for every 18-year-old, have them come to Maine on day one and get free college? We don't have enough money to pay for MaineCare. We don't have enough money to pay for our roads. We don't have enough money to pay for a lot of priorities here in Maine for Mainers. Why wouldn't we have at least a one-year residency requirement before we give somebody free education?

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Hodgdon, Representative Quint.

Representative **QUINT**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would sort of piggyback on that question. If we're trying to draw them to Maine, then, for free college, is there any sort of requirement, then, that they have to stay and work in Maine after graduating on the taxpayer expense for at least one year?

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is Acceptance of the Majority Ought Not to Pass Report. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

**ROLL CALL NO. 237**

YEA - Abdi, Ankeles, Archer, Arford, Beck, Bell, Boyer M, Brennan, Bridgeo, Cloutier, Cluchey, Crafts, Crockett, DeBrito, Dhalac, Dodge, Doudera, Eaton, Faircloth, Farrin, Friedmann, Frost, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Hepler, Julia, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lee, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Milliken, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, O'Halloran, Osher, Pluecker, Pugh, Rana, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sato, Sayre, Shagoury, Sinclair, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Warren, Webb, Yusuf, Zager.

NAY - Adams, Albert, Arata, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Bunker, Campbell, Carlow, Caruso, Cimino, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Cray, Daigle, Dill, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eder, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Gifford, Greenwood, Griffin, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Hymes, Jackson, Lanigan, Lavigne, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, McIntyre, Mingo, Morris, Nutting, Olsen, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Pomerleau, Quint, Rudnicki, Schmersal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, Walker, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S, Woodsome, Mr. Speaker.

ABSENT - Chapman, Copeland, Javner, Lance, Underwood.

Yes, 74; No, 72; Absent, 5; Vacant, 0; Excused, 0.  
74 having voted in the affirmative and 72 voted in the negative, with 5 being absent, and accordingly the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report was **ACCEPTED** and sent for concurrence.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH** with the exception of matters being held.

Majority Report of the Committee on **EDUCATION AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS** reporting **Ought Not to Pass** on Bill "An Act to Create Alternative Pathways for Certification or Endorsement of Industrial Arts Teachers"

(H.P. 880) (L.D. 1357)

Signed:

Senators:

RAFFERTY of York  
PIERCE of Cumberland

Representatives:

MURPHY of Scarborough  
BRENNAN of Portland  
CARLOW of Buxton  
CROCKETT of Portland  
DODGE of Belfast  
HAGGAN of Hampden  
LYMAN of Livermore Falls  
MITCHELL of Cumberland  
SARGENT of York

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought to Pass** on same Bill.

Signed:

Senator:

LIBBY of Cumberland

Representative:

BAGSHAW of Windham

**READ.**

On motion of Representative MURPHY of Scarborough, the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report was **ACCEPTED** and sent for concurrence.

Majority Report of the Committee on **EDUCATION AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-312)** on Bill "An Act to Improve Professional Development for Educational Technicians and School Support Staff"

(H.P. 1080) (L.D. 1626)

Signed:

Senators:

RAFFERTY of York  
PIERCE of Cumberland

Representatives:

MURPHY of Scarborough  
BRENNAN of Portland  
CROCKETT of Portland  
DODGE of Belfast  
MITCHELL of Cumberland  
SARGENT of York

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought Not to Pass** on same Bill.

Signed:

Senator:

LIBBY of Cumberland

Representatives:

BAGSHAW of Windham

HAGGAN of Hampden

LYMAN of Livermore Falls

**READ.**

Representative MURPHY of Scarborough moved that the House **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended Report**.

Representative LYMAN of Livermore Falls **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended Report**.

More than one-fifth of the members present expressed a desire for a roll call which was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Livermore Falls, Representative Lyman.

Representative **LYMAN**: Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise in respectful opposition to LD 1626.

While the intent to provide professional development for educational technicians and school support staff is commendable, this bill imposes a significant and unfunded mandate on our local school administration units. The bill requires school districts to offer paid, in-person, annual training on a wide range of topics from emergency procedures and confidentiality policies to individualized education plans. And I really, really want to stress that this is work that has been ongoing in our schools and practitioners have been involved in it for years. Yet the reality is that during the school year startup period, all staff are already fully scheduled for critical mandatory trainings. At the same time, instructional teams are planning curriculum and preparing to meet diverse needs of their students.

There is simply no capacity within current calendars or budgets to accommodate the additional requirements outlined in this bill. Implementing these mandates would necessitate more in-service days, more staff hours and more funding; resources that districts currently lack. Furthermore, provisions involved in IEP briefings must be handled with great care to avoid potential violations of FERPA, the federal law protecting student privacy.

Under the Constitution of Maine, if this bill imposes a State mandate, it must be accompanied by either General Fund appropriation covering at least 90% of the associated local cost, or a mandate preamble approved by two-thirds of both Chambers. If neither occurs, local districts will not be obliged to implement the requirements, undermining the bill's effectiveness from the start.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge a no vote on LD 1626 unless it is fully funded and allows for practical implementation. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Scarborough, Representative Murphy.

Representative **MURPHY**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Support staff play a vital role in every school in Maine. We don't often spend enough time acknowledging the work that they do, often working with some of our most challenging students. Education technicians are the backbone of school systems throughout the State, and the role they play in the schools is integral.

This legislation requires at least six hours of paid professional development for ed techs and other support staff. It also requires a minimum level of training for school support staff, specifically requiring schools to train new hires on emergency procedures, confidentiality policies and reporting obligations. It also requires that ed techs are paid; given paid time to understand the individualized education programs of students with whom they're working. Most districts, as my good friend from Livermore Falls has said, most districts already do this, but the goal is for all districts to be doing this. Support staff are paid by the hour, so, some districts have excluded ed techs from professional development opportunities in an effort to economize.

This is yet another prong in the solution for marked increase in students exhibiting dysregulated behaviors. It gives an opportunity to ed techs to have access to training they need to safely handle these challenging situations. Again, recognizing it's a big Fiscal Note, but showing our commitment to the educational staff in our schools that are often overlooked when it comes to training, and they are doing very difficult work in our schools and working with kids who need the most support, and so, giving them the tools they need to do their job most effectively is a win for everybody. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is Acceptance of the Majority Ought to Pass as Amended Report. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

**ROLL CALL NO. 238**

YEA - Abdi, Ankeles, Archer, Arford, Beck, Bell, Boyer M, Brennan, Bridgeo, Bunker, Cloutier, Cluchey, Crafts, Crockett, DeBrito, Dhalac, Dodge, Doudera, Eaton, Faircloth, Farrin, Friedmann, Frost, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Hepler, Julia, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lee, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Milliken, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, O'Halloran, Osher, Pluecker, Pugh, Rana, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sato, Sayre, Shagoury, Sinclair, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Warren, Webb, Wood P, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Adams, Albert, Arata, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Campbell, Carlow, Caruso, Cimino, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Cray, Daigle, Dill, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eder, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Gifford, Greenwood, Griffin, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Hymes, Jackson, Lanigan, Lavigne, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, McIntyre, Mingo, Morris, Nutting, Olsen, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Pomerleau, Quint, Rudnicki, Schmearsal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, Walker, White J, White R, Wood S, Woodsome.

ABSENT - Chapman, Copeland, Gattine, Javner, Lance, Underwood.

Yes, 76; No, 69; Absent, 6; Vacant, 0; Excused, 0.

76 having voted in the affirmative and 69 voted in the negative, with 6 being absent, and accordingly the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended Report** was **ACCEPTED**.

The Bill was **READ ONCE**. **Committee Amendment "A" (H-312)** was **READ** by the Clerk and **ADOPTED**.

Under suspension of the rules the Bill was given its **SECOND READING WITHOUT REFERENCE** to the Committee on **Bills in the Second Reading**.

Under further suspension of the rules the Bill was **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-312)** and sent for concurrence.

Majority Report of the Committee on **EDUCATION AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-325)** on Bill "An Act to Expand Access to Justice in Rural Maine by Incentivizing Attorneys to Practice in Underserved Areas"

(H.P. 1126) (L.D. 1691)

Signed:

Senators:

RAFFERTY of York  
PIERCE of Cumberland

Representatives:

MURPHY of Scarborough  
BRENNAN of Portland  
CROCKETT of Portland  
DODGE of Belfast  
MITCHELL of Cumberland  
SARGENT of York

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought Not to Pass** on same Bill.

Signed:

Senator:

LIBBY of Cumberland

Representatives:

BAGSHAW of Windham  
CARLOW of Buxton  
HAGGAN of Hampden  
LYMAN of Livermore Falls

**READ.**

On motion of Representative MURPHY of Scarborough, the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report was **ACCEPTED**.

The Bill was **READ ONCE. Committee Amendment "A" (H-325)** was **READ** by the Clerk and **ADOPTED**.

Under suspension of the rules the Bill was given its **SECOND READING WITHOUT REFERENCE** to the Committee on **Bills in the Second Reading**.

Under further suspension of the rules the Bill was **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-325)** and sent for concurrence.

---

Majority Report of the Committee on **EDUCATION AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS** reporting **Ought Not to Pass** on Bill "An Act to Ensure the Rights of Parents of Minor Children in Education"

(H.P. 1252) (L.D. 1881)

Signed:

Senators:

RAFFERTY of York  
PIERCE of Cumberland

Representatives:

MURPHY of Scarborough  
BRENNAN of Portland  
CROCKETT of Portland  
DODGE of Belfast  
MITCHELL of Cumberland  
SARGENT of York

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-315)** on same Bill.

Signed:

Senator:

LIBBY of Cumberland

Representatives:

BAGSHAW of Windham  
CARLOW of Buxton  
HAGGAN of Hampden  
LYMAN of Livermore Falls

**READ.**

Representative MURPHY of Scarborough moved that the House **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report.

Representative LYMAN of Livermore Falls **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report.

More than one-fifth of the members present expressed a desire for a roll call which was ordered.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is Acceptance of the Majority Ought Not to Pass Report. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

**ROLL CALL NO. 239**

YEA - Abdi, Ankeles, Archer, Arford, Beck, Bell, Boyer M, Brennan, Bridgeo, Bunker, Cloutier, Cluchey, Crafts, Crockett, DeBrito, Dhalac, Dill, Dodge, Doudera, Eaton, Faircloth, Farrin, Friedmann, Frost, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Hepler, Julia, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lee, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Milliken, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, O'Halloran, Osher, Pluecker, Pugh, Rana, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sato, Sayre, Shagoury, Sinclair, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Warren, Webb, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Adams, Albert, Arata, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Campbell, Carlow, Caruso, Cimino, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Cray, Daigle, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eder, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Gifford, Greenwood, Griffin, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Jackson, Javner, Lanigan, Lavigne, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, McIntyre, Mingo, Morris, Nutting, Olsen, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Pomerleau, Quint, Rudnicki, Schmersal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S, Woodsome.

ABSENT - Chapman, Copeland, Hymes, Lance, Underwood, Walker.

Yes, 77; No, 68; Absent, 6; Vacant, 0; Excused, 0.

77 having voted in the affirmative and 68 voted in the negative, with 6 being absent, and accordingly the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report was **ACCEPTED** and sent for concurrence.

Majority Report of the Committee on **ENERGY, UTILITIES AND TECHNOLOGY** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-318)** on Bill "An Act to Clarify the Public Utilities Commission's Authority to Establish Time-of-use Pricing for Standard-offer Service"

(H.P. 119) (L.D. 186)

Signed:

Senator:

GROHOSKI of Hancock

Representatives:

SACHS of Freeport

GEIGER of Rockland

RUNTE of York

WARREN of Scarborough

WEBB of Durham

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought Not to Pass** on same Bill.

Signed:

Senator:

HARRINGTON of York

Representatives:

FOSTER of Dexter

MCINTYRE of Lowell

PAUL of Winterport

WADSWORTH of Hiram

**READ.**

Representative SACHS of Freeport moved that the House **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report.

Representative PAUL of Winterport **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report.

More than one-fifth of the members present expressed a desire for a roll call which was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Winterport, Representative Paul.

Representative **PAUL**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Time-of-use rates are already a voluntary option in Maine. What this bill does is open the door for the PUC to be able to establish time-of-use rates as a default option and would force Mainers to opt out of a system that raises cost, limits freedom and doesn't even work.

Let me be clear: this is not modernization; this is a coercive, costly experiment with real consequences for real people. We've seen this proposed model in California. From 2017 to 2022, the California Legislative Analyst's Office reported a 47% increase in residential electric rates with time-of-use pricing. Peak prices shot up to 50 cents per kilowatt-hour, two to three times higher than off peak. Low-income families were hit the hardest, and most households saw no benefit at all, and many paid more. The state spent between \$10 to \$15 million just to re-educate people to do their laundry and cook dinner in the middle of the night. And for what? A 2024 study by Richard McCaan showed time-of-use pricing had little impact on peak demand. And let's not forget, in 2020, California suffered rolling blackouts during a heatwave even with time-of-use in place. And that's the model we are now being asked to follow.

Twenty-eight percent of Maine households are low income, according to the Maine Center for Economic Policy. They can't just shift usage to off peak. A single parent in Waldo County can't wait till 2:00 a.m. to run a dryer. A diner in Rockland can't cook their burgers at midnight. And McCrum's in Aroostook County can't start and stop with the sun. The truth is this: Mainers are already struggling because of policies established in this building. And now we want to add another?

Families are stretched thin, small businesses are fighting to stay open and now, we're going to ask them to fund their own loss of freedom. This is not about saving energy; it is about covering up the failure of an energy policy built on unreliable sources and political slogans. That is not choice; it's manipulation. It is not affordability; it's punishment.

I urge this Body to vote against time-of-use gimmicks, vote against forced behavior modification and vote for common sense and for the people who sent us here. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from York, Representative Runte.

Representative **RUNTE**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I only have about 20 minutes to speak here.

I'm going to emphasize a couple of things. Every single element of the cost of electricity is driven by how much electric demand there happens to be at any point in time. That's how we build our wires, that's how we size how much generation we need; all of those factors come into your bill. There are many ways to deal with how that demand occurs, but one tool is the use of time-of-use rates. Because the reality is, in our region, every five minutes, in thousands of locations, the price is different, and it depends on the hour. The purpose of time-of-use rates is to mitigate that demand that has a direct impact on all of those costs. Thirty-two states already offer some form of it, including four of the six states in New England, and the reason is straightforward: it's about minimizing peak power, the biggest driver of cost.

Now, a lot of the things that you will hear in opposition to this method of designing rates has to do with the rate design. Right now, no one can say, well, all this bill does is it says the PUC; yes, you can go off and, number one, figure out what the best way might be to implement this or decide not to implement it at all. And then, it would be followed by a second adjudicatory proceeding, where the actual terms and conditions of the system would be defined. Issues like opt-in and opt-out, who is affected and who isn't affected, what the time-of-day chunks will be decided. All of that is subject to a whole lot of detailed examination with a huge amount of stakeholders.

Now, one thing I'd also like to note is that if the entire New England system was running on nuclear or oil or gas or whatever else, you'd still want to do this model, because it's demand that's being affected, and it directly affects prices. It has nothing to do with whatever the form of generation is. I urge the Body to pass this as Amended. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Dexter, Representative Foster.

Representative **FOSTER**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I appreciate my good friend from York standing to speak to this. I hope it has the same results as the bill he spoke to yesterday.

I stand opposed to the pending motion, and I long, as anyone who served with me on the Energy Committee for the Maine Climate Council a few years ago, have touted the ability for time-of-use rates to help our citizens. Do your laundry, run the dryer in the middle of the night, whatever it takes to reduce your electric bill. And at that time, I argued that that was a good way to reduce the peak load in lieu of; instead of spending ratepayer money on battery storage.

Now, my concern with this bill at this time is the fact that I believe there is an opportunity here for those who invest in battery storage, some of the larger concerns that have it already or those who use a lot of energy that can manipulate the system to start draining those kilowatt-hours that are available when time-of-use rates would be in effect, whereas the homeowner

who's struggling to pay their bills will then not have that electricity available. Therefore, I ask that you follow my light on this motion.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Freeport, Representative Sachs.

Representative **SACHS**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the pending motion that, as my good friend from Winterport stated, let me be clear: this is an evidence-based initiative that has already had one feasibility study with evidence that here in Maine, by our own Public Utilities Commission, stated could meaningfully reduce overall cost for ratepayers, but needs to engage with additional input and stakeholders in order to properly design it for Maine. Again, this is used in 32 different states, the majority here in New England.

I will also note that the Amendment says it must avoid negative impacts of time-of-use rates on residential customers who rely on life support systems, those who receive assistance from the State due to medical condition or are participants in their lifeline programs, senior citizens or economically vulnerable residential customers.

This is about shifting load, reducing peaks. It's not about, again, type of generation; it's not about battery storage. This is about making sure this is the right solution for Maine, one tool in the toolbox. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is Acceptance of the Majority Ought to Pass as Amended Report. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

**ROLL CALL NO. 240**

YEA - Abdi, Ankeles, Archer, Arford, Beck, Bell, Boyer M, Brennan, Bridgeo, Bunker, Cloutier, Cluchey, Crafts, Crockett, DeBrito, Dhalac, Dill, Dodge, Doudera, Eaton, Faircloth, Farrin, Friedmann, Frost, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfuls, Hepler, Julia, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lee, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Milliken, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, O'Halloran, Osher, Pluecker, Pugh, Rana, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sato, Sayre, Shagoury, Sinclair, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Warren, Webb, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Adams, Albert, Arata, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Carlow, Caruso, Cimino, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Cray, Daigle, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eder, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Gifford, Greenwood, Griffin, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Lanigan, Lavigne, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, McIntyre, Mingo, Morris, Nutting, Olsen, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Pomerleau, Quint, Rudnicki, Schmersal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, Walker, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S, Woodsome.

ABSENT - Campbell, Chapman, Copeland, Lance, Underwood.

Yes, 77; No, 69; Absent, 5; Vacant, 0; Excused, 0.

77 having voted in the affirmative and 69 voted in the negative, with 5 being absent, and accordingly the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended Report was ACCEPTED.**

The Bill was **READ ONCE. Committee Amendment "A" (H-318) was READ** by the Clerk and **ADOPTED.**

Under suspension of the rules the Bill was given its **SECOND READING WITHOUT REFERENCE** to the Committee on **Bills in the Second Reading.**

Under further suspension of the rules the Bill was **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-318)** and sent for concurrence.

Majority Report of the Committee on **ENERGY, UTILITIES AND TECHNOLOGY** reporting **Ought to Pass** on Bill "An Act to Include Qualified Out-of-state Electric Vehicle Providers and Clarify Provisions Regarding Electric Bicycles Under the Electric Vehicle Fund"

(H.P. 833) (L.D. 1258)

Signed:

Senators:

LAWRENCE of York  
GROHOSKI of Hancock

Representatives:

SACHS of Freeport  
GEIGER of Rockland  
KESSLER of South Portland  
RUNTE of York  
WARREN of Scarborough  
WEBB of Durham

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought Not to Pass** on same Bill.

Signed:

Senator:

HARRINGTON of York

Representatives:

FOSTER of Dexter  
MCINTYRE of Lowell  
PAUL of Winterport  
WADSWORTH of Hiram

**READ.**

Representative SACHS of Freeport moved that the House **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought to Pass Report.**

Representative FOSTER of Dexter **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought to Pass Report.**

More than one-fifth of the members present expressed a desire for a roll call which was ordered.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is Acceptance of the Majority Ought to Pass Report. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

**ROLL CALL NO. 241**

YEA - Abdi, Ankeles, Archer, Arford, Beck, Bell, Boyer M, Brennan, Bridgeo, Bunker, Cloutier, Cluchey, Crafts, Crockett, DeBrito, Dhalac, Dill, Dodge, Doudera, Eaton, Faircloth, Farrin, Friedmann, Frost, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Gramlich, Hasenfuls, Hepler, Julia, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lee, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Milliken, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, O'Halloran, Osher, Pluecker, Pugh, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sato, Sayre, Shagoury, Sinclair, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Warren, Webb, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Adams, Albert, Arata, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Carlow, Caruso, Cimino, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Cray, Daigle, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eder, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Gifford, Greenwood, Griffin, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Lanigan, Lavigne, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, McIntyre, Mingo, Morris, Nutting, Olsen, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Pomerleau, Quint,

Rudnicki, Schmersal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, Walker, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S, Woodsome.

ABSENT - Campbell, Chapman, Copeland, Graham, Lance, Rana, Underwood.

Yes, 75; No, 69; Absent, 7; Vacant, 0; Excused, 0.

75 having voted in the affirmative and 69 voted in the negative, with 7 being absent, and accordingly the Majority **Ought to Pass** Report was **ACCEPTED**.

The Bill was **READ ONCE**.

Under suspension of the rules the Bill was given its **SECOND READING WITHOUT REFERENCE** to the Committee on **Bills in the Second Reading**.

Under further suspension of the rules the Bill was **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED** and sent for concurrence.

---

Majority Report of the Committee on **ENERGY, UTILITIES AND TECHNOLOGY** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-321)** on Bill "An Act to Require Utilities to Monitor Meters for Natural Gas Leaks"

(H.P. 965) (L.D. 1473)

Signed:

Senator:

LAWRENCE of York

Representatives:

SACHS of Freeport

GEIGER of Rockland

KESSLER of South Portland

RUNTE of York

WARREN of Scarborough

WEBB of Durham

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought Not to Pass** on same Bill.

Signed:

Senator:

HARRINGTON of York

Representatives:

FOSTER of Dexter

MCINTYRE of Lowell

PAUL of Winterport

WADSWORTH of Hiram

**READ.**

Representative SACHS of Freeport moved that the House **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report.

Representative FOSTER of Dexter **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report.

More than one-fifth of the members present expressed a desire for a roll call which was ordered.

The **SPEAKER**: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is Acceptance of the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

**ROLL CALL NO. 242**

YEA - Abdi, Ankeles, Archer, Arford, Beck, Bell, Boyer M, Brennan, Bridgeo, Bunker, Cloutier, Cluchey, Crafts, Crockett, DeBrito, Dhalac, Dill, Dodge, Doudera, Eaton, Faircloth, Farrin, Friedmann, Frost, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Hepler, Julia, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lee, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Milliken, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, O'Halloran, Osher, Pluecker, Pugh, Rana, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sato, Sayre,

Shagoury, Sinclair, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Warren, Webb, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Adams, Albert, Arata, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Carlow, Caruso, Cimino, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Cray, Daigle, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eder, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Gifford, Greenwood, Griffin, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Lanigan, Lavigne, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, McIntyre, Mingo, Morris, Nutting, Olsen, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Pomerleau, Quint, Rudnicki, Schmersal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, Walker, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S, Woodsome.

ABSENT - Campbell, Chapman, Copeland, Guerrette, Lance, Mitchell, Underwood.

Yes, 76; No, 68; Absent, 7; Vacant, 0; Excused, 0.

76 having voted in the affirmative and 68 voted in the negative, with 7 being absent, and accordingly the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report was **ACCEPTED**.

The Bill was **READ ONCE**. **Committee Amendment "A" (H-321)** was **READ** by the Clerk and **ADOPTED**.

Under suspension of the rules the Bill was given its **SECOND READING WITHOUT REFERENCE** to the Committee on **Bills in the Second Reading**.

Under further suspension of the rules the Bill was **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-321)** and sent for concurrence.

---

Majority Report of the Committee on **INLAND FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-323)** on Bill "An Act to Stabilize and Sustainably Fund the Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife, Fisheries and Hatcheries Division by Increasing the Inland Fishing License Fees and Establishing the Inland Fisheries Conservation and Enhancement Fund"

(H.P. 41) (L.D. 77)

Signed:

Senators:

BALDACCI of Penobscot

CARNEY of Cumberland

Representatives:

ROBERTS of South Berwick

BRIDGEO of Augusta

CLUCHEY of Bowdoinham

DILL of Old Town

TERRY of Gorham

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought Not to Pass** on same Bill.

Signed:

Senator:

GUERIN of Penobscot

Representatives:

MASON of Lisbon

THORNE of Carmel

WOOD of Greene

WOODSOME of Waterboro

**READ.**

Representative ROBERTS of South Berwick moved that the House **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report.

The same Representative **REQUESTED** a roll call on her motion to **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report.

More than one-fifth of the members present expressed a desire for a roll call which was ordered.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair Recognizes the Representative from South Berwick, Representative Roberts.

Representative **ROBERTS**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today in strong support of LD 77, a bill that reflects our shared responsibility to protect Maine's outdoor heritage and ensure the Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife has the resources it needs to do its job.

This bill is the primary funding mechanism for many of the Department's initiatives. It was developed in collaboration with the Sportsmen's Alliance of Maine and has their full support. It's important to note that; unlike most Departments; IF&W receives very few General Fund dollars. Instead, it relies almost entirely on users to fund its work. An expansive amount of time was spent to get this bill where it is today; time to align the goals and results of both the Department and the Sportsmen's Alliance, who reaffirmed their support during the public hearing and in subsequent work sessions. And yet, the Committee vote split along party lines.

Now, I understand we don't always agree, but I'd be remiss not to acknowledge the irony here. When I was appointed Chair of IF&W, I wasn't exactly the obvious pick. As a Democrat from southern York County who had just spent four years chairing the IDEA Committee, some folks weren't quite sure what to make of that, both inside and outside the building. And some were more vocal than others. Yet here I am, defending the very traditions some thought I wouldn't understand or have a vested interest in. I stand here to support the Department, its staff and I stand in support of the Sportsmen's Alliance of Maine. I hope that irony is not lost or taken for granted, because doing this job well doesn't require fitting a stereotype. It requires showing up, doing the work and listening to the people whose livelihoods, identities and communities depend on strong stewardship.

LD 77 updates fees that haven't been touched in over 15 years. That's not overreach; it's overdue. Even with the changes, our fees remain among the lowest in the Northeast. These adjustments are not about generating revenue for its own sake, they're about protecting the foundation of one of Maine's core identities: our connection to the outdoors. We often discuss the importance of funding public services; education, public safety, infrastructure; and we understand that these things require investment. The same logic applies here. If we want to sustain Maine's outdoor traditions, we must ensure the Department tasked with that work has the tools and the funding to do so.

The consequences of inaction are real. Without adequate funding, fish and wildlife populations become harder to enhance and protect. Efforts are stretched thin, making it harder to uphold protections and regulations that keep our resources healthy and accessible. Opportunities for the next generation to engage in hunting, fishing and conservation will begin to disappear, leading to fewer license holders and even less revenue for the Department. LD 77 is not about imposing burdens. It increases fees slightly and more for nonresidents, a reasonable and appropriate adjustment. A five-dollar increase is not a burden to support a robust, user-funded system. It's about protecting that system that supports everything from rural economies to the memories Mainers make in the woods and on the water.

Let me add this: Maine's fisheries are unique not only in the Northeast, but in the country. With our 6,000 lakes and ponds and 32,000 miles of rivers and streams, our waters attract hundreds of thousands of anglers each year, with over 275,000 of them from right here in Maine, Mr. Speaker, as well as across

the country and beyond. Our fisheries contribute approximately \$400 million to Maine's economy. That is support for our small businesses, tackle shops, general stores, guide services, sporting camps, restaurants and more. It's imperative to recognize that many of these businesses are located in rural Maine, where economic opportunities are limited.

Maine is the last true stronghold in the East for wild brook trout, and we have the only remaining populations of landlocked arctic char and sea-run Atlantic salmon. That is not just rare, it's irreplaceable. But their habitats are under pressure. Poor water quality, invasive species and climate stressors are compromising these populations across their historic range. Thankfully, LD 77 offers us a path forward. With the funding from a slight fee increase, the State would be better positioned to prioritize high-quality habitat conservation, restore degraded habitat, reconnect fragmented waterways and support hatchery operations that backstop our native populations. This bill also creates a new Inland Fisheries Conservation and Enhancement Fund. This is a win-win for conservation and recreation.

Mr. Speaker, I've always aimed to work across the aisle in this Chamber, and I'll continue to do so. Good policy comes from collaboration, and I appreciate the thoughtful conversations we've had about this bill in Committee, but our responsibility today is clear. It's about protecting Maine's outdoor economy. It's about ensuring future generations can fish our rivers and hunt our woods. It's about honoring the people who've built their lives and livelihoods around these traditions. It's about backing our values with action. We may not agree on every detail, but I hope we can agree on this: it is time to invest in the long-term success of Maine's fish and wildlife programs. I urge a yes vote on the Majority Ought to Pass Amended Report. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Greene, Representative Wood.

Representative **WOOD**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I've been on IF&W for 11 years, and I've never voted against IF&W's budget. I did this year.

They increased their budget by \$16 million. That is outrageous. I even supported their new building, which I call the Taj Mahal. It is way more than what they need, and I did support it. And they only hired two; their budget's only going to hire two more Game Wardens. We need a lot more Game Wardens out there in the woods to prevent crimes going on out there. I'm a Maine Guide, I'm out in those woods when I'm not here; a lot more times than most of the Game Wardens are, I can tell you that much. And talking to the sportsmen that are out there, IF&W is charging more to register a canoe with a motor on it. It costs you 50 bucks, almost; well, \$40; \$41 to register your canoe or the kayak. Register a small rowboat with a motor on it; \$41. That's a pretty high price to register a small boat. Fishing license, combination hunting/fishing license, costs you, I believe it's \$48, I believe, for a combination hunting/fishing license.

You know, \$16 million; we should be able to take a few less spots for biologists and fix our hatcheries and stuff of that. I mean, there's a lot to be cut in IF&W that we could fix our fish hatcheries with. So, I'd ask you to vote Ought Not to Pass on this one.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Winter Harbor, Representative Faulkingham.

Representative **FAULKINGHAM**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to the pending motion.

We definitely support fish hatcheries, they're essential to protecting our native fish, but as the Good Representative from Greene pointed out, there's been a dramatic increase in the budget of IF&W; a dramatic increase. And Mr. Speaker, I would

say that there is no sector of the society that gives more and receives less than the sporting community. And I'll focus on; this is a long bill title; but our opposition is to the part that says, 'Increasing Inland Fishing Licenses.' We believe that the sporting community pays enough already and that funding for these hatcheries should not come through increased license fees. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Lisbon, Representative Mason.

Representative **MASON**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise today to strongly oppose LD 77, a bill that increases inland fishery license fees.

I understand the intent of this bill to protect and enhance Maine fisheries. It's a goal we all share. However, this fee increase places an unnecessary financial burden on Maine people, especially now, when many are struggling with the rising cost of living. These are challenging times for many families; we should not be adding to that struggle in such a way. We all value Maine's natural resources. We understand their importance. But we must also protect the financial well-being of our constituents. This bill makes it more expensive for Maine families to enjoy a traditional outdoor activity, an activity that should be accessible and all of little financial burden. I believe that the Department could fund this if they wanted to, and I believe they can.

Like Representative Wood said, the Department put forth their budget of almost \$16 million. There are many things in that budget that should not be in there, like a quarter-million-dollar excavator. The one they have now has 5,000 hours on it. And I know a little bit about excavators; I've been in the business for 30-plus years. My excavator, purchased the same year as theirs was, has 9,000 on it. And when I get out of here, it will be going back to work all summer long with little problems, I believe. I am all for the Wardens to have what they need to do their job effectively, safely, but we can't all have shiny new stuff all the time. I believe that budget could be trimmed down, and I believe that we do not have to raise the license fees for Maine families. This can be done within the Department.

I urge you to carefully consider how this bill will affect the people of Maine. We need to find a better way to fund the Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife than placing an additional burden on those who just want to go to their local fishing spots and enjoy the great outdoors in the State of Maine. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Milford, Representative Drinkwater.

Representative **DRINKWATER**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that this is going to pass. And having been a former Member of the Committee, I want to throw out some ideas that I recommended to the Committee that they start thinking outside of the box. Because, as we all know, when you're in government, you get thinking one way, and you can't think outside the box; hence, that's why we bring a perspective as a Committee to the Department.

Just a few years ago, they increased the doe fees. That raised; I don't have the number, but that raised a substantial amount of money. Just last session, we asked for a piece of the gas tax to help fund the Department. That was approved; that was a substantial amount of money. And also, if they wanted to, they could've increased the moose permit application fee, because that's a voluntary thing; if you want to get into the drawing, you pay the fee. They could've raised that instead of going the way they went. One thing I even mentioned to the Chief Executive and the Commissioner is we own a lot of land; the State of Maine owns a lot of land, why aren't we selling the

carbon credits? There are companies that want to purchase carbon credits, so they can feel good about their 'sins.' If they are willing to give us millions of dollars, we should be talking about that and pursuing that.

And the other part, Mr. Speaker, is the State of Maine is part of the Northern Maine Woods, and there's a gate fee every time you go through there. The State of Maine participates with Northern Maine Woods, and they get a percentage of that gate fee. Why isn't that going to the Department? I would have encouraged the Commissioner and the Department to think outside the box. There's plenty of avenues to raise extra revenue. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Sidney, Representative Collins.

Representative **COLLINS**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Recently, I watched a story from an IF&W employee, Josh Pollard, talking about the diversity, equity and inclusion in this Department. My question for the Speaker is, do we know how much money is spent on diversity, equity and inclusion by the Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife? Thank you.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is Acceptance of the Majority Ought to Pass as Amended Report. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

**ROLL CALL NO. 243**

YEA - Abdi, Ankeles, Archer, Arford, Beck, Bell, Boyer M, Brennan, Bridgeo, Bunker, Cloutier, Cluchey, Crafts, Crockett, DeBrito, Dhalac, Dill, Dodge, Doudera, Eaton, Faircloth, Farrin, Friedmann, Frost, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Hepler, Julia, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lee, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Milliken, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, O'Halloran, Osher, Pugh, Rana, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sato, Sayre, Shagoury, Sinclair, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Warren, Webb, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Adams, Albert, Arata, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Campbell, Carlow, Caruso, Cimino, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Cray, Daigle, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eder, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Gifford, Greenwood, Griffin, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Lanigan, Lavigne, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, McIntyre, Mingo, Morris, Nutting, Olsen, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Pomerleau, Quint, Rudnicki, Schmersal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, Walker, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S, Woodsome.

ABSENT - Chapman, Copeland, Lance, Pluecker, Underwood.

Yes, 76; No, 70; Absent, 5; Vacant, 0; Excused, 0.

76 having voted in the affirmative and 70 voted in the negative, with 5 being absent, and accordingly the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended Report was ACCEPTED.**

The Bill was **READ ONCE. Committee Amendment "A" (H-323)** was **READ** by the Clerk and **ADOPTED.**

Under suspension of the rules the Bill was given its **SECOND READING WITHOUT REFERENCE** to the Committee on **Bills in the Second Reading.**

Under further suspension of the rules the Bill was **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-323)** and sent for concurrence.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH** with the exception of matters being held.

Majority Report of the Committee on **INLAND FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE** reporting **Ought Not to Pass** on Bill "An Act to Preserve Maine's Sporting Heritage and Enhance Sporting Opportunities for Maine's Youth by Allowing Maine's Youth to Hunt on Sunday"

(H.P. 293) (L.D. 439)

Signed:

Senators:

CARNEY of Cumberland  
GUERIN of Penobscot

Representatives:

ROBERTS of South Berwick  
BRIDGEO of Augusta  
CLUCHEY of Bowdoinham  
DILL of Old Town  
TERRY of Gorham

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-322)** on same Bill.

Signed:

Senator:

BALDACCI of Penobscot

Representatives:

LANCE of Paris  
MASON of Lisbon  
THORNE of Carmel  
WOOD of Greene  
WOODSOME of Waterboro

**READ.**

Representative ROBERTS of South Berwick moved that the House **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report.

The same Representative **REQUESTED** a roll call on her motion to **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report.

More than one-fifth of the members present expressed a desire for a roll call which was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from South Berwick, Representative Roberts.

Representative **ROBERTS**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the pending motion, and I want to acknowledge the intention behind this bill is admirable, we all share a commitment to ensuring that Maine's rich outdoor traditions, especially hunting, are passed down to the next generation. However, good intentions don't always translate into good policy, and this proposal is a prime example.

For centuries, Maine has held a unique place in the national conversation around outdoor recreation. We are one of the last states in the country to maintain a prohibition on Sunday hunting. And that isn't by accident. This tradition exists because it reflects a deliberate and carefully maintained balance between hunters, landowners, recreational users and the broader public. One day a week, just one, is reserved for reprieve. A chance for landowners to walk on their fields without fear of conflict, a time for hikers, birders, horseback riders and families to enjoy the outdoors without navigating the safety concerns that come with active firearms in the woods. That mutual understanding has been key to preserving landowner relationships and ensuring continued access for hunters throughout Maine. This bill before us would upend that balance. It suggests that by carving out a youth exemption, we can thread the needle. But

the truth is introducing Sunday hunting, even for a narrow population, reopens the decades-old tensions. It introduces new enforcement complexities and increases the risk of accidents during a time traditionally viewed as a day of rest and recovery for outdoor professionals and landowners alike.

This is not theoretical. During Committee testimony, we heard real concerns from private property owners, Game Wardens and outdoor recreation groups who warned the ripple effects of this change would be significant. In rural parts of our State, where community trust and mutual respect matter deeply, this proposal doesn't move us forward; it drives a wedge. And it's not hard to envision the gateway this would provide for a parent to, intentionally or not, end up hunting with their children on Sunday.

Maine's youth already have multiple dedicated opportunities to hunt: youth days, expanded seasons and extensive educational programs. If our goal is to encourage youth participation, we should be investing in those tools. We have unanimously passed other bills that will do this within existing resources. We can promote youth hunting without undoing the social compact that keeps our outdoor spaces accessible and safe for all.

This isn't about resisting change for the sake of tradition; it's about honoring the Maine model, a model that works precisely because it recognizes that our outdoors are shared. Let's preserve what makes Maine special and continue our commitment to stewardship, safety and shared use of our cherished natural resources. So, today, I respectfully urge this Body to support the Majority Report Ought Not to Pass. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Monticello, Representative Ardell.

Representative **ARDELL**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This bill serves to allow Maine's youth to hunt with a mentor, a parent or grandparent, an aunt or uncle or a family friend, on Sundays. But it is not primarily a Sunday hunting bill.

Looking over the horizon at statistics and data regarding hunter involvement, Maine's hunter involvement is actually dropping and is not growing at a rate with the population. What that serves to do is be able to project over the horizon that hunter involvement is dropping as a percentage of the population. Now, what a lot of the Members of this Body may or may not know is that a very old; 1930s, I believe; federal program called the Pittman-Robertson program; takes 10 or 11% of an excise tax off firearms and ammunition at a federal level and applies it to conservation throughout the U.S. What that does, it's the American model of conservation that's been copied worldwide and is extremely, extremely effective, and it's been effective in bringing back white-tailed deer, turkeys, moose, every type of game animal, elk. The problem is that if we don't; well, so, the Pittman-Robertson funds are accessed by states through a four-to-one matching with the sale of hunting licenses and hunting tagging fees. So, in the case of Maine, if we have reduced hunter involvement, we have reduced hunting license fees, we have reduced hunting tagging fees and we get a smaller piece of the pie. We lose it to other states.

Last year, Maine was able to get \$10.3 million in conservation funding from the Pittman-Robertson fund. The problem is, as a percentage of the other states, it's dropping. We absolutely need to provide opportunities for our youth to get involved in sporting opportunities. We absolutely need to. And this is not predominantly a Sunday hunting bill. It's a conservation funding bill.

And I ask this Body to vote to give the kids another day, so that our wildlife conservation program may continue into the future. I appreciate peoples' time, and I would appreciate their vote to support this measure. Thank you.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Milford, Representative Drinkwater.

Representative **DRINKWATER**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker; grew up in a hunting family. Picture this, now: two school buses converted to campers. We go up in the North Maine Woods for a week or two. One bus, we designated the Christian bus; the other bus, we designed it as the heathen bus. I won't tell you which one I was on. But Mr. Speaker, Sunday was our best day of the week. It was family time; horseshoes, turkey dinner, riding around picking up firewood. We had a great time on Sundays. Those are memories I will always cherish.

But let's just talk about the bill at hand. I want to quote from the Maine Woodland Owners testimony, Mr. Speaker, because I think a lot of people don't realize that the Department in 2021, they funded a survey to the tune of \$71,000, and here are some of the results that came back from that survey: The survey showed that "hunters are not in favor of Sunday hunting if it results in a loss of access to private land." The survey indicates that "a majority of landowners in all regions of the State do not favor Sunday hunting. It concerns the Board that a majority of landowners indicated that they would respond to a law permitting Sunday hunting by restricting access to their lands for hunters and other recreational users." Now, let's just talk about the large landowners like Irving, the largest landowner in the State. The Department was concerned last Session that we would have organizations come and lease a large 10,000-acre lot or whatever and post it for their private hunting clubs. We've seen that in Colorado, we've seen that in Texas. We don't want Maine to lose our tradition of that public land being open for all of us to use. And that was one of the fears. And "the survey showed that 44% of those sampled who do not currently post their land say they would be more likely to restrict access to hunting on their land if Sunday hunting was allowed."

Mr. Speaker, we heard a lot of testimony on this bill in years past about, you know, people only get one day, Saturday, to hunt. Well, I have some breaking news. Starting in May of 2026, there's 12 weeks of paid family medical leave will be available. We've heard from a paper mill in the State of Maine that they're concerned that during hunting season, a lot of their employees will use their vacation time to go hunting and they're concerned with covering the shifts. So, that will be available to families to use. And also, we hear from educators about they didn't appreciate Friday being set aside for kids. I just want to repeat what I was always told as I was growing up: If I keep my grades up, my dad would take me hunting and that was a motivation to keep my grades up.

So, I am going to vote with the majority that we should not allow it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Harpswell, Representative Golek.

Representative **GOLEK**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I didn't plan on speaking today, so, I don't have anything prepared, but I want to stand and share my; I will support this Ought Not to Pass motion, but want to speak on as to why.

I, too, grew up in a hunting family. We hunted to eat, so, I know the need for families to have the ability to be able to get out there and hunt and for youth to be able to learn and participate in it. The problem is we, as a State, do rely on other people's land to hunt on. We certainly did not have enough land, nor did my neighbors; you know, my neighbors that still hunt; have enough land to hunt on. Whenever this bill comes up, and

this is like the 78th time that a Sunday hunting bill has come up, we lose hunting ground, people post their property. These bills hurt our State's hunting tradition.

So, I stand here in full support of hunting and our hunting traditions and will continue to oppose Sunday hunting, because it hurts the families that do not have the land to hunt on, to be able to participate and hunt. As far as opportunities to hunt, in our State, we can hunt 245 days out of the year. We can get plenty of opportunities. It's a wonderful family experience, it's a great event, but we have lots of opportunities to do it.

Let's do what we can to preserve what we have and not take away the 52 days and lose potential hundreds and thousands of acres of hunting ground. Please support the motion that's on the floor.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Carmel, Representative Thorne.

Representative **THORNE**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to the pending motion.

I'm a proponent of Sunday hunting, plain and simple. I don't make any apologies for it. Maine is one of the safest hunting states in the country. It brings in almost half a billion dollars to Maine's economy. That's just what you find. There are other add-ons that it brings that aren't included in those numbers: the restaurants, the meals, the gas, the lodging, the merchandise, everything that comes with it.

I know of no other sport where they say, you can only do it six days a week, you can only go; you can't go skiing on Sunday. Too much traffic; people up there don't want traffic going up to the ski slopes, so, we're going to restrict you to no Sunday skiing. That's about what this is. When you hunt in the woods, you may or may not hear a gunshot the whole day, even during hunting season. You hear more gunshots on Sunday from people out in the woods target practicing and shooting and firing their rifles. To say that we are living in fear of what might happen is anecdotal.

We respect Maine woodland owners; we respect the 8,000 members of SAM. But there's 300,000 hunting and fishing licenses that are sold in the State of Maine. Mr. Speaker, that's a lot of people that are being told they can't do their sport on one day a week, especially if they're working five days a week and they only have two days off. And unlike the Good Representative said, there's not 300-something days of hunting. Deer hunting is primarily only in November, and we take away Sundays, so, it's about 20-something days if you're a rifle hunter.

Mr. Speaker, Maine has gone to great extremes to make the sport of hunting a way to manage its wildlife, make sure that the people on the roads are safer. I just came down this morning, and there was a vehicle that had hit a deer and was pulled over, ran into the side, big dent on the driver's side, deer was laying dead on the side of the road. There's a reason why we manage our wildlife, so that people are safer. We just dealt with in Committee another bill on MDI, because they don't have an open hunting season on deer down there, and they're being overrun, and peoples' ornamentals and hostas and rhododendrons are being eaten, and there's a problem and they're trying to figure out how to make sure they can do it. This is the way to do it.

This is talking about youth. This is all this is, youth hunting. In Committee, we opened up what was a one-day youth hunt on Saturday and expanded it. We wanted to make it Saturday-Sunday back then, but we ran into the same roadblock. In business, the one thing that kills business, is the mentality of, 'that's the way we've always done it; but that's the way we've always done it.' There are many states and many Canadian provinces that successfully have a Sunday hunt included, seven

days a week. I'm a registered Maine Guide; there are other registered Maine Guides. So, that one day, you're saying you can't earn your living. It's a short season when we're talking about bear hunting, deer hunting, moose hunting, bird hunting, all the reasons why all these people come to Maine to hunt and recreate.

Mr. Speaker, it's just not fair, plain and simple. There is no reason why we cannot have a Sunday youth hunting day. It's not hurting anyone. I'll say it again: Maine has one of the safest hunting records in the country. People can still go on their land. They can go on their land Monday through Saturday now. Common sense says, wear something visible. It's not all right if you're on your land and you open it to hunting to go around with brown and white gloves and run around the woods. Common sense says do what you need to do to be safe. Hunters are more identifying of their target now.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill, and I oppose the pending motion and encourage those to bring back what we're trying to do, which is to bring all the youth into hunting, keep them in school during the week; let them go out in the field with their uncles and their grandparents and their parents and their brothers, sisters, have a good time and be able to hunt on Sunday. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is Acceptance of the Majority Ought Not to Pass Report. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

**ROLL CALL NO. 244**

YEA - Abdi, Ankeles, Arata, Archer, Arford, Beck, Bell, Boyer M, Brennan, Bridgeo, Bunker, Carlow, Caruso, Cloutier, Cluchey, Cooper, Crafts, Cray, Crockett, DeBrito, Dhalac, Dill, Dodge, Doudera, Drinkwater, Eaton, Faircloth, Friedmann, Frost, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Griffin, Hasenfus, Hepler, Hymes, Javner, Julia, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lee, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Milliken, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, O'Halloran, Osher, Parry, Pugh, Quint, Rana, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sato, Sayre, Shagoury, Sinclair, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Tuell, Wadsworth, Webb, White R, Woodsome, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Adams, Albert, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Bishop, Boyer D, Campbell, Cimino, Collamore, Collins, Daigle, Ducharme, Eder, Farrin, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Gifford, Greenwood, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Jackson, Lanigan, Lavigne, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, McIntyre, Mingo, Morris, Nutting, Olsen, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Pomerleau, Rudnicki, Schmursal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Thorne, Walker, Warren, White J, Wood P, Wood S.

ABSENT - Blier, Chapman, Copeland, Lance, Pluecker, Underwood.

Yes, 89; No, 56; Absent, 6; Vacant, 0; Excused, 0.

89 having voted in the affirmative and 56 voted in the negative, with 6 being absent, and accordingly the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report was **ACCEPTED** and sent for concurrence.

Majority Report of the Committee on **INLAND FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-324)** on RESOLUTION, Proposing an Amendment to the Constitution of Maine to Establish the Right to Hunt and Fish

(H.P. 527) (L.D. 820)

Signed:

Senators:

BALDACCI of Penobscot  
GUERIN of Penobscot

Representatives:

CLUCHEY of Bowdoinham  
DILL of Old Town  
LANCE of Paris  
MASON of Lisbon  
TERRY of Gorham  
THORNE of Carmel  
WOOD of Greene  
WOODSOME of Waterboro

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought Not to Pass** on same RESOLUTION.

Signed:

Senator:

CARNEY of Cumberland

Representatives:

ROBERTS of South Berwick  
BRIDGEO of Augusta

**READ.**

Representative ROBERTS of South Berwick moved that the House **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report.

The same Representative **REQUESTED** a roll call on her motion to **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report.

More than one-fifth of the members present expressed a desire for a roll call which was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from South Berwick, Representative Roberts.

Representative **ROBERTS**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to the pending motion and ask my colleagues to do the same.

Let's be clear from the outset: this is a Constitutional Amendment, a serious, permanent change to our State's foundational legal document. It demands clarity, necessity and restraint. And this proposal meets none of these standards. Proponents claim that this is about protecting the right to hunt, but the right to hunt is already protected, both by Statute and by judicial precedent. Just recently, the Maine Supreme Judicial Court, in interpreting the right to food Amendment, reaffirmed that, quote, "hunting is a lawful means of procuring food," end-quote. There is no legal threat; there is no gap in protection.

This Amendment is a hammer in search of a nail. And worse yet, it's a proposed solution that actually creates new problems. The proposal explicitly limits protections to just State laws. It has no effect on municipal ordinances, citizens' initiatives or ballot referenda; the very tools that have historically been used to challenge hunting practices in Maine. So, suggesting this Amendment will block future efforts to enact bans on bear baiting or allow for Sunday hunting is either mistaken or misrepresenting what this Amendment actually does.

As someone who has Chaired another Committee that dealt with ballot initiatives gone wrong, I know firsthand what happens when we inject policy into a statewide campaign.

Some of us will recall in 2004 and 2014, Maine voters were targeted by a multi-million-dollar campaign funded largely by out-of-state interests, aimed at banning bear baiting, trapping and the use of hounds. It wasn't science that drove those debates; it was emotion, confusion and advertising dollars. And it wasn't harmless. It divided communities, undermined trust in our wildlife professionals and put rural Maine traditions under a microscope. Now, Mr. Speaker, ask yourself, do we really want to go through that again?

Also, we can't just skip over the Sunday hunting thing again, I guess, an issue this Chamber has debated over and over and over and over again. It's not just about tradition; it's about landowner trust. And groups like the Maine Farm Bureau and Maine Woodland Owners has consistently opposed lifting that ban, warning that doing so could lead to the loss of private land access. Our last Constitutional Amendment, adjacent to this topic, brought forth a lawsuit to open up Sunday hunting. If we bring this Amendment forward, we risk reviving that fight, too, without actually changing the outcome.

All of that said, we must understand the broader context in front of us today. Public support for hunting is declining. National hunting participation has dropped by nearly 50% since the 1980s. According to a 2023 Pew Research Center poll, only 38% of Americans support hunting for sport, and support plummets when it involves baiting or trapping.

This Amendment doesn't strengthen hunting protections; it puts them under a spotlight. It gives national groups a new target. It invites renewed scrutiny, misinformation and another round of expensive, divisive ballot warfare. And let's be honest, those of us who have been around long enough know what that looks like in many policy areas.

Mr. Speaker, the Constitution is not a messaging platform. It's not a stage for political production. It is a structural document. It should not be used to provoke ballot fights that hurt the very communities this Amendment claims to protect. This isn't about defending tradition; it's about igniting a controversy and welcoming disarray. I urge my colleagues to oppose the pending motion with me. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Caratunk, Representative Caruso.

Representative **CARUSO**: Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm honored to rise in support of LD 820. As a passionate outdoor advocate and guide, I sponsored this Constitutional Amendment to safeguard the public right to hunt, fish and harvest game.

There are currently 24 states in the country that have enshrined this right in their Constitution. The first state was Vermont in 1777. And this fall, when I saw a map of the 24 states, I was shocked that Maine was not one of them, of all the states in the country. Mr. Speaker, hunting and fishing has been the heritage of our great State, and hunting and fishing is the legacy that we must leave our future generations. Maine's identity and heritage, not just L.L. Bean's, is deeply rooted in these time-honored activities that promote family time, provide food and sustenance, promote wildlife conservation and stimulate our Maine economy.

Like many Mainers, hunting provides the meat that fills our freezer and feeds my family. But since 1992, my husband and I have also worked as Maine Guides. Much of my district's local economy, like much of Maine, is dependent on recreational and nature-based tourism. Many areas like ours piece together their seasonal hospitality economies to keep their businesses open and families employed all year round. This is true whether you're in western Maine or the coastline. Hunters and anglers spend hundreds of millions every year in Maine on trip-related

expenditures. Hunting, boating and fishing supports thousands of Maine jobs, generates millions of State and local taxes and contributes hundreds of millions to our GDP.

Mr. Speaker, LD 820 received overwhelming bipartisan support in the Committee, because it's very simple: it maintains the status quo. Nothing changes. It continues the jurisdiction of our current regulatory agencies, IF&W and Marine Resources. It continues the protections for wildlife conservation and management. It continues all current landowners' property rights and protections. It continues that hunting and fishing shall be the preferred means to manage our wildlife. It preserves the future of Maine's hunting and fishing heritage, and it recognizes the right given to us by nature.

But let's be clear what this bill is not. It does not change Sunday hunting. It does not change rules, regulations or create a new governance structure, and it doesn't change or weaken private property rights. With regards to food, this Amendment will work in unity with the right to food, as well as a bill this session that defines harvesting. Together, two Amendments will form a wall of protection and work in harmony with one another. In legal terms, it's called *in pari materia*. But this Amendment goes a step further. It also protects our current conservation efforts, which align with the North American Model of Wildlife Conservation as the preferred means to preserve Maine's wildlife in perpetuity.

You may think we already have the ability to hunt and fish, but it's only in Statute and we know that laws can be changed with future Legislatures. In recent years, 13 states have faced legislative threats to hunting and fishing. IF&W Commissioner Camuso stated that nationally, interest in hunting and fishing has seen a slight decline. We all know that computer devices and the online alternative reality has captured many people away from physical activity. LD 820, enshrining our right to hunt and fish in the Maine Constitution, is our proactive step to getting ahead of any future threat and ensuring that our heritage and legacy of hunting and fishing in Maine is forever protected.

If this is as important to you as it is to me, I ask you to vote yes, so Maine can join the 24 states that have already recognized the importance of protecting rights and conversation in the Constitution. I believe LD 820 is good for Maine people, Maine wildlife and Maine's future. It can bring unity and healing. And on behalf of all the local communities, the small business owners and families who depend on hunting and fishing for their food and sustenance as well as their livelihoods, and if you want to protect your childhood memories, family heritage and the hunting and fishing legacy that we can leave our children, I ask this Body to vote yes and give Mainers a chance at the ballot box to vote. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Scarborough, Representative Warren.

Representative **WARREN**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today in support of LD 820 and the current motion.

I support this Amendment, although I come from a different childhood and not the same experiences of hunting, because I see it as a way to reach out to some of my constituents who have different experiences than me and different priorities from their legislators and who may not always agree with my votes, but whom I value just as much as any others. I don't hunt, I never have. I have fished, but only a couple times. I do support Maine's strong traditions of harvesting wild game, both for sustenance as well as game management and control. This Amendment ensures that all of our current hunting laws; which I support; will be protected into the future.

Some of the concerns that I've heard from colleagues on either side of the aisle are fair and reasonable, and I want to

address them a bit as I've considered this bill. There's a question; maybe this will end the ban on Sunday hunting, this will allow people to hunt unrestricted by law, that this will allow people to trespass in order to hunt. I think these are well-intentioned concerns and fair ones and thoughtful ones. Engaging with the content of this proposal, I think that they are addressed clearly in the language. Every constitutional provision is subject to reasonable restriction, and this Amendment, like any other, would be subject to that same scrutiny. This Amendment gives the Legislature and Department strong authority to regulate. It includes specific provisions for private property rights. Most importantly, this language is similar to the 24 other states who have already adopted the amendment.

So far, any of the challenges using this Amendment have been well reasoned, thoughtful and worthy of the court's time. We have yet to see a frivolous lawsuit born from this type of language. To be specific, two examples, both in the same state, both from North Carolina. In the first example, there was a lawsuit to expand Sunday hunting, which there was already some access to, using the right to hunt and fish amendment. That effort failed. The North Carolina Supreme Court found that the State had the authority to regulate Sunday hunting. The next example, in North Carolina, the North Carolina Marine Fisheries Commission was sued using the right to hunt and fish for allowing unsustainable harvests of many species of fish. So, going back to that responsible game management and control. This effort's ongoing, but the courts so far seem to be siding with the plaintiffs. And these two cases show that this Amendment can work in both ways and go beyond lip service to the notion of this. Though bringing up well intentioned concerns, I think are fairly addressed, and I appreciate them and I've heard them.

Where resources are plentiful, they should be used, and where they're scarce, they must be protected. Current law is the status quo, and this proposal is conservative in nature; it's maintaining and codifying that. This Amendment ensures a scientifically adequate harvest, whether that's increasing or decreasing the numbers.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to follow my light. For some that may come from a background more like mine, it might be an opportunity to show responsible gun owners and maybe the more rural parts of our State a light that we hear them, that we validate their concerns and that we take action on their behalf and seriously consider the proposals that we're asked to. I hope you follow my light.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Carmel, Representative Thorne.

Representative **THORNE**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the pending motion. I don't have a long and elaborate printed out speech. I would ask the Speaker a procedural question.

The SPEAKER: The Member may proceed.

Representative **THORNE**: Does this vote require two-thirds?

The SPEAKER: The Chair would answer in the negative. If this motion were to prevail, when the bill comes back to the House for Enactment, at that point; presuming the Other Body agrees with the Majority Ought to Pass as Amended Report; when the bill comes back for Enactment, at that point, it will require two-thirds of those present and voting. The Member may proceed.

Representative **THORNE**: And one more procedural question, if I may? It doesn't make it law, it only puts it to the people for a vote, correct?

The SPEAKER: The Chair would answer in the affirmative. The Member may proceed.

Representative **THORNE**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A real quick check says that the Maine Constitution has been amended 177 times since its inception and creation in 1834. And that's all we're merely doing, is we're saying, is this worthy to present to the people of Maine, to have the people of Maine decide and determine if this is worthy of an Amendment, a change to the Constitution? I looked when the last time that we amended the Constitution. You have to go all the way back to November 7th of 2023. Specifically, the Question Six: Require Indian Treaty Obligations and Other Constitutional Provisions Included in Official Printing Amendment. Simply put, that would require Maine Treaty obligations and other constitutional provisions to be included in the official printed copies of the Constitution. That was a pretty important constitutional change; important to our tribal community here in the State of Maine. We did right by doing that Constitutional Amendment, and the people of Maine thought so, too.

I was sent here as a legislator, like everybody else, to be a voice for the people. In this case, all I'm doing, all we're doing, is presenting it to the people. Do we want to present it to the people to have them decide, or do we want to keep it from them and not give them the opportunity to decide here in the State of Maine whether or not they want to include this? With your permission, I'd like to read the way that the bill is proposed to be written on the ballot?

The SPEAKER: The Member may proceed.

Representative **THORNE**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It says, "Do you favor amending the Constitution of Maine to provide that the right of the people to hunt, fish and harvest game may not be infringed, subject to reasonable laws and rules, and to provide that public hunting and fishing are the preferred means of managing and controlling wildlife?" Let's give the people of Maine the opportunity to decide that, Mr. Speaker. I would urge you to vote yes on the pending motion. And we have a bipartisan; not only bipartisan sponsorship, but we have a bipartisan Majority Report in favor of this. How often do we have that here in this House? Not very often. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from the Passamaquoddy Tribe, Representative Dana.

Representative **DANA**: [*The Representative gave a greeting in Passamaquoddy.*] Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. [*The Representative spoke in Passamaquoddy.*] Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of LD 820, a proposal that would enshrine in the Maine Constitution the right of the people to hunt and fish, a right that for my people, the Passamaquoddy, has existed since time immemorial.

LD 820 is similar to Maine's Constitutional Article I, Section 25, the right to food. This bill will protect our rights as Maine citizens to harvest wild game and feed our families. I mean, according to FDA, you have to have a healthy balance of proteins and veggies, right?

So, long before there were maps or governments, before colonization introduced industrial farming and processed foods, we lived off this land. Hunting, fishing and gathering weren't hobbies, they weren't pastimes; they were how we fed our families and honored the balance between people and nature. These practices shaped our identity, our spirituality and also our survival. They still do. I believe, Mr. Speaker, this falls into the realm of food sovereignty and the right to feed our families as Maine citizens.

Since our lands were brought under the jurisdiction of the United States, we have watched that way of life erode.

Sometimes it's due to the government regulations, sometimes it's due to private property boundaries and sometimes it's just due to the changing landscape itself. All too often, we are pushed away from the foods and the traditions that once sustained us, only to become more reliant on systems that do not reflect our values or nourish our spirits. Big Food, fast foods and foods full of sugar and desserts which are causing a multitude of health conditions and diseases for my people.

Mr. Speaker, I know that as a tribal citizen, our culture often exists on the margins, but there are moments when our way of life and the broader culture overlap. Hunting and fishing are among those of those shared spaces. When a Mainer spends a day in the woods tracking a deer or wakes up before dawn to cast a line, they are participating in a long-lasting culture and a heritage and learning skills of survival that has been passed down by all of our ancestors. No matter what background, creed or race that you come from, and that is a connection worth protecting, Mr. Speaker.

LD 820 confirms that hunting, fishing and harvesting game are not just pastimes, but they are our inherent right; rights that the State of Maine recognizes, respects and protects. This Amendment acknowledges what our ancestors have always known: our relationship with the land and its animals are sacred and managing that relationship responsibly is a shared obligation. The Amendment reads that "the right of the people to hunt, fish and harvest game and fish, including by the use of traditional methods, may not be infringed, subject to laws enacted by the Legislature, or rules adopted by the State agency designated for fish and wildlife management as provided by Statute, to promote wildlife conservation and management and preserve the future of hunting and fishing." Mr. Speaker, this is not just about rights, it's about stewardship. It's about making sure that the traditional methods like hunting, trapping, are protected. That the wildlife is harvested ethically for the food and sustenance, not left to suffer for mismanagement or unchecked population growth.

We've seen the consequences of inaction. For example, in New Jersey, the suspension of the bear hunt led to a 237% increase in bear-related incidents over just one year, including livestock attacks and home invasions. Their Governor had to reverse course and declare an emergency hunt. Maine could face similar situations, especially with the bear population that's 10 times larger than the population in New Jersey. Us as tribal members in the Passamaquoddy Tribe partake in a spring bear hunt. We do not necessarily hunt bear on our own, but we had to develop a bear hunting system, because of the population overgrowing within our communities and stepping into the lived areas. This Amendment does not remove regulation; it enforces the importance of it. It makes clear that we must continue to manage wildlife wisely, with seasons, bag limits and licensed tracking, but it prevents reactionary measures, Executive outreach and/or out-of-state pressure from stripping away a way of life that is already under constant threat.

As the Passamaquoddy Tribal Representative, I don't take these decisions lightly. I understand the political dynamics in this Chamber. But when I look at this issue, I see a rare opportunity. It's an opportunity for this Body to do something meaningful for rural Mainers, for tribal communities and also for those who feel like their way of life is quietly slipping away. This Amendment costs nothing, it does not create new laws and it simply says, 'we see you, we hear you and we will protect your way of life.' It's all our inherent right to hunt and fish and that's worth putting in our Maine State Constitution. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Waterboro, Representative Eder.

Representative **EDER**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Men and Women of the House, people are coming from all over the country because of the Maine brand. People are moving from the cities to enjoy the mystique of Maine; L.L. Bean, the plaid shirt. But let's face it, they may not, in the end, agree with the traditions that underpin that mystique and the Maine brand. That's why we have to enshrine the right to hunt and fish and maintain our traditions. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from South Berwick, Representative Roberts.

Representative **ROBERTS**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to respond briefly to some of what I've heard today, and frankly anticipated by means of just --

The SPEAKER: The Member may proceed. The Chair will remind Members that when another Member is speaking and you want to leave the row, exit from the row that would not cause you to pass in front of a Member who is speaking. The Member may proceed.

Representative **ROBERTS**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Frankly, I was able to anticipate a lot of this by checking out the website of the backers of this movement, those that helped this pass in all the other states, as if somehow that means it's right for Maine.

Our Constitution, Mr. Speaker, is not for sale. Let's be real: cookie-cutter Constitutional Amendments are exactly the kind of out-of-touch policymaking we should be pushing back against. What works in Kansas or Michigan or, more accurately, what was marketed and sold to voters in those states, doesn't automatically translate to the complex cultural, legal and land use dynamics that we have here in Maine. This isn't a lobbyist or partisan issue; this is a Maine issue. And in Maine, we have a proud, functional wildlife management system; we have local control; we have private landowners who generously allow access; we have traditions; yes, we also have tensions, but they're deeply specific in our State. This Amendment was not written with Maine in mind and, frankly, that shows.

We've also heard that this Amendment will enhance protections for hunters, but again, that's just not true. It doesn't impact ballot initiatives being started; it doesn't block citizen referenda; it doesn't stop municipalities from passing their own ordinances; it just says "State." In fact, by carving out only State law, this Amendment risks weakening protections by signaling that local and citizen-led challenges are now fair game.

And let's talk about the argument that this sends a message. Sure, it sends a message, just not the one we want. It tells the public there's a threat to hunting rights when there isn't. It tells out-of-state groups that Maine is gearing up for another fight over bear baiting or Sunday hunting. It tells private landowners; who already are skeptical; that the State is willing to play fast and loose with the delicate balance they help maintain. It tells voters again that the Legislature is willing to spend time and taxpayer resources on a symbolic Constitutional Amendment, instead of dealing with the real issues facing Mainers: wildlife habitat loss, climate impacts, access challenges and declining recruitment of new hunters.

Mr. Speaker, I've sat through the aftermath of these ballot battles. I've worked with stakeholders across the spectrum. I've watched as misinformation and out-of-state cash took precedence over facts. We've seen this before. We know how it ends. We don't need to pick this fight again, and we certainly don't need to enshrine it in the Constitution.

Let's govern with clarity, not confusion. Let's protect Maine traditions with policy, not politics. I urge this Body once again to reject this Amendment and the motion before us.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is Acceptance of the Majority Ought to Pass as Amended Report. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

**ROLL CALL NO. 245**

YEA - Adams, Albert, Arata, Archer, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Bell, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Bunker, Campbell, Carlow, Caruso, Cimino, Cluchey, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Cray, Crockett, Daigle, Dill, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eaton, Eder, Farrin, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredericks, Fredette, Frost, Gifford, Greenwood, Griffin, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Hasenfus, Henderson, Hepler, Hymes, Jackson, Javner, Julia, Lavigne, Lee, Lemelin, Libby, Lookner, Lyman, Mason, McIntyre, Milliken, Mingo, Morris, Nutting, O'Halloran, Olsen, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Pomerleau, Quint, Ray, Rielly, Roeder, Rollins, Rudnicki, Sargent, Schmearsal-Burgess, Simmons, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Supica, Swallow, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, Walker, Warren, Webb, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S, Woodsome.

NAY - Abdi, Ankeles, Arford, Beck, Boyer M, Brennan, Bridgeo, Cloutier, Crafts, Dhalac, Dodge, Doudera, Faircloth, Friedmann, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, Osher, Pugh, Rana, Roberts, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sato, Sayre, Shagoury, Sinclair, Skold, Stover, Terry, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

ABSENT - Chapman, Copeland, DeBrito, Lance, Lanigan, Pluecker, Underwood.

Yes, 93; No, 51; Absent, 7; Vacant, 0; Excused, 0.

93 having voted in the affirmative and 51 voted in the negative, with 7 being absent, and accordingly the Majority **Ought to Pass as Amended** Report was **ACCEPTED**.

The Resolution was **READ ONCE**. **Committee Amendment "A" (H-324)** was **READ** by the Clerk and **ADOPTED**.

Under suspension of the rules the Resolution was given its **SECOND READING WITHOUT REFERENCE** to the Committee on **Bills in the Second Reading**.

Under further suspension of the rules the Resolution was **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-324)** and sent for concurrence.

Majority Report of the Committee on **STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT** reporting **Ought Not to Pass** on Bill "An Act to Provide for a 5-year Automatic Repeal of Agency Rules" (H.P. 319) (L.D. 490)

Signed:

Senators:

BALDACCI of Penobscot  
BEEBE-CENTER of Knox

Representatives:

SALISBURY of Westbrook  
COPELAND of Saco  
FARRIN of Jefferson  
GREENWOOD of Wales  
MATLACK of St. George  
POMERLEAU of Standish  
ROLLINS of Augusta  
TUELL of East Machias  
UNDERWOOD of Presque Isle

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-320)** on same Bill.

Signed:

Senator:

MARTIN of Oxford

**READ.**

On motion of Representative SALISBURY of Westbrook, the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report was **ACCEPTED** and sent for concurrence.

Majority Report of the Committee on **STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT** reporting **Ought Not to Pass** on Bill "An Act to Require the Automatic Repealing of Agency Rules" (H.P. 624) (L.D. 965)

Signed:

Senators:

BALDACCI of Penobscot  
BEEBE-CENTER of Knox  
MARTIN of Oxford

Representatives:

SALISBURY of Westbrook  
COPELAND of Saco  
FARRIN of Jefferson  
MATLACK of St. George  
POMERLEAU of Standish  
ROLLINS of Augusta  
TUELL of East Machias  
UNDERWOOD of Presque Isle

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-319)** on same Bill.

Signed:

Representative:

GREENWOOD of Wales

**READ.**

Representative SALISBURY of Westbrook moved that the House **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report.

Representative GREENWOOD of Wales **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **ACCEPT** the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report.

More than one-fifth of the members present expressed a desire for a roll call which was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Hodgdon, Representative Quint.

Representative **QUINT**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am speaking on behalf of the sponsor, the Good Representative from Auburn, who has been barred from speaking on behalf of her constituents.

I rise today in strong support of LD 965, a common-sense measure to restore balance, transparency and accountability to Maine's regulatory system. Right now, Agency rules; no matter how outdated, burdensome or ineffective; can remain on the books indefinitely. There's no built-in check, no expiration, no real incentive to review or re-eval. That leads to a bloated, rigid bureaucracy that slows our economy, stifles innovation and chips away at public trust. LD 965 changes that.

This bill establishes a straightforward principle: rules should not last forever. Starting in 2026, any rule adopted by a State Agency will automatically repeal after five years unless it is reviewed, justified and renewed. This reform reduces red tape by clearing out obsolete regulations. It demands accountability by requiring agencies to defend their rules with cost-benefit analysis and returns authority to the Legislature when the people's Representatives, not unelected bureaucrats, make final decisions. This is how government should work; focused, lean and responsive to the people that it serves. LD 965 does not dismantle necessary protections; it ensures that those protections are still relevant, still working and still worth the cost.

Let's bring discipline to the rulemaking process, let's reduce regulatory buildup and let's pass LD 965. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Westbrook, Representative Salisbury.

Representative **SALISBURY**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As you probably noticed, we have two bills that talk about rulemaking and the repealing of Agency rules, and the concern here is that an arbitrary number of years for all rules to sunset isn't reasonable, nor is it a rational way to run a government.

This bill would put a huge burden on the Rulemaking and Administrative Procedure Act compliance program within the Department of the Secretary of State, creating more bureaucracy and paper shuffling with no real benefit to Mainers. There would be some harm, however, to Maine people, businesses and government administrations, as this proposal could lead to confusion, uncertainty and increase the litigation about the effect of certain rules.

People are welcome to go online to the Secretary of State's website to review rules. If you want to weigh in on rule, rulemaking notices are posted. You can make comments; you can weigh in on the process. And rulemaking doesn't happen in the dark; it's an open process. We shouldn't implement these arbitrary rules just because people who haven't availed themselves of the information and opportunities for input that are already readily available.

I think that I just need to reiterate the fact that this is a very open process to Mainers. You can be involved, you can weigh in on this process and I encourage Members to follow my light and support the pending motion.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is Acceptance of the Majority Ought Not to Pass Report. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

**ROLL CALL NO. 246**

YEA - Abdi, Ankeles, Arata, Archer, Ardell, Arford, Babin, Beck, Bell, Blier, Boyer M, Brennan, Bridgeo, Bunker, Campbell, Carlow, Caruso, Cloutier, Cluchey, Collamore, Cooper, Crafts, Cray, Crockett, Daigle, Dhalac, Dill, Dodge, Doudera, Ducharme, Eaton, Faircloth, Farrin, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Fredette, Friedmann, Frost, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Guerrette, Hall, Hasenfus, Henderson, Hepler, Jackson, Javner, Julia, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lanigan, Lee, Lemelin, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mason, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Milliken, Mingo, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, Nutting, O'Halloran, Olsen, Osher, Parry, Pomerleau, Pugh, Rana, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sayre, Shagour, Simmons, Sinclair, Skold, Soboleski, Stover, Strout, Supica, Swallow, Terry, Tuell, Warren, Webb, White R, Wood P, Wood S, Woodsome, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Adams, Albert, Bagshaw, Bishop, Boyer D, Cimino, Collins, Drinkwater, Eder, Foster, Gifford, Greenwood, Griffin, Haggan, Lavigne, Libby, Lyman, McIntyre, Morris, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Quint, Rudnicki, Schmersal-Burgess, Smith, Thorne, Wadsworth, Walker, White J.

ABSENT - Chapman, Copeland, DeBrito, Fredericks, Hymes, Lance, Pluecker, Sato, Underwood.

Yes, 112; No, 30; Absent, 9; Vacant, 0; Excused, 0.

112 having voted in the affirmative and 30 voted in the negative, with 9 being absent, and accordingly the Majority **Ought Not to Pass** Report was **ACCEPTED** and sent for concurrence.

---

Majority Report of the Committee on **STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT** reporting **Ought to Pass** on Resolve, to Increase the Number of Kennebec County Commissioners (H.P. 1255) (L.D. 1884)

Signed:

Senator:

MARTIN of Oxford

Representatives:

ADAMS of Lebanon  
GREENWOOD of Wales  
MATLACK of St. George  
POMERLEAU of Standish  
TUELL of East Machias  
UNDERWOOD of Presque Isle

Minority Report of the same Committee reporting **Ought Not to Pass** on same Resolve.

Signed:

Senators:

BALDACCI of Penobscot  
BEEBE-CENTER of Knox

Representatives:

SALISBURY of Westbrook  
COPELAND of Saco  
FARRIN of Jefferson  
ROLLINS of Augusta

**READ.**

Representative SALISBURY of Westbrook moved that the House **ACCEPT** the Minority **Ought Not to Pass** Report.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Wales, Representative Greenwood.

Representative **GREENWOOD**: I request a Roll Call, I'll turn off my fan and request permission to speak.

Representative **GREENWOOD** of Wales **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **ACCEPT** the Minority **Ought Not to Pass** Report.

More than one-fifth of the members present expressed a desire for a roll call which was ordered.

The SPEAKER: The Member may proceed.

Representative **GREENWOOD**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was hopeful that with a bipartisan Majority Report, we would move that today.

Let's talk about the bill for a moment, Mr. Speaker. It says, "to Increase the Number of Kennebec County Commissioners." That's not what this bill does. This bill could have increased the number of County Commissioners. Statutorily, we could've done that. However, I took a different approach. Kennebec County doesn't have a charter, so, they fall under State Statute. I took the position that we'll let the Kennebec County voters decide if they want to increase their Board of Commissioners from three to five. I also took a methodical approach to make sure that we get the largest number of voter participation, so that it doesn't have this November; it would happen at the November 2026 election.

Let me read the question that would appear on the ballot to the Kennebec County residents: "Do you favor increasing the number of Kennebec County Commissioner Districts from three to five and staggering the terms of the five County Commissioners beginning in 2028?" The voters will indicate by a yes or no. This does not automatically increase the number of Commissioners. We heard from two of the Kennebec County Commissioners during testimony at the public hearing. One was in favor, and one was opposed. I supported the transparency of putting it out to the voters, Mr. Speaker, and I want that to be clear, that this; this bill is a vehicle for the citizens of Kennebec County to decide if they want to have a five-member Commission.

I was a County Commissioner for eight years, Mr. Speaker, and we were on a board of three, and we approved a charter through a charter process, and that charter process went to a board of seven. The 16 counties in Maine all have varying numbers of Commissioners, depending if they fall under State Statute or if they fall under a county charter. Some are three, some are five and, again, one is a board of seven. This was never meant to be a political thing, Mr. Speaker, but I'm hearing in the background that apparently, it is. There was no malice put forward by my bill proposal. I was asked by citizens of my two Kennebec County towns whom I meet with frequently, and this was one of their requests. That's why the bill is before you today.

I would ask you to vote no on the pending motion of Ought Not to Pass, so that we can then let the citizens of Kennebec County, and only the citizens of Kennebec County, decide if they want a Board of Commissioners of five. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Fairfield, Representative Rudnicki.

Representative **RUDNICKI**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Once again, I'm standing to complain that the majority party's Chair of the Committee gets to decide which Report is moved forward, and that's not right. And it does not help the fact that we have spent months working in these Committees, and we come to agreement, we get a majority vote and then, the Chair decides they don't want to put forth the Majority; they just want

to do what they want to do, the heck with everybody else. So, once again, I'm going to say, why do we even bother to go any further, if the Chairs of the majority party can do what they want? Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would request that Members, if they would like to have loud conversations, to take their conversations out into the hallway. The Chair recognizes the Representative from Sidney, Representative Collins.

Representative **COLLINS**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just adding on to what the Good Representative from Greene stated. Simply put, this bill offers Kennebec County residents an opportunity to elect two more Commissioners to the County Commission. Concerns have been raised about the expanding Kennebec County budget. Significant decisions have been made by two Commissioners as, at times, one Commissioner may be absent. This is unacceptable.

According to one of the members of the County Budget Committee, Jon Beekman, "the Kennebec County budget has increased substantially for most municipalities over the last two years. I believe this is partially due to a lack of oversight and leadership by our part-time Commissioners. Adding two additional Commissioners would certainly increase the opportunity for oversight and communications with the individual County cost centers," and "encourage and allow for more diverse representation." One of the examples he referenced; although it wasn't in the last two years, it's the last five years; is the administrative budget, which has increased by 385% from 2001 to 2026.

Are there concerns about the cost of hiring more Commissioners? I would say no. One proposal from John Whitcomb, the Chair of the Sidney Select Board, suggests, and I quote, "my advocacy in increasing the number of Commissioners does not mean I would advocate for an increase in total compensation. The stipend, as it stands now, should be divided between all of the members, no matter what the total number of Commissioners is." And his reasoning for that was to say their work would be divided amongst five rather than three, so, why should they be paid more.

Is there a fiscal impact for this bill? No. Representative Greenwood already addressed that. The question would come before the people of Kennebec County during a general election. No fiscal impact.

Please, I urge this Body to allow the people of Kennebec County the democratic opportunity to choose whether or not to elect two more Commissioners. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from East Machias, Representative Tuell.

Representative **TUELL**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to the pending motion.

And you might wonder why someone from Washington County would interject themselves in a Kennebec County dispute. Well, I do out of respect for my Kennebec County colleagues, but also, having recently gone through our Washington County District Attorney bill and the uphill battle that that has faced, I believe we need to be listening to our citizens, the people who live in our communities that we represent. And I heard time and again in the Committee that Kennebec County is divided. Well, the way to solve the division in this case is not in this room, but out that window. And to let the people of the County decide. The Representative from Wales has done so in a thoughtful and responsible manner.

This bill doesn't try to redistrict or debate the pros and cons of whether Kennebec County should have five Commissioners; you could even disagree on that personally, but this bill just gives the people a vote. And that's what we should be pushing for,

just as we did several years ago with Franklin County, when a former colleague of ours, Scott Landry, pushed for years to; along with others and many in the majority; tried to get Franklin County. And I'll admit, that was a hard sell for me at first, but ultimately, it was settled on to have a vote, and the vote was held and after it was held, we came back, the voters agreed to it, we moved forward with apportionment and it worked out to the benefit of Franklin County. And I don't see why the same process can't work here.

And I would also add that, if people from Washington County ever wanted to have five Commissioners, I myself would support bringing a vote forward to this Body. Whether I support it at the ballot box is another matter, but I think the people of the County should have that vote, and I would encourage you to vote down the pending motion. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Bridgton, Representative Cimino.

Representative **CIMINO**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to say in the State of Maine, compensation for the County Commissioners, including stipends, travel allowances and necessary expenses, are paid for by the County government. The County Treasurer is responsible for disbursing these funds; which are typically derived from the County's budget; and that includes the tax revenue from those people in that County. So, I don't think it's right for us to be dictating to individual counties how much they need to be allotting for positions that we're creating for these counties. So, I would vote; just follow my light. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is Acceptance of the Minority Ought Not to Pass Report. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

**ROLL CALL NO. 247**

YEA - Abdi, Ankeles, Archer, Arford, Beck, Bell, Boyer M, Brennan, Bridgeo, Bunker, Cloutier, Cluchey, Crafts, Crockett, Dhalac, Dodge, Doudera, Eaton, Faircloth, Farrin, Friedmann, Frost, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Hepler, Julia, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lee, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Milliken, Mitchell, Montell, Moonen, Murphy, O'Halloran, Osher, Pugh, Rana, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sato, Sayre, Shagoury, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Warren, Webb, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

NAY - Adams, Albert, Arata, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Campbell, Carlow, Caruso, Cimino, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Cray, Daigle, Dill, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eder, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredette, Gifford, Greenwood, Griffin, Guerrette, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Jackson, Javner, Kessler, Lanigan, Lavigne, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, McIntyre, Mingo, Morris, Nutting, Olsen, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Pomerleau, Quint, Rudnicki, Schmersal-Burgess, Simmons, Sinclair, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, Walker, White J, White R, Wood P, Wood S, Woodsome.

ABSENT - Chapman, Copeland, DeBrito, Fredericks, Hymes, Lance, Pluecker, Underwood.

Yes, 72; No, 71; Absent, 8; Vacant, 0; Excused, 0.

72 having voted in the affirmative and 71 voted in the negative, with 8 being absent, and accordingly the Minority **Ought Not to Pass** Report was **ACCEPTED** and sent for concurrence.

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH** with the exception of matters being held.

**CONSENT CALENDAR  
First Day**

In accordance with House Rule 519, the following items appeared on the Consent Calendar for the First Day:

(S.P. 36) (L.D. 120) Bill "An Act to Expand the Membership of the Homeland Security Advisory Council" Committee on **CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND PUBLIC SAFETY** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-167)**

(S.P. 50) (L.D. 124) Bill "An Act to Protect the Right to Food" Committee on **AGRICULTURE, CONSERVATION AND FORESTRY** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-162)**

(S.P. 211) (L.D. 554) Bill "An Act to Encourage Resident-owned Communities and Cooperatives and Preserve Affordable Housing Through Tax Credits" Committee on **TAXATION** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-163)**

(S.P. 237) (L.D. 558) Bill "An Act to Strengthen Consumer Protections by Prohibiting the Report of Medical Debt on Consumer Reports" Committee on **HEALTH COVERAGE, INSURANCE AND FINANCIAL SERVICES** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-151)**

(S.P. 294) (L.D. 679) Bill "An Act to Increase the Funding to the Live Fire Service Training Facilities Fund" Committee on **CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND PUBLIC SAFETY** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-168)**

(S.P. 346) (L.D. 786) Bill "An Act to Promote Public Safety and Retain Essential First Responders by Funding the Maine Length of Service Award Program" Committee on **CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND PUBLIC SAFETY** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-169)**

(S.P. 460) (L.D. 1100) Bill "An Act to Clarify the Requirements for Accessing Nonformulary Drugs and Drugs Used to Treat Serious Mental Illness" Committee on **HEALTH COVERAGE, INSURANCE AND FINANCIAL SERVICES** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-166)**

(S.P. 520) (L.D. 1290) Bill "An Act to Update the Laws Regarding Athletic Trainers" Committee on **HEALTH COVERAGE, INSURANCE AND FINANCIAL SERVICES** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-152)**

(S.P. 572) (L.D. 1377) Resolve, to Convene a Working Group to Evaluate Potential Regulation of the Vehicle Towing Industry and the Impact on State Agencies and Industries Committee on **TRANSPORTATION** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-164)**

(S.P. 635) (L.D. 1551) Bill "An Act to Support Maine Eating and Drinking Establishments by Allowing Vendors to Operate on the Premises of an Establishment with a Liquor License" Committee on **VETERANS AND LEGAL AFFAIRS** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (S-153)**

(H.P. 1151) (L.D. 1724) Resolve, Authorizing the Baxter State Park Authority to Convey Certain Land in Cumberland County Committee on **AGRICULTURE, CONSERVATION AND FORESTRY** reporting **Ought to Pass as Amended by Committee Amendment "A" (H-326)**

Under suspension of the rules, Second Day Consent Calendar notification was given.

There being no objection, the Senate Papers were **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED as Amended** in concurrence and the House Paper was **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED as Amended** and sent for concurrence.

**ENACTORS**

**Emergency Measure**

An Act Regarding the Licensing of Assisted Living Facilities

(H.P. 818) (L.D. 1243)  
(C. "A" H-254)

Was reported by the Committee on **Engrossed Bills** as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure, a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a total was taken. 117 voted in favor of the same and 0 against, and accordingly the Bill was **PASSED TO BE ENACTED**, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

**Emergency Measure**

An Act to Validate Certain Referendum Proceedings Conducted by the City of South Portland

(S.P. 601) (L.D. 1483)  
(C. "A" S-137)

Was reported by the Committee on **Engrossed Bills** as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure, a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a total was taken. 113 voted in favor of the same and 3 against, and accordingly the Bill was **PASSED TO BE ENACTED**, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

**Emergency Measure**

An Act to Allow the Use of a Siren in a Vehicle Used by a Harbor Master or Deputy Harbor Master

(H.P. 1026) (L.D. 1568)  
(C. "A" H-303)

Was reported by the Committee on **Engrossed Bills** as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure, a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a total was taken. 118 voted in favor of the same and 2 against, and accordingly the Bill was **PASSED TO BE ENACTED**, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

**Emergency Measure**

An Act to Allow Matinicus Isle Plantation to Issue a Revenue Bond for Urgently Needed Repairs to the Plantation's Electric Power Generating Facility

(H.P. 1274) (L.D. 1913)  
(C. "A" H-280)

Was reported by the Committee on **Engrossed Bills** as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure, a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a total was taken. 113 voted in favor of the same and 0 against, and accordingly the Bill was **PASSED TO BE ENACTED**, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

**Emergency Measure**

Resolve, to Support the Full Implementation of Certified Community Behavioral Health Clinics in the State

(H.P. 460) (L.D. 721)  
(C. "A" H-257)

Was reported by the Committee on **Engrossed Bills** as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure, a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a total was taken. 116 voted in favor of the same and 0 against, and accordingly the Resolve was **FINALLY PASSED**, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

**Emergency Measure**

Resolve, to Support Rural Health Care Workforce Recruitment

(S.P. 387) (L.D. 898)  
(C. "A" S-144)

Was reported by the Committee on **Engrossed Bills** as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure, a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a total was taken. 118 voted in favor of the same and 0 against, and accordingly the Resolve was **FINALLY PASSED**, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

**Emergency Measure**

Resolve, Regarding Legislative Review of Chapter 379: Compensation for Impacts to High-Value Agricultural Land from Solar Energy Development, a Late-filed Major Substantive Rule of the Department of Environmental Protection

(H.P. 1320) (L.D. 1976)

Was reported by the Committee on **Engrossed Bills** as truly and strictly engrossed. This being an emergency measure, a two-thirds vote of all the members elected to the House being necessary, a total was taken. 114 voted in favor of the same and 0 against, and accordingly the Resolve was **FINALLY PASSED**, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

**Acts**

An Act Regarding Temperature Standards for School Buildings

(S.P. 24) (L.D. 11)  
(C. "A" S-142)

An Act to Allow Employees to Request Flexible Work Schedules

(H.P. 24) (L.D. 60)  
(C. "A" H-266)

An Act to Regulate Employer Surveillance to Protect Workers

(H.P. 25) (L.D. 61)  
(C. "A" H-213)

An Act to Expand Access to the Maine Wage Assurance Fund

(H.P. 30) (L.D. 66)  
(C. "A" H-265)

An Act Regarding Penalties for Violating the Maine Weights and Measures Law

(H.P. 52) (L.D. 88)  
(C. "A" H-296)

An Act to Include the Declaration of an Emergency by the President of the United States as a Basis to Allow the Governor to Provide Disaster Relief to Local Governments

(S.P. 31) (L.D. 119)

An Act Regarding Coverage for Step Therapy for Metastatic Cancer

(H.P. 111) (L.D. 178)  
(C. "A" H-272)

An Act to Expand Opportunities to Invest Municipal Tax Increment Financing Revenues

(H.P. 118) (L.D. 185)  
(C. "A" H-255)

An Act to Exempt from State Sales Tax Utility Vehicles Purchased for Use in Commercial Fishing, Agricultural Production, Aquacultural Production and Wood Harvesting

(H.P. 125) (L.D. 192)  
(C. "A" H-256)

An Act Regarding the Rates of Speed at Which School Buses Travel

(H.P. 212) (L.D. 312)  
(C. "A" H-278)

An Act to Support the Francis Malcolm Science Center

(S.P. 152) (L.D. 361)  
(C. "A" S-143)

An Act to Allow Unaccompanied and Emancipated Minors to Access Their Vital Records At No Cost

(H.P. 262) (L.D. 408)  
(C. "A" H-253)

An Act to Prohibit Deceptive Pricing in the Rental of Short-term Lodging and in the Sale of Tickets

(H.P. 268) (L.D. 414)  
(C. "A" H-252)

An Act to Identify the State's Unidentified Human Remains

(H.P. 359) (L.D. 540)  
(C. "A" H-144)

An Act to Provide Funding to the Maine Semiquincentennial Commission to Commemorate the United States of America's 250th Birthday in 2026

(H.P. 384) (L.D. 616)  
(C. "A" H-262)

An Act to Certify Chiropractic Assistants Who Perform X-rays as Chiropractic Radiographers

(H.P. 417) (L.D. 649)  
(C. "A" H-269)

An Act to Fund the Provision of Advocacy Services to Persons with Intellectual Disabilities

(H.P. 507) (L.D. 800)  
(C. "A" H-271)

An Act Regarding Pre-need Funeral Insurance

(H.P. 553) (L.D. 867)  
(C. "A" H-274)

An Act to Protect State Retiree Pensions from Inflation

(S.P. 389) (L.D. 900)  
(C. "A" S-146)

An Act to Increase the Maximum Cash Prize for the Long Lake Ice Fishing Derby

(H.P. 605) (L.D. 940)  
(C. "A" H-275)

An Act to Amend the Law Regarding the Checking of Baifish Traps

(H.P. 631) (L.D. 971)  
(C. "A" H-263)

An Act to Include Food Provided or Served at Emergency Shelters in General Assistance Reimbursement

(S.P. 434) (L.D. 1017)  
(C. "A" S-149)

An Act to Allow Federal Civil Service to Count for Purposes of Maine Public Employees Retirement System Benefits

(S.P. 443) (L.D. 1025)  
(C. "A" S-145)

An Act to Regulate Alcoholic Beverage Competitions

(H.P. 662) (L.D. 1033)  
(C. "A" H-276)

An Act to Provide Free Admission to State Parks and Historic Sites for the Immediate Family Members of Veterans and Active Military Personnel

(H.P. 672) (L.D. 1043)  
(C. "A" H-294)

An Act to Remove the Limit on the Length of Probation That May Be Served for Aggravated Attempted Murder

(H.P. 696) (L.D. 1074)  
(C. "A" H-307)

An Act to Provide Comprehensive Perimenopause and Menopause Education

(H.P. 701) (L.D. 1079)  
(C. "A" H-301)

An Act Regarding Unallocated Balances in a School Administrative Unit School Budget

(S.P. 466) (L.D. 1103)

An Act to Prohibit Governmental Entities That Charge a Fee for In-person Credit Card Purchases from Refusing to Accept Cash

(H.P. 764) (L.D. 1159)  
(C. "B" H-223)

An Act Regarding the Number of Voters of a Municipality Required to Petition for Consideration of Deorganization of That Municipality

(S.P. 532) (L.D. 1302)

An Act to Amend the Laws Governing Insurance Coverage of Preventive and Primary Health Services

(S.P. 540) (L.D. 1310)  
(C. "A" S-148)

An Act to Require Continuing Education for Licensed Architects

(H.P. 915) (L.D. 1393)  
(C. "A" H-218)

An Act to Improve Access to Sustainable and Low-barrier Trauma Recovery Services

(S.P. 581) (L.D. 1425)  
(C. "A" S-150)

An Act to Prevent Financial Exploitation of Vulnerable Adults

(S.P. 586) (L.D. 1445)  
(C. "A" S-147)

An Act to Promote Artisans and the Creative Economy

(H.P. 954) (L.D. 1462)

An Act to Amend the Laws Governing Primary Care Reporting by the Maine Quality Forum and to Establish the Primary Care Advisory Council

(H.P. 981) (L.D. 1497)  
(C. "A" H-268)

An Act to Establish the Maine Charter School Commission as a Public Instrumentality of the State

(S.P. 671) (L.D. 1718)  
(C. "A" S-140)

An Act to Repeal and Replace the Charter of the Yarmouth Water District

(H.P. 1165) (L.D. 1747)  
(C. "A" H-279)

An Act to Update the Laws Governing Osteopathic Physician Licensing

(H.P. 1175) (L.D. 1757)

An Act to Require the Department of Environmental Protection to Provide Certain Information Regarding Perfluoroalkyl and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances to the Public and Private Drinking Water Well Owners

(H.P. 1197) (L.D. 1786)  
(C. "A" H-308)

An Act to Repeal the Low-alcohol Spirits Product Tax

(H.P. 1239) (L.D. 1855)  
(C. "A" H-297)

An Act to Amend the Laws Pertaining to the Maine Public Employees Retirement System

(H.P. 1306) (L.D. 1947)

Were reported by the Committee on **Engrossed Bills** as truly and strictly engrossed, **PASSED TO BE ENACTED**, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

---

**Resolves**

Resolve, Directing the Department of Education to Communicate to School Administrative Units and Private Schools the Importance of Adopting Seizure Action Plans

(H.P. 134) (L.D. 211)  
(C. "A" H-273)

Resolve, to Establish the Commission to Study the Reduction of Unfunded and Outdated Municipal and County Mandates

(H.P. 402) (L.D. 634)  
(C. "A" H-259)

Resolve, to Direct the Department of Transportation to Report Progress Made Toward Implementing Recommendations Based on the 2025 Public Transit Advisory Council Report

(H.P. 882) (L.D. 1359)  
(C. "A" H-302)

Resolve, Directing the Secretary of State to Develop Recommendations for a Multiyear Registration System for National Car Rental Companies

(H.P. 912) (L.D. 1390)  
(C. "A" H-277)

Resolve, Directing the Department of Labor to Report the Findings of the Indoor Air Quality Advisory Group

(H.P. 929) (L.D. 1407)  
(C. "A" H-267)

Resolve, To Improve Air Quality and Ventilation in Newly Constructed Schools

(H.P. 1258) (L.D. 1887)  
(C. "A" H-314)

Were reported by the Committee on **Engrossed Bills** as truly and strictly engrossed, **FINALLY PASSED**, signed by the Speaker and sent to the Senate.

The following items were taken up out of order by unanimous consent:

**SENATE PAPERS**

The following Joint Order: (S.P. 787)

ORDERED, the House concurring, that when the Senate and House adjourn, they do so until Monday, June 2, 2025, at 10:00 in the morning, or until the call of the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, respectively.

Came from the Senate, **READ** and **PASSED**.

**READ** and **PASSED** in concurrence.

---

**ORDERS**

On motion of Representative CLOUTIER of Lewiston, the following Joint Order: (H.P. 1330)

ORDERED, the Senate concurring, that Bill, "An Act to Create the Building Opportunity Through Out-of-school Time Program," H.P. 911, L.D. 1389, and all its accompanying papers, be recalled from the Governor's desk to the House.

**READ** and **PASSED**.

Sent for concurrence.

---

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

The following matters, in the consideration of which the House was engaged at the time of adjournment yesterday, have preference in the Orders of the Day and continue with such preference until disposed of as provided by House Rule 502.

Expression of Legislative Sentiment Recognizing the Old School Pantry, of Mexico

(HLS 210)

TABLED - April 24, 2025 (Till Later Today) by Representative HENDERSON of Rumford.

PENDING - **PASSAGE**.

Subsequently, this Expression of Legislative Sentiment was **PASSED** and sent for concurrence.

---

Expression of Legislative Sentiment Recognizing Island Indulgence Spa, of Rumford

(HLS 211)

TABLED - April 24, 2025 (Till Later Today) by Representative HENDERSON of Rumford.

PENDING - **PASSAGE**.

Subsequently, this Expression of Legislative Sentiment was **PASSED** and sent for concurrence.

---

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH** with the exception of matters being held.

**BILLS HELD**

Bill "An Act to Allow the Public Utilities Commission to Establish Performance-based Metrics and Rate-adjustment Mechanisms for a Public Utility in Any Proceeding"

(H.P. 201) (L.D. 301)

- In House, Minority (6) **OUGHT NOT TO PASS** Report of the Committee on **ENERGY, UTILITIES AND TECHNOLOGY READ** and **ACCEPTED** on May 22, 2025.

- In Senate, Majority (7) **OUGHT TO PASS AS AMENDED** Report of the Committee on **ENERGY, UTILITIES AND TECHNOLOGY READ** and **ACCEPTED** and the Bill **PASSED TO BE ENGROSSED AS AMENDED BY COMMITTEE AMENDMENT "A" (H-243)**.

- In House, House **RECEDED** and **CONCURRED**. **HELD** at the Request of Representative FAULKINGHAM of Winter Harbor.

Representative FAULKINGHAM of Winter Harbor moved that the House **RECONSIDER** its action whereby the House voted to **RECEDE AND CONCUR**.

Representative MOONEN of Portland **REQUESTED** a roll call on the motion to **RECONSIDER** the House's action whereby the House voted to **RECEDE AND CONCUR**.

More than one-fifth of the members present expressed a desire for a roll call which was ordered.

The **SPEAKER**: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Scarborough, Representative Warren.

Representative **WARREN**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the current motion. I rise in opposition to LD 301.

I think the policy that we're talking about; incentivizing great improvement and good performance from our utilities; is a really interesting one. I think it's really compelling. Unfortunately, there is not evidence for the great claims that we have heard about this proposal. We can look to Hawaii and see a very different regulatory structure for some of the ways that, in an evidence-based manner, we can evaluate success. At the same time, we can go to Connecticut and see some dynamics that are a little bit more similar, but appreciate that we're in the first couple of years trying that out.

When we think about ratemaking, we're talking about many millions of dollars of public money. We have an enormous responsibility when we get into rate design. I think it's really important that the policies we propose are evidence-based. Earlier today, Mr. Speaker, we passed time-of-use rates provisions. Those are great, those are extremely evidence-based. This policy is something quite different. I appreciate the goals and the intentions in the bill that's being brought forward, but I have to rise in support of the current motion, because we're just not there yet. The implications are really hard to understate. This will have ramifications going into the future.

I would ask us as a Body to consider, what do we mean when we say performance; what do we mean when we're evaluating metrics; how will we know when we've achieved success; how much money are certain forms of performance worth. There are not answers to any of those questions, there is simply an idea, there is simply a request to try it out, because of how bad things are today, frankly, as well as a threat from one of our utilities who has engaged in extremely poor behavior and, as a response to legislation passed in 2022, they were appropriately penalized. There was a use of a great bill that was passed by this Legislature, and at that first indication, when we're talking about a lot of money, the response was to say, 'this is unjust, we're going to sue you.' I appreciate and understand that threat. I don't think it's appropriate to look at this policy as a reasonable or measured or evidence-based response to that. We passed a great policy; I think we should stick by it.

I don't think we should open up positive financial incentives in any rate proceeding. That is the question before us. There is; there is just; there's absolutely no evidence to support the theory, especially for deregulated utilities. There is no cap in the level of financial incentive, there's no guardrails, there's not even a requirement around a report-back or a study or evidence that this has done what we want it to do. Despite the ask of supporters, I cannot simply say, 'let's try it out.' I would've supported a study, Mr. Speaker, but that's not what's before us. What's before us is a complete reinvention of the notion of a reasonable rate of return. There's already a guaranteed profit, what is the motivation for different behavior *versus* the motivation we know in the last decade that has been manufactured by our utilities to game the system for their own financial benefit. That has happened in other states, but it's happened here as well.

There are absolutely unintended consequences to rate design regarding energy policy that has enormous financial implications. We know this when it comes to solar subsidy; we know this for previous use of PBR within the last 15 years here in our State. We've got to be really clear-eyed about how much money we're talking about and about the entities that are before us, whether we trust them as partners to change behavior *versus* the great policy we've so recently enacted around fines and penalties, which is just, which is reasonable, which is great policy, and I stand behind that and I hope that we will support and encourage designs like that. But we've got to be rigorous if we seek to consider this proposal. If we do that, we cannot even point to that guaranteed rate of return, which is already an open question to explain our enormously high and growing rates; third rising in the nation. We will have to simply ask our Commission what performance did they seek, how much did they pay to incentivize it and did they think it was worth all the extra public money that was given to do it.

PBR in its current context is acknowledged by supporters, as well as critics like myself, as a very new policy, and I'm absolutely committed to finding proposals to address the very real problems that this proposal is trying to solve. But our proposals, when we're talking about this much money, when we understand the actors that we're dealing with in our utilities, we've got to be very mindful and aware and evidence-based in the proposals that we put forward.

This Session, we will implement time-of-use rates, cost-effective proposal to cut costs and right-size use. We'll also have an energy fairness proposal to limit the amount of money that our utilities can recover in rates.

The **SPEAKER**: The Member will defer. The Chair would advise the Member that the motion before us is to Reconsider. The Chair has provided pretty good latitude on making an argument for why Reconsideration is important. The Member is beginning to start making arguments about other policy proposals, other potential bills that I'm not exactly sure are relevant to the pending motion of why this Body should Reconsider its action.

The Chair reminded Representative WARREN of Scarborough to stay as close as possible to the pending question.

The **SPEAKER**: With that in mind, the Member may proceed.

Representative **WARREN**: I'll leave it here to say, I respect that this has been a contentious debate. I respect that there are many ways people approach this issue. I want to find solutions for the problems this proposal seeks to address. I think this proposal has enormous unintended consequences that we have seen here in our own State. This is just a proposal that is

not ready for primetime. It asks too much, it goes too far, it gives too much trust to our utilities and incentivizes behavior that they should do anyway, without any additional ratepayer money. I hope that you will consider following my light, in support of the pending motion and in respectful opposition to LD 301.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Freeport, Representative Sachs.

Representative **SACHS**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to pose the pending motion, as the Good Representative from Newport yesterday asked, 'were there any proposals here to lower costs for ratepayers?' I give you LD 301. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from South Portland, Representative Kessler.

Representative **KESSLER**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to oppose the pending motion.

I want to remind the Body that this is clarifying what we have already passed in the 131st Legislature about enabling our Public Utilities Commission to establish these types of metrics when we're trying to hold utilities accountable for the job that they do. And pending right now is a case where Versant has not done their job, and if we Reconsider this and have this bill fail, the ratepayers of Versant are going to be paying more for less. I do not believe that this is going to lead to a slippery slope where they are going to incentivize utilities for doing their job. Please oppose the pending motion.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Scarborough, Representative Warren.

Representative **WARREN**: Thank you very much. I just want to rise in very respectful disagreement with my Good Colleague from South Portland.

LD 1959 was a great piece of legislation about incentivizing particular behavior through penalties and fines. So, negative financial incentive. There's a threat from Versant at the first use of that great policy. This proposal is asking us to allow for any form of financial incentive, positive or negative, in any rate proceeding. That is very different than the penalties for poor performance as offered in LD 1959. It hadn't been my understanding at any point that there was a question about whether this was simply a clarification of that law or whether this was allowing performance-based ratemaking in any proceeding and that it includes incredibly new and non-evidence-based proposal for positive financial incentives paid for by Maine ratepayers; all Maine ratepayers. I just want to be clear about the proposal before us and my concern --

Representative **DRINKWATER**: Point of Order.

The SPEAKER: The Member will defer. The Chair would inquire as the Representative from Milford's Point of Order.

Representative **DRINKWATER**: The motion is to Reconsider. The merits of the bill will come later. This is a discussion about to Reconsider.

On **POINT OF ORDER**, Representative DRINKWATER of Milford asked the Chair if the remarks of Representative WARREN of Scarborough were germane to the pending question.

The SPEAKER: The Chair would provide the same reminder that he has provided already to the Member related to keeping the comments germane to why the Body may want to Reconsider its action whereby this bill; whereby it Receded and Concurred. The Member is able to make arguments about what Reconsidering means and why and the relevance to the policy, but should not go too far afield from that point.

The Chair reminded Representative WARREN of Scarborough to stay as close as possible to the pending question.

The SPEAKER: The Member may proceed.

Representative **WARREN**: Okay. I just want to state again I think that LD 1959 was a great piece of legislation, and I would hate to think that the policy before us or what I'm advocating for was in any way opposition to that great work, but instead is a concern about performance-based ratemaking, positive incentives for all Maine ratepayers at a time when I don't think we can afford it and I don't think it's ready; this proposal is ready; or evidence based. And that's all. Thank you.

The SPEAKER: The Chair recognizes the Representative from Buxton, Representative Carlow.

Representative **CARLOW**: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, for one, have appreciated the debate that's unfolding in the House at the moment. It's been really helpful, and I think this merits Reconsideration. But fundamentally, the motion to Reconsider is a motion providing a courtesy to Members who have either changed their minds or weren't here to register their vote. And I would urge the House to adopt the motion to Reconsider, so that we can continue this vibrant discussion and afford Members that courtesy. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: A roll call has been ordered. The pending question before the House is to Reconsider the House's action whereby the House voted to Recede and Concur. All those in favor will vote yes, those opposed will vote no.

**ROLL CALL NO. 248**

YEA - Adams, Albert, Arata, Ardell, Babin, Bagshaw, Bishop, Blier, Boyer D, Campbell, Carlow, Caruso, Cimino, Collamore, Collins, Cooper, Cray, Daigle, Dodge, Drinkwater, Ducharme, Eder, Faulkingham, Flynn, Foley, Foster, Fredette, Frost, Gifford, Greenwood, Griffin, Haggan, Hall, Henderson, Jackson, Javner, Lavigne, Lemelin, Libby, Lyman, Mason, McIntyre, Mingo, Montell, Morris, Nutting, Olsen, Parry, Paul, Perkins, Poirier, Pomerleau, Rudnicki, Schmersal-Burgess, Simmons, Sinclair, Smith, Soboleski, Strout, Swallow, Thorne, Tuell, Wadsworth, Walker, Warren, White J, Wood P, Wood S, Woodsome.

NAY - Abdi, Ankeles, Archer, Arford, Beck, Bell, Boyer M, Brennan, Bridgeo, Bunker, Cloutier, Cluchey, Crafts, Crockett, Dhalac, Dill, Doudera, Eaton, Faircloth, Farrin, Friedmann, Gattine, Geiger, Gere, Golek, Graham, Gramlich, Hasenfus, Hepler, Julia, Kessler, Kuhn, Lajoie, Lee, Lookner, Macias, Malon, Mastraccio, Mathieson, Matlack, McCabe, Meyer, Milliken, Mitchell, Moonen, Murphy, O'Halloran, Osher, Pugh, Rana, Ray, Rielly, Roberts, Roeder, Rollins, Runte, Sachs, Salisbury, Sargent, Sato, Sayre, Shagoury, Skold, Stover, Supica, Terry, Webb, Yusuf, Zager, Mr. Speaker.

ABSENT - Chapman, Copeland, DeBrito, Fredericks, Guerrette, Hymes, Lance, Lanigan, Pluecker, Quint, Underwood, White R.

Yes, 69; No, 70; Absent, 12; Excused, 0.

69 having voted in the affirmative and 70 voted in the negative, with 12 being absent, and accordingly the motion to **RECONSIDER** the House's action whereby the House voted to **RECEDE AND CONCUR FAILED**.

---

By unanimous consent, all matters having been acted upon were **ORDERED SENT FORTHWITH**.

---

On motion of Representative MOONEN of Portland, the House adjourned at 3:42 p.m., until 10:00 a.m., Monday, June 2, 2025, or until the call of the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, respectively, pursuant to the Joint Order (S.P. 787).