Short-term Rentals (STRs)	
Require a municipality that regulates STRs to include in the municipality's ordinance:	Senator Pouliot
• A septic inspection requirement for STR permit applicants. The applicant shall pay a septic inspection fee and	
the municipality shall use the fee revenue to pay a third-party inspector to conduct septic inspections.	
• Require existing STRs to have an annual or biannual septic inspection.	
• Grant program for municipalities - funded by fee assessed on STR registration applicants.	
Require municipalities to have an STR registry.	Sutherland (Bar Harbor)
Create a category in State law for STRs for property valuation/assessing purposes.	Sutherland (Bar Harbor)
Require STRs to obtain a permit – not a license (LD 1588 from 129 th Legislature).	Dugal (HospitalityMaine)
STRs in a residential zone – should this be an allowed use in a residential zone or is this a commercial activity in a residential zone?	Rep. Gere
Redirect 50% of an STR's portion of lodging tax revenue [from the General Fund] to the municipality of the STR.	Senator Pouliot
Revenue from the lodging tax on short-term rentals ¹ be allocated to a rental assistance program for tenants.	Commissioner McGovern
Create a taxable use category that shifts the assessment of properties, whole or in part, used as short-term rentals into	Commissioner Graham
a commercial category to reduce the impact on residential assessments. Create a distinction between owner-occupied	
rental units and whole residential units. This removes the investment use of property in a residential setting from	
driving your grandmother in the same neighborhood from her home because of disproportionate tax assessment.	
Home occupation business is already an allowable use in a residential area for owner occupied rentals such as ADU's.	Commissioner Graham
To the extent that whole homes are used in this way, either make it allowable only under a community established	
short-term rental property cap limit when rented year-round and apply an exception to the cap limit only for property	
that is rented to local seasonal workforce members if the asset would be an additional property above the residential	
cap limit.	
Establish a state-wide registry of whole residential short-term rental units and prohibit more than 1/3 of multi-unit	Commissioner Graham
dwellings to be short-term rentals.	

¹ "Short-term rental" is not defined in statute; "transient rental platform" is defined. Prepared by OPLA - revised 10/13/22

Financial/Technical Assistance to Municipalities	
Investigate how the State can provide assistance and guidance to municipalities regarding solar [array] placement. ²	Senator Pouliot
Provide financial resources to municipalities to assist with regional planning generally, including STRs.	Sutherland (Bar Harbor)
Invest in State planning resources to support towns and tie these resources to towns that are encouraging affordable	МАНС
housing development.	
Housing Infrastructure Bond to incentivize municipalities and developers to work to build new housing with a	MAHC
housing infrastructure bond.	
Allow local-option sales tax so municipalities can pay for infrastructure – particularly roads (improves transportation	Sutherland (Bar Harbor)
and water quality).	
When qualifying/competing for State grants (from MaineHousing, for example) a municipality should earn points if	Rudy (Gray)
that community is statistically underserved in terms of affordable housing.	
Establish that all low-income housing projects that receive state, local or federal incentives must remain as low to	Commissioner Graham
moderate income units for a minimum of 45 years to avoid developers selling "affordable housing" to communities	
and receive TIF incentives quickly being converted into market rate units or condos once TIF restrictions are expired,	
evicting tenants.	
Create a non-lapsing fund within Maine Housing and directly finance fully government funded housing development	
in areas of need with a 25% local match and keep rents at no more 30% of tenant income and use rental proceeds to	
reinvest and rehabilitate the same units, and fund building additional properties in other areas. Include rehabilitated	
residential units as eligible properties to allow small communities in rural areas to provide affordable housing that is	
attractive to a wide variety of tenants.	

² 130th Legislature, 1st Regular Session: LD 820 – Resolve, To Convene a Working Group To Develop Plans To Protect Maine's Agricultural Lands When Siting Solar Arrays - directed the Department of ACF to develop plans and consider ways to discourage the use of land of higher agricultural value and encourage and encourage the use of more marginal agricultural lands when siting solar arrays. DACF submitted a report to ACF, ENR and EUT Committees in January 2022. A copy of the report can be found at the following link: <u>https://legislature.maine.gov/doc/7908</u>

Land Use/Zoning	
GrowSmart Maine Policy Action 2023	Commissioner Smith
Maine's current uncoordinated approach to building places is causing real, unintended and significant social,	
environmental, financial, economic and cultural challenges and requires the creation of a cohesive approach to land	
development, redevelopment and placemaking. The following policy actions (relevant to the work of the Housing	
Commission) are recommendations for potential legislation:	
#1: Increase coordination/collaboration among local, State, regional government to support development in the right	
places.	
#4: Rewrite Growth Management Law to create a more flexible and effective framework for all communities.	
#5: Strengthen State Historic Tax Credit to fully realize the benefits throughout Maine.	
#6: Update subdivision regulations to encourage development in the right places.	
#7: Explore fiscal policies to incentivize development in downtowns and villages, while reducing sprawl.	
#8: Move toward carbon neutral buildings to advance State climate goals.	
Look at alternative uses for aging commercial strip malls; the value of allowing housing as a component of bringing	Commissioner Smith
these places back to life. Encouraging this sort of development will increase options for workforce housing across	
Maine. We need to encourage municipalities to change their ordinances to allow it.	
White Paper produced by GrowSmart Maine "Implementing the Vision: First Steps – Practical Steps to Transform	
Commercial Strips into Mixed-used Centers"	
Provide residential housing in commercial zones; allow new apartment condominium developments to be built in	MAHC
commercial and mixed-use zones – ideally with 20% of the homes affordable to low-income households.	
Revitalization zones.	
Housing is critical infrastructure that is lacking in Maine; we need to rethink the meaning of what "highest and best	MAHC
use" is for our land; it's to house people in Maine; everyone deserves a home. That is one way to reimagine land use.	
Encourage municipalities to consider highest and best use of land as residential, not commercial.	
Differentiate between residential and commercial use in statute, including taxation.	Commissioner Smith
Increase cooperation between regional and State approaches.	Commissioner Smith
Give some consideration to studying how new and existing housing connects to transportation, especially public	Commissioner Neale
transportation for affordable housing.	

Maine Affordable Housing Appeals BoardCommissioner ClancyThe Legislature could create a comprehensive permitting process that would enable housing proposals containing at least a certain proportion of affordable units to be considered by localities in a fashion that (i) consolidated reviews and local permitting in one local agency and (ii) enabled those reviews to be expedited. This provision alone could greatly simplify and streamline local processes without affecting local control.Commissioner ClancyA legislatively created state housing oversight board (the Housing Board) could further assist worthwhile proposals on moving forward expeditiously without affecting local control if structured as follows:I.1. Local decisions IN FAVOR of qualifying housing proposals could ONLY be appealed by abutters or other opponents by first appealing to the Housing Board, which would hear the matter and agree or disagree with the local decision. If it disagreed, the petitioner opposing the housing could then contest the proposal in state court on existing terms. If the state concurred in the local approval, the petitioner would be intended to secure the payment of costs if the court finds the harm to the proponent of the proposal or to the public interest occasioned by the delays caused by the litigation merits payment based on the lack of merit to the appeal.I.2. Local decisions AGAINST qualifying housing proposals could not be appealed to the Housing Board but the proponent. To assist it in this work, it would draw on technical advisors to the board with deep experience in local permitting and affordable housing creation. Its suggestions would be ADVISORY only and not in any way binding on local officials.Commissioner Clancy	Miscellaneous	
least a certain proportion of affordable units to be considered by localities in a fashion that (i) consolidated reviews and local permitting in one local agency and (ii) enabled those reviews to be expedited. This provision alone could greatly simplify and streamline local processes without affecting local control. A legislatively created state housing oversight board (the Housing Board) could further assist worthwhile proposals on moving forward expeditiously without affecting local control if structured as follows: 1. Local decisions IN FAVOR of qualifying housing proposals could ONLY be appealed by abutters or other opponents by first appealing to the Housing Board, which would hear the matter and agree or disagree with the local decision. If it disagreed, the petitioner opposing the housing could then contest the proposal in state court on existing terms. If the state concurred in the local approval, the petitioner would be required to post a bond to appeal the local, Housing Board - supported decision in state court. This bond would be intended to secure the payment of costs if the court finds the harm to the proponent of the proposal or to the public interest occasioned by the delays caused by the litigation merits payment based on the lack of merit to the appeal. 2. Local decisions AGAINST qualifying housing proposals could not be appealed to the Housing Board but the Housing Board would be informed of them. It would review the decision, consult with the locality and the proponent as appropriate and offer any suggestions as to ways to resolve the disagreement between the locality and the proponent. To assist it in this work, it would draw on technical advisors to the board with deep experience in local permitting and affordable housing creation. Its suggestions would be ADVISORY only and not in any way binding	Maine Affordable Housing Appeals Board	Commissioner Clancy
and local permitting in one local agency and (ii) enabled those reviews to be expedited. This provision alone could greatly simplify and streamline local processes without affecting local control. A legislatively created state housing oversight board (the Housing Board) could further assist worthwhile proposals on moving forward expeditiously without affecting local control if structured as follows: 1. Local decisions IN FAVOR of qualifying housing proposals could ONLY be appealed by abutters or other opponents by first appealing to the Housing Board, which would hear the matter and agree or disagree with the local decision. If it disagreed, the petitioner opposing the housing could then contest the proposal in state court on existing terms. If the state concurred in the local approval, the petitioner would be required to post a bond to appeal the local, Housing Board - supported decision in state court. This bond would be intended to secure the payment of costs if the court finds the harm to the proponent of the proposal or to the public interest occasioned by the delays caused by the litigation merits payment based on the lack of merit to the appeal. 2. Local decisions AGAINST qualifying housing proposals could not be appealed to the Housing Board but the Housing Board of them. It would review the decision, consult with the locality and the proponent as appropriate and offer any suggestions as to ways to resolve the disagreement between the locality and the proponent proponent. To assist it in this work, it would draw on technical advisors to the board with deep experience in local performed of them. Its suggestions would be ADVISORY only and not in any way binding	The Legislature could create a comprehensive permitting process that would enable housing proposals containing at	
greatly simplify and streamline local processes without affecting local control. A legislatively created state housing oversight board (the Housing Board) could further assist worthwhile proposals on moving forward expeditiously without affecting local control if structured as follows: 1. Local decisions IN FAVOR of qualifying housing proposals could ONLY be appealed by abutters or other opponents by first appealing to the Housing Board, which would hear the matter and agree or disagree with the local decision. If it disagreed, the petitioner opposing the housing could then contest the proposal in state court on existing terms. If the state concurred in the local approval, the petitioner would be required to post a bond to appeal the local, Housing Board - supported decision in state court. This bond would be intended to secure the payment of costs if the court finds the harm to the proponent of the proposal or to the public interest occasioned by the delays caused by the litigation merits payment based on the lack of merit to the appeal. 2. Local decisions AGAINST qualifying housing proposals could not be appealed to the Housing Board but the Housing Board would be informed of them. It would review the decision, consult with the locality and the proponent as appropriate and offer any suggestions as to ways to resolve the disagreement between the locality and the proponent. To assist it in this work, it would draw on technical advisors to the board with deep experience in local permitting and affordable housing creation. Its suggestions would be ADVISORY only and not in any way binding		
A legislatively created state housing oversight board (the Housing Board) could further assist worthwhile proposals on moving forward expeditiously without affecting local control if structured as follows: 1. Local decisions IN FAVOR of qualifying housing proposals could ONLY be appealed by abutters or other opponents by first appealing to the Housing Board, which would hear the matter and agree or disagree with the local decision. If it disagreed, the petitioner opposing the housing could then contest the proposal in state court on existing terms. If the state concurred in the local approval, the petitioner would be required to post a bond to appeal the local, Housing Board - supported decision in state court. This bond would be intended to secure the payment of costs if the court finds the harm to the proponent of the proposal or to the public interest occasioned by the delays caused by the litigation merits payment based on the lack of merit to the appeal. 2. Local decisions AGAINST qualifying housing proposals could not be appealed to the Housing Board but the Housing Board would be informed of them. It would review the decision, consult with the locality and the proponent as appropriate and offer any suggestions as to ways to resolve the disagreement between the locality and the proponent. To assist it in this work, it would draw on technical advisors to the board with deep experience in local permitting and affordable housing creation. Its suggestions would be ADVISORY only and not in any way binding		
on moving forward expeditiously without affecting local control if structured as follows: 1. Local decisions IN FAVOR of qualifying housing proposals could ONLY be appealed by abutters or other opponents by first appealing to the Housing Board, which would hear the matter and agree or disagree with the local decision. If it disagreed, the petitioner opposing the housing could then contest the proposal in state court on existing terms. If the state concurred in the local approval, the petitioner would be required to post a bond to appeal the local, Housing Board - supported decision in state court. This bond would be intended to secure the payment of costs if the court finds the harm to the proponent of the proposal or to the public interest occasioned by the delays caused by the litigation merits payment based on the lack of merit to the appeal. 2. Local decisions AGAINST qualifying housing proposals could not be appealed to the Housing Board but the Housing Board would be informed of them. It would review the decision, consult with the locality and the proponent as appropriate and offer any suggestions as to ways to resolve the disagreement between the locality and the proponent. To assist it in this work, it would draw on technical advisors to the board with deep experience in local permitting and affordable housing creation. Its suggestions would be ADVISORY only and not in any way binding		
 Local decisions IN FAVOR of qualifying housing proposals could ONLY be appealed by abutters or other opponents by first appealing to the Housing Board, which would hear the matter and agree or disagree with the local decision. If it disagreed, the petitioner opposing the housing could then contest the proposal in state court on existing terms. If the state concurred in the local approval, the petitioner would be required to post a bond to appeal the local, Housing Board - supported decision in state court. This bond would be intended to secure the payment of costs if the court finds the harm to the proponent of the proposal or to the public interest occasioned by the delays caused by the litigation merits payment based on the lack of merit to the appeal. Local decisions AGAINST qualifying housing proposals could not be appealed to the Housing Board but the Housing Board would be informed of them. It would review the decision, consult with the locality and the proponent as appropriate and offer any suggestions as to ways to resolve the disagreement between the locality and the proponent. To assist it in this work, it would draw on technical advisors to the board with deep experience in local permitting and affordable housing creation. Its suggestions would be ADVISORY only and not in any way binding 		
opponents by first appealing to the Housing Board, which would hear the matter and agree or disagree with the local decision. If it disagreed, the petitioner opposing the housing could then contest the proposal in state court on existing terms. If the state concurred in the local approval, the petitioner would be required to post a bond to appeal the local, Housing Board - supported decision in state court. This bond would be intended to secure the payment of costs if the court finds the harm to the proponent of the proposal or to the public interest occasioned by the delays caused by the litigation merits payment based on the lack of merit to the appeal. 2. Local decisions AGAINST qualifying housing proposals could not be appealed to the Housing Board but the Housing Board would be informed of them. It would review the decision, consult with the locality and the proponent as appropriate and offer any suggestions as to ways to resolve the disagreement between the locality and the proponent. To assist it in this work, it would draw on technical advisors to the board with deep experience in local permitting and affordable housing creation. Its suggestions would be ADVISORY only and not in any way binding		
 decision. If it disagreed, the petitioner opposing the housing could then contest the proposal in state court on existing terms. If the state concurred in the local approval, the petitioner would be required to post a bond to appeal the local, Housing Board - supported decision in state court. This bond would be intended to secure the payment of costs if the court finds the harm to the proponent of the proposal or to the public interest occasioned by the delays caused by the litigation merits payment based on the lack of merit to the appeal. 2. Local decisions AGAINST qualifying housing proposals could not be appealed to the Housing Board but the Housing Board would be informed of them. It would review the decision, consult with the locality and the proponent as appropriate and offer any suggestions as to ways to resolve the disagreement between the locality and the proponent. To assist it in this work, it would draw on technical advisors to the board with deep experience in local permitting and affordable housing creation. Its suggestions would be ADVISORY only and not in any way binding 		
terms. If the state concurred in the local approval, the petitioner would be required to post a bond to appeal the local, Housing Board - supported decision in state court. This bond would be intended to secure the payment of costs if the court finds the harm to the proponent of the proposal or to the public interest occasioned by the delays caused by the litigation merits payment based on the lack of merit to the appeal. 2. Local decisions AGAINST qualifying housing proposals could not be appealed to the Housing Board but the Housing Board would be informed of them. It would review the decision, consult with the locality and the proponent as appropriate and offer any suggestions as to ways to resolve the disagreement between the locality and the proponent. To assist it in this work, it would draw on technical advisors to the board with deep experience in local permitting and affordable housing creation. Its suggestions would be ADVISORY only and not in any way binding		
 Housing Board - supported decision in state court. This bond would be intended to secure the payment of costs if the court finds the harm to the proponent of the proposal or to the public interest occasioned by the delays caused by the litigation merits payment based on the lack of merit to the appeal. Local decisions AGAINST qualifying housing proposals could not be appealed to the Housing Board but the Housing Board would be informed of them. It would review the decision, consult with the locality and the proponent as appropriate and offer any suggestions as to ways to resolve the disagreement between the locality and the proponent. To assist it in this work, it would draw on technical advisors to the board with deep experience in local permitting and affordable housing creation. Its suggestions would be ADVISORY only and not in any way binding 		
court finds the harm to the proponent of the proposal or to the public interest occasioned by the delays caused by the litigation merits payment based on the lack of merit to the appeal. 2. Local decisions AGAINST qualifying housing proposals could not be appealed to the Housing Board but the Housing Board would be informed of them. It would review the decision, consult with the locality and the proponent as appropriate and offer any suggestions as to ways to resolve the disagreement between the locality and the proponent. To assist it in this work, it would draw on technical advisors to the board with deep experience in local permitting and affordable housing creation. Its suggestions would be ADVISORY only and not in any way binding		
litigation merits payment based on the lack of merit to the appeal. 2. Local decisions AGAINST qualifying housing proposals could not be appealed to the Housing Board but the Housing Board would be informed of them. It would review the decision, consult with the locality and the proponent as appropriate and offer any suggestions as to ways to resolve the disagreement between the locality and the proponent. To assist it in this work, it would draw on technical advisors to the board with deep experience in local permitting and affordable housing creation. Its suggestions would be ADVISORY only and not in any way binding		
2. Local decisions AGAINST qualifying housing proposals could not be appealed to the Housing Board but the Housing Board would be informed of them. It would review the decision, consult with the locality and the proponent as appropriate and offer any suggestions as to ways to resolve the disagreement between the locality and the proponent. To assist it in this work, it would draw on technical advisors to the board with deep experience in local permitting and affordable housing creation. Its suggestions would be ADVISORY only and not in any way binding		
Housing Board would be informed of them. It would review the decision, consult with the locality and the proponent as appropriate and offer any suggestions as to ways to resolve the disagreement between the locality and the proponent. To assist it in this work, it would draw on technical advisors to the board with deep experience in local permitting and affordable housing creation. Its suggestions would be ADVISORY only and not in any way binding		
as appropriate and offer any suggestions as to ways to resolve the disagreement between the locality and the proponent. To assist it in this work, it would draw on technical advisors to the board with deep experience in local permitting and affordable housing creation. Its suggestions would be ADVISORY only and not in any way binding		
proponent. To assist it in this work, it would draw on technical advisors to the board with deep experience in local permitting and affordable housing creation. Its suggestions would be ADVISORY only and not in any way binding		
permitting and affordable housing creation. Its suggestions would be ADVISORY only and not in any way binding		
A Housing Board structured in this manner could lessen the delays occasioned by opponents when there IS local	A Housing Board structured in this manner could lessen the delays occasioned by opponents when there IS local	
approval - and engage the state in being a resource to localities and developers where disputes over affordable housing		
proposals can potentially be resolved in a positive manner consistent with local concerns. Particularly as this board		
had extensive experience with disputed proposals, it could potentially become more useful in education opponents and		
assisting localities and developers in getting to yes.		
Preserving and making permanently affordable for the life of the property all currently subsidized properties including Commissioner Ladoka		Commissioner Ladoka
section 515 rural rental housing ³ .		

³ The Rural Housing Service (RHS) is part of Rural Development (RD) in the US Department of Agriculture (USDA). It operates a broad range of programs that were formerly administered by the Farmers Home Administration to support affordable housing and community development in rural areas. RHS provides direct loans (made and serviced by Prepared by OPLA - revised 10/13/22 Page 4 of 5

Make affordable housing funding accessible to small rural developers and eliminating scoring advantages.	Commissioner Ladoka
Create a pilot program to incentivize homeowners to add accessory dwelling units.	Commissioner Payne
Create a State rental assistance program that would take the place of the recently ended emergency rental assistance	Commissioner McGovern
program.	
Increase general assistance benefit levels so that they are adequate to cover rising housing costs.	Commissioner McGovern
Increase the amount of the real estate transfer tax or increase the portion of the real estate transfer tax that is allocated	Commissioner McGovern
to the development of affordable housing.	
Provide a tenant right to purchase when an owner sells a building or a mobile home park.	Commissioner McGovern
Prohibit or limit application fees for tenants applying for housing.	Commissioner McGovern
Prohibit discrimination against voucher holders by landlords.	Commissioner McGovern
Eliminate no-cause evictions.	Commissioner McGovern
Prohibit lease restrictions in development units from containing provisions that tenant vehicles must be current with	Commissioner Graham
MV registration or risk triggering eviction and towing from the property. Agents of the state should be the only	
enforcement mechanism for MV registration enforcement. This disproportionately impacts low-income tenants.	

USDA staff) and also guarantees loans for mortgages extended and serviced by others. Rural renting Housing Loans (section 515) are direct, competitive mortgage loans made to provide affordable multifamily rental housing for very low-, low-, and moderate-income families, elderly persons and persons with disabilities. Page 5 of 5 Prepared by OPLA - revised 10/13/22