

Senator Daughtry, Representative Sylvester and members of the Labor & Housing Committee:

My name is Dan Davis from Kezar Fall (*Porter*) over in Oxford County, and angst toward **LD2003** involves no paid or non-profit affiliation or corporate handler (*benevolent, commercial, political, or otherwise*).

LD2003, like LD1312, will likely result in the same damage caused throughout Maine prior to the 1990's, and is tone deaf to the vastly rural reality of this state. The less accessible and less developed 75% of the state will undoubtedly be subjected to unrestrained and unplanned development and speculation (*real estate, gentrification, STR's*) should this be signed into law as it is written. Many areas in rural Maine do not define regions as single-family, because these areas are often monolithically residential and mixed-use.

Doubling, even tripling densities is unsustainable in many rural sparsely populated areas that simply do not have adequate tax base, infrastructure, any semblance of community resources, and that require extensive travel to find work or opportunity. This will cause a wide array of long-lasting negative consequences, including additional enforcement costs to municipalities to combat rampant STR's (*short-term rentals*). Will the state pay those burdens? Not likely. Will the state enforce its own 30-day rentals restriction? Not likely. This is an unfunded mandate that will change the landscape of rural Maine for the worse. This bill does not even differentiate a community with 2 people per square mile from a community with over 3,000 people per square mile. Why has that not been considered?

A population threshold is recommended for this bill, possibly over 5,000 in pop/community and even then, only be required where communities have legitimate access to public transportation or viable private transport opportunities (*bus, train, taxi's, Uber, LYFT, etc.*) and legitimate ADA accessible community resources within reasonable walking or biking distances. ***M.R.S.A. 30-A § 4364-B §§ 2, and M.R.S.A. 30-A § 4364-D §§ 3 C & E need to be addressed to acknowledge towns with limited community resources, transportation access, businesses, and employment opportunities.***

If "community resources" are limited in a town and it is known that people have to travel forty-five minutes to an hour or more to find work, clothing shops, grocery stores, food markets, and that there is no on-street parking, how does this bill address that? The State is attempting to broadly override common-sense local land use parking regulations without have the capacity to understand the impacts (*which is why we have comprehensive planning law, for local study and local decision-making*). This bill, like *LD 1312*, discredits decades of conscientious local comprehensive planning regarding appropriate development growth, right-sized zoning based on capacity and demand, and the protection of natural resources. As far as community resources in *Porter*, we have a church, a town hall, and a health center. Is the state now promoting religion, or is it promoting access to pay taxes, registrations, fees, and medical bills to people who will have no access to other businesses or employment? Which is it? Ironically, our lone church doesn't even have adequate parking, and now this bill wants to make things worse?

Uber/LYFT-type services offer little to the majority of this state, most of the communities in Maine have no public transit systems and largely have little to no local business and employment opportunities. Travel is required and there will be an impact to doubling or tripling density in many areas throughout Maine, so competent and reasonable parking is needed and should not be prescribed in a one-size-fits-all approach. This bill, like *LD1312* and many others, seems structured for the more urban 25% of the state that enjoys an ample tax base.

The assault on Home Rule by this bill and others like it is unacceptable. If part-time amateur legislators feel compelled to design land use and town sense of place for everyone in Maine, then by all means, but there should then be an accompanying bill to repeal *subdivision law, comprehensive planning law, shoreland law, and local planning board and code enforcement unfunded mandates* from our legislative construct, as well as a fiscal note for the state to pay to resolve all local impacts.

As a Mainer who strives to learn from past mistakes, the potential long-term unintended damage that broad, poorly-vetted bills such as LD2003 (*and LD1312*) can inflict on Maine's environment and resources is readily apparent. I respectfully ask that LD 2003 **OUGHT NOT TO PASS**, be tabled for more thorough discussion and understanding of the long-term risks, and amended in the 131st to appropriately acknowledge the rural socio-economic realities of Maine.

Daniel Davis - Porter, Maine

Dan Davis
Porter
LD 2003

Senator Daughtry, Representative Sylvester and members of the Labor & Housing Committee:

My name is Dan Davis from Kezar Fall (Porter) over in Oxford County, and angst toward LD2003 involves no paid or non-profit affiliation or corporate handler (benevolent, commercial, political, or otherwise).

LD2003, like LD1312, will likely result in the same damage caused throughout Maine prior to the 1990's, and is tone deaf to the vastly rural reality of this state. The less accessible and less developed 75% of the state will undoubtedly be subjected to unrestrained and unplanned development and speculation (real estate, gentrification, STR's) should this be signed into law as it is written. Many areas in rural Maine do not define regions as single-family, because these areas are often monolithically residential and mixed-use.

Doubling, even tripling densities is unsustainable in many rural sparsely populated areas that simply do not have adequate tax base, infrastructure, any semblance of community resources, and that require extensive travel to find work or opportunity. This will cause a wide array of long-lasting negative consequences, including additional enforcement costs to municipalities to combat rampant STR's (short-term rentals). Will the state pay those burdens? Not likely. Will the state enforce its own 30-day rentals restriction? Not likely. This is an unfunded mandate that will change the landscape of rural Maine for the worse. This bill does not even differentiate a community with 2 people per square mile from a community with over 3,000 people per square mile. Why has that not been considered?

A population threshold is recommended for this bill, possibly over 5,000 in pop/community and even then, only be required where communities have legitimate access to public transportation or viable private transport opportunities (bus, train, taxi's, Uber, LYFT, etc.) and legitimate ADA accessible community resources within reasonable walking or biking distances. M.R.S.A. 30-A § 4364-B §§ 2, and M.R.S.A. 30-A § 4364-D §§ 3 C & E need to be addressed to acknowledge towns with limited community resources, transportation access, businesses, and employment opportunities.

If "community resources" are limited in a town and it is known that people have to travel forty-five minutes to an hour or more to find work, clothing shops, grocery stores, food markets, and that there is no on-street parking, how does this bill address that? The State is attempting to broadly override common-sense local land use parking regulations without have the capacity to understand the impacts (which is why we have comprehensive planning law, for local study and local decision-making). This bill, like LD 1312, discredits decades of conscientious local comprehensive planning regarding appropriate development growth, right-sized zoning based on capacity and demand, and the protection of natural resources. As far as community resources in Porter, we have a church, a town hall, and a health center. Is the state now promoting religion, or is it promoting access to pay taxes, registrations, fees, and medical bills to people who will have no access to other businesses or employment? Which is it? Ironically, our lone church doesn't even have adequate parking, and now this bill wants to make things worse?

Uber/LYFT-type services offer little to the majority of this state, most of the communities in Maine have no public transit systems and largely have little to no local business and employment opportunities. Travel is required and there will be an impact to doubling or tripling density in many areas throughout Maine, so competent and reasonable parking is needed and should not be prescribed in a one-size-fits-all approach. This bill, like LD1312 and many others, seems structured for the more urban 25% of the state that enjoys an ample tax base.

The assault on Home Rule by this bill and others like it is unacceptable. If part-time amateur legislators feel compelled to design land use and town sense of place for

everyone in Maine, then by all means, but there should then be an accompanying bill to repeal subdivision law, comprehensive planning law, shoreland law, and local planning board and code enforcement unfunded mandates from our legislative construct, as well as a fiscal note for the state to pay to resolve all local impacts.

As a Mainer who strives to learn from past mistakes, the potential long-term unintended damage that broad, poorly- vetted bills such as LD2003 (and LD1312) can inflict on Maine's environment and resources is readily apparent.

I respectfully ask that LD 2003 OUGHT NOT TO PASS, be tabled for more thorough discussion and understanding of the long-term risks, and amended in the 131st to appropriately acknowledge the rural socio-economic realities of Maine.

Daniel Davis - Porter, Maine