

---

---

## PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED FOR ADJACENCY REVIEW PROCESS

---

---

Maine Land Use Planning Commission  
Maine Department of Agriculture, Conservation and Forestry

**Adjacency Review Comments, Group #7:** *Comments about proposed rule revisions related to application of the adjacency principle*

The Commission appreciates the broad public interest in its review of the adjacency principle, and will consider comments about the review when submitted. Because the comment period will span almost four months, the Commission will generally make written public comments available on the website after a Commission Meeting where the adjacency review is discussed. Groups of comments include those received to date from the last time the Commission published a group.

**Comments submitted between:** September 29, 2018 – November 9, 2018

**Public Comment Deadline:** September 24, 2018 – The Commission will continue to accept written comments beyond this date, and will consider establishing a new rulemaking schedule at its meeting on October 10, 2018.

RECEIVED

OCT 01 2018

AUGUSTA

Sept 26<sup>th</sup>, 2018

Land Use Planning Commission  
c/o Ben Godsoe  
18 Elkins Lane  
22 State House Station  
Augusta Maine  
04333

Mr. Godsoe,

I am writing to you today to urge you to put the Land Use Planning Commission's proposed changes to the "One Mile Rule" on hold. And I also ask the LUPC to have a third party analysis done on whether development that has been approved under the current rules is meeting the purpose and intent of the law. And I would also like to see a detailed analysis of all of these proposed changes made for public review.

Fifteen years ago I moved here to Maine from the front range of Colorado mainly because of this State's many years of commitment to preserving and protecting it's many wild areas and limiting urban sprawl from destroying the lakes, watersheds, and natural areas.

The Maine Woods are far too important, to both us and to the generations that come after us, to make these kinds of changes that the LUPC is considering without a full understanding of all the potential impacts, which I do believe will be negative, profound, and irreversible.

Thank you for your time,



Bill Di Giulio  
359 Litchfield Rd  
Bowdoin, Maine  
04287

WOODCOCK FARM

502 High Street • Lincolnville, Maine 04849

Please do not change the adjacency principle's one mile rule. We need our North Woods to be extensive for the benefit of our planet, ourselves, other animals and flora as we move into

which may be probably an  
ever more human dominated  
future on earth.

RECEIVED

OCT 01 2018

30 - AUGUSTA

Thank you

lys Healy

September 23 2018

27 Sept. 18

Dear Mr. Godsoe,  
I am whole-  
heartedly again-  
st the LUPC's  
proposal to elim-  
inate the adja-  
cency principle's  
1 mile rule.

The change  
proposed would  
put approximate-  
ly 2 million acres  
of land at risk  
for residential,  
commercial +  
industrial devel-  
opement.

RECEIVED

OCT 01 2018

LUPC - AUGUSTA

maine's North  
Woods sets our  
state apart +  
draws tourists +  
residents alike,  
just as our  
coastal beauty  
does. At a time  
when we should  
focus on climate  
change strategies  
our forests are  
essential to the  
health + wellness  
of maine families  
+ to the future  
health + integrity  
of our tiny planet.  
Hands Off!

sincerely, Suzanne Tietje

## Godsoe, Benjamin

---

**From:** Michael Schaab <Michael.Schaab@mma.edu>  
**Sent:** Monday, October 01, 2018 8:28 AM  
**To:** Godsoe, Benjamin  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL SENDER] Proposed Changes to the Adjacency Principles  
**Attachments:** Not Another Fish Letter.docx

Dear Mr. Godsoe,

I have attached a letter I sent to the Republican Journal. I believe it clearly states my opposition to the proposed changes in the *Adjacency Principle*. To this, I would like to add that as stewards of the land under your jurisdiction, I am sure you are aware of the enormous responsibility you have to the people of Maine now and well into the future. I trust that your legacy will be one of protection and preservation and urge you to reach a decision that will give our children and grandchildren the opportunity to access the unique experience of our Maine wilderness.

Sincerely,  
Michael Schaab

This message, including any attachments, contains confidential information intended for a specific individual and purpose, and is protected by law. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender immediately by reply e-mail and destroy all copies. You are hereby notified that any disclosure, copying, or distribution of this message, or the taking of any action based on it, by anyone other than the intended recipient, is strictly prohibited.

## Not Another Fish Letter

It is clear from the many Letters to the Editor about the proposed salmon farm in Belfast that many people in Belfast, on BOTH sides of this discussion, care deeply about the environment. I believe, therefore, that many of you would want to know that there is another proposal that will have enormous repercussions for all of Maine. This is the proposed change in the “*Adjacency Principle*” being considered by the Land Use Planning Commission (LUPC). The LUPC is the group charged with the stewardship of the unorganized territories of Maine – about 14,000 mi<sup>2</sup>.

Our large open wilderness is unique in this day and time. If you have ever marveled at the wide expanse of wilderness from the top of Mount Katahdin, or while hiking the myriad of trails here in Maine, know that it is the adjacency principle (with perhaps some help from the black flies) that protects this area from development ‘sprawl’. Development that would fragment this great expanse. The adjacency principle has been in place for nearly 45 years and provides the backbone for decisions on how the area can be developed. The current policy states that development cannot take place at a distance greater than one road mile from existing similar development. The new policy being considered increases this distance to 2 miles AND any area within 10 miles of rural hub communities. This increases the area of residential, commercial and industrial open to possible development by nearly 2 million acres!

While this proposal would certainly benefit some people, it would adversely affect the character of the Maine Woods and I would be one who would see that as a disadvantage. It would also hurt the economies of these rural centers such as Millinocket and Patten by easing the exodus of their small tax base, while increasing demands on their schools, medical facilities, security, etc. Perhaps some zoning changes need to occur, but this is too large and too fast (does this sound familiar?).

I urge you to visit the LUPC website ([www.maine.gov/dacf/lupc/projects/adjacency/adjacency.html](http://www.maine.gov/dacf/lupc/projects/adjacency/adjacency.html)) to learn more and consider contacting Benjamin Godsoe ([benjamin.godsoe@maine.gov](mailto:benjamin.godsoe@maine.gov), 287-2619) to let him know how you feel about the proposed change. LUPC plans to vote on this in early November and is currently seeking public input.

Michael Schaab

Monroe, ME

207-922-8812



## Godsoe, Benjamin

---

**From:** Linda Babcock <lindabbc@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 02, 2018 8:51 AM  
**To:** Godsoe, Benjamin  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL SENDER] Adjacency Rule - in Unorganized Territories and the wilderness areas in the state of Maine

Dear Mr. Godsoe,

Please reconsider the changes proposed to land use in northern Maine forests. The adjacent policy is an effective rule to protect many areas from "creep" development. Many people, including myself and fellow hikers who go to Baxter State Park, find this area in Maine as unique with wilderness areas for wildlife, lakes and waterways, and unfragmented forests and old growth trees. One of the aims for establishment of Baxter State Park, a park which has been self-supporting since 1931, is that these woods be untamed and undeveloped for the people of Maine and more in perpetuity.

For 40 years the "One-Mile Rule" has effectively protected the forests, and I encourage the Land Use Planning Commission to continue the policy.

Sincerely,

Linda Babcock

Haydenville, MA, formerly from Bangor Maine

## Godsoe, Benjamin

---

**From:** Brooke Williams <brookiedw@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 09, 2018 4:42 PM  
**To:** Godsoe, Benjamin  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL SENDER] Comments on the proposed adjacency rule revisions

Brooke Williams  
57 Cedar Street  
Cambridge, MA 02140

October 9, 2018

Dear Benjamin Godsoe, Maine Land Use Planning Commission,

As an outdoor recreation enthusiast, I appreciate the chance to review and provide feedback on this extensive change proposed to the current development framework in Maine's Unorganized Territory.

The proposed update would change where new zones for subdivisions and businesses could locate. Many of these new development zones are located along Maine's scenic byways. These routes are popular travel destinations and support a unique experience as a visitor drives from more populated areas into the wild and remote parts of the state. Allowing development to extend along these roads outside of the service center communities would change the character and experience of these specially designated byways.

This proposal also specifically opens up all permanent trailheads and many Maine lakes to residential subdivision development. Trails like the Appalachian National Scenic Trail (AT), the Allagash Wilderness Waterway, the Northern Forest Canoe Trail, and countless others are revered because of the opportunity they provide for users to have a remote backcountry experience. Allowing homes to be developed within a 1/2 mile of the access points to places is too risky without a thorough analysis of which recreational resources can sustain substantial increases in use without altering their character or the user experience.

Instead of making these broad changes to the adjacency principle, LUPC should consider efforts to meaningfully incentivize development within existing communities in rural Maine. These places are already struggling to attract and retain the residents they need to support the services they provide.

There is certainly more room for growth in and adjacent to (within 3 miles) established communities. Growth should be focused there rather than expanding into currently undeveloped regions of the Unorganized Territory.

Finally, I will note that the background resources on the LUPC website are helpful but complicated. I encourage LUPC to slow down the process and engage in additional outreach around the state to ensure more people understand the content of this proposal.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed adjacency rule revisions.

Sincerely,  
Brooke Williams

## Godsoe, Benjamin

---

**From:** Bindy P <upstairsmac@myfairpoint.net>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 17, 2018 3:07 PM  
**To:** Godsoe, Benjamin  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL SENDER] Adjacency Rule Comment

To LUPC % Ben Godsoe

Please enter this into Public Hearings & discussion re: proposal to abolish the "one mile adjacency rule".

I am a 6th generation Mainer whose roots hail both from the coast & to the northern border. Over the years I have watched the wilderness of Maine & it's waters getting increasingly penetrated by 'development'. Hill & mountain tops are populated with cell towers & windmills & corresponding roads to tend them. Where people used to get to by foot or paddle- now roads, planes, RVs etc find their way *already decreasing* the experience of 'wildness & nature'. Eliminating the "one mile adjacency rule" would only add to the watering down effect of what used to be 'natural world untouched/lightly touched by humans'.

Additionally, Maine is one of the last States in the NE/Eastcoast that has any sizable remote wilderness areas like Big Reed Forest for example. And this is largely thanks to the Rule as it stands. We have unique wildness of nature in doses not available for millions of others living on the Eastern Seaboard. Although LUPC is getting pressured to change the rule for economic reasons, Maine in fact is already generating more & more money from "eco tourism/recreation as the Rule stands. Both for the environment & for outdoor enthusiast it is good to have different levels of wildness, having some areas where people are concentrated & areas where nature prevails & people/industry/machines rarely go.

Let us leave the One Mile Rule in place so that the next & next generations will be able to experience some of Maine in it's more natural original state.

Mainely Yours  
Belinda Pendleton  
Belfast, Maine

## Godsoe, Benjamin

---

**From:** Stratton, Robert D  
**Sent:** Friday, October 19, 2018 10:02 AM  
**To:** Horn, Samantha; Beyer, Stacie R; Godsoe, Benjamin  
**Cc:** Brautigam, Francis; Overlock, Joe; Camuso, Judy; Robicheau, Ryan; Connolly, James  
**Subject:** Heritage Fish Waters

Samantha,

We are currently finalizing our recommendations on LUPC's Adjacency and Subdivision rulemaking proposals and will provide them to you as soon as we can. In the interim, you asked me to provide our input on the regulatory applicability of Heritage Fish Waters. Per your request, please see below.

### Heritage Fish Waters

Maine is fortunate to have many valuable aquatic resources. Of them, Heritage Fish Waters support self-sustaining, pond dwelling populations of wild brook trout and charr. Heritage Fish Waters were originally designated to inform and influence fisheries management activities in respect to the unique properties of these resources. Of the 578 listed Heritage Fish Waters, it appears that 72 heritage waters come in contact with LUPC development zones. Many Heritage Fish Waters are remote, undeveloped to lightly developed headwater lakes and ponds. Listed Heritage Fish Waters may not be stocked with fish and live fish may not be used as bait in efforts to maintain the integrity of these fisheries.

It should be noted that MDIFW has not designated any inland fishery habitat as a formal Significant Wildlife Habitat (09-137 CMR Chapter 10; 06-096 CMR Chapter 335) or afforded them special regulatory considerations in environmental regulatory review, aside from the laws, rules, and standards intended to allow for identification and protection of many important aquatic, wetland, and terrestrial resources. Heritage Fish Waters are important fishery resources in Maine but, there are many other waters that also support important fisheries of the state and which deserve protection.

In the final rules, it is imperative that MDIFW continue to have the opportunity to review regulatory proposals and provide resource information and recommendations to LUPC to help insure the management of inland fisheries resources in the public waters of the State for their preservation, protection, enhancement and use.

Thank you, Bob.

**Bob Stratton**  
**Environmental Program Manager**  
**Fisheries and Wildlife Program Support Section Supervisor**

Maine Department of Inland Fisheries & Wildlife

284 State Street; 41 State House Station

Augusta, Maine 04333-0041

Tel: (207) 287-5659; Cell: (207) 592-5446

[mefishwildlife.com](http://mefishwildlife.com)

*Correspondence to and from this office is considered a public record and may be subject to a request under the Maine Freedom of Access Act. Information that you wish to keep confidential should not be included in email correspondence.*

## Godsoe, Benjamin

---

**From:** Tom Lizotte <countymanager@piscataquis.us>  
**Sent:** Friday, October 26, 2018 2:14 PM  
**To:** Godsoe, Benjamin  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL SENDER] Rule revisions

Ben,  
I had a chance today to download the proposed rule revisions from the LUPC website and analyze the impact of the proposed changes on the adjacency principle and subdivision standards.

While I realize many folks are close-minded about any changes to subdivision and commercial development in the UT, for those who are still willing to consider new approaches I believe the proposed changes are truly responsive to the concerns the public expressed to the initial rollout. The scaling back of the rural hubs list, the reduction in distance from the hubs from 10 to 7 miles, and the reduction in distance from public roads from 2 miles to 1 are all steps in the right direction.

I put the location of development map dated May 23 and the new map dated Oct. 5 side by side for comparison purposes, and the differences are striking. It would be difficult for anyone viewing the two versions to conclude that LUPC staff did not take public testimony seriously and respond in good faith.

You and Samantha have done good work on this.

Tom Lizotte  
Piscataquis County Manager  
Dover-Foxcroft

## Godsoe, Benjamin

---

**From:** william armstrong <wla.train@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 30, 2018 12:40 PM  
**To:** Godsoe, Benjamin  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL SENDER] Fwd: Lupc adjacency rulings

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

> The current system has and is working and balances planned development with environmental and associated economic benefits of the Maine Woods and Baxter State Park. In addition we are in an unknown period of adjustment to climate change which is not the time to make significant changes to a management system to our vital natural resources. Finally, Millinocket and surrounding areas are just beginning to recover from economic devastation from industrialized failure of resources use and that recovery is based in the recreational, tourist and sustainable forest practices in place. What questions will your grandchildren pose about the decisions being made that will determine the quality of their lives?

> Please maintain the current management system and study thoroughly the cumulative effects of any potential changes.

> Respectively,

> William Armstrong

> Monroe, Maine

>

> Sent from my iPhone



# Natural Resources Council of Maine

3 Wade Street • Augusta, Maine 04330 • (207) 622-3101 • Fax: (207) 622-4343 • www.nrcm.org

RECEIVED  
NOV 01 2018  
LUPC - AUGUSTA

To LUPC Staff,

The following members and supporters of the Natural Resources Council of Maine have shared their deep concerns about proposals underway to change LUPC's adjacency policy, including the potential elimination of the one-mile policy. They are concerned that changes could increase the potential for development sprawl that threatens Maine's North Woods, natural resources, and wildlife habitat. Please include this letter as part of the public record.

Sincerely,

Carly Peruccio  
Forests and Wildlife Outreach Coordinator  
Natural Resources Council of Maine

Diane Batty  
Bangor, ME

Mary Heath  
Brunswick, ME

James Beyer  
Franklin, ME

Carlton Wiggin  
Bangor, ME

Patricia Wescott  
Brunswick, ME

Joseph White  
Georgetown, ME

Larry Douglas  
Bath, ME

Rosita Friel  
Buckfield, ME

Deann Marsh  
Gorham, ME

Fran Milsop  
Bath, ME

David Plimpton  
Cape Elizabeth, ME

Johanna Chase  
Harborside, ME

Nancy Nutt  
Belfast, ME

Patty Blackstone  
Caribou, ME

Susan Williams  
Harpwell, ME

Ronald Martin  
Berwick, ME

Stephen Rees  
Cherryfield, ME

Robert Hughes  
Hiram, ME

Cathleen Clark  
Birch Harbor, ME

Edward Tubias  
East Andover, ME

Peter Huston  
Hiram, ME

Rebecca Wentworth  
Blue Hill, ME

Virginia Heustis  
Embden, ME

Reba Phipps  
Kennebunk, ME

Robert Jones  
Bridgton, ME

Constance Dayton  
Falmouth, ME

Jolene Staruch  
Kennebunk, ME

John Leathers  
Brownville Junction, ME

Dale Moeykens  
Farmingdale, ME

Lucian Clark  
Kingman, ME

Protecting the Nature of Maine

Printed on post-consumer recycled, processed chlorine-free paper

RECEIVED

NOV 01 2018

LUPC - AUGUSTA

Claire Barbour  
Kittery, ME

Elizabeth Denton  
Poland, ME

Tom Hart  
South Portland, ME

Angela West  
Lewiston, ME

Ben Boegehold  
Portland, ME

Nancy Hubley  
South Portland, ME

Karralena Castaway  
Limestone, ME

Rosanne Graef  
Portland, ME

Allison Melvin  
Stonington, ME

Sandra Spinney  
Montville, ME

Beth Orcutt  
Portland, ME

Stephen White  
Stratton, ME

Wayne Gregersen  
Mount Desert, ME

Halorie Throne  
Portland, ME

Craig MacDonnell  
Twp C, ME

Marie Richards  
New Portland, ME

Donna Brown  
Pownal, ME

Lyn Grotke  
Unity, ME

Brenda Dunn  
New Sharon, ME

Lesley Bollinger  
Rockland, ME

Gloria Weisheit  
Vassalboro, ME

Jack Bailey  
North New Portland, ME

Bradford Miller  
Rockport, ME

David Morse  
Wells, ME

Stephen Parisi  
North Yarmouth, ME

Chris Coggins  
Round Pond, ME

Kimberly White  
Westbrook, ME

D. Benjamin Mathes  
Oakland, ME

J. Christopher Frost  
Round Pond, ME

Noah Stelmok  
Whitefield, ME

Claus Hamann  
Orland, ME

Rene Parsons  
Rumford, ME

Barbara Berry  
Windham, ME

Emily Carvalho  
Orono, ME

Jeffrey Dustin  
Sabattus, ME

Mary Sauschuck  
Windham, ME

Cheryl Robertson  
Orono, ME

Scott Hardy  
Saco, ME

Andrew Steinharter  
Yarmouth, ME

Kent Frati  
Palmyra, ME

William Babson  
Sinclair, ME

Nancy Fossa  
York, ME

Zachary Holderby  
Penobscot, ME

Kevin Flanagan  
Solon, ME

Susan Rakaseder  
York, ME

Mark Hanley  
Pittson, ME

Wendy Pirsig  
South Berwick, ME

John Misener  
New London, CT



RECEIVED  
NOV 01 2018  
LUPC - AUGUSTA

Trudi Burrows  
Brewster, MA

MaryLee Aubry  
Manikin-Sabot, VA

Bill Rohan  
Williamsburg, MA

Eric Benson  
Champaign, IL

William Fagan  
Bohemia, NY

Samuel Hoyt  
New York, NY

Carol Bialy  
Kingston, NY

Richard Martini  
Putnam Valley, NY

Barb Phipps  
Norton, OH

Ronald Schwartz  
Drumore, PA

C.K. Roulette  
Gettysburg, PA

Amy Matthey  
Hermitage, PA

Shirley Hamilton  
North East, PA

Bruce Davis  
Philadelphia, PA

James Taylor  
Reading, PA

Sean McQuilken  
Mount Pleasant, SC

Clay Jones  
Glen Allen, VA