

STATE OF MAINE 118TH LEGISLATURE

SECOND REGULAR SESSION AND SECOND SPECIAL SESSION

BILL SUMMARIES JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE ON STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

MAY 1998

MEMBERS: Sen. John M. Nutting, Chair Sen. Jill M. Goldthwait Sen. James D. Libby

Rep. Douglas J. Ahearne, Chair Rep. William Lemke Rep. Lucien A. Dutremble Rep. Martha A. Bagley Rep. Laura Sanborn Rep. F. Thomas Gieringer, Jr. Rep. Randall L. Bumps Rep. Robert F. Fisk, Jr. Rep. Susan Kasprzak Rep. Belinda A. Gerry

Staff:

Deborah C. Friedman, Legislative Analyst Danielle D. Tetreau, Legislative Analyst David C. Elliott, Principal Analyst

Office of Policy and Legal Analysis Room 101/107/135, 13 State House Station Augusta, ME 04333 (207)287-1670



Maine State Legislature

OFFICE OF POLICY AND LEGAL ANALYSIS

13 State House Station, Augusta, Maine 04333-0013 Telephone: (207) 287-1670 Fax: (207) 287-1275

ONE HUNDRED EIGHTEENTH LEGISLATURE SECOND REGULAR AND SECOND SPECIAL SESSIONS

Summary Of Legislation Before The Joint Standing Committees May 1998

We are pleased to provide this summary of bills that were considered by the Joint Standing Committees of the Maine Legislature. The document is a compilation of bill summaries which describe each bill and relevant amendments, as well as the final action taken. Also included are statistical summaries of bill activity this Session for the Legislature and each of its joint standing committees.

The document is organized for convenient reference to information on bills handled by the joint standing committees. It is organized by committees and within committees by bill (LD) number. The committee report(s), prime sponsor for each bill and the lead co-sponsor(s), if designated, are listed below each bill title. All adopted amendments are listed by paper number. Two indices, a subject index and a numerical index by LD number are provided for easy reference to bills. They are located at the back of the document. A separate publication, <u>History and Final Disposition of Legislative Documents</u>, may also be helpful in providing information on the disposition of bills. These bill summaries also are available at the Law and Legislative Reference Library and on the Internet (www.state.me.us/legis/opla).

Final action on each bill is noted to the right of the bill title. The abbreviations used for various categories of final action are as follows:

CON RES XXX	ter # of Constitutional Resolution passed by both Houses
CONF CMTE UNABLE TO AGREE DIED BETWEEN BODIES	
DIED IN CONCURRENCE One body accept	
DIED ON ADJOURNMENT	Action incomplete when session ended; bill died
EMERGENCY	
FAILED EMERGENCY ENACTMENT/FINAL PASSAGE	
FAILED ENACTMENT/FINAL PASSAGE	
FAILED MANDATE ENACTMENT INDEF PP	Bill imposing local mandale failed to get 2/3 vole Bill Indefinitely Postnoned
ONTP	Ought Not To Pass report accepted
OTP ND	
OTP ND/NT	Committee report Ought ToPass In New Draft/New Title
P&S XXX	
PUBLIC XXX	
RESOLVE XXX	
UNSIGNED VETO SUSTAINED	•

Please note the effective date for all non-emergency legislation enacted in the Second Regular Session (unless otherwise specified in a particular law) is June 30, 1998 and July 9,1998 for the Second Special Session. Second Special Session laws include Public Laws beginning with Chapter 718, Private and Special Laws beginning with Chapter 82 and Resolves beginning with Chapter 117.

LD 1358 An Act to Amend the Procedures for Finalizing the Kennebec ONTP County Budget

Sponsor(s)	Committee Report	Amendments Adopted
JONES SA	ONTP	
CAREY		

LD 1358 proposed to eliminate the requirement under current law that the Kennebec County commissioners submit the annual county budget to the Legislature for approval. It also would have eliminated the advisory budget committee and placed responsibility for the final budget approval on a budget committee composed of elected and appointed municipal officials representing the county commissioner districts.

LD 1359	An Act to Amend the Androscoggin County Budget Process	ONTP
	The first to finite the final obcoggin county Dauget 1 roccos	

Sponsor(s)	Committee Report	Amendments Adopted
BOUFFARD	ONTP	
JENKINS		

LD 1359 proposed to amend the budget approval process for Androscoggin County by removing the requirement that the budget be submitted to the Legislature for final approval. Instead, the existing budget committee would have been empowered to adopt the budget and submit it to the county commissioners. The bill proposed that the county commissioners could alter the committee's budget only by a unanimous vote; and, if the commissioners did so, the budget committee county commissioners' change by a two-thirds vote.

LD 1551An Act to Amend the Amount of Retainage on Public BuildingDIED BETWEENContractsBODIES

Sponsor(s)	Committee Report		Amendments Adopted
PLOWMAN	OTP-AM	MAJ	
	ONTP	MIN	

LD 1551proposed that in the case of a contract awarded for any public improvement, the State may not withhold money due the contractor under the contract pending acceptance of the project by the State.

Committee Amendment "A" (H-1087) replaced the bill but was not adopted because the Senate and House were unable to agree. As proposed, the amendment applied to state construction projects over \$1,000,000 in value and to school construction projects over \$1,000,000 in value and for which state aid is received. The amendment proposed to limit the retention of contract payments on those public improvement construction projects to line items in the project contract and to situations in which unsatisfactory progress has been made by a contractor or subcontractor. In those cases, up to five percent of the payment due under the project contract could have been withheld until all contract requirements for the line item were completed. Following completion of a line item, any retained payments would have been required to be paid promptly. At the end of a project, the value of punch list and incomplete items could be retained as well as withholding to cover good faith claims of the owner, including

claims for unsatisfactory progress on the project. The amendment proposed that over the course of the project, the owner makes the determination of how much of the payment due will be retained up to the five percent limit and as to whether satisfactory progress has been made on the project.

Senate Amendment "A" to Committee Amendment "A" (S-704) proposed the following changes in the committee amendment. It was not adopted.

- 1. It would have clarified that payments may be withheld against both a general contractor and a subcontractor under public improvement projects.
- 2. It would have removed an unnecessary reference to nonperformance of contract line items.
- 3. It would have clarified that the owner makes the determination of completion and acceptance of work on contract line items.
- 4. It would have clarified that retention of payments is a percentage of the payment due for approved work on line items under the contract.
- 5. It would have clarified that retention at the end of line item work under the contract may be up to five percent of the value of the line item.
- 6. It would have clarified that an owner is not obligated to make payments in case of nonperformance.

Senate Amendment "B" to Committee Amendment "A" (S-707) proposed the following changes in the committee amendment in an attempt to reach compromise on the bill. The amendment was adopted in the Senate but failed when the bill died between bodies.

- 1. It would have clarified the situations under which payments may be withheld against both a general contractor and a subcontractor under public improvement projects.
- 2. It would have defined "nonperformance" for the purpose of retention of payment on contract line items.
- 3. It would have clarified that the owner makes the determination of completion and acceptance of work on contract line items.
- 4. It would have clarified that retention of payments is a percentage of the payment due for approved work on line items under the contract.
- 5. It would have clarified that retention at the end of line item work under the contract may be up to five percent of the value of the line item.
- 6. It would have clarified that an owner is not obligated to make payments in case of nonperformance.