

State Of Maine 122nd Legislature

Second Regular Session

Bill Summaries

Joint Standing Committee on Judiciary

July 2006

<u>Members:</u> Sen. Barry J. Hobbins, Chair Sen. Lynn Bromley Sen. David R. Hastings III

Rep. Deborah L. Simpson, Chair Rep. Sean Faircloth Rep. Stan Gerzofsky Rep. Marilyn E. Canavan Rep. Mark E. Bryant Rep. Michael Edward Dunn Rep. Roger L. Sherman Rep. Roderick W. Carr Rep. Joan Bryant-Deschenes Rep. Joan M. Nass

<u>Staff</u>: Margaret J. Reinsch, Senior Analyst

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

Maine State Legislature



Office of Policy and Legal Analysis Office of Fiscal and Program Review

122nd Maine Legislature Second Regular Session

Summary of Legislation Before The Joint Standing Committees

Enclosed please find a summary of all bills, resolves, joint study orders, joint resolutions and Constitutional resolutions that were considered by the joint standing committees of the Maine Legislature this past session. 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 considered by the committees. It is arranged alphabetically by committee name 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/billsumm.htm).

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 | Chapter # of Constitutional Resolution passed by both Houses |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| CONF CMTE UNABLE TO AGREE | |
| | |
| DIED IN CONCURRENCEOne | body accepts ONTP report; the other indefinitely postpones the bill |
| DIED ON ADJOURNMENT | |
| EMERGENCY | Enacted law takes effect sooner than 90 days |
| | |
| FAILED ENACTMENT/FINAL PASSAGE | Bill failed to get majority vote |
| FAILED MANDATE ENACTMENT | Bill imposing local mandate failed to get 2/3 vote |
| NOT PROPERLY BEFORE THE BODY | Ruled out of order by the presiding officers: hill died |
| INDEF PP | Bill Indefinitely Postponed |
| ONTP | |
| OTP-ND | Committee report Ought To Pass In New Draft |
| P&S XXX | Chapter # of enacted Private & Special Law |
| PASSED | Joint Order passed in both bodies |
| PUBLIC XXX | Chapter # of enacted Public Law |
| RESOLVE XXX | Chapter # of finally passed Resolve |
| UNSIGNED (Pocket Veto) | Bill held by Governor |
| VETO SUSTAINED | Bill held by Governor |

Please note that the effective date for all non-emergency legislation enacted in the Second Regular Session (unless otherwise specified in a particular law) is August 23, 2006.

Joint Standing Committee on Judiciary

LD 1817 **ONTP** An Act To Protect Access to Social Security Numbers Amendments Adopted Committee Report Sponsor(s) ONTP HOTHAM LD 1817 proposed to expand the prohibition under current law on use of social security numbers to prohibit all businesses, organizations, government entities and all other entities operating in the State from requesting a person's social security number for any purpose, with exceptions. The bill proposed to allow businesses and the other specified entities to request a person's social security number when necessary to collect or disburse social security funds and when federal law requires the Federal Government to obtain a person's social security number from the business and other specified entities. Under the proposed bill, employers would be permitted to request an employee's social security number without these limitations. LD 1837 An Act To Protect Retirement Funds **ONTP** Amendments Adopted Sponsor(s) Committee Report SMITH W ONTP MARTIN

LD 1837 proposed to exempt from creditors, including in bankruptcy proceedings, the full value of individual retirement accounts and "Roth individual retirement accounts" established under Section 408A of the United States Internal Revenue Code.

See LD 948 from the First Regular Session.

LD 1842 An Act To Allow Certain End-of-life-care Decision-makers To PUBLIC 587 Consent to Organ and Tissue Donation

| Sponsor(s) | Committee Report | Amendments Adopted |
|------------|------------------|--------------------|
| GROSE | OTP-AM | H-890 |

LD 1842 is a concept draft pursuant to Joint Rule 208. It proposed to set forth standard language to be included in living wills to provide increased guidance and certainty in situations when a patient is terminally ill or when a doctor has determined that all lifesaving means have been exhausted.

Committee Amendment "A" (H-890) proposed to replace the bill. It proposed to amend the Uniform Anatomical Gift Act to revise who can make organ donation decisions.

Joint Standing Committee on Judiciary

Enacted law summary

Public Law 2005, chapter 587 amends the Uniform Anatomical Gift Act to include in the prioritized list of persons who can make decisions about organ donation both agents appointed under a durable health-care power of attorney or an advance health-care directive and registered domestic partners.

LD 1870 An Act To Clarify Laws Governing Eminent Domain PUBLIC 579

| Sponsor(s) | Committee Report | Amendments Adopted |
|------------|------------------|--------------------|
| SIMPSON | OTP-AM | H-945 |

LD 1870 was proposed in response to the United States Supreme Court decision in <u>Kelo v. City of New London</u>, 73 USLW 4552 (2005). The bill proposed to prohibit the use of eminent domain authority for purposes of private retail, office, commercial, industrial or residential development; primarily for the enhancement of tax revenue; or for transfer to a person, nongovernmental entity, public-private partnership, corporation or other business entity. The proposed restriction would not apply to an area upon a finding of blight under current law governing urban development and community development, or to utilities.

Committee Amendment "A" (H-945) proposed the following changes to the bill.

- 1. The amendment proposed to limit the new restrictions on the use of eminent domain authority to land used for agriculture, fishing or forestry or land improved with residential homes, commercial buildings or other structures. The restrictions, therefore, would not apply to vacant or open land that is not in use.
- 2. The amendment proposed to revise the restriction on transferring property taken through eminent domain authority to prohibit transfers to individuals and to for-profit business entities.
- 3. The amendment proposed to revise the blight exception to the restrictions to include property taken under housing authority programs.
- 4. The amendment proposed to revise the bill's provisions relating to governmental purposes that are not affected by the eminent domain restrictions. Instead of listing permitted purposes as proposed by the bill, this amendment proposed to provide that the new provisions do not prohibit municipalities and counties from exercising eminent domain authority for any purposes other than private retail, office, commercial, industrial and residential development; tax revenue enhancement; and transfers to impermissible transferees.

The amendment proposed to make the changes take effect retroactively to June 23, 2005.

See also LD 1203, LD 1297 and LD 1904.

Enacted law summary

Public Law 2005, chapter 579 prohibits the use of eminent domain authority for purposes of private retail, office, commercial, industrial or residential development; primarily for the enhancement of tax revenue; or for transfer to individuals and to for-profit business entities. The restriction does not apply to an area upon a finding of blight under current law governing urban development, community development and housing authority programs. The