

NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY TASK FORCE QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

Pages 2-14: What is working well?

Pages 15-35: What Recommendations do you have for how we can do things differently?

Pages 36-45: What future challenges should our plan/recommendations anticipate?

Pages 46-52: What future opportunities should our plan/recommendations anticipate?

Pages 53-76: Other comments and suggestions that you think would be helpful.

What is working well?

I believe the Marine Resources Committee does a very thorough job. I also believe that the Natural Resources Committee does an equally good job.

The Maine Warden Service and Marine Patrol Officers each do a great job in their respective fields.

- 1) Online purchase of licenses at MDIFW....reduced agency operational costs, increased availability and convenience to the PC-literate purchaser
 - 2) MDIFW policies regarding customer service (response times to public phone calls, emails, letters, etc)...well received by the public
 - 3) Regionally staffed offices at MDIFW...for customer service, coordinating/conducting regional field work, addressing local requests/needs, etc.
 - 4) Most natural resource agencies have a strong and vocal constituent base. Proposed agency consolidation is expected to: alienate constituents, create public concerns that agency-specific issues of concern are no longer an agency responsibility or priority, reduce agency support and assistance from the public, create additional distrust of agency "agendas", create a larger bureaucracy, increase opportunity for future agency consolidation and program loss through staff/program reductions.
-

Each entity has several different divisions that have tasks that gather information on the resources that they are charged to manage. The process to obtain the data is an ongoing task and most dedicated employees will do the best they can with the material that is made available in obtaining that information.

The working relations between LURC and the MDIF&W, the Shoreland Zoning program of DEP, and the UT division of Maine Revenue Services have been the best interdepartmental working relationships I've experienced in my 36 years with LURC. There are many shared program goals amongst these various agencies that provide an incentive to work together.

I'm a private consulting forester in Brewer.

What I think works very well is calling the forest service or other agencies with questions. I always feel well served and the people seem knowledgeable and friendly.

Staff professionalism and commitment to Maine and the ideals and objectives of their agency responsibilities.

Maine has great outdoor resources that are easily accessed. I think the agencies are working much harder to coordinate activities.

When a goal is achieved using an efficient manner.

In contrast to HHS, Corrections and Education, these departments are doing pretty well!

In all my contacts with various agencies, I am impressed with the dedication, professionalism and commitment of the staff. They focus on their assignments, and pursue their missions despite significant funding and resource limitations.

I think all is working well. I like how you are able to come to school events and work with the kids here in Litchfield, Maine.

Forest Rangers are experts in enforcing open burning laws, timber theft and investigating wildfires. While other law enforcement officers are capable of enforcing the same laws as Forest Rangers, many do not have the time, interest or expertise to investigate timber theft or illegal fires. I recommend that Forest Rangers continue to enforce all laws associated with recreating and working in the Maine woods.

Maine people are served well by its five natural resource agencies. My experience has largely been with Conservation and Environmental Protection, and I cannot think of a time that I did not feel that my concerns or issues were not addressed promptly and completely. I have also worked with folks in Marine Resources and IF & W, and have been impressed by the dedication of staff to the various tasks at hand. There are great people working for us in these agencies!

Unfortunately, none of these agencies is adequately funded. In the case of Conservation, for example, Maine's parks are burdened with deferred maintenance and by inadequate staffing to manage even the routine work. Biologists in IF & W and Marine Resources have to look for outside grant support to help cover the cost of gathering essential information about fish and wildlife. Whereas I am impressed by the resourcefulness of

these folks, it is more than a bit depressing that we can't seem to muster the political will to adequately address and fund the important work of these agencies.

When compared with other western democracies, we in the United States pay a fraction to support our government -- no surprise to me that we get what we pay for!!

The Quebec government found \$4 million to develop tent sites, lean-tos, chalets, and 300 miles of trail for the International Appalachian Trail. Our Department of Conservation does not have the resources to replace crumbling privies on the Allagash.

Simply, it is a matter of priorities.

Shared resources like the storehouse.

The online licensing that is now offered for hunting and fishing licenses is excellent.

While lacking enough technical staff, LURC is doing a good job of balancing environmental protection with social and economic growth needs. My impression is that IFW and MR do a good job of working with environmentalists, the public, government, and businesses.

The urge to consolidate agencies/departments and reduce redundancies should be tempered by the reasons that gave rise to the current agencies/departments structure in the first place. Typically, in any given state function--from compliance/enforcement, technical assistance, general information sharing with the public, outreach, permitting--a specialized department is likely to produce the best answer and outcome for a situation where that department plays the biggest role. Consolidation may gain efficiency from a business perspective, but perhaps at the detriment of the customer perspective (customer = the public relying on state expertise and services). Thus, streamlining how the public can get to the right person in state government efficiently may be of greater concern than consolidation efficiencies.

The fact that Maine has active and concerned people who want to be involved with decisions being made regarding their water, air, and land, The fact that there are a number of community groups around Maine that have effectively worked to educate each other how to be involved with the decision-making processes. The fact that there are good people within these agencies who do their best to serve the Public.

The portside bycatch study of the North Atlantic Herring fishery. This is one of the best, efficient, and unique projects here at DMR.

The Fisheries Division does a fair to good job with management regarding stocked and warm-water fisheries, primarily in southern and central Maine. (Regions A and B)

As a life long commercial fishermen, USCG fishing vessel safety instructor and currently a NMFS gear expert, I am certain that the DMR MP are the best fisheries enforcement officers and protectors of our marine resources throughout all of New England. I am in the unique position of training all the NE state marine resource enforcement bodies regarding the federal whale plan and the success Maine DMR MP experiences is well recognized by all other state enforcement bodies.

In an effort to duplicate the success of the DMR MP we have identified a key element of the Me DMR MP that is the foundation of their success. Having a dedicated agency to marine resources and not a combined natural resources agency allows the DMR MP to become specialized professionals and is the foundation from which they stand so strong. In plain English, our MP is not trapping a fox one day and gaffing a buoy offshore to inspect for federal whale rules the next. Our DMR MP is clearly recognized as the best and has been asked to train the other state agency officers. Let's not try to fix what is not broken and allow the DMR MP to continue being the leaders of their profession.

In the Forest Protection Division, Maine Forest Service it has been a challenge to keep pace with increasing demands from the public. In the 22 years I have worked in this division we have added job tasks including; FPA enforcement, LURC compliance inspections, timber theft & timber trespass enforcement, trip ticket violations, increased qualifications and credentials for wild land fire suppression, all risk hazard response such as flooding and hurricanes, just to name a few. To date, we have been able to keep pace given permissions and latitudes allowing us to do so. We have done so with significant staff reductions and budget constraints.

I find staff to be hard-working but over extended. This results in inconsistencies.

The management arrangements for Baxter State Park are working well. These are in accordance with the Deeds of Trust, starting with the Baxter State Park Authority.

DMR has continuously found ways to improve overall services to the public over the past 13 years beginning with a reorganization and reduction of middle managers under the Productivity Realization Task Force initiative in 1995/96. Specifically, active monitoring, assessment, and management of marine resources has expanded from a core program on four species to 12 species. A survey of all Maine's coastal marine resources was initiated eight years ago and is providing critical data for management of the groundfish, lobster, and herring fisheries. Co-management was implemented in the lobster fishery with the establishment of seven Lobster Zone Councils in addition to the Lobster advisory Council. Co-management was established for the sea urchin fishery with the establishment of the Sea Urchin Zone Council. DMR now has 20 councils, boards, and technical committees that it works with on fisheries and aquaculture issues.

In addition DMR is engaged in shellfish management at the municipal level with over 70 coastal towns, interstate management of 11 coastal migratory species, federal management of 17 species, and international management for Atlantic salmon. I know of no other natural resource agency in the state that deals with resource management at such diverse and complex levels!

DMR's successes in fisheries management are largely due to actively engaging the industries in solutions to issues in their industries, whether it is disease issues in the aquaculture industry, marine mammal interactions in the lobster fishery, vessel safety, cooperative research, or overfishing and resource depletion. Another critical reason for DMR's effective implementation of management is the excellent working relationship between the managers, scientific staff, and enforcement staff who work together to develop solutions to issues, and regulatory and statutory proposals.

DMR works closely with other agencies in the state to accomplish its mission. There is no duplication in effort among these agencies but there is expertise and complementary work that is helpful to DMR. For example, DMR and DEP work closely together on pollution sources identification and remediation with regard to water quality over shellfish growing areas, as well as on aquaculture lease monitoring. DMR's Public Health program works closely with the Bureau of Health on red tide and public health issues resulting from shellfish consumption. Again, there is no duplication of effort, but rather there is different expertise and focus that is helpful to DMR in investigating illnesses related to shellfish consumption.

Budget realities have resulted in efficiencies initiated between agencies with similar but different mandates. For example IFW, BP&L and BSP have combined orders for herbaceous seed to reduce overall cost.

-- Regional Warden (Inland F & W) stopped by several times to trap nuisance porcupines. [ca. 1997-99: discontinued due to lack of nearby warden]

-- Field agent from Bureau of Land & Water Quality (DEP) stopped by to inspect site of proposed small farm pond and left several useful suggestions. [5-27-99]

-- State Apiarist (Dept Agriculture) stopped by on short notice to inspect hives and make useful recommendations. [5-13-05]

-- Forest Service [Dept Conservation]. Prompt knowledgeable responses from Regional Forester, and follow-up visit of whole property by team of 4 (including entomologist), all very helpful. Also, hearsay makes it appear Canopy program is helpful on broader scale. [Summer & fall, 2007]

Having separate lands programs ensures that each mission is addressed. DOC has worked mainly in the large industrial forest lands in northern Maine acquiring forest easements. DOC lands are managed for timber production and recreation, with no preference given to hunting fishing and trapping over other types of recreation. IFW has set a goal of having large blocks (5,000 + acres) of huntable land within an hours drive of

each major metropolitan area of the state. These lands are managed for the benefit of wildlife and then for hunting, fishing, and trapping. Each agencies programs serve a vital need, they don't do the same things or waste resources. Both programs could use additional resources; neither agency has people standing around doing nothing, looking for work. Each program has a different sphere of influence that ties in to their mission it brings more people and dollars to the table through its partners. Yes, discussion and coordination does occur.

A: Hmmm? , The incident Command system. This is a proven management model. This has been adopted by all Incident response Agencies, some more than others. Since it was ramped up after 911 & H. Katrina, there is Homeland security funding behind it as an incentive and a common inter-agency understanding of accountability in intermediate to large incident organization is beginning to be established. Where do we look for answers? The Commissioners? In twenty-five years of state service I've been asked once for my opinion and I'm considered a specialist in my field. This makes twice. The first time was almost a decade ago and it involved the issuance of life safety equipment. Ten years later an entire division does not have that vital piece of life safety equipment while performing our duties mandated by the states constitution even though independent analysts strongly advised the state to provide our division with that equipment. It was revealed years later that although the equipment was approved by the Senate, it was defeated by the appropriations committee at the advice of a commissioner who was motivated by bias, not fact.

In the field, the divisions and agencies work cooperatively, referring complaints to the appropriate authority in person and in doing so there has to be core knowledge of the other agencies duties and authority. Time and time again, one agency has the in field discretion to refer violations to another agency or not because the official referral process gets convoluted by administrative territorialism instead of just doing the public the service of dealing with it when it is at hand.

Granted, each of these Agencies have specialized fields but rest assured, each specialist has the core knowledge to know when a violation within another specialized field is occurring. And rest assured there are many instances when one specialist could handle that violation instead of referring it to another specialist hence delaying the efficient disposition of the violation and even allowing it to continue. This has occurred up to and includes violations where life safety is at emanate risk. Imagine a Natural resource officer encountering a respondent with warrants who is committing another criminal offense and who leaves that respondent to continue their criminal act with the only action being a phone call to the appropriate agency. That not only happens regularly but is a mandate hidden in our policies.

There are instances where official referrals are made but are never acknowledged. On the other side of the coin, there are incidents where the public respondent is visited by two or more agencies in response to the very same violation. In these instances, the public respondent can expect a hand written inspection notice from one agency, a letter of finding from another agency and a consent agreement from yet another agency for the same violation and each agency gets to record their intervention in their separate data base that is presented to the legislature as separate activities.

The answer is to break down the walls of territorialism, create a uniform reporting system, and abandon the archaic programs that are no longer needed, by reducing the top heaviness in our government starting with the Commissioners.

The field has been cut to the bone, and rendered ineffective by the distractions of special projects mandated by top administrators. We understand the occasional need for special projects. But we are smart enough to question to what end some projects are for. To put it bluntly, why serve the special interests of four commissioners when you can serve the special interests of one.

Knowledge in most areas of the agencies is very good. The personnel know their trade.

As a public servant to the department of Marine Resources:

The Service Center managed with a Director and a Deputy Director

The Department with a Commissioner and a Deputy Commissioner

An assigned Financial Analyst for each agency

Resource Administrator levels within the departments

Budget and Financial Management System (BFMS)

Bureau of the Budget Analysts positions

Office of Fiscal Program Review, legislative analysts

MFASIS Warehouse for historical information thru FY07

Automated Time and Attendance Management System (TAMS)

Query friendly FORTIS automated records and reporting system

DMR Commercial Licensing system fulfilling the intricate eligibility process

On-Line licensing of commercial licenses

Scientific databases for fisheries management planning

Public Health process of identifying potential health risks of shellfish populations

As a taxpayer:

A satisfied knowledge that there is a host of employees dedicated to meeting the needs of the public and industry while accomplishing the missions of the department and maintaining the health of Maine's marine resources.

I can obtain information about any agency on the web and if calling an agency most likely will receive the information I need.

I can register my vehicle and boat on-line. I can buy my fishing and hunting licenses on-line. I can query for job openings on-line and apply on-line.

I can listen to legislative sessions via the internet and view live sessions via the internet.

What is not working as well?

Advantage – new automated financial system has been a very slow transition

InfoAdvantage is not as user friendly as its predecessor MFASIS Warehouse

More time is needed for Service Center staff to learn the departments and programs they serve before reaching optimum effectiveness.

OIT needs more staff for inventory tracking. We are currently non-compliant with common business practices for inventory tracking. More funding is needed in order to accomplish basic controls.

As a state employee involved in the financial and budgeting sector, I consider the current overall internal functions of state government less than adequate since the consolidation of the financial and administration functions of the 5 Natural Resource agencies. The reason, simply, is the loss of staff and lack of recovery time to define roles and identify processes.

Prior to one of the most aggressive consolidations in the history of state government, internal controls were tightly adhered to and easily maintained and achieved. Today due to the loss of staff it will be at least another year before internal controls can even be identified, re-written and then implemented. It's not that staff is not aware of the need, or the unwillingness to begin, it is simply a lack of time to devote to the process.

So in my opinion, to disrupt these 5 agencies with even more consolidation efforts would be a disservice to the employee and more importantly the public who deserves accountability with their tax dollars. Until we have at least two years to view program levels, no one can make an intelligent suggestion without first ensuring the current model is working.

Financial and administrative services are the foundation of state government. Please don't make the mistake to disrupt this core even more by pandering to a political desire. The public never sees the internal works of WalMart, Sears or McDonalds, nor do they care to. All they want are the services provided. Today I believe the state is providing those services. However, when the state requested the opinion of the public for ideas to cut state government, I felt it was an inappropriate venue and was an unconstitutional process. We have a democratic process with state representatives, senators, congressmen and the legislative process for these ideas to pass through committees and public hearings. I believe we circumvented the entire system and received only a small margin of public input with the potential for hearing from only disgruntled people and not from the people who know the services in place are working.

Therefore, your task of finding more consolidation efforts I'm afraid will devastate an already overburdened work force. The knowledge of what your Task Force has been tasked with is already looming over the heads of state employees and has a very negative impact on their daily work production. If anything I would hope the Task Force would acknowledge the hard work and dedication of the state employee instead of implying that their current efforts are falling short of effectiveness.

Me DMR has worked very hard over the past several years to improve communication between the agency and its stakeholders. DMR has also improved the communication between different user groups with in the marine fishery industry.

I am only dealing with DMR, so I cannot comment on the other agencies. For the most part, DMR does a good job. The fisheries that have council systems in place have to be careful to avoid the “Fox guarding the chicken coop” temptation, which is very real. The economic realities that we are living with make it increasingly difficult to put the resource before the harvesters and buyers. Left unchecked, industry will manage themselves out of business, in many fisheries.

Smaller agencies have a tendency to work more efficiently if they are well managed. The Dept. of Marine Resources is a good example. Merging this agency into a larger organization would adversely affect this efficiency and its focus on its core mission of promoting marine industry while conserving and managing the resource.

Each of these agencies has very important responsibilities to their ecological community(s) and the citizens that depend on them. As our society and our government have matured, so has the level of sophistication required to understand and manage these natural ecosystems. Our public demands a level of sophistication in our government agencies so that they do their jobs effectively and do not make mistakes. I therefore think it is critical that these agencies continue to get the support and public funding required to continue to improve their understanding of these ecosystems and to have the capacity to develop and enforce effective policies.

What is working well is that we have dedicated people working on these issues. We do not need to be blending the knowledgeable people across these disciplines in order to reduce budgets. There may be ways to develop more efficient administrative functions between these agencies, but we need to find a way to increase the capacity of these agencies to conduct science, engage citizens, support policy, and enforce regulations that will result in better and more sustainable management of these important natural resources.

* Can't say I have much of a sense that anything in these state government agencies is working well, particularly around anything having to do with serving the public. I know of some exceptions to this, but this Pollyannaish question avoids “what's not working” quite deftly and this takes the heat off all of you by your not having to take the risk to address the core question “who's interests are being served well by the current system of governance?” I think the agencies do real well at perpetuating themselves and at promoting the agendas of the various private sector constituents who bend the bureau's ears long and loudest. But for the average public, Jo and Judy Schmo out here, those lofty four ideals expressed as associated recommendations must seem pretty vacuous to them. Part of the problem for me in this “what's working and not exercise” is the revealed and disturbing fact that these agencies have evidently lost any ability to self reflect and re-address the questions, issues and priorities having to do with their public service mandate and accountability. And now you want to hear back, feedback from all your external constituents? Have you lost your way and wherewithal to re-direct your public mandates, or, is it really the case that so much private interest is running the public screen?

* Collaboration between the D.E.P.'s Bureau of Land & Water Quality Wastewater Licensing program, and D.M.R.'s Shellfish Sanitation program, ensures certified shellfish dealer wet storage applications comply with both programs. Posting D.M.R.'s emergency shellfish legal notices on the website, and sending legal notice email updates to several distribution lists, provides "real-time" updates to the public, regulatory authorities, and shellfish harvesters. These methods provide much faster and more detailed notifications than those of six years ago.

* Within the scope of the DMR (Department of Marine Resources) current activities, two in particular are necessary. The function of the Marine Patrol is necessary, is carried out efficiently, and is well accepted by the fishing community and the general public. The activities of the Dept. with respect to water quality monitoring in support of the shellfish industry and the activities related to shellfish sanitation and health issues are the proper function of government oversight and are necessary to meet Federal requirements in this area.

* Marine Patrol works exceptionally well. It is one of the best marine patrol forces in the country. The patrol officers are specialists in what they do and truly use the best of community police methods. Marine enforcement is very complex given the complex regulatory framework they work in and the areas are vast -- with only 6+ vessels. Maine is lucky to have this force because it is essential for compliance -- essential in turn for good stewardship.

The municipal clam program works amazingly well. Key to its success is the outreach and competence of the Area Biologists.

* The municipal program for softshell clams works well as a local management unit where clam committees are elected. Lobster zone area management is working well as an intermediate management unit because the zones reflect the ecology of relatively discrete sections of the coast. Its size reflects local fishing practices and provides an elected intermediate management unit for fishermen and DMR. The restrictive regulations to limit lobsterman mobility, the numbers of traps fished, owner-operator provisions and apprentice plans, have created a stewardship ethic where fishermen, towns, and concerned individuals have supported local solutions to local problems, such as the Zone C lobster hatchery to supplement reduced lobster larval settlement in coastal bays. This is management that works. Maine's other fisheries have either become depleted or absorbed by the New England Fisheries Management Council, leaving Maine's coastal fishermen with little access.

It appears that the daily operations / management is all working well, however it is interesting and a bit surprising how little each respective agency knows about what the other is doing, and what resources from other agencies are available to their own.

* **DMR:**

Aquaculture Division: Staff is professional, responsive, and aware of needs of constituents. For the most part, healthy communication between agency and industry.

Public Health Division:

Biotoxin Program: Excellent performance:

- Very serious about protecting Public Health yet also
- Very responsive to industry's needs.

Growing Area Classification Program: By and large, poor performance:

- Not only is the Program understaffed, some existing staff are not professional or qualified to do the jobs they have been hired to do.
 - Under-performing staff has put the program out of compliance with FDA regulations and have caused great hardship to the shellfish industry.
 - Lack of proper planning underutilizes existing agency resources (DMR laboratories are not being currently used at their maximum capacity)
 - Very poor communication with the industry has hurt growers and harvesters.
 - Industry efforts to collaborate to address some of these issues have resulted in very combative exchanges due to DMR's lack of interest in listening to its constituency.
 - Growing Area Program has regulated ME's industry much more strictly than other state programs, putting ME's industry at a disadvantage vis-à-vis other states'.
 - Attempts at thinking outside the box and providing creative solutions to problems are non-existent within the agency and are resisted if coming from the outside.
-

* The licensing unit of Administration at the Department of Marine Resources provides the management and issuance of marine resources licenses to commercial and recreational harvesters and to the seafood industry people. The majority of the fishermen we deal with are commercial harvesters. This unit functions well.

This unit works closely with the fishermen and industry people to assist in determining what licenses are needed. The customers we serve are often overwhelmed with the yearly changes and increased complexity of the laws and rules and regulations. Our staff is required to use specialized knowledge of detailed DMR laws and rules and regulations

to explain and interpret this information in a manner that is understandable to our customers. I feel our staff works very hard to provide services and accommodate the fishermen and seafood industry people.

The licensing process is a very detailed process. The complexity and eligibility issues of our licenses call for detailed applications and much information is required. These applications must be reviewed thoroughly using specialized knowledge of the license qualification criteria and eligibility. Research is needed regarding boat ownership and federal permit status. Accuracy and precision are a must while processing these applications as an individual's livelihood depends on the process. Once again I feel our staff performs in a competent manner while processing licenses.

Because of the nature of the work, many issues overlap. This makes it necessary for the licensing unit to work directly with other bureaus in the department. Frequently extensive research of records must be completed by licensing for the Bureau of Marine Patrol and on a daily basis license checks are done. Licensing also works closely with the landings program to be sure that only those individuals that meet all reporting requirements are issued licenses. This is done in an effective and efficient manner.

As discussed above the work done by the DMR licensing unit is very detailed and complex. Because of the complexity it is not the type of work that would be easily divided and done by others. I feel that a division of duties would be the beginning of the end - so to speak. The DMR licensing staff works well as a unit and as efficiently as possible with the intricate subject matter.

* Here is an opportunity to present our latest success to state & federal agencies.....we have been providing free loam and conservation advice to Lake Auburn watershed property owners with excellent results! It basically works like this:

All communities have some level of road maintenance, with this comes removing ditching material from the sides of roads & other repair and upgrades. Normally this mass of used materials has to be disposed in land fills, or areas that may or most likely may not have the permits, or environmental consideration to do so.

Enter Sticks & Stones, wayside stand in North Auburn. One of our services is providing an area for state & local municipalities, including local contractors & farmers to leave their loamy, sandy soils for recycling. The lake association, Lake Auburn Watershed Neighborhood Association (LAWNA) & Auburn Land Share provide resources to rent equipment to sort & screen these soils (including a dash of manure) to produce high quality, screened loam FREE to Lake Auburn watershed property owners. Sticks n Stones does not allow off-site stock piling of this material to homeowners, but requires the loam be immediately used to restore an area of exposed erodible soils (run-off nutrients is the NUMBER ONE POLLUTANT of our water bodies) or a planned & permitted area under transition back to a vegetative state like a field/grass, shrubs or rain garden area.

This change of erodible or impervious area to vegetative buffer provides an area to treat the harmful ingredients found in the ditching material when excavated from roads & highways, transported and then processed. This vegetative buffer continues to help our environment perpetually.

The refuse from screening called tailings (even more -- sticks n stones) are also recycled into Best and Integrated Management Practice material such as rip-rap & erosion control mix, which is also provided to watershed projects.

Garbage from the road side material is either out in the recycle or in solid waste garbage bags and picked up by the City of Auburn and disposed of appropriately. This operation, without any formal monetary aid, and a convenience to public works, is already financially self-sufficient in its four months of operation. In fact, there is plenty of loam to go around for personal projects and local sales to cover gas and other equipment and incidental costs. With outside funding this program could be expanded to other critical watersheds, and possibly even to the entire community that sheds into the Androscoggin River, although it would make more sense not to centralize such a service to any one area. Make it happen globally as I am thinking as I prepare to fly to filthy Beijing this afternoon!

In addition to providing FREE loam, the watershed education is unbelievable! For example, one lady called in and asked about the loam, I asked, what immediate watershed her home was in and she said "I don't know," I then asked her: What if someone was to change their oil in your driveway and accidentally spilled some on the ground? Then it began raining, where would the washed oil go? She said, "I have no clue, probably down in my backyard somewhere." I said, you mean towards the Whitman Spring Road? She said "YES!" I then told her how our communities drinking supply, just off this road would be polluted, to a small degree, but still polluted by this action, on her property, and then told her of the many ways properties in her area can affect the water quality.

This property owner has a whole new perspective, and now today, a beautiful lawn without the use of unnatural fertilizers.

Belinda, almost every community and their waters, throughout the world could benefit from what we are doing here in North Auburn, thanks for your continued dedication to the people and thanks for forwarding this Maine resource. As you know politics has slowed my progress in educating local leaders of a "crazy" septic ordinance around this neighborhood, however, today politics has helped and I appreciate your personal commitment to share.

What recommendations do you have for how we can do things differently?

My recommendations are practical. There is little doubt in anyone's mind of the inequity of representation within the Joint Standing Committee on Inland Fisheries and Wildlife. I have been consistently surprised at the unwillingness of the administration to allow a more balanced committee, representing the true makeup of Maine's citizens. We have the USF&W/US Census Bureau 2006 Survey on Fishing, Hunting and Wildlife Watching to provide the numbers that can be used to balance this inequity. The study shows that while the number of people hunting continues to drop at the rate of 1% a year (10% over the last ten years) we can see that wildlife watching has increased 19% over the same time period. There needs to be a balance on this committee that has never been before. It is extraordinarily biased toward the consumptive sporting community. This is resulting in a lack of inclusiveness for the majority of Maine's citizens when it comes to wildlife. My suggestion, which is already, I am sure, being fought tooth and nail by the DIF&W and sporting community, is to combine the existing IF&W committee with either the Marine Resource or Natural Resources Committees. My belief is that the Natural Resources Committee is a better fit as far as the different bills that would be heard are concerned. Wildlife is and always has been considered a natural resource, and with the continuous growth of and interest in non-consumptive activities like canoeing, hiking, kayaking, biking etc, which while not primarily based in wildlife viewing, needs to be considered for their economic value. The people who take part in these and many other similar activities enjoy these activities in Maine partly because of our natural attractions, including wildlife. These people need representation when it comes to wildlife and this joining of committees will even the playing field as far as equitable representation is concerned. With equitable representation it will then be a justifiable request to ask for funding from a broader spectrum of Maine than there currently is. It will also streamline the process of allowing all on-shore natural resources a single governing body, hopefully adequately representing all of Maine's citizens, equitably. Maine citizens who hunt make up only 11% of the population of our state. This is the single most important change I foresee can happen in Augusta when it comes to natural resources governance.

I believe that a merger of Game Wardens and Marine Patrol Officers makes sense. Both are academy certified law enforcement professionals. What this means is that in a dangerous and stressful situation we are trained to react in a similar fashion. I feel that Officers from both groups would quickly come to trust one another and work together.

While we are both involved with law enforcement, the jobs we perform are very different. I do not know how much, if anything would be saved by moving us into the same group.

The amount of time and resources spent dealing with complaints about nuisance wildlife issues is a big waste. A law enforcement professional is not needed to give information out on how to deal with nuisance wildlife issues or to transport a bat found in a house up to the Augusta Lab for testing. The time spent dealing with these issues pulls the Warden away from his core mission. A solution for this alone would free up wardens to do their job instead of spending four or five hours and hundreds of miles driven to deliver a rabies specimen to Augusta. Spending hours upon hours giving out information to people on how to deal with nuisance wildlife concerns could be solved with education and easily accessed information. While these issues need to be dealt with, I have to believe a more efficient solution could be found.

Smaller 4-wheel-drive pickups and other vehicles that get better gas mileage.

1) Since Maine is a significant tourist destination (important source of state revenues) there should be a strong focus on supporting this economic "growth opportunity" through the activities the natural resource agencies are responsible for. For example, MDMR focuses almost exclusively on commercial fishing interests. Some agency, if not MDMR, needs to focus on saltwater fishing resources with recreational interests in mind. Most saltwater recreational fisheries are in decline. Enhancement of saltwater fishing opportunity will enhance recreational opportunities to encourage additional tourism/guiding/equipment sales. Such enhancement will certainly also benefit residents, adding to our quality of life.

2) MDIFW has a successful public water access program, but insufficient funding/staffing (currently one 1/2 time position for all land/water property acquisition and development). Public access to lands and public waters of the state is critical to supporting our tourist based economy and quality of life. What is Maine if you can't get to and enjoy all those places on the "post cards".....Public access is a very important natural resource agency function. This "function" at MDIFW should either be supported with enhanced staffing through reallocation of existing staffing or considered for merging into MDOC, where a larger version of MDIFW's land/water access program resides. If such merger occurred, a strong level of coordination would be required between IFW and MDOC regarding acquisition/development priorities to address agency program differences.

3) Greater efficiency (lower costs/more efficient use of staff time) would be realized through the issuance of credit cards to IFW regional offices to facilitate minor purchases (mostly for maintenance and repair) to eliminate the state costs of processing invoices for small purchases (often only a few dollars). Furthermore, the current system requires that we only use vendors on the state's vendor list; as a result we must sometimes go out of our way and sometimes pay more to make a purchase only where we have an established account. Available credit cards with small credit limits would potentially support

timelier, less costly, and efficient use of staffthe current system is very inefficient and more costly and would never exist in the private sector.

4) A more thorough review of agency dependence and cost-effectiveness of agency reliance upon Central Fleet for vehicle rental + gas, as opposed to agency ownership of vehicles. The same analysis should occur for telecommunications infrastructure (pc, phones, printers, radios, etc). While a convenient service to state agencies, these types of "in-house" support functions are relatively expensive and there is some information to suggest the current service approach is not as cost effective as an approach where the agencies purchase and maintain their own equipment.

Remove the repetition of data gathering of information for our resources that occurs not only within all the above agencies but by federal agencies as well as consulting organizations hired by both public and private entities.

Every consideration should be given to removing LURC from DOC and either integrated into DEP (aligned with the municipal shoreland zoning program) or integrated with the fiscal administrator of the UT (now in Audit) and the UT division of MRS into a quasi-municipal agency for the UT. As a regulatory program, LURC has never been a good fit within DOC. While this DOC administration has been the most supportive of LURC programs, it seems to be based principally on a personal interest by those in the Commissioner's office – this has not always been the case. At a particular low-point in LURC's history, a particular newly appointed DOC Commissioner informed LURC staff that he "didn't understand what LURC did and didn't want to understand; he simply wanted us to stay out of the headlines."

The most significant improvement that could be made in LURC's ability to meet its statutory mandate would be to place the agency under the Natural Resources Committee of the Legislature. The current oversight committee (ACF) has seldom, if ever, demonstrated any meaningful understanding of LURC's charge. The ACF committee seems to be more in tune with the programs of the Dept of Agriculture.

What does not work so well is to try to find information on the websites. Especially the WoodsWISE website is very confusing. There seem to be 2 WoodsWISE sites, with slightly different tasks. Unfortunately it's not very clear which of the sites you need to go to for the information you are seeking

I do see problems with the new arrangement of the cost-share programs. Now that MFS is partnering with USDA.

The biggest problem for me is that the USDA programs are based on competitive bids and that if you apply for too many acres you might be kicked out of the race completely. I

have thinning projects for a conservation trust, several hundred acres (even thousands of acres) and I was told that there might be cost-sharing for about 25 to 35 acres per year. That's great. The problem is that if I apply for 35 acres but money is available for only 30, my application will not be considered.

Why can't I apply for xxx acres and still be considered even if only a smaller amount might be cost shared. Now I have to be very conservative with the acreage I apply for, so I don't risk being kicked off the list completely.

I do not pretend to know the answer to this question in any context. I have concerns that chronic budget shortfalls and reductions have resulted in the loss of expertise in some areas that will never be replaced, and that the knowledge of the value of that expertise itself will be lost over time. I have concerns that the appropriate environmental monitoring data are not available to make informed decisions on various natural resource policy issues. I have concerns that too much of the available staff time is spent in response to issues rather than in the proactive development of programs to enhance Maine's natural resource ideals and opportunities.

First of all, limiting the task force to developing a plan to “increase efficiencies, eliminate duplication and enhance cooperation” is woefully inadequate. It shows a lack of imagination, an inability to see “the big picture”, a lack of understanding of how state government is failing to deliver the services that are needed, and failure to grasp the severity of problems within state government. The task force should have been given the task of developing a plan to “maximize the effectiveness, efficiency and responsiveness” of the subject state agencies.

As a state employee and as a citizen, taxpayer and voter, in my view, state government is badly broken. Here are several fundamental problems:

- 1) *Each agency has its own constituency (ies) that it caters to-often at the expense of the common good.* The best example is the system at DIF&W whereby the Joint Standing Committee on Inland Fisheries and Wildlife, the Commissioner's Advisory Council, the department and the statutes all favor a very small segment of the population-those who hunt, fish and trap. This not only makes for often poor decision-making, it also greatly limits and inhibits increasing department funding by so-called “non-consumptive users” who constitute some 70-80% of Maine residents. In my work, I have also seen similar favoritism at DMR and DAFRR. In addition to intra-agency favoritism, there is also inter-agency infighting as agencies seek to protect their clientele from regulation. *Combining these agencies into one “Super Agency” may improve the state's work product by diminishing the relative influence of special interest groups and by forcing the agencies to work together for the common good.*
- 2) *State government lacks creativity, inventiveness and courage.* We spend far too many of our work days muddling through doing the same old thing, day in, day

out. We talk about problems but seldom solve them. Management is either afraid to or unable to come up with new ideas and ways of improving our effectiveness, efficiency and responsiveness. The system ignores or even punishes those who think outside the box and rewards those who practice mediocrity by keeping their heads down and not rocking the boat. There is a serious lack of management and leadership skills in state government. *State government needs to promote inventiveness, creativity and positive change by employing and rewarding those who promote and practice them.*

- 3) *State government lacks the ability to plan effectively.* Far too much time and attention are focused on day to day department operations. No one is looking at the big picture, or if someone is, it is from an ivory tower. If there is any planning being done, front-line staff are not involved and input from them is rarely sought. *State government needs to learn to look long-term and needs to learn how to solicit and use staff input in the planning process.*
- 4) *State government is not proactive. State government should lead, not follow.*
- 5) *State government lacks effective accountability of its employees. State government must improve accountability at all levels.*

The Public needs a lot more education and working jointly at marketing and public education would be beneficial. Most people don't know or care which department is the lead.

1. Consider 4 day work week were applicable, 2. Allow folks to work from home especially those in computer based positions, with provisions in place to ensure production standards continue at least in the winter to minimize facility costs. 3. Nurture interagency relations, different Natural Resource agencies work/travel together to discuss issues in common areas and save on fuel/vehicle wear and tear. 4. Utilize the vast amount of federal excess equipment available to equip all state agencies with necessary tools (see DRMO website.) 5. Offer incentives to employees to create ways to conduct business in an efficient manner.

1. There must be more effort put into production and local marketing of products grown or produced in Maine.
2. Encourage the development of more “wind farms’ like the one getting underway on Kibby Mountain.
3. Increased action is needed in order to keep our streams and lakes from getting overgrown with harmful vegetation. Greater attention should be paid to pollutants accumulating here due to their production in other states. Bigger fines might help.
4. Wildlife and natural resource preservation must continue at a faster pace lest parts of Maine become concrete jungles like those emerging in many other states.

5. All of the above represents increased budgets in a time of decreased availability of real dollars. The above named departments might consider banding together to obtain some high powered lobbying efforts that might be able to divert some \$\$ away from development of tourism and light industry and toward preservation and protection of our natural resources.
 6. Elect public officials (at all levels of government) who are committed to improving all aspects of our environment. Actively advocate for the election of such candidates.
 7. Work with local officials to encourage their participation in protecting natural resources. Town ordinance committees should be helping.
-

Both within and among agencies, there are many small parallel programs pursuing similar goals. The most obvious examples are the field-based enforcement programs, where both Wardens and Rangers are thinly spread over the landscape, each covering the same ground. With some cross-training and coordination, we could work towards better coverage of our state. Four different agencies site and manage boat launches, and within each agency there are numerous small single-purpose programs, each without the resources to do a really good job on their assignment. Each of these programs has constituents who value it, and are afraid that they will lose something if their program is mingled in to a larger universe.

Ideally, it would be great if we could decide what we, as a state, need to have our government do for us, and, with that in front of us, design a delivery and support system. Having lived in several other states, it seems to me that a Department of Natural Resources could help us organize our work into more logical blocks, and perhaps facilitate cross-program interaction and assistance.

I think that there could be more availability to have the resources come to schools and teach kids about the different things. Do not switch where they are located like putting them up north just have them stay where they are. Put more photos of the projects and activities that you do.

1. Eliminate the IF&W. It has become a slave of special interest groups. Place Warden services and licensing functions under the D.E.P.
 2. Reduce size, dollars, and influence of the Department of Agriculture. They simply waste taxpayer money and try to redistribute funds into their marketplace.
 3. Place all environmental issues under DEP including farm pollution control, non-native massive water infestations, milfoil control, and water quality. Make DEP the “super agency.”
-

1) With home heating oil and firewood prices on the rise, there have been more reports of firewood theft. While Rangers do investigate theft of firewood in cases where

it was outright taken, they do not measure investigate fraudulent practices such as “shorting” a customer on the amount of firewood. Rangers are certainly capable of measuring a cord of wood and should not have to call the Dept of Agriculture’s Weights and Measures Division for this issue. Besides, Weights and Measures don’t have a quick way of issuing a summons if the amount is short. By allowing Rangers to handle anything to do with firewood, it would also allow Weights and Measures to do other work to which they are more familiar. It would also give Rangers an opportunity to educate and inform people on how to purchase and dry firewood effectively.

2) Rangers could also investigate complaints on wood scaling, which I think is also handled by weights and measures.

3) Most Forest Rangers have 2 or 4 year degrees in Natural Resource related topics and are capable of recognizing and enforcing water quality issues. I suggest that they be able to investigate and enforce water quality issues related to timber harvesting and road building. This would reduce the workload from the Dept of Environmental Protection and / or LURC and eliminate two agencies showing up to investigate one complaint. DEP or the local Code Enforcement Officer could still enforce shoreland zoning laws where structures are involved.

We should explore the creation of a natural resource agency that combines IF & W and Marine Resources at the very least, and possibly Conservation. A new Department of Natural Resources may be able to find economies of scale in areas of enforcement, for example, or with the work performed by biologists, ecologists, geologists, and the like.

Agriculture and Environmental Protection are distinct enough that they should continue to stand alone.

Everyone’s CFM budget is going to be circling the drain so why not do something collaboratively to reduce these costs?(I have no idea what else can be bulk bought or put under one contract but those in the know may have some idea) The office spaces we occupy all over the state can **maybe** consolidated a little more. In the past few years more of us are sharing to pare down cost and MAYBE we can do a little more.

It seems that the Maine Warden Service is having some tough times, at least in the eyes of some seasoned veterans of the Warden Service. Someone should listen to them.

My main interest is in furthering and promoting the aquatic resources that Maine has been blessed with. Our present management of these resources came about over time and it has been proven to be less than adequate for the task, in fact it is fragmented and

inconsistent. We have suffered great diminishment and loss of these resources under the present management scheme.

The breadth and depth of these resources is so large that I feel we need to have one department which manages only these aquatic resources and nothing else. One department which manages all of our aquatic resources for sustainability, a department with a commissioner whose sole task is to make Maine once again a premier destination recognized worldwide for its fisheries.

I cannot over-emphasize the fact that we need consistency. This is lacking in current management.

Of less importance, but not insignificant, is this; the Feds are mandating a saltwater license. With this proposed management system we could have one fishing license for the whole state, both freshwater and salt. License buyers would, however, have to fill out a questionnaire regarding their preference. It seems we would sell many more licenses and consequently provide more funds for the resource.

Most of DEP still works as “environmental police” with the assumption that the public and businesses are out to harm the environment, and only reluctantly issue permits or licenses. Of all the agencies listed above, the DEP is the only one that appears unwilling to consider them as serving the public. In other words, they act as if they know better and environmental protection trumps all other considerations.

Personally, I believe every consolidation that has occurred—computer services/IT and Natural resources service center—has led to an erosion of employee support functions. We used to have dedicated department computer people who could also help us generate reports from existing databases to helping out with general computer technology, setting up software. From the IT perspective when we had our own dedicated IT personnel they typically knew what we needed because they knew how we functioned as a department/division and were used to dealing with the kind of information we accumulate and services we need to provide. Customer support (in this case, customer = department staff) eroded. An example is the decision to go with Crystal Reports and eliminate Reportsmith. I believe this decision came from the IT people. Well, Reportsmith was actually fairly easy to learn for staff. Crystal Reports is “more powerful” and is favored by IT staff who know computer software better than department staff. The decision was poor because it took a useful tool out of department staff’s hands and relegated it to somebody else, and left us with a hard-to-decipher software that was also too expensive to allow everyone to be licensed to use it (everybody had access to Reportsmith). The NRSC probably works fine, I don’t know, but I do know I now do more of my own purchase requisition documentation than I used to do when we had more clerical staff within the department, so the efficiency realized may not be real, merely a passing on of tasks to department staff.

-
- Make more effort to notify and include the Public of decision making processes about projects that will impact their land, air, water, and health.
 - Work to incorporate values and practical programs for Environmental Justice in all the environmental agencies' practices. Maine has been directed by the Federal EPA to have a Department of Environmental Justice, but it is currently effectively non-existent in Maine.
 - Make sure those members of local community groups that are working on environmental issues are included in the decision-making process, and that it is not dominated by big business representatives/lobbyists. Also recognize that big environmental non-profit organizations, while they do good work to protect the environment, are not the same thing as local citizen groups, and that local citizens groups have valuable knowledge that needs to be included in the decision-making processes.
 - Stop calling toxic waste "biomass" and the dumping and burning of it "beneficial use." Make an effort to counteract the influence that waste industry lobbyists and law firms have over environmental agencies in setting their rules and regulations.
 - Have a 30-day period for Public Comments requesting Public Hearings, in response to applications accepted for processing. Maine currently only has a 20-day period, but as I understand it, the Federal Clean Air or Water Act requires a 30-day period.
 - Have a standard process for granting Public Hearings - if a certain amount of people request a Public Hearing within a reasonable and fair time period, that Public Hearing should be held. A structure more like Town Meeting would be far more fair and democratic than what is in place now, where agencies can apparently arbitrarily decide whether or not to grant a hearing, no matter how many people request one. Under Town Meeting structure, if a member of the Public gathers an amount of signatures (usually 10% of the amount of people who voted in the last election) and submits them to the Town Office, a Special Town meeting will be held, or the issue will be placed on the warrant for the annual Town Meeting. This could be very helpful to institute on the State level as well.
 - Work to make agency operations more transparent, and make sure that there is as much an effort to include the Public in the decision-making process as has gone into including big business in the process.

The fisheries Division should be completely restructured or combined into one agency that would manage all of the State's fisheries (I.E. Regional management is not working. The Division lacks leadership and management is seldom based on biology and science

especially when it concerns Maine's native and wild salmonids.) (DMR's management of fisheries under their jurisdiction is almost always based on science and biology.)

Less steps and layers of people for out of state travel requests.

1. Combining of the management of all state lands. Each agency has a different priority for their land management decisions. IF & W manages their lands with a goal of providing a good hunting experience, while Public Lands manage their woodlands for timber production (and to feed their budget). Different goals produce different land management strategies. These would need to be reconciled.

2. Combining all the law enforcement staff. Game wardens are more than just law enforcement staff; they are also the face of the Department providing some fish and wildlife information. Since they are often the face of the Department it is helpful that they interface with the biologists so that they can explain why a fishing regulation is what it is, or why buck only areas. Not to mention the coordination between the wildlife biologists and wardens in addressing nuisance wildlife.

Forest Rangers, who originally were tasked with fighting forest fires, but who know also assist the Licensed foresters in timber trespass violations and other Forrester Practice Act issues must also regularly interact with the forester.

A common thread is the need of the enforcement arm of an agency to interact on a regular basis with the scientists and professionals of their agency. The policies and goals are set by the management/technical part with consultation with the enforcement section of the agency. Without the two staffs remaining together the continuity and understanding will be lost.

Strengthen Community Based Fisheries Management (CBFM). The DMR has partnered with our fishing communities and through lobster zone management efforts they have established the start of CBFM. These communities are who the DMR should partner with and not look at partnering with other natural resource agencies.

We desperately need to document actual/active fishing effort. Fisheries management bodies such as the ASMFC and the Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Team are forced to take action based on license sales, trap tags, and latent effort calculations to name a few. We must capture actual active fishing effort through an effort such as log books or an equivalent reliable and duplicative measure if our marine resources and fisheries are going to be managed properly and fairly.

LURC and development applications:

When LURC was established nearly forty years ago, it was impossible to anticipate the enormity of the task it faces today. LURC was not created to deal with applications of the magnitude of Plum Creek's proposed Concept Plan for the Moosehead Lake Region. LURC staff and Commissioners have been overtaxed ever since Plum Creek submitted its initial application in 2005. Furthermore, it seems likely that Plum Creek's proposal is only the first of many large-scale development applications that LURC will need to consider over the coming decades. And the evaluation of a developer's application is only the first step: once a permit is issued, LURC is charged with enforcement of its terms. Even now, LURC has inadequate resources for proper enforcement of its regulations, and the situation will get much worse with the approval of large projects such as the one proposed by Plum Creek. If Maine's natural resources are to be protected for future generations, I believe it is vital to re-evaluate the staff and fiscal resources that LURC is likely to need in the future. I believe the state should also reconsider whether it is reasonable to expect Commissioners who work on a volunteer basis to deal with the huge volumes of information associated with proposals like Plum Creek's.

Wind power:

Implementation of the recommendations of the Governor's Task Force on Wind Power Development is proving to be complicated because the relevant legislation and associated rules are divided between two state agencies—LURC and DEP. Going forward, it will be important for these two agencies to work closely together to coordinate their efforts with regard to wind power as seamlessly as possible.

When we speak in terms of consolidations or changes in natural resources I would consider moving the Maine Warden Service in to Public Safety, then the remainder of DIF&W consolidating with Conservation. If we look at training, qualification, and job tasks, the Maine Warden Service is very similar to State Police except their focus is on enforcing a very specific set of laws. Other States are configured in this manner. This would provide a general law enforcement presence in the unorganized territories which does not currently exist

We need to develop a long term building replacement plan which identifies funding. With soaring energy costs and very old buildings, repairs and upgrades are not solving any problems. We are currently using a band-aid approach to a serious issue. This would result in significant long term savings.

Stabilize the budget.

If you don't have it already, a board of representatives from each of the agencies should be created to meet quarterly for the purpose of discussing programs, challenges, issues, and how to coordinate and collaborate between agencies and with other partners and stakeholders.

These arrangements should remain as they are.

I've thought a lot about this and do not have any recommendations to do things differently. There are so many aspects of DMR that are unique because we are the only agency that works exclusively in the marine and estuarine environments. While there is some overlap between the riverine environments that the Bureau of Sea Run Fisheries and IF&W work in, the species that the two groups work on are entirely different. The Bureau of Sea Run Fisheries species spend half their lives in saltwater so the link to Marine Resources, interstate and international management is much stronger than the link with Inland Fisheries. Communication has improved greatly between those groups in recent years on issues where there has been conflict in the past.

Combine the functions that should have been accomplished by the Productivity Task Force in the 90's but weren't.

- 1) Combine the DOC and IFW boating programs. Funding comes from different sources but it shouldn't be too difficult to track this.
 - 2) Combine the DOC off road program with IFW which provides much of the funding from gas taxes and registrations (done at IFW). Off road enforcement, licensing and registration, and safety training are all at IFW.
 - 3) LURC is a regulatory agency and belongs with DEP as a separate Bureau as it is now.
-

-- Extension Service seems full of publications and good cheer, but in my experience, follow-up can be slow. For example, I'm still waiting for results of 1967 soil test for my septic tank.

-- Neighboring poultry farmer has given up asking Dept Agriculture (Animal Health & Industry, Market & Production Development) for assistance. His impression is they are directed away from small-scale farms, though we all recall the Aroostook sugar-beet fiasco and the Turner egg industry. So this is not a new policy. I remember, way back, being told by the person who established the Wolfe Neck Organic Beef operation that neither the then governor nor the then Commissioner of Agriculture -- even after a dinner at Wolfe Neck with organic beef entrée -- that neither expressed the least interest in his pilot project.

-- Similarly, some of my neighbors, with generations of farming, laugh at the idea of letting the Forest Service come on their land. I guess they have always believed that "the gumment just wants to tell us how to run things." Same response when the town Natural Resources Planner proposed a survey of vernal ponds, with volunteers looking for frog and salamander eggs: "Not on my property!"

Forget about reorganization and find money to support these agencies which are not duplicating each others work. Currently you will not find. We all need a source of revenue that goes beyond user fees and licenses from our constituents. We have had a number of studies that emphasize the value of outdoor based recreation and have looked at reorganization to come up with the same conclusions the outdoors in Maine is big

business and reorganization elsewhere has not shown any increased benefits in savings or efficiencies.

Why not do what really demonstrate that all of that money that has been spent in studies showing the value in Maine's outdoors has not been wasted and adequately fund the natural resource agencies with a percentage of the sale tax?

Well you hit the nail on the head in your cover letter by stating that we need to eliminate duplication. This by default will generate greater efficiency and foster a positive public opinion of our government.

We need to look at the core of why there is duplication. The answer lies in territoriality. After being hit repeatedly by budget cuts and downsizing, each organization is hanging on desperately to every program they have, looking for placement in other agency programs merely as a survival mechanism. Efficiency is not in the thought process at all. Only survival of programs even if they are obsolete because they can be held like an Ace up the sleeve during the next budget cut.

Tear down territorial modes of thinking within the agencies. Bring in to the agencies that awareness of divided we fall, (don't get funding), united we stand, (job security). Share their knowledge and areas of expertise. The US Marine Commando type turns people off, be genuinely friendly.

Have the agencies be more public exposed. Many people don't even know of the great State operations headquarters exists in Jonesboro!!! Ask someone where the game wardens office is and they couldn't tell you. Same for the state biologists, who and where are they?

I do not mean this to be disrespectful, but open your eyes and ears to the current work force. They are overwhelmed. Do not attempt to make any grandiose or huge changes at this time. Delay any attempt to consolidate on a large scale. Instead during your discussions find some common ground in programs and then set up interviews with the employees involved in those programs. Let them find the commonalities while you observe their dialog. Let them discover where they are overlapping services. Do not bother to hire facilitators who have their own agenda and who don't effectively listen to the state employees. It will give a sense of collaboration and pride knowing they made the difference. And stress that it is not an exercise to eliminate positions but rather to promote efficiencies.

Management of Maine's recreational fisheries both Inland and Marine need to be done more effectively. We currently manage our Marine Recreational Fisheries to the same benchmarks that we do our Commercial Fisheries, maximum sustainable yield. This is a fundamental resource management error. Recreational fisheries need to be managed in such a way that a larger biomass of species is available. By nature, recreational (rod and Reel) fishing is inherently inefficient when compared to commercial fishing. To correct this we need to manage our recreational fisheries in a way that provides for not only

higher quantity, but includes better quality fishing. In other words we need to manage all our recreational fisheries with a goal of providing a fully represented age structure within each species. More big fish and lots of fish will build a world class recreational fishery in Maine that would be an economic engine for our struggling tourist industry.

We need to make it easier for Maine's natural resource businesses to conduct business. We need to streamline regulations, streamline licensing and permitting, open up better and easier lines of communications between state agencies and businesses.

Concentrate on managing fisheries as one larger process rather than many separate ones. The rise and fall of one species can dramatically affect the populations of other species. The underwater battles for food and territory can be critical in determining what species flourish and which ones struggle or even disappear. If you advocate for protecting the resource, industry considers you the enemy and will try to get rid of you

Cooperation between agencies should be enhanced. This could be done through the use of MOUs that are adhered to and updated on a regular basis, for example. Actions by one agency that affect the resource of concern to another agency should be reported to that second agency. For example; permitting actions by the DEP for activities in coastal wetlands should be reported annually in summary form at least to the DMR.

We need to identify more dedicated revenue streams to support these agencies. User groups of these natural resources need to understand that there are costs to managing the resources and the state needs highly skilled staff to properly do the job. Ideas include: increased user fees, real estate transfer taxes, a tax structure that targets visitors and tourists, etc.

Provide staff development opportunities for state workers in these natural resource agencies to encourage them to stay current with the literature and the technologies that will allow better management of these complex ecosystems. Perhaps higher education modules can be developed with the University and the Community College system that creates certificate programs that encourage state workers in these disciplines to be learning new tools and information. This could be tied to a career ladder program to help incentivize better knowledge and innovative approaches.

To some degree this already exists, but there are many instances where the state natural resources agencies could benefit from establishing advisory committees that include both the regulated community and general public along with experts in the field. This helps to ensure transparency in government and may yield innovative approaches that often elude those that are too close to the issue from inside of government.

Looking for administrative efficiencies between these agencies is obviously one of the goals of this exercise. It is my sense that the service center approach is already being used for some of the agencies. Whether there are other dimensions of the work that can be brought into that approach or not is hard to tell. We certainly still need leadership in the administrative roles of the agencies and falling into the trap of combining the

leadership roles into fewer positions is potentially damaging. Leadership in each of these agencies is already being pulled in many directions from the public, the regulated community, the legislature, other agencies, and the federal government. If these natural resources are going to continue to play an important role in Maine's economy, we need to be aggressively supporting them, conserving them, using them wisely, and enabling responsible business development that takes advantage of the resources while helping to advocate (and pay for) their management. This all requires strong leadership and commitment and I think each of these agencies needs to have a leader as part of the governor's cabinet.

State government should get better at utilizing strong partnerships in approaching some of these issues that the natural resources agencies are struggling with. Government need not go it alone. Nor should our public and the business community get a free ride. There is a huge need to engage all citizens in these challenges and to own the problems and the solutions. Partnerships between local communities and stakeholders, along with NGOs and the private sector will go a long way to helping government to be seen as more effective, to behave more effectively, and ultimately, to be supported so that it will always be more effective.

* It might not hurt if your task force got out of the Augusta conference room mode and decentralized, moving around the state, spending time with people out here getting a sense of who we are, what we need and hearing what might help us deal with the social, economic, and environmental issues facing us every day. You know, as in listening and responding to the public. But, you probably don't have the time of day for that, you know working alongside people working the woods and waters and communities out here; to hear-to listen-to learn. Disengaged is disengaged is disengaged.

* The Dept. of Agriculture and the D.M.R. have to resolve the issue of which agency will be responsible for inspecting food establishments that are currently not inspected by either agency. This has been an ongoing problem for several years, and it must be resolved in some way.

I recommend that the D.M.R.'s Marine Patrol be placed under an "Enforcement" group with the other agencies enforcement units. Although many Marine Patrol officers are excellent and fair, there are others who pick and choose which laws to enforce. There is also an attitude (in the field and in the leadership), that the Marine Patrol doesn't necessarily need to support the work of the other Department bureaus. Applying the laws and regulations inconsistently, and having an antagonistic manner toward other coworkers, isn't an efficient or effective use of everyone's time. If the Marine Patrol were placed in a group with other enforcement units, hopefully attitudes and work practices would become more standardized and accountable.

* My experience is primarily with the functions of the Marine Resources Agency, and fisheries management in particular, so will limit my remarks to that area.

The paradigm of current management philosophy is for State controlled, top down management of all fisheries. This management structure requires significant numbers of government employees, with ever increasing numbers required as the managers fulfill wish lists for additional information in the way of statistics and data, for an ever-increasing number of the species found in the marine environment. This thirst for knowledge is commendable. The cost is, or will become, prohibitive to the taxpayers and/or the people involved in the fisheries.

My recommendation is for the Task Force to explore alternative options for accomplishing the management of Maine State controlled commercial fisheries.

* Although it is not in your charge, marine fisheries management is under-funded in Maine. As you consolidate do not underestimate the complexity that DMR operates with nor the demand for a) people to work with people in the field and b) effective senior policy makers. DMR has a large on-the-ground science responsibility in many species as well as a huge requirement to have trained scientific people to interact with the interstate and federal science community if Maine interests and resources are to be adequately protected and available for use by Maine citizens.

* When compared to the failure of traditional "open waters" fisheries, the success of Maine's lobster and clam area management plans clearly indicate that the present fragmented management approach needs to be replaced with a similar integrated management system that generates stewardship strategies.

The success of all Maine's near shore and inshore fisheries (lobsters, cod, haddock, flounder, scallops, herring, alewives, etc.) depend on good annual spawning and recruitment. That only happens relatively close on the coastal shelf. Yet today, Maine's inshore waters are where fish and shellfish are most depleted.

They collapsed because the current approach fails to deal effectively with fine-scale ecological details critical to a sustainable fishery. This can be changed by creating a series of nested management areas that include all fisheries within. This would allow spawning and nursery habitats to be protected by zone rules while still permitting fishing methods appropriate for each area to be used, with current fishing methods allowed further offshore.

Maine already has such a system, but hasn't put it together. The municipal clam area provides a good model for local management areas, while lobster zones provide a good, ecologically sound intermediate unit; with offshore areas managed federally and are least restrictive.

Important components of Maine's area management success in these fisheries have been the result of restricting fishing vessel or clam digger mobility and limiting fishing gear. These have been pivotal in slowing depletions and generating stewardship among fishermen. Similar results should accrue if other fisheries such as scallops and halibut were folded into the lobster zone areas along with owner-operator provisions, local councils of elected fishermen similar to lobster zone councils and clam committees, and limits. Intertidal zone species such as mussels and urchins would be better managed locally with smaller management units having zone-wide limits. This would allow local areas to address their problems locally.

Doing these things would create a series of three management units with local and intermediate units nested within a State-wide region that would be more effective for stock restoration and management.

The State of Maine needs to mimic New England's only successful management plan of a large fishery that's actually sustainable... Maine's lobster plan. Other than lobsters and clams, today's remaining State fisheries for scallops, urchins, and halibut contribute little to the State's coastal economy.

The current approach of making different management zones for urchins, halibut, and now scallops (9 zones proposed) has created a morass for managers and fishermen alike. Standardize all those separate management areas into something rational and manageable... fold them into the lobster zones.

Create inshore fisheries that reflect and support Maine's large fleet of inshore fishermen, rather than the few boats with federal permits. Change the rules to give some local fishermen access to the fisheries in their lobster zone (but only if they agree to support conservation rules). The State currently has a fishing fleet of more than (est.) 8,000 inshore boats, mostly lobster fishermen that return to port each day and (est.) only 100 vessels that trip fish. Letting them fail will be an economic disaster for the coast.

I know these comments do not meet your Aug. 22 deadline but I couldn't do this sooner and I must give you my opinions on some very great problems relating to improvements in evaluating, conserving and managing our natural resources. I am an assessment fisheries scientist that used to be in charge of data collection, analysis and provision of management advice for all managed marine species for the East coast of the U.S. from NMFS out of Woods Hole Mass. I also *was* Research Director for DMR for 2 years in the 70's and tried to correct some of the problems that you are trying to solve now. Changes that affect the daily lives of workers are difficult to impose unless you have a solid mandate and the support to carry it out. Maybe now is a time to make some important changes.

It is relatively easy to address duplication and overlap among natural resource agencies such as law enforcement, monitoring, collecting basic data, paper management, and administration. It's obvious that you should combine groups that are doing the same things like licensing, etc. Combining the Inland wardens with the Marine Patrol is an example. The slow and busy times for each enforcement group are sufficiently different

that their combination would bring more people to the problems. It's tougher to set up a group of organizations that can be efficient and still manage our resources. It's not the simple answer of more money needed. Its organization, leadership and priorities!

* In one of my former lives I supervised 250 people and a \$15 million budget through 8 program leaders, 1 budget leader and 1 administrative/personnel director. We produced some of the best fisheries assessment science in the world. The key was a relatively flat organization, good job descriptions and good people.

So, this should not be an exercise in just how to save money or be more efficient by better cooperation/coordination of current activities or reconfiguration of the agencies. You have been given BOTH a great challenge to improve efficiencies and an opportunity to correct some very bad problems, reduce bad staff, add good staff, save money and greatly improve the management of our natural resources. It does no good to coordinate low priority activities just for efficiencies. We want these agencies to be efficient but first we want them to do what they were set up to do and to know what they are responsible for. A super agency is no good if they are not doing the right stuff.

The first issue is to know what needs to be done in priority order by whom and are they doing it. For example is the DIF&W assessing the status of moose, bear, lynx and wild salmon, etc. correctly and frequently enough for management to provide maximum benefit to the State? Is DMR providing expertise to the New England Fisheries Management Council on Maine cod and herring so that our interests are properly considered? Are 3 groups (DOC, EPA, and IDF&W) doing some level of water sampling and are they meeting all needs, including habitat issues?

Some of these problems are efficiency problems and some require upgrading of personnel skills. I realize that your charge is not to change or increase funding. The only way to save money which can be used to upgrade personnel is to get rid of people—such as coordinators, special assistants, and even Deputies that we do not need. This will naturally occur, as you change the organizational structure to improve efficiency. And you have to get rid of costly unneeded positions. A rule of thumb is that for every 3 unneeded positions removed, one needed position can be hired and money can be saved.

Having a different politician or administrator in charge as Commissioner every 4 or 8 years does not provide continuity and certainly not intellectual leadership. These agencies have been a dumping ground for termed out politicians and “special assistants” for some time and they are really not needed. The only way to get rid of these drags on the system is to reorganize—which should be done every 10 years or so anyway. Such reorganization has never been done for the DIF&W, for example and it shows. The work force should consist of people that can best address the current priorities. This means that these priorities must be known as well as the type of scientist/administrators that are needed to do the job. Combining agencies would get rid of some of these Commissioners, Deputies, and coordinators and allow the hiring of knowledgeable

people to provide leadership that is clearly lacking now. This is one solution. I assume you have the correct people on your committee and that you are addressing this!

I know that you don't know all the problems with their magnitude and your charge does not specifically address solving them. But this is the nearest thing I've seen for making some progress. I, therefore, want to give you my ideas on some problems and some solutions specifically for the DIF&W, that I hope you will consider.

The IDF&W, in particular, suffers from its old fashion organizational structure, lack of science, excessive use of hatcheries, no knowledge of genetics, how to conduct game assessments (census vs. sampling designs), lack of habitat evaluations with their solutions and problems for deer and moose, loss of salmon fishing, invasive species, and lack of leadership from politicians and administrators that lack sufficient knowledge to recognize the problems and how to solve them.

A full position is not needed for a "planner". This is really a part time job. The Advisory Council should be abolished. It serves only as a dodge and a buffer for the Commissioner who lacks knowledge for directing resource management. The Council brings little expertise to the problems under discussion.

Scientists should not be wasting their skills writing grant applications. Proper job descriptions and better budget control would solve this. Statistician and computer specialists are needed to update and improve the quality of the analytical activities.

Surveys of all inland water bodies should be coordinated with others or preferably removed from the DIF&W. Now, the biologists can only survey their waters properly once every 10 years whereas a fishery survey every 5 years is the minimum needed. DOC is also surveying water bodies which could be expanded.

Research on habitat, smelts and exotics should also be done by someone. While exotics may be the most significant biological limitation to fisheries management programs, no 2 is the misuse of hatcheries particularly as it relates to wild salmon, and no 3 is a general lack of knowledge about our fisheries resources which could be addressed if biologists didn't have to survey waters.

Combine activities with DEP on access to rivers and lakes. Expand the Information and Education Division (within the IDF&W) across agencies to handle all external outreach. Develop management policies and priorities for every water body.

Set up scientific peer review programs every 5 years, at least, for the DIF&W that can review status assessments and recommend refinements in techniques.

Compare actual budget practices of the DIF&W to the "best practices" as suggested by the Governmental Finance Officers Association or with other proven practices.

Evaluate sufficiency of support staff such as computer programmers, statisticians, Ph. D level scientists, etc., and facilities such as airplanes, ATV's, snowmobiles, surveillance equipment, automated informational systems, computers and library support.

There is a big difference in assessment and management of our marine and inland fish and shellfish resources. A lot of DMR and the IDF&W should remain separate. The level of expertise differs greatly and leadership needs to know this. Statisticians, computer jocks, Ph. D level assessment scientists need to be hired for the marine field and to a lesser extent for the inland work. The DMR organization is so flat that a case can be made that there is no organization.

There are many books written on the management of people and organizational structure and all advocate a lean management staff with a minimum chain of command. The chain of command in the DIF&W. runs thru 5 levels from the Commissioner through the Deputy, the Bureau Chief, the Director and/or the Supervisor to the Regional Biologist to the worker in the field. Over time this inefficient system has evolved to address the poor pay scale system where a good scientist could go a lifetime w/o a promotion. The pay system should be solved as well as the organizational structure.

In Search of Excellence by Tom Peters and Bob Waterman, (just one example on how to run an organization), there are 8 basic principles that the best run companies of America use -"to stay on top of the heap" Three of these, in particular, apply to the Fisheries group. No. 7 is - "Simple form, lean staff-few administrative layers, few people at the upper levels" In most laboratories that I know of, the Deputy is not in the chain of command. He can be replaced by a scientist with organization skills. Coordinators can be removed or reduced.

I note in the newspaper article by Kevin Miller that you want comments from the public on ways to eliminate duplication among the Departments under review. This is Principle no. 2 in "In Search of Excellence"—Stay close to the customer, learn his preferences and cater to them. For some time the "Sportsman's Alliance of Maine" has recommended that the IDF&W form an ongoing "publics" committee to suggest how involvement with public, volunteers, and recommendations concerning the public can move forward. The DIF&W has always ignored SAM.

Principle no. 6 of "In Search of Excellence" is "stick to the knitting'- do what you do best". People trained as biologists or assessment scientists do not necessarily make the best managers and administrators. In Maine, promotion from within has been the norm. A good reorganization with some Ph.D level scientists under a decent pay schedule would solve this.

* Communication between and among agencies can be better so the left hand knows what the right hand is doing so to speak.

There seem to be many areas between these agencies of common goals or common purpose where working together could enhance the delivery of services or the outcome desired.

The few times I have experienced two or more agencies at the same table however, there seems to be competition between agencies instead of cooperation toward a common goal; almost as if the sentiment is “why should we help you with your problems when we have problems of our own?”

* **DMR:**

- **Foster more inter-agency collaboration:** DMR, DEP and the ME healthy Beaches Program do a lot of duplicate work in the Public Health/Clean Water areas: Shoreline studies, water sampling collection and processing, and volunteer coordination to name a few.
- **Foster more agency-industry collaboration:** industry can do a lot to alleviate DMR staff workload: Volunteers already collect half the water samples that DMR uses to classify growing areas. There is room for more collaboration in this area, as well as in the area of shoreline surveys.
- **Provide DMR with funds** needed to support excellent programs such as the Biotoxin Program and the Aquaculture Program.

What future challenges should our plan/recommendations anticipate?

I anticipate the continual downward spiral of monies available to manage wildlife in our state if the IF&W committee continues to be an exclusive club (save for Jane Eberle) for hunters and trappers. Less money means poorer management. Poorer management means less of one of Maine's most valuable and unique resources for our future, our wildlife and its habitat.

The increasing cost of sampling a large number of waters in remote areas spread over large areas.

Doing more with less.

It will be difficult to demonstrate any meaningful savings in any realignment of the natural resource agencies without a reduction in the level of service provided to the public.

Climate Change - This is very likely the most important environmental and natural resource issue Maine faces along with the rest of the world. Nevertheless, there are unique challenges and opportunities for Maine in this regard. We need adequate monitoring across ecosystem types coupled with more intensive research on key ecosystem types (e.g., farms, forests, wetlands) to see the early warning signs of climate-related change, to understand the mechanisms of response, and to explore opportunities for natural resource based economies that these changes represent.

Energy - The logical and appropriate push for new sources of renewable energy opens the door to many opportunities in Maine (e.g., terrestrial and marine wind, solar, hydro, biomass) but the successful exploitation of these opportunities demands adequate environmental assessment and monitoring of these natural resources. Much like with climate change, this type of broad based program is not currently in place, nor are the details of such a program appropriately developed to date for Maine's unique needs. In addition, Maine faces new opportunities in carbon sequestration that can be best developed with good systems of monitoring and validation, as well as research that defines the response to management alternatives.

Development - The rate of development, particularly along the coast and the major river drainages, is occurring at a rate that is beyond our ability to adequately define and is certainly happening in ways that are not in the best interest of long-term sustainability and economic development. We need a broad based push to define the issues under this heading and implement a program to change the direction we are on at the present time.

Knowledge to Action - Maine needs a better mechanism to capture the expertise of its academic institutions, the private sector, citizens as partners with state agencies to make the best use of the knowledge base we have and to enable timely (even rapid) and informed responses that maintain our natural resource objectives in a manner that provides for sustainability and economic growth.

I can't say for certain -- poor economy could continue to stretch the average Mainer. The increasing growth of new immigrants leaves a new challenge for education (not necessarily bad, I would add, just a challenge. If we continue to lose young adults, the stewardship will rest with an older and older population.

Change in availability of services to the public.

Resources will likely continue to shrink, and costs to rise. At the same time, demand for services and expectations of the state also are increasing. At the same time, there is both a major risk and opportunity that many dedicated state employees will be reaching retirement age. The state will lose a tremendous amount of institutional knowledge, and perhaps an equal amount of institutional inertial.

Global warming, of course, is our greatest future challenge. I believe that a problem that poses questions even larger than those posed by the problem of energy independence is: "How to ensure sufficient supplies of potable water to the future populations of Maine?" These are the three greatest future challenges that we face.

1) & 2) Weights and Measures may want to keep cordwood measurement and wood scaling under their control because they are the authority for other measurements such as gasoline, propane and scales.

3) DEP may want to continue enforcing water quality laws. Some Forest Rangers from the "old school," may not want to take on enforcing water quality, but I think over the long term, this would be more efficient for state government.

The cost of doing business will not be going down. We should be as creative as possible in finding long-term funding solutions for such things as the management of parks and lands, for example. The Allagash Wilderness Waterway Advisory Council is actively exploring the creation of an endowment fund -- for lack of a better name to call it at the

moment, which might be able to support maintenance of infrastructure, seasonal staffing needs, and possibly improved interpretation and the like.

Fuel costs, aging of the workforce, knowledge leaving the state, higher electrical cost and LOWER income due to less tourism.

We need to strive to keep Maine a “rural” minded state. Traditional uses such as hunting, fishing, and trapping are being replaced by ATV and snowmobile riders. The traditional interests need to be protected, because it is hunting and fishing licenses that create much needed revenue for the state. Furthermore, there are many of us who deeply value traditional use activities.

Public access needs to be a priority issue. As large timber companies sell their land to smaller organizations, the state needs to ensure that the vast majority remains publicly accessible.

Plum Creek and the wind farms are perfect examples of the projects that Maine needs to develop a more balanced approach to evaluating. All Maine really has to offer these days are its natural resources, and it is logical that businesses will want to utilize them for profit. These projects should be viewed as opportunities, not threats, and as innocent until proven guilty, not the other way around.

The fine line between technical assistance and compliance/enforcement needs work with respect to the interactions between various agencies and departments. The example of Winterwood Farm brought about an ugly spectacle of two agencies—DAFRR and DEP—used by politicians and pitted against each other politically and ideologically over the proper course of action in balancing the elimination of water quality violations and protecting an agricultural resource. This should not happen again.

Natural Resource task force should make sure to account for regional office needs. I cannot elaborate too much here, but that the task force should be mindful that regional offices have functions “customized” to regional issues, depend for certain things on the Augusta offices, need support for things that may be taken for granted in Augusta.

- How to make sure that the voices of local people can be heard and have a real effect on the decision-making process in a time of increased pushes for regionalization and consolidation.

- Make sure there is an effective way local people to have a voice in decisions that will effect their health, water, and air quality even when the projects planned would take place on land under LURC jurisdiction, which does not distinguish between a person living in a town bordering the territory and a person living in Maine 200 miles away.

- Make sure the Public can be informed and participate via print media and phone - don't move all operations to the internet. Many people in Maine do not have effective internet connections or knowledge of how to effectively use computers, and they should not be discriminated against and left out of the decision making processes.

Obviously, increased fuel costs, and increased cost of living.

The need for leadership and proper management of the State's wild and native fisheries will only increase as we move into the future. As an example, the introduction of competing species and invasive species will continue to be a problem. Instead of the fisheries Division telling us that there is little that they can do once a species is introduced into a water, maybe we should look at the way other State's and Province's deal with this issue. Many, especially those that depend on the economic value of their fisheries, ban the use and possession of all live fish as bait. Maine could certainly justify such a restriction in western and northern Maine (those areas that hold the majority of our wild and native salmonids) but as long as the Fisheries Division opposes limiting the use of live fish as bait the public will strongly oppose the restriction.

Restoring the health of our marine resources other than our lobster resource. The Scallop Advisory Council has recently recommended going to a "Bay by Bay Management Scheme" where some bays are closed and others open. This is another step towards CBFM and should be embraced by the DMR, fishing communities and the legislators. We must move towards CBFM and the fishing industry must take part ownership of our marine resource problems as well as the solutions. We will never have the funds in this state from the general fund to do all that is needed for our marine resources. Industry and the fishing communities can and should provide some relieve of the expense incurred from building sustainable fisheries.

The pressure to develop Maine's north woods has increased sharply in recent years and will likely increase further in the future. Many large landowners no longer intend to hold their property for the long term as working forestlands. Instead, they are treating their holdings as shorter-term investments and see development as a means of extracting maximum value from their lands for their shareholders. It is particularly important that the Comprehensive Land Use Plan provide strong safeguards against exploitation of remote, undeveloped forestlands for short-term corporate gain at the expense of Maine's citizens.

Buildings and essential fire suppression equipment are not being replaced. Our out dated infrastructure is becoming a burden for the future. Continued cuts in funding and personnel will result in an inability to perform our mandated tasks.

Tourism will decrease due to the cost of travel.

The recent increase of retired people moving to Maine will stop, due to the cost of heating homes.

As the public is impacted by the economy, support for natural resource agencies could suffer. Education and outreach must be preserved and even increased to maintain or improve public support.

Re your plan/recommendations -- I don't see challenges related to Baxter State Park.

Combining agencies for the sake of having one commissioner/cabinet level position may produce some very limited cost savings; however, service to our constituents will likely be diminished. Programmatically there is no way that one commissioner could stay on top of all of the issues two (or more) agencies deal with. There would have to be deputy commissioners filling the roles lost by commissioners lost in the consolidation.

I have worked in a “super” agency in my past and could see no advantages to it. The Director of our Division (equivalent to our current Department) served all of the functions of our Commissioner, except sitting on the Governor’s cabinet. I believe Maine’s marine commercial and recreational fishing and aquaculture industries would experience a tremendous loss of voice and service by Maine State government if DMR were no longer a cabinet level agency. We are a small state in which people’s voices can and should be heard.

1) Energy issues will become increasingly important. Maine needs energy efficiency standards and financial incentives for households that invest in small scale wind, solar and geothermal technologies.

2) Promote LP gas stations so LP cars are more practical.

3) Increase the tax breaks for hybrid vehicles.

4) Promote more public transportation options for both urban and rural areas.

BE VERY CAREFUL OF UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES IN PROMOTING WOOD HEAT! The BP&L firewood program is a great example. These things take time to plan and implement. How many people will be burning wet wood this winter?

-- Obviously, along the coast, lakes, ponds, and rivers, development pressure. Witness, of course, Plum Creek.

-- At same time, potential dissolution of pulp & paper industry, at least regarding mills located in Maine.

-- Expanding tourist industry should be held to high standards, both environmental and service -- no more tacky OOBs or Marion Village motels. Maybe encourage some kind of uniform classifications, as throughout Europe. (See suggestion, on a coastal scale, by Joseph Fisher in *The Maine Coast: Prospects and Perspectives*, Bowdoin College Center for Resource Studies, 1967.)

-- Everywhere, restrain sprawl. To start with, make more widely known the thinking -- green cities and the rest -- of Rep. Earl Blumenauer (D, Oregon).

Possible loss of support for our programs as they are consolidated under one agency/commissioner who then sets priorities for all programs. This is especially a concern if lands programs are combined as the agency would prioritize internally and all programs would not get the same emphasis. The state has lands that support different functions related to the agencies mission or species. They complement each other and the agencies do work together on joint initiatives all ready.

There is very good chance we will have less resources available to get the job done if programs, even the lands are consolidated. There are restrictions that require income to IFW (license sales and other monies that are covered under State of Maine agreement with USFWS) to be dedicated to the IFW's wildlife and fisheries management programs. Income from the lands that IFW acquired with PR or DJ funds or manages with federal funds is protected by USFWS and can't be diverted.

Currently all of the agencies are working hard in unique areas; there aren't waste and duplicate efforts. Taking a loaf of bread that has been sliced up and putting it back together doesn't give you a bigger loaf. We need more bread to spread around.

Our Agencies receive their authority through our constitution and our statutes. These statutes will need to be analyzed and ratified. Jurisdictional authority will need to be broadened in some disciplines and eliminated in others. Our judicial system is overwhelmed with complaints causing D.A.'s and A.D.A.'s to perform triage resulting in the dismissal of legitimate complaints. This empowers violators to continue to violate.

We have good examples through out our country to draw from. One good example exists in the New Hampshire judicial system giving Natural Resource officials the authority to prosecute civil offenses. This frees up time for the District Attorneys to focus on criminal violations. It also puts full ownership on the officer to present a sound case to the court.

Change in the next generations interests. If you don't grow up with a fishing rod or gun in your hands you don't care if the brooks are clean or that the forest provides adequate cover for over wintering. A challenge coming is limited access to previously wide open roaming privileges. Convince the new land owners to give people the chance to allow people to continue access until the public bothers something. Remember, the reason for them coming to Maine was the appeal of wide open access and enjoyment of nature. Don't hog it to yourself, share.

Make an experiment out of saturating a community like East Machias & Machias of agency involvement. Take one school and community; get the agency people involved with taking people out in the field. Show them the technology satellite GPS, computers, aerial surveillance, night goggles, dog usage, ATV operation, snowmobile activity,

rescue missions, fish and game behaviors and viewing, and science related decision making.

A poor economy and lack of funding.

Our agencies must work together. We need to share resources in our biological and law enforcement divisions. The rivalry and combativeness between IF&W and DMR has to stop either through a complete merger of the two agencies or by addressing the core issues causing the problems.

All our natural resource agencies need to realize that tourism, our largest industry in Maine, can only flourish if quality resources are available. The tourism industry can very effectively promote what resources we have but without those resources tourism and our entire Maine economy will suffer. Our Natural Resource Agencies need to refocus their mission and goals to provide a quality product that can be marketed.

Make it a priority to keep Maine coastal waters clean. Supporting industries that have the potential to pollute the ocean (cruise ships, boat yards, chemical companies, paper mills, etc.) as the state does is risky business.

These would include securing a reliable funding source for natural resource agencies and maintaining a skilled and motivated work force through appropriate compensation and advancement.

It would seem wise to realize that federal support for many of the programs within these agencies is likely to continue to diminish. Therefore the budgetary constraints that exist right now are going to be exacerbated over time by the lack of federal resources. It also seems likely that, for the next decade or two, the demographics of Maine are going to remain flat and therefore the tax base unlikely to change without identifying new revenue streams. I think this situation will change over these next couple of decades and that Maine will eventually be able to reap significant benefits from its natural resources. This can only happen though if we can manage to support the public service functions that encourage sustainable management of our natural resources now. It's compelling to turn to the service sector, or tourism sector, or light manufacturing, but I think that is short sighted. Although it is important to develop economic opportunity in all of those places, we can never get back the natural resources if we let them go. We must manage them now to have them in the future.

The state of Maine needs a vision for its natural resources and a long range commitment to sustainable management of all of these precious resources. This has been discussed at length in the marine community and desperately needs to be done. This visioning needs to transcend politics and the typical four-year horizon. It needs to be bold and firm in terms of not compromising the integrity of our ecological health. It needs to take advantage of the economic opportunities unique to areas rich in natural resources. It

needs to acknowledge that hard short-term decisions occasionally need to be made in order to ensure long-term opportunity. It needs to be precautionary.

Climate change is an obvious factor for many of these natural resources. It is critical that the agencies, in partnership with other institutions, begin to understand the impacts, monitor key elements as ecological change takes place, and be creative about helping our communities and business in adapting to these changes. Again, the agencies must engage experts in these fields to help be as prepared as possible for eventual ecosystem change.

* You won't get to anything about the future until you address and accept the current issue of disconnection from the public and build back out here the relationships that have withered in the face of the an increasing Augusta-centric focused state government. You may have to come to terms with the fact that down under all the ongoing glad tidings about improvement and efficiency in state government, no one meshed in the current private/public system wants change, it is too disruptive for Augusta and all the external special interests who have created the current system that I suspect works quite well for them. No one in this mix wants it any different as the current arrangement is very purposeful and meaningful, but not for the broader base of public interests in the social, economic and environmental well-being of Maine

* Consideration must be given to the future work loads and requirements for server traffic for the agencies. Currently, it seems that the server speed, when uploading critical documents to a website, can be affected by high server traffic volume at other agencies.

* The challenges anticipated, with respect to the functions of DMR, have to do with the ever-increasing costs associated with new regulatory initiatives. Some of these initiatives are surfacing in response to mandates from federal govt. sources. Federal shellfish sanitation regulations are an example, and are absolutely necessary to health and safety.

The current initiative for additional data through detailed individual landings reports mandated by ASMFC (Atlantic States Fisheries Commission) will prove to be very costly, with the refinement of data collection proving to be of subjective value. The State of Maine is on a slippery slope of uncontrollable escalation of costs associated with fisheries management following the top-down management philosophy. We really have to consider what other options are available. There are alternative measures in practice elsewhere in the world that may be appropriate here.

The basic premise of current management philosophy is that the resources belongs to the general public and current management policies are biased toward maintaining all resources at highest levels for the public good. I believe this philosophy needs to be re-examined in light of changing social and economic conditions, both here and worldwide, at least with respect to management of fisheries within State waters. Management of migratory species generally falls under Federal regulations, with associated costs supported by Federal programs.

* Marine fisheries management operates in a uniquely federal and interstate arena. This will continue and the context is a difficult one for Maine to operate in successfully. The state is large and marine interests are diverse because the ecology as well as the socio-economic contexts is different in southern Maine than they are in eastern Maine. Furthermore, we are remote from the decision-makers and the meetings, and in many cases our interests -- because of our location, economy and ecology -- differ greatly from those of the other New England or East Coast states, who also have votes in the decisions. The policy-making in the interstate and federal arenas is a combination of very sophisticated self-interest politics and difficult science. To date, what is happening is that homogeneous rules are being promulgated that fit the rest of New England but steadily further disenfranchise our coastal, multi-fishery, small-boat fleet. These boats and the fishermen who fish them are the backbone of our coastal communities. It will require real sophistication in the department personnel in order to succeed in protecting the interests of our small-boat fleet in the face of increased New England-wide industrialization of a number of fisheries. What is at stake is the continuation of our fishery because, over time, we cannot sustain coastal communities on a fishery that is >75% dependent on one fishery, lobster.

* Without consolidating management units into the lobster zone, DMR will continue to close more coastal fisheries and force Maine's remaining coastal fishermen into the same single-species mess currently used by the NE fisheries management council. The only economic safeguard coastal fishermen ever had was their access to other coastal fisheries. The challenge of tomorrow will be to reduce gear size in every fishery while letting other small scale fishermen in... to stabilize their incomes from fluctuations in other fisheries vs. turning the fishery into a few large operators will continue to be a growing problem. Or worse, continue to ignore the problem. If Maine's places its other fisheries into a common area management plan (lobster zones), fishermen will have reason to improve them and the State's problems will be having to oversee management of a suite of healthy marine stocks.

* Revenues and program funding will continue to be a challenge for all levels of government. The perception that Maine is a highly taxed state will remain and the need to look for further efficiencies will continue.

If combined into one super agency, the resulting combined budget will be a much larger target for future cuts and efficiencies gained through initial consolidation may be lost to future budget reductions.

Resistance to change is always a challenge – especially when coupled with the instinct for self preservation.

Change for the sake of change is not always the best route however – why do these agencies exist separately now? What was the evolution of this structure and the reasoning behind it?

* Resistance to inter-agency collaboration from DMR.
Resistance to agency-industry collaboration from DMR.
In-house problems at DMR will not go away simply by merging agencies.
Replacing under-performing staff will not be easy.
Hiring qualified staff is also a challenge.

What future opportunities should our plan/recommendations anticipate?

I envision in the future many opportunities to build on our non-consumptive, wildlife watching economic future. Looking at how Canadians manage Algonquin National Park, keeping it wild and open to all, is a good example of how inclusiveness leads to enhanced use and opportunity, which leads to having enough money to manage these resources properly.

The rising cost to the public to travel to fishing sites may create opportunities for destination fishing areas, along the lines of sport fishing camps.

There may be opportunities to contract with guides and commercial camp owners to provide sound, accurate information on their catches that can be forwarded to and used by managers (much of the data currently submitted by volunteers does not meet this level of reliability). Useful data would include angler counts and accurate fish information.

Embedded in my comments above is the notion that as we respond to the climate/energy challenges that have begun and will escalate, we also should be aggressive in identifying and developing the new opportunities that these changes represent.

A dirty word in any bureaucracy whether it is public or private--Downsize. In any organization where more information is needed, what is the easiest way to gather more of what is needed then to hire more help(whether by seeking grants or asking for additional funding) so that the present staff can continue with what they are doing. I have been around the state government long enough to know that the DEP was not that at all, but was known as the Water Improvement Commission. The original task to protect our waters was all well and good, but that mushroomed into all aspects of protection that has led to studies that were most likely assigned to other agencies in earlier times. This has led to much in the way of repetitive tasks that in most instances are done because the realm that one is working in has to be protected for the bureaucracy it has become.

Placement of LURC in DEP will help insure greater consistency in LURC/DEP regulatory programs.

I think people will continue to want to be active closer to home. Maine is so fortunate that there is a lot to offer and this message should be continued and enhanced, including things like the first-time campers program that helps people learn how to enjoy Maine. Cost savings to the State.

Encourage development of more wind and tidal “farms.” Increased wireless availability might result in more green businesses locating in Maine; those that develop wind, solar and tidal power generation should be encouraged. More solar panels on roofs of big buildings like car dealerships and big box stores might be required of developers by local planning boards. We could use fewer gasoline car/truck dealerships and more battery and propane vehicle dealerships; the latter are attractive to the business community since they represent untapped opportunities for financial gain.

With the reorganization of information technology, we should be in a position to reduce office overhead and disperse staff to the locations where they are needed, and to reduce the need for routine face-to-face contact between co workers. GIS and related technologies are evolving rapidly, and can help us both make better decisions and deploy our resources more effectively. One well-trained field enforcement/assistance employee, equipped with electronic linkages to knowledge bases and support, could cover a wide variety of tasks in a relatively small area, providing much better public service.

A change in laws would be needed, since Rangers can't write summonses under title 10 for wood measurement or water quality laws.

We should anticipate a future in which the people better recognize the value of their public service agencies -- and the entire state government for that matter -- and develop a willingness to pay for those great benefits of great society through their taxes and hard work. If that time should ever come, we should be prepared to show how effectively and efficiently Maine's natural resource agencies in particular can perform their functions well, thus insuring good stewardship of Maine's environment. Whatever can be effectively done online should be done online. As time goes on, there will be fewer and fewer who avoid the online experience.

Consider collecting funds from ATV and Snowmobile riders, who do not already pay for a hunting and fishing license that will go to habitat conservation and management efforts.

Environmentally friendly energy production from wind, biomass, and tides.

Promote niche businesses like the hiking/hut systems, heirloom fruit orchards, rafting, etc.

Fix up and promote State parks!

There are a number of local community groups working to help the environment in Maine - these groups could provide a wealth of knowledge, resources, and effort to help make Maine environmental agencies more accessible and accountable to the Public they serve.

A cleaner and healthier herring fishery in terms of bycatch.

Maine has 97% of all native and wild brook trout populations found in lakes and ponds in the U.S. With proper management Maine's wild and native brook trout fisheries should provide a tremendous economic benefit to the State (much more than we currently experience). IF&W has to be on board in order to achieve this benefit. In addition, management must focus on preserving the resource and providing a quality destination fishery.

The opportunities are those I listed under recommendations and challenges. The opportunity to build CBFM where it can become clear to all that we all have an interest in the health of our marine resources and a responsibility to maintain the health of these resources is a fantastic opportunity.

At this moment we have the opportunity to continue our good work through a dedicated marine resource agency, the DMR. Let's not rough the waters with a natural resources supper agency. Let's take this opportunity to say loud and clear that the DMR must commit all their resources to our marine resources.

The fact that many large landowners no longer intend to hold their property for the long term presents opportunities as well as challenges. As properties of high ecological and recreational value come upon the market, the state is presented with valuable opportunities to purchase these lands as a legacy for future generations of Maine's citizens. It would be a great benefit to Maine's citizens if the state's natural resource agencies could work together to develop a strategic plan to prioritize lands for purchase by the state. Of course, such purchases would require substantial funding; in my view, it would be ideal if the Land for Maine's Future program could be guaranteed a sustained level of funding instead of relying on sporadic bond issues.

The need to show support to high paying forest products manufacturing jobs and less focus on tourism. An example is the current push for bio-fuels and using technology to manufacture new products for the housing industry. Show case all the good things we do for our customers.

Development laws should be more friendly to accommodate those people who wish purchase new more efficient homes.

I coordinate Project WET (Water Education for Teachers) in Maine. I believe this should be a state-sponsored program, such as Project WILD is. (Similarly, Project Learning Tree is supported by DOC.) As water continues to be in the news (Poland Springs, etc.) the need for a non-partisan, non-biased water education curriculum is underscored- much of what I see in the media is wrong and many people debating are not using good information. This is an education issue that will cost the state in the long run.

- 1) Appropriate and thoughtful use of the abundance of renewable wood we have in Maine with careful consideration of all the consequences.
- 2) Wind power development on state lands should provide tangible benefits to Maine vs. the developer. For example a state located WP project could be required to provide power for state buildings instead of being sold into the grid for less than we pay per Kwh in our homes.

These I guess are mostly for Survey II, yet this one sticks out:

-- Reassess role of property tax as determinant of future land use.

Let the agencies get back to work and fund them adequately, more resources are needed.

Another study of reorganization is done and the first report shows that savings have not been documented elsewhere, yet you continue. Why not tackle the real problem and adequately fund these agencies so they can do their jobs.

We can expect more efficient and increased vigilance of our Natural Resources. As a result of this, we can expect an increase in public awareness of the importance of these resources as well as a new found respect for a government performing diligence for the right thing in the right way.

Note: We all wish life was a sunny day at a State Park but its not. In my twenty-five years of experience, I have learned that government must serve the people not only by education and protecting the unfortunate but also by regulation. Most often, the result of a violation of our regulations is a fine. This does not make regulation a popular element of government. But even the crudest forms of government acknowledge its necessity.

Monetary consequence is a form of education but a more holistic approach would include a form of public service. Regardless, it all comes at a cost to all of us.

Respectfully submitted and

At your Service for twenty-five years.

Anticipate the need to re-stir the interest in sporting for fish and game. Maybe a camera rather than a gun, just get the young people out there to enjoy the out of doors.

This administration needs to focus all efforts on reducing the state's health insurance liability. It's even in the fiscal notes you supplied showing we are lower than comparison states on all factors except the payroll. Our payroll costs are rising due to health insurance the fastest rising benefit of all payroll costs.

Maine is competing in a global marketplace with all our natural resources. Be it commercial fishing, logging, potatoes or eco-tourism. We need to change the mindset that we are "Vacationland" and they will come. We need to change the mindset that "they will always buy Maine Lobster or Maine potatoes". They will only come to Maine or buy our products if they are of quality. Maine's private sector can only promote what we have.

Better management of Maine's precious character and natural resources.

Climate change is also likely to yield unforeseen opportunities. Again, monitoring change and thinking creatively about how those changes may become opportunities for our business and citizens will be important. Staying current with this change will be critical as new opportunities that may arise will no doubt require knowledge, experience, policy and regulation in order to ensure that sustainable practice are implemented. For example, it is possible that Maine's salt water recreational fishing industry will change markedly in the coming decades. This can be a significant economic opportunity for many coastal communities and businesses, but will also bring increased pressures and potential conflicts. We can look to our south to learn lessons and perhaps fend off some of the more obvious calamities. This is another example of an opportunity to develop a revenue stream in terms of a saltwater recreational fishing license. Not broadly popular, but probably essential.

Regional consideration needs to be given to many of these issues. The New England states (and Northeast US as well as Atlantic Canada) share the same concerns with regard to natural resource issues. Partnering in this sense across political boundaries may be a good way to secure resources as well as to come up with options and strategies that will work over a larger ecosystem and limit redundancy or confounding solutions.

* If the saltwater fishing license is established, the monies from this license should be considered an opportunity to increase the public, and the fishing industries, access to the shoreline. Several different groups have spent time, money and efforts trying to figure out how to increase public access to the ocean and inland waters. The license money would be a potential source for these types of projects.

* The opportunity presented for consideration by this committee is to identify those species/fisheries under State jurisdiction and to explore alternative management philosophies and management options. Lobsters, scallops, urchins, wrinkles, sea cucumbers, brown shrimp, clams, oysters, quahogs, whelk, crab, and probably several others could be classified as state water fisheries.

Review current regulations. What is the cost of administering and supporting the current regulatory philosophy? What are possible alternative regulatory philosophies and what management options would be necessary to enable those alternatives?

Is the goal to support the social and economic fabric of shore side communities? Is the goal to provide the public access to the resources, i.e.: seafood to eat, and how to provide that access. Obviously the predominance of access is through purchase of the product at food stores.

Do the people who harvest the resources provide a service to the consuming public, or are they themselves the users of the resource by virtue of harvesting it. Could the responsibility for managing the resources be delegated to the harvesters and if so how and what would be the role of the State in this type of management. The incentive for sustainable harvest is greatest to those who have the most to lose. One can buy seafood from anywhere in the world, but harvesters are pretty much limited to what is available in the area where they live and fish to make their livelihood.

Several things are certain. The taxpayer cannot continue to support an increasing regulatory bureaucracy. The fisherman cannot absorb the cost of a regulatory bureaucracy. There are other less costly management philosophies and measures that place the burden of management cost on the user. If the taxpayer can not afford the management cost, and the end user (consumer) can buy cheaper from elsewhere in the world, how do we maintain that social and economic fabric of our coastal communities? I believe the ultimate answer is that we must transfer ownership of HARVESTABLE resources to those who harvest them and make them responsible for MAINTAINING a SUSTAINABLE resource. How to accomplish this goal AND preserve the social and economic fabric of our coastal communities is the real challenge.

* The tradition of stewardship and localized management in Maine in the clam and lobster fisheries provide an opportunity for appropriate scale community stewardship that could create much better decision making. This is a huge opportunity and is more possible in Maine than virtually anywhere else in Maine. I hope your plan envisions a DMR that empowers and supports this type of local responsibility.

*If Maine converts its coastal fisheries to small scale, habitat-friendly fishing methods and force the few remaining destructive fisheries offshore, DMR will only have to deal with successful recoveries that could parallel the one experienced by lobster fishermen.

* By combining several agencies into one there is an obvious opportunity to reduce mid and upper level management tiers – to reduce bureaucracy and save money.

In theory many of these agencies share a common goal of protecting and managing Maine's natural resources and therefore by working together toward this common goal their work should be more effective and perhaps even more efficient.

By becoming one super agency, the weight of this agencies' unified voice may prove more effective at justifying operations and funding in that the impact / oversight of this larger agency affects so many more constituents.

* Savings by elimination of duplicative work (DEP/DMR/ ME Healthy Beaches Program).

Savings realized by leveraging existing resources (volunteers, municipal employees, etc)
Efficiencies generated from replacing under-qualified and/or under-performing individuals with qualified, dedicated staff.

Savings by maximizing agency's current capacity (DMR lab).

Industry support for an agency that is run efficiently and is willing to collaborate and think creatively.

Please add any other comments or suggestions that you think would be helpful.

I recommend more inclusiveness on the part of stakeholders, as you are now doing. This sets an example that hopefully will encourage the DIF&W and its committee.

Maine's Dept of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife has been forced into consolidating different parts of the Dept's operation in the last few years such as Central Fleet for vehicles, our Storehouse and most recently Accounting and Purchases. Every recent consolidation of services that involved MDIF&W has cost the Dept more money and services have been reduced. At least from this Dept's perspective there has been no efficiency gained from any of these mergers, whatsoever. Therefore, I am strongly opposed to any further consolidation that involves the MDIF&W.

My comments pertain to the Small Community Grant Program (SCGP) funded by bond issue for about 1 million dollars annually. First, I must preface my comments by stating that the program has done a lot of good for the people of this state and has contributed significantly to improving the water quality and economic viability of this state by reopening shellfish areas. It also has been very well managed by the DEP staff. That being said, I have some suggestions for improving the program and its ability to serve this state as follows:

The SCGP should only be available to communities which will put in cluster system and retain ownership of the system as a municipal entity rather than having the grant system pay for septic system for an individual home owner. Municipality can then collect user fee from the participants to cover necessary maintenance cost as well as eventual replacement cost.

There are several loan programs available to individual home owners to fix their own septic system. A portion of the SCG program could be combined with the other state assisted loan programs to keep the interest cost down on these loans. The important part here is that the fund would be self replenishing as loans are paid back and all citizens would be treated equally. Presently if you have a septic system which could impact a water body you are r eligible for the grant program, however if your system doesn't directly impact a surface water body you are required to get a loan.

Our commissioner solicited ideas and suggestions on ways to make our natural resource agencies a bit more efficient. I'd suggest taking a look at staff training.

All employees of these agencies are required some minimum level of training, i.e. ergonomics, harassment recognition, general office safety, hazard communications etc. Amongst all these agencies are field state that require a bit more blanket training, i.e.

First Aid/CPR, general field safety. But within each agency are some that require more specialized training – all agencies have some staff that work on the water requiring water-survival and or small boat handling courses. IF & W, DEP and DOC all have a subset of staff that are required to maintain SARA training (Chemical hazard and exposure recognition).

Seems that one training unit for all the agencies might prove beneficial in both conserving staff time and department dollars, but also bring consistent relevant training to the states field staff.

My experience of the state's natural resource agencies, which is considerable, is that they have over the past 15 years been systematically deprived by the legislature of resources adequate to perform their assigned missions.

This reflects, I believe, the erosion of their familiarity and understanding within the legislature, as it has changed along with the state's demographics, from north to south and to the suburbs, and the several agencies' constituencies having remained fragmented and unwilling to pull together for political effect.

The only way I can conceive of their regaining effect and resources, and of their realizing whatever economies of scale might exist among them, is to merge them into a single agency with effective central management of common functions and coordinated, collaborative approaches to the state budget process and the legislature.

The agencies' missions are, in fact, not all that dissimilar; it is only the narrowness of their constituencies' perceived interests and their tenacity, I believe, that stand in the way of greater resources for their purposes and stronger resource management for Maine.

I believe that focus on the core responsibilities is getting lost as agencies try to be all things to all people. They end up with their resources diluted to a point where the core mission is not supported properly. It has been very tempting to add responsibilities to agency agendas every time an issue arises. In many cases the citizens pushing for the addition of these responsibilities could handle their own problems, if they would simply take responsibility.

I believe that the culture within the agencies needs to change. They need to act in a way that empowers volunteers and persons willing to take action. At this time the culture is more of a “we don't trust the general public and therefore we need to handle all issues in house without outside support.”

Enforcement of existing laws is the first priority and all peripheral issues need to be swept away. The Wardens, Marine Patrol, and Forest Rangers need the ability to do their jobs.

As the founder and current President of Maine Equestrian Trails Alliance I have worked to form an organization that will need little if no support from the state agencies. It is my hope that the equestrian community will carry its own weight and place no burdens on any state agencies, or their resources.

-
1. The foresters of Maine are very interested in increasing the knowledge of our young people so our forests are looked at now with love and will be in the future. Foresters have trusted me with equipment to use with our high school science institutes. Foresters are flexible and go above and beyond in their duties
 2. I would like to see more foresters trained in teaching, some seem a bit awkward with the task.
 3. Money to provide opportunities for students
 4. Continue allowing foresters to interact with all groups of students.
-

Good luck with your momentous task.

For many years, various fisheries biologists at DIF&W have actively opposed the efforts of DMR to restore sea-run fish to many of Maine's rivers and lakes. This opposition has greatly hampered the legislatively-mandated restoration of native sea-run fish, including Atlantic salmon, shad, and alewives. I believe that overall state fisheries management would be improved if this management were combined in one agency (this would extend the process recently begun with the merger of the Atlantic Salmon Commission and DMR).

Here are some comments on my use of government services as a landowner:

My land is used as a woodlot, and as a farm. As an ecosystem the two land uses are integrated. Over the years I have used the Maine Forest Service for forestry advice and County Extension for farming advice. Both are very professional services and have done a great job for me. Both are staffed by people who go above and beyond for the farms and forests of the state. Please stop cutting their budgets.

IF&W has not done anything for me as a landowner. That is not a complaint, just an observation. I don't know that they are tasked with getting information to landowners or helping them with land management issues. Their mandate seems to be to deal with land users not landowners. I take care of my own hunter, trapper, snowmobiler, and ATV issues, mostly by allowing access. Although I don't understand how anybody who loves the land and wants plants and animals to flourish can approve of recreational ATV use. If you want to stop degradation of the ecosystem start with looking at ATV use.

The Maine office of GIS is another service I have used. Their pictures of land have helped me visualize my land use better than just looking at a map.

Forest Rangers are well respected hard working individuals whose primary mission is to suppress and investigate forest fires. During the last several years, there has been a

decline in the amount of forest fires – primarily due to rainy summers- and Rangers, in my opinion have been somewhat underutilized. I believe we need to do what ever we can to keep the current amount of Forest Rangers employed by the State. If we are to have a dry summer fire season, we will need all of them working to keep Maine from burning. In the meantime, I think they have a responsibility to keep busy and should welcome opportunities to eliminate inefficiencies in State government.

We should anticipate a future in which the people better recognize the value of their public service agencies -- and the entire state government for that matter -- and develop a willingness to pay for those great benefits of great society through their taxes and hard work. If that time should ever come, we should be prepared to show how effectively and efficiently Maine's natural resource agencies in particular can perform their functions well, thus insuring good stewardship of Maine's environment.

4 day work week with the option to work up to 8 hours at home or reduce workweek to 32 hours. Would allow State to reduce energy costs and allow people with childcare issues to still be flexible as 10 hours is a little long to work with kids.

If any grouping is going to occur it should be done by discipline, not by Budget Apples to Apples and Oranges to Oranges. (Ag and Conservation, IFW & MR)

I had a question about tree damage this past winter. I sent that question to Ken Canfield and received a prompt answer. I have always found the extension service to be most helpful and there is really no place else to go with this type of question.

I wanted to take this opportunity to thank you for the work your task force is doing regarding the management of the natural resources of the State of Maine and I am encouraged by the cooperation of agencies, personnel, and resources to create the most efficient way to meet these goals.

I am writing in response to the survey you have on your website. I am suggesting the task force take an aggressive look at attacks the state repeatedly has faced over the last few years against traditional land uses in the state, specifically hunting, fishing, and trapping. More specifically, the third item trapping has been attacked for the last several years by extremist animal rights organizations through manipulation of the Federal Endangered Species Act, lawsuits against the state in the Federal Court System, and threatened lawsuits in order to extort change. These extremist groups claim that their goal is to keep the federally protected Canadian Lynx from being incidentally caught in foothold traps legally set by licensed trappers within this state. However, their goal as evidenced by their continued threatening and bullying is clearly to end trapping all together within this state. If this is to happen the impact on the remaining wildlife in the

state, wildlife that many Mainers depend on to make a living and wildlife that represents lifetimes of tradition will be severely effected. Currently the only effective management tool to work at predator control is through trapping. A few years ago the state took a look at deer populations across the state and they found some startling numbers. Specifically, established wintering deer yards were essential to maintaining deer numbers in many areas of the state. The states biologists agreed with this assessment and started working with landowners to ensure these winter yards would remain standing to ensure a healthy herd. There was also a pilot coyote snaring program to address the predatory nature of coyotes to frequent these deer yards in the winter because the established trails and the deep snow provided for an easy meal. This pilot program was suspended because of a threatened lawsuit by the animal groups saying that a Lynx may incidentally be caught in a snare. This left hunting and trapping as the only remaining management tool. Removing trap ping will only leave hunting and the numbers will not be enough to effectively manage the population, thus leaving the remaining deer at the mercy of any and all predators that are looking to stay fed during the winter. This will greatly affect the deer population and essentially change the face of hunting within this state; it already has in Downeast Maine with the closing of a number of sporting camps and a drop in hunting licenses for the area because of lack of game. An example of how ineffective hunting is, Downeast Maine sponsored a coyote hunting tournament to try and curb their numbers and ran the hunt through a weekend and only one coyote was registered. I know this is a long winded statement but in my opinion it is time the Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife and the State of Maine stood up and said "we are going to manage our game the way we see fit, based on habit, sound information provided by our departmental biologists, working with the small woodlot owners and big land owners to identify their needs, working with all of Maine, debunking the North vs. South debate, working with the sportsman that are in the field, with the game, and in the best interest of keeping the traditional land uses that this great state was founded on available for generations to come." And "we are not going to be bullied, threatened, sued, litigated, or coerced into game management, and natural resource decisions based on a small number of animal rights and environmental extremists with idealistic images of Maine, the way life should be."

I am the CEO for Wilton. My problem is that the State Planning Office and DEP (mostly DEP) create the model shoreland ordinance and require that the towns adopt it pretty much as written with no real local control. Why not just make one shoreland ordinance at the state level and require everyone to go by it. This would save much time, effort, and money for the towns and would streamline the process whenever changes are made. It is not like the towns really have a choice. Why go through the process of having to take it to public hearings and town meetings?

I am also very concerned that the new building code process and red tape will be a money sucker. Adopt the building code, but require the contractors to be licensed to the code before you require the towns to administer the code. Also, take a good look at how the State Plumbing office handles permits. They are so far behind in record keeping it is not funny.

It is imperative that the State of Maine retain valuable jobs that are at risk due to high energy costs (many have already been lost - Eastport- Gates Fiber; Maine Poly, Sylvania Lighting, Celotex, GP - Old Town, Kathadin Paper, ... soon to be Wausau Paper, Lemforder, Barber Foods, Fairchild, Corning, Currently the State does not have one cohesive core entity managing or directing the state's energy initiatives and policy with singular authority. There are "5" independent entities implementing their own plans on energy initiatives. There is a lip-service group that is supposed to integrate cabinet agencies on energy issues but that's all it is, lip service. Many attendees say it's the most dysfunctional group they've been involved with.

Businesses are confused because multiple agencies visit them each proprotg to be the energy point of contact for the state. For example Fairchild Semiconductor and National Semiconductor have had half a dozen state leaders or entities visit them regarding their energy concerns.

It has been conveyed to me personally by leaders at these businesses and others that the message is confusing to them, who in Augusta are really leading the states energy policy and initiatives. Fairchild and National Semiconductor core executives all asked for one thing, Leadership in Augusta regarding the State's Energy Issues.

List of Agencies that are involved in "independent" and "overlapping" energy initiatives at the State Level:

1) Maine Public Utilities Commission has two groups working on energy initiatives:

- a) Efficiency Maine.
- b) Public Advocates Office.

2) Department of Environmental Protection

- a) Office of Innovation - Energy Initiative - Stepup Program / NOW Program...

3) Department of Conservation

- A) Wood-to-Energy Initiatives

4) Maine State Housing Authority - Energy Conservation and Renewable Energy Project Funding (Bond Bank Sourcing).

5) Governor's Office of Energy Independence and Security.

Observations:

The PUC is a "regulatory" agency, a utilities court so it's bizarre that Efficiency Maine and the Public Advocate are working on energy conservation, policy, and initiatives directly related to energy and not "utility regulation" and infrastructure policy.

The DEP is an environmental regulatory and policy agency, not energy?

The DEP could support the OEIS Comprehensive Energy Planning, Policy and Initiatives related to air, organic solid waste-to-energy, and water protection and management.

The DOC is not an energy agency but could support the OEIS Comprehensive Energy Planning, Policy and Initiatives related to wood fiber and water.

MSHA is a "housing" authority but could work closely with the OEIS to help implement cohesive energy initiatives that are part of the overall Comprehensive Energy Plan for the State related to housing.

The OEIS could establish a non-profit Energy Services Company much like MSHA model that does not "add" cost to state budget but reduces it by self-funding its existence and also the OEIS budget. This ME-ESCO then provides Maine state agencies and businesses one-stop shopping for energy support in the form of free go-no-go studies, pre-engineering to implement concrete energy projects and initiatives that will save jobs and protect the environment.

The OEIS should implement Energy Projects identified for all state facilities, BGS has two three ring binders listing dozens of energy projects, and few have been implemented.

The core / root issue is money. All these agencies except the Governor's Office of Energy Independence and Security have a real budget, real state and receive substantial funding from the DOE and other Federal agencies. None of the agencies want to give up this source of funding even if it makes sense to consolidate the State's Comprehensive Energy Planning, Policy and Initiatives.

Consolidation Plan:

Governor's Office of Energy Independence & Security should be the Primary Leader on Energy Policy, Planning and Initiatives:

- a) Move Efficiency Maine under the OEIS, the PUC is a regulator agency, no other state has their energy program linked to their regulatory agency (see Rebecca Rockafeller's report to the Legislature in 01/08, referenced Michigan's Energy Office)
- b) Move any Public Advocate Energy initiatives under the OEIS, it not in their charter.
- c) Move the DEP office of Innovation's Energy Initiative under the OEIS, what is their charter?
- d) Move BGS energy initiatives under the OEIS to implement concrete energy projects for State Agencies and Educational sites.
- e) Integrate MSHA energy initiatives under the OEIS direction and coordination.
- f) Create the non-profit OEIS ESCO to help fund the OEIS office, State Energy Initiatives and save jobs.

This is a very basic summary. If you would like more information I'd be glad to create something more formal.

1st – get the legislature out of trying to run the state. Every time they add controls or steer an agency, things get worse.

2nd – One school district statewide. People won't like it, but they can't afford more than that anyway. Maine is smaller than the 15 largest districts in the nation. Each has better programs as measured by student outcomes than the collective locally managed cash hungry mess we have. If the Broadband – Laptop initiative is real – then the Governor should request the Board of Education rewrite Chapter 125 to be in-line with the 21st century using e-learning, not build more concrete dinosaurs.

3rd – We have 400 employees for road and bridge planning and NO money for paving or repairs. I think you'll agree a no-brainer... Pike Industries is laying off, Maine DOT – I don't think so...

4th – Expand regulation and inspection of insurance agencies, agents are running wild because BOI doesn't have enough bodies to enforce the laws on the books.

5th – Pass legislation linking the size of gov't to the revenue stream available. A gov't job is service, not a lifelong career path.

6th – Pass legislation preventing unions from garnishing wages of those that do not voluntarily join. The teachers union has 4x as many office staff representing fewer folks than the 15 districts named above. Why? Everybody pays... SEIU is the same... They are using the extra money for keeping the pot stirred and justifying their bloated salaries. The top twenty employed at the MEA make between \$100,000 and \$140,000 a year. Do Teachers? Embarrassing...

GOOD LUCK... You have a state addicted to services and a revenue base running across the border. I hope folks like yourself makes the changes before the rest of us move to prevent bankruptcy.

I recently read an email concerning the Legislature's charge to your committee to establish one agency or at least a better coordination between natural resource agencies. I submit that this is a wonderful opportunity for the Legislature to hear that, in fact, one super agency, with unit directors responsible for various activities is a viable option. It is also an opportunity for a consulting firm with a business and government background to design such an agency, with the assistance of a group such as yours for guidance. Perhaps we citizens are ready for a bold new idea to administrate and deliver all environmental services.

Thank you for the opportunity to voice my opinion.

I read the article in the B.D.N. seeking input from the public on how to reduce state spending, specifically: redundancy, inefficiency and unnecessary departments. I worked in the paper mill here in Millinocket for 32 years. One of the premier papermaking facilities in the world ended up bankrupt and now has one machine running out of the 12 it had in the hay-day of its existence, not to mention the loss of 2 million acres of valuable natural resources. Getting to the point, do you think that asking the public for suggestions on how to save our mill, back in the 80's would have given management the ideas it should follow, in order to be profitable? Of course not. The problems of our government have to be solved from the inside. The state employees know where the waste and inefficiencies are. The problem lies in the fact that no one wants to cut their own jobs or their departments.

The solution to getting the information you need from the state employees is to announce to all state employees that there will be a statewide cut in salaries and benefits of all employees in order to meet your financial goals. To protect the lowest paid individuals from suffering the most, the cuts will be done on a percentage basis. Once state personnel realize, that in order to save their current salaries and benefits, it now becomes their responsibility to do so. They will be calling your number with lots of suggestions, which needs to be set up to ensure the confidentiality of the people offering the suggestions.

Well that's your solution, do you have the courage to pass it on, or is the delete button much easier to push?

P.S. if you not able to get around the union contracts, than attack the non union fat cats.

Thank you for inviting our participation as you work toward your legislative directive to create a plan which will improve delivery of services to the citizens of Maine by the agencies charged with protecting and managing Maine's natural resources.

The Maine Association of REALTORS is dedicated to the preservation of private property rights and to the protection of the economic interests of real property owners in Maine. We believe, as stated in our Public Policy Statement, "The social and economic fabric of our nation, and our state, is deeply rooted in the fundamental right of all people to own, use, and transfer real property. Real property ownership has been and continues to be one of the highest priorities of most Americans."

Our Public Policy Statement further states that, "The Maine Association of REALTORS supports protection and preservation of Maine's environment and natural resources provided economic development, accessibility of housing for all Maine's citizens, and private property rights are not overly and unreasonably restricted." We believe that balance is the key.

The Association urges collective and cooperative action by lawmakers, government representatives, general industry and real estate industry leaders, and environmental

groups to address and resolve the problems and challenges of environmental protection and responsible land use.

It is important, as proposals and decisions involving natural resources are considered, that all possible ramifications be analyzed. Accordingly, it is important that all stakeholder groups and agencies affected be included in discussions from the very start. It is difficult, and certainly more potentially contentious, to amend decisions after the fact...and of course easier and less painful to implement changes if affected parties have participated in decisions.

It is, and likely will continue to be, a challenge to balance the protection of natural resources with the need for economic growth and strong private property rights. Harmonious efforts by the Legislature, various state agencies, and affected stakeholder groups are necessary to find that appropriate balance.

We look forward to having the opportunity to comment on specific proposals as they emerge from the Task Force. Thank you for including us in your considerations.

I do not know enough about how the Resources Agencies are aligned now, but it seems redundant to have a Department of Environmental Protection and a Department of Conservation. All oversight should flow from the DEP.

Every state has its strengths and weaknesses and a purpose: for example New Jersey and Connecticut became filled up largely to serve labor needs in New York City, which starting as a port has always been a center of commerce.

Maine has to remain devoted to nature and its natural resources, rural history and distinctive production to have any distinction. It should become identified with innovative green architecture, protection of natural resources, study of nature.

Identical big-box-stores in every town limit taste and choice and create centers of sprawl and asphalt. There is no reason for this in Maine. This is not how it excels. The DEP should have a lot to say about how it grows and is protected.

I would like to see a listing of all or a majority of the data bases, reports, etc. that the agencies use on one of the natural resource agencies web sites. Not only would this provide a service to Maine citizens looking for information, but it would free up time that staff takes to answer questions from the public.

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to your outreach questionnaire regarding the efforts of this task force to improve the delivery of services by the various natural

resource agencies in Maine. Frankly, considering my widely varying interactions with several of these agencies on a personal and professional level, I found it difficult to narrow down my comments (good and bad) to just a few. However, as I considered it further, I realized that many of my comments could be summarized under one overarching suggestion.

DE-CENTRALIZE THE DEP:

Please don't quote me on the exact numbers, but at one time I believe that approximately 75% of the 400 DEP employees were housed in the Augusta office. In my experience under the "what is working well" category, that would be my dealings with the Presque Isle Regional office of the DEP. The staff of this (and I presume other) regional office forge a relationship with the regulated community and strive to better understand the competing pressures on any given facility or operation. Since environmental protection is not always black-and-white, it takes this common-sense understanding to work with all parties to establish priority and to do the right thing. The more removed from the region, the less likely such understanding and customer focus will exist.

Many successful private companies have moved towards empowering employees in local offices to make decisions. These folks are "on the ground" in local communities, interacting with the public and with other businesses, understand the challenges and priorities of the region, and conducting promotional and educational programs. I think the DEP would benefit from this type of system. The central office should house the Commissioner and his staff to establish policy and maintain consistency among the field offices. Otherwise, licensing and enforcement actions should be managed locally to the extent possible. Training could be accomplished through the use of the interactive TV system to reduce travel time and costs.

I believe this approach would reduce overall cost, provide more efficient and timely service to the regulated community and residents, and build goodwill with the agency.

In contrast, the existing system is often cumbersome as multiple levels within the Department must review and approve permit applications. Regional staff spend a significant amount of time travelling to Augusta to attend meetings and training programs. An inherent distrust exists between the Department and the regulated community, often because the people making the decisions are from "away." Review and approval of license applications often cannot be completed in a timely fashion, thus impeding development of much needed or useful projects. I could go on, but in the interest of brevity will end here.

I own a piece of woodland in Lewiston ME.

I wanted to harvest this property and didn't know how to begin. I contacted Ken Canfield at the Maine Forest Service.

He showed up and walked the property this spring with me and showed me how to do it with a plan.

I got some telephone numbers for Maine Foresters in the area.

I hired one to do the marking of the trees, handle the money, and make a plan. The job is almost completed. All of this done on a professional level, quick action, and helpful with any questions I might of had. I am very satisfied with the Maine Forest Service.

I received the e-mail about the task force sent out by Wendy Pieh and Karin Tilberg. I do have a suggestion and have submitted it many times to various government officials, but it has always fallen, I suppose, on deaf ears - or in any case it appears that way since I never get a response and have never seen any initiatives along the line of my suggestion. I confess to being skeptical of this effort and have no desire to personally commit any of my own time to such a task force, but for what it's worth, here is my suggestion.

Whenever possible, lands held by the State of Maine for educational, recreational, or conservation purposes should be managed by local, nonprofit entities. I'm not talking about huge units of public land that are actively managed for timber or wildlife - they need to remain under the management of a state agency. But smaller parks and parcels that are more passively managed, especially those located in or near centers of population, could be more efficiently managed by a small locally staffed nonprofit community based organization than a large state agency. I offer the Pine Tree State Arboretum as an example. I know our situation is somewhat unique in terms of size, location, and community support, but I believe a number of state parcels could use a similar management model.

The effect of such a policy would be limited in extent, but could have a significant local impact. Local residents could take on a more active role in determining how a parcel is managed and citizen volunteers could take on a significant portion of the labor and management costs. This would not be "outsourcing" but a gentle push toward local, grassroots responsibility. Let the people who most deeply care about and most frequently use the land have a greater share in the management of it and the responsibility for protecting it.

Best of luck with your efforts. I am happy to speak with anyone who is interested in the partnership between the private nonprofit sector and state government that is the Pine Tree State Arboretum.

One more comment, by combining departments there would be a loss of top cabinet positions. Realizing it is only human nature to muster a fight for a limited number of issues, which issues will be lost or slighted and under represented at the cabinet level? If Ag is combined with DOC, will the Commissioner be able to argue successfully for all the issues of both agencies? With two Commissioners with different constituencies and different agency goals they can argue for more issues.

I think it would be more productive to look at reducing the size of the legislature, overhauling and setting priorities for Human Services and doing a better job at

addressing the high cost of education than looking at combining various natural resource agencies or programs. Stop tinkering and really solve the problem.

I just attended a DEP state Shoreland Zone training session for CEO's. The DEP has recently come out with a new model shoreland zone ordinance for the towns to adopt. This means all of the towns have to rewrite their Zoning Ordinances and DEP has to review them for compliance. Public Hearings and Town Meeting articles are required for the Towns to hold and there is no choice at the Town level. The Towns have to pass the state minimum standards. The DEP rules should be accepted at the state level, just like the Plumbing Code and the new Building Codes. This would save both the Towns and the State both time and money and provide better consistency through out the state. If a town wanted stricter regulations, they could then adopt them and have the state review those stricter regulations.

The Passamaquoddy Tribal environmental department supports a recreational salt water fishing license to generate funds to help patrol and monitor the coast of Maine for red tide, increased marine patrol presence, and conducting research on marine natural resources.

We are not sure consolidation of departments will be an improvement. There are insufficient resources for every department now to adequately manage the resources; consolidation may only make it worse. While there seems to be duplication of effort in addressing marine fish and fresh water fish management, it still takes staff in the field, and the issues are very different. And it is not hard to determine who should be studying anadromus/catradromus fish. We recommend keeping the departments separate, and increase the staff, using funds from a salt water license.

I received two grants for an environmental project at our school in Bowdoin. Because of the excellent services of Denise Blanchette and her team at the DEP and Ken Canfield of the Maine Forestry Service, our project was a success. Denise and her team were invaluable for their direct contact with the students on a monthly basis for six months (December to June). Denise and team taught lessons, directed the testing, and provided contacts and resources that I needed for the project. Ken, not only worked directly with students for an afternoon, but also returned to assess the property for placement of trees. He was invaluable for his expertise and subsequent contacts that I needed for purchases of bushes, trees and plants for our stream's buffer. Both provided me with immediate help and Ken connected me with a statewide network that I could contact when necessary. Because of these knowledgeable people and services that they provide, teachers are able to provide environmental studies for our youngest citizens; our hope for the future. I think that these services are extremely important for the environmental education of our children and the demand for such services should only increase in the coming months and years. A provision for this type of resource is essential to school districts within the state and ultimately to the health of the planet.

It is very unclear what problems have been identified that warrants a solution of consolidation. It is difficult to find a creative solution to a problem that may not exist. If this is a budgetary exercise, then cost savings should be determined up front, rather than booking savings first and finding them later.

During my six years with BLWQ, I managed two, small ground water protection programs: the Underground Injection Control (UIC) Program and the Sand and Salt Pile Program. The UIC Program worked primarily with auto and truck repair shops to eliminate floor drains that discharged to the environment (subsurface or on surface). The Sand and Salt Pile Program worked with municipal, county and state government to address salt pollution of groundwater from uncovered sand/salt piles. With both programs, I covered the entire state and paid little heed to whether a floor drain or sand/salt pile was in or out of my jurisdiction just because it was in an unorganized territory. I did inspections, wrote Notices of Violation and treated all sand/salt piles and floor drain offenders equally. Occasionally, I would interact with LURC staff, but usually I was informing them about the current state of the law or they were referring issues to me. I guess that's why I'm writing: it just seems silly to have some other agency enforce environmental law just because the town is unorganized.

Groundwater pollution is groundwater pollution and it doesn't recognize the political make-up of the town it may be in. LURC may be good for some things, but enforcement of environmental protection laws should be left to DEP for the entirety of the State of Maine. It's one area that screams "duplication of effort." I'd recommend that the task force examine the jurisdictional issues between DEP and LURC and eliminate the duplication between organized and unorganized territories.

I have worked in natural resource management in 3 states for 42 years. There is never enough funding to adequately manage the resources entrusted to us. A funding mechanism that would provide a more stable economic base for natural resources would be great. A surcharge on new energy projects?

I am always eternally optimistic about these initiatives for change but am never surprised when they fail.

Greetings Task Force. Glad you are taking the job seriously and are reaching out for opinions.

Though I own 80 acres of farmland, only a small portion -- maybe 25 acres -- is maintained (by my dairy-farm neighbor) as hay-field. I don't imagine he ever consulted with the Maine Department of Agriculture about either that acreage or his own, which is much more considerable.

My own interests run more toward maintaining wildlife habitat (my land is in the town of Brunswick). In this context I have had contacts with the Forestry Department and the Cooperative Extension Service. Yes, I believe the latter comes under the University as well as the Department of Agriculture, so perhaps lies beyond your field of inquiry.

That observation brings to focus an overriding observation about your mission. My sense is that the five departments should best be maintained with independent jurisdictions. Individually, each might well deserve some streamlining, but it's hard to see that a redesign of the overall allocation of responsibilities would be helpful, either financially or in practice. Might look cleaner on paper, but I think that's about it.

I've worked for State government for a number of years and still feel like I am trying to learn about the natural resource agencies and what everyone does. We are really big. Sometimes when I am out in the field working, someone from the public will say, "Someone from DEP was just here." It is usually someone from a different part of DEP. I may or may not know who they are and what they do.

My point is this - some internal training on State govt. for State Employees would be useful. If someone calls from the public, we will better know who to refer them to if necessary. For example, what does SPO do? I guess I can go on their web site if I have time.

Get real and face the facts: the natural resource agencies are underfunded and understaffed. Consolidation for the sake of satisfying a legislative directive in the interest of saving a few bucks will do nothing but further weaken these agencies. You could wipe these departments off the map completely, and the Legislature would still have to deal with a huge hole in the budget. Natural resource agencies are not the problem. Go where the real money and the real inefficiencies are - DHHS, Education, DOT - and fix those problems. Then come back and take a look at natural resources.

The reason that the state budget is so out of whack is that legislators keep creating new programs that cost a little bit when first authorized, but then they grow out of control in the "out years," when the legislators who created the programs are no longer around to be held accountable. That's not the fault of the natural resource agencies.

The Legislature needs to look at all of the new programs (particularly social services) and tax expenditures (read, business tax breaks) created or authorized in the last decade and either cut them or, if they are so important, cut an equivalent amount from the beneficiary agencies and let the department heads figure out what programs to get rid of. It's called the Last In First Out principle.

Rumor has it that some commodity-based interest groups have expressed strong support for effectively dismantling the Department of Conservation by, for example, moving the Forest Protection Division in the Maine Forest Service to the Department of Public Safety and moving the rest of the Maine Forest Service to the Department of Agriculture. This is foolish, selfish, self-serving, short-sighted thinking. The Department of Conservation is devoted to the wise use and protection of the state's natural resources.

The Department of Agriculture largely serves the purpose of promoting the production of agricultural commodities - a totally different mission.

The state might be better served if all of the natural resource protection functions were combined under a single natural resources agency and the commodity promotion functions were sent over to DECD. There probably is some duplication of effort among these departments, and there are some very turf-minded groups (wardens, for example) that continually resist any efforts to do things differently, but the savings involved in incremental changes are chump change. Instead of cutting "middle management" and/or clerical staff and/or other "worker bees" - those who actually do the work of state government, combine ALL of the natural resource departments and get rid of a bunch of commissioners and their associated staffs. If the state combined DEP, DMR, DOC, Ag and DIFW into a Department of Natural Resources, it could shed itself of four commissioners and at least some other political appointees within each of the current departments. There could also be fewer legislative committees. That would amount to more serious money.

Your recommendations listed above do not reflect the need to provide quality competitive products and services that are key for the survival and growth of our largest industry - Tourism.

Tourism is a value added industry that benefits Maine's entire business community. People come (or not) to Maine because of our natural resources.

In that letter You refer to the Governor's Task Force as a step in the right direction. With Partners now out of the picture, this task force is the only hope for real land owner relations in Maine. A step does not make a journey. To walk a path requires rhythm, one foot in front of the other, arms swinging in unison. Please take the next step for this task force, by setting a date for a meeting dedicated entirely to land owner relations.

We take vacations in the LURC Jurisdiction. We spend 90% of our recreational time on land immediately adjacent to where we live. This 90% gives us the quality of place that brings people to live in Maine or keeps them here to begin with. You can't wind down after a stressful day at the office by skiing for an hour in Baxter State Park. If you take your dog for a walk every morning, you do it on your neighbor's woods road, not in the North Maine Woods. It is land near where we live that needs land owner relations the most. Unfortunately that is not appealing to lobbyists, or Legislators. They want big victories, not lots of little ones. It is the little people who need little victories. They need the tools that I have been talking about to get those victories for themselves.

My line of work takes me to nearly every state in this country examining and interacting with state officials and citizens concerning issues of hunting, fishing, trapping and the general outdoors. It is my opinion that the state of Maine would be making a huge mistake in melding the Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife into one bigger agency, more than likely called the Department of Natural Resources. I know of no other state that is happy with doing as Gov. Baldacci and the Legislature is suggesting Maine do.

Much of the problems as I see them come from the MDIFW being asked to take on roles that were never intended to be part of its mission. It is strapped financially because it is required now to undertake programs not associated with fish and GAME! I.E. search and rescue, ATV and snowmobile patrolling and enforcement, etc.

Maine should be a leader in this country and return the MDIFW to the Maine Department of Fish and Game, whose function would be as was intended, to manage game animals for the purpose of providing hunting, fishing and trapping opportunities for its residents.

Forcing 5 agencies into one creates a host of problems. With focus mostly on MDIFW issues, too many of those with interest in wildlife watching, hiking, biking, etc. have no history or understanding of hunting and it's necessary part of wildlife management. They see hunters as being something that runs contrary to their opportunities of wildlife viewing.

Too often, people have no idea that they would never have these opportunities to watch a moose in the meadow, see deer in a field or a family of Canada lynx frolic in the tall grasses in spring, if not for the efforts and fees paid by our hunters and fishers.

The demands of the wildlife viewer far exceed their willingness to pay for that privilege. Some have asked that these viewers start paying up. I agree but NOT through a so-called unified natural resources department. State after state that does this regrets the day they did. As more non-hunters begin coughing up fees, they also demand more representation, as one would expect. This becomes a problem and a problem for the so-called consumptive sportsmen as I have already pointed out.

New Jersey is a prime example of a state that keeps insisting that members of anti-hunting and animal rights groups should have a seat on the fish and game boards. We know their only goals are to end hunting, trapping and fishing and this is how it is done. Surely it cannot be in the best interest of Maine people to seat an anti-hunter on the board of fish and game or any board that oversees the operation of fish and game.

People snicker and say this will never happen but it does.

If Maine decides to move the MDIFW into a Department of Natural Resources, it will be the beginning of the end for hunting and fishing as we know it in the Pine Tree State. It has always been my belief that Maine and all other states should reverse that direction and return to fish and game agencies, with only that objective. Leave snowmobile and atv policing to law enforcement, search and rescue to local search and rescue and build wildlife viewing stands with monies collected from general taxation or private money and stop asking the licensed sportsmen to keep picking up the tab. Fish and game does not belong as part of a department of natural resources.

I believe it is the governor's intention to begin using money from general taxation to help fund fish and wildlife. Again, this type of funding, unless proper laws are created to

protect our hunting and fishing heritage, will only lead to poor representation of the hunting, trapping and fishing interests, leading to a reduction in those opportunities many Maine residents enjoy. This too will result in a reduction of license fees and the proverbial snowball begins to grow.

Maine is not trying to write a new book here. There are plenty of states that have contributed to this book and would hope that this task force would examine thoroughly what has taken place in states with similar demographics as Maine.

I urge this task force and the governor of the State of Maine, to resist the temptation to bring the MDIFW into this bigger entity with the thoughts that it will save money AND better serve the Maine citizen. It will not!

Fishermen are good at finding loopholes and bending the rules that DMR makes. In my own industry, certain people are holding multiple licenses when they should be limited to one. Buyers are paying cash and not completing log books and nothing is done about it. It's an uneven playing field. When someone does get caught, they get a slap on the wrist and continue doing what they do. Lobsters are the only healthy fishery right now so they get all the attention, at the expense of other fishers. But having all eggs in one basket is not good management. Lobstering is petroleum based and leaves a big carbon footprint. In appalled at the litter of lobstermen on beaches. Many of them don't deserve the privileges that their license grants them. Many seem to feel entitled to damage the environment (draggers) and other non targeted species because they've always done it that way. Especially way Downeast. No one stands up to these people.

I wonder if there has been an effort to look at other states for models of how to (or not to) blend the functions of these types of agencies. I know in some places they have created the natural resources super agency. I suspect there are varying levels of this around the country and varying degrees of success.

I will try to get the survey completed this week, but in case I do not I do have a question and a comment. My question is whether there is an emergency response plan in place when something happens to one of our natural resources? If there isn't, I believe that it should be part of the task force plan to have one developed. The reason I ask comes from the frustration I hear from lobstermen and lobster dealers over the tomalley issue that surfaced this summer. While the word got out quickly to the general public to avoid eating the tomalley, the follow up to say that lobster was safe and to keep reiterating that message seemed woefully inadequate. There has been very little that I have seen from the Dept of Marine Fisheries or the Lobster Promotion Council, and it made me wonder if there was an emergency response plan in place, or if everyone was waiting for someone else to handle it? If you Google lobster tomalley, you get a headline that reads "Don't eat Maine Lobster Tomalley" <http://www.webmd.com/food-recipes/food-poisoning/news/20080728/fda-dont-eat-maine-lobster-tomalley> , then two more pages of similar warnings. Those first four words are enough to scare anyone. I applaud the task force for tackling these issues.

* I am an assessment fisheries scientist that used to be in charge of data collection, analysis and provision of management advice for all managed marine species for the East coast of the U.S. from NMFS out of Woods Hole Mass. I also *was* Research Director for DMR for 2 years in the 70's and tried to correct some of the problems that you are trying to solve now. Changes that affect the daily lives of workers are difficult to impose unless you have a solid mandate and the support to carry it out. Maybe now is a time to make some important changes.

It is relatively easy to address duplication and overlap among natural resource agencies such as law enforcement, monitoring, collecting basic data, paper management, and administration. It's obvious that you should combine groups that are doing the same things like licensing, etc. Combining the Inland wardens with the Marine Patrol is an example. The slow and busy times for each enforcement group is sufficiently different that their combination would bring more people to the problems. It's tougher to set up a group of organizations that can be efficient and still manage our resources. It's not the simple answer of more money needed. Its organization, leadership and priorities.

In one of my former lives I supervised 250 people and a \$15 million budget through 8 program leaders, 1 budget leader and 1 administrative/personnel director. We produced some of the best fisheries assessment science in the world. The key was a relatively flat organization, good job descriptions and good people.

So, this should not be an exercise in just how to save money or be more efficient by better cooperation/coordination of current activities or reconfiguration of the agencies. You have been given BOTH a great challenge to improve efficiencies and an opportunity to correct some very bad problems, reduce bad staff, add good staff, save money and greatly improve the management of our natural resources. It does no good to coordinate low priority activities just for efficiencies. We want these agencies to be efficient but first we want them to do what they were set up to do and to know what they are responsible for. A super agency is no good if they are not doing the right stuff.

The first issue is to know what needs to be done in priority order by whom and are they doing it. For example is the DIF&W assessing the status of moose, bear, lynx and wild salmon, etc. correctly and frequently enough for management to provide maximum benefit to the State? Is DMR providing expertise to the New England Fisheries Management Council on Maine cod and herring so that our interests are properly considered? Are 3 groups (DOC, EPA, and IDF&W) doing some level of water sampling and are they meeting all needs, including habitat issues?

Some of these problems are efficiency problems and some require upgrading of personnel skills. I realize that your charge is not to change or increase funding. The only way to save money which can be used to upgrade personnel is to get rid of people—such as coordinators, special assistants, and even Deputies that we do not need. This will naturally occur, as you change the organizational structure to improve efficiency. And

you have to get rid of costly unneeded positions. A rule of thumb is that for every 3 unneeded positions removed, one needed position can be hired and money can be saved.

Having a different politician or administrator in charge as Commissioner every 4 or 8 years does not provide continuity and certainly not intellectual leadership these agencies have been a dumping ground for termed out politicians and “special assistants” for some time and they are really not needed. The only way to get rid of these drags on the system is to reorganize—which should be done every 10 years or so anyway. Such reorganization has never been done for the DIF&W, for example and it shows. The work force should consist of people that can best address the current priorities. This means that these priorities must be known as well as the type of scientist/administrators that are needed to do the job. Combining agencies would get rid of some of these Commissioners, Deputies, and coordinators and allow the hiring of knowledgeable people to provide leadership that is clearly lacking now. This is one solution. I assume you have the correct people on your committee and that you are addressing this!

I know that you don't know all the problems with their magnitude and your charge does not specifically address solving them. But this is the nearest thing I've seen for making some progress. I, therefore, want to give you my ideas on some problems and some solutions specifically for the DIF&W, that I hope you will consider.

The IDF&W, in particular, suffers from its old fashion organizational structure, lack of science, excessive use of hatcheries, no knowledge of genetics, how to conduct game assessments (census vs. sampling designs), lack of habitat evaluations with their solutions and problems for deer and moose, loss of salmon fishing, invasive species, and lack of leadership from politicians and administrators that lack sufficient knowledge to recognize the problems and how to solve them.

A full position is not needed for a “planner”. This is really a part time job.

The Advisory Council should be abolished. It serves only as a dodge and a buffer for the Commissioner who lacks knowledge for directing resource management. The Council brings little expertise to the problems under discussion.

Scientists should not be wasting their skills writing grant applications. Proper job descriptions and better budget control would solve this.

Statistician and computer specialists are needed to update and improve the quality of the analytical activities.

Surveys of all inland water bodies should be coordinated with others or preferably removed from the DIF&W. Now, the biologists can only survey their waters properly once every 10 years whereas a fishery survey every 5 years is the minimum needed. DOC is also surveying water bodies which could be expanded.

Research on habitat, smelts and exotics should also be done by someone. While exotics may be the most significant biological limitation to fisheries management programs, no 2 is the misuse of hatcheries particularly as it relates to wild salmon, and no 3 is a general lack of knowledge about our fisheries resources which could be addressed if biologists didn't have to survey waters.

Combine activities with DEP on access to rivers and lakes.

Expand the Information and Education Division (within the IDF&W) across agencies to handle all external outreach.

Develop management policies and priorities for every water body.

Set up scientific peer review programs every 5 years, at least, for the DIF&W that can review status assessments and recommend refinements in techniques.

Compare actual budget practices of the DIF&W to the "best practices" as suggested by the Governmental Finance Officers Association or with other proven practices.

Evaluate sufficiency of support staff such as computer programmers, statisticians, Ph. D level scientists, etc., and facilities such as airplanes, ATV's, snowmobiles, surveillance equipment, automated informational systems, computers and library support.

There is a big difference in assessment and management of our marine and inland fish and shellfish resources. A lot of DMR and the IDF&W should remain separate. The level of expertise differs greatly and leadership needs to know this. Statisticians, computer jocks, Ph. D level assessment scientists need to be hired for the marine field and to a lesser extent for the inland work. The DMR organization is so flat that a case can be made that there is no organization.

There are many books written on the management of people and organizational structure and all advocate a lean management staff with a minimum chain of command. The chain of command in the DIF&W. runs thru 5 levels from the Commissioner through the Deputy, the Bureau Chief, the Director and/or the Supervisor to the Regional Biologist to the worker in the field. Over time this inefficient system has evolved to address the poor pay scale system where a good scientist could go a lifetime w/o a promotion. The pay system should be solved as well as the organizational structure.

In Search of Excellence by Tom Peters and Bob Waterman, (just one example on how to run an organization), there are 8 basic principles that the best run companies of America use - "to stay on top of the heap" Three of these, in particular, apply to the Fisheries group. No. 7 is - "Simple form, lean staff-few administrative layers, few people at the upper levels" In most laboratories that I know of, the Deputy is not in the chain of command. He can be replaced by a scientist with organization skills. Coordinators can be removed or reduced.

I note in the newspaper article by Kevin Miller that you want comments from the public on ways to eliminate duplication among the Departments under review. This is Principle no. 2 in “In Search of Excellence”—Stay close to the customer, learn his preferences and cater to them. For some time the “Sportsman’s Alliance of Maine” has recommended that the IDF&W form an ongoing “publics” committee to suggest how involvement with public, volunteers, and recommendations concerning the public can move forward. The DIF&W has always ignored SAM.

Principle no. 6 of "In Search of Excellence" is "stick to the knitting'- do what you do best". People trained as biologists or assessment scientists do not necessarily make the best managers and administrators. In Maine, promotion from within has been the norm. A good reorganization with some Ph.D level scientists under a decent pay schedule would solve this.

* Maine’s inshore fisheries have been trashed several times over the years by highly mobile fishing vessels using gear too large and too heavy for shallow coastal habitats to withstand and have destroyed the area's local stocks. This is a consequence of Maine's state-wide policy of open oceans.

Unless DMR generates the courage to address this problem, by placing all its coastal fisheries into a common series of smaller management units (the lobster zones), in spite of Maine’s best management plans, today’s powerful fishing technology will continue to drive the inherently complex and fragile coastal ecology to collapse.

I think that could be savings and benefits to have the DHHS Radiation Control Program incorporated into DEP along with our Response Services staff. Both programs deal with calls from the public with spills or releases to the environment. One focuses on hazardous waste or oil releases and the other with radiological types of releases. Other states often have both programs under the same department.

* I don’t see how Agriculture is a fit with the rest of these agencies and would suggest that leaving them out of any consolidation discussion that included the others would be prudent. Maybe they stand alone, or perhaps there are other agencies that would provide a better fit.

I think the opportunities for improved service delivery through coordination of effort, and for reduced upper / mid level management through consolidation are strong arguments for consolidation of these natural resource agencies.

* In my rush to get that questionnaire off to you before the long weekend I left out the “bigger picture” thoughts. They relate to issues that have come up with inter-agency collaboration in regards to shellfish safety and growing area classification.

To illustrate them, I will refer to scenarios that we’ve been faced with (the examples below are hypothetical):

- 1) **Scenario 1:** DEP approves a sewer treatment plant in “my Town” for 700,000 gallons of discharge per day. DMR conducts a hydrographic study and determines that if the gallonage discharged exceeds 350,000 gallons in one day, a very large portion of the shellfish growing area downstream of the plant needs to be closed for 21 days. The plant exceeds the 350,000 on a daily based, so the flats are permanently closed. The plant does not feel it needs to increase its capacity because the DEP permit allows it to discharge 700,000 gal/day. The shellfish industry faces the consequences of this disparity.

Needed: Better communication (a single standard?) between DMR and DEP when granting permits to STPs adjacent to shellfish growing areas. Or consolidating DEP’s and DMR’s water quality divisions?

- 2) **Scenario 2:** Harvester X finds a pipe that tests “hot” in a productive river where the water quality deteriorates after heavy rainfall. He contacts DMR and sees that no remedial action is taken over the course of the following weeks. When he calls the DMR staff to find out why there has not been an effort to abate this source of pollution, DMR staff replies that he does not have the statutory authority to remove the pipe. He tells the harvester that only DEP or the town inspector can do the job.

Needed: A more streamlined process to ensure that pollution sources are addressed shortly after they are detected. Consolidating DEP’s and DMR’s water quality divisions under DEP (DEP staff have the statutory ability to complete the task—they do the shoreline survey works as well)?

- 3) **Scenario 3:** DEP enforces the Clean Water Act by regulating the discharge of fecal coliforms in the water. Sewer treatment plants by and large use chlorination methods and contact times designed to inactivate fecal coliforms (bacteria) but not viruses. Soon, DMR will likely have to close and open shellfish areas based on viruses as well as fecal coliforms (proposal to the ISSC Biennial, the body that regulates interstate shellfish commerce). The shellfish industry will be adversely affected by these diverging standards.

Needed: Better communication (and a single standard) between DMR and DEP (as well as the EPA and the ISSC). Consolidating DEP’s and DMR’s water quality divisions?

- 4) **Scenario 4:** Land farmer X spreads manure onto fields that lie adjacent to shellfish growing area Y. When shellfish harvesters approach Dept of Ag to express concerns about the impact of this manure in shellfish growing waters, Ag assures the harvesters that if buffers are respected there should not be a problem,

actively discouraging testing of the water prior and after the manure is spread.
Clearly, allegiances are with the land farmer.

Needed: Keep land and sea-based farm regulation separate. I'd rather not see DMR folded into AG.

5) **Scenario 5:** DMR was at one point responsible for both regulating and promoting the shellfish industry. Due to perceived conflict of interest, DMR currently regulates only. No other agency has taken on the role of promoting the ME's sea-based products.

Needed: An agency (AG?) that's willing to promote ME's fish and shellfish.