Maine has always been proud of its wildlands – the Big Woods, land of Indian and trapper, of white pine tall enough for masts on His Majesty’s ships, of mountain lion, moose, and eagle. Much of the wildness was still there when Thoreau went in by birchbark canoe, a little over a century ago. And much of it remains. There is spruce and fir, moose and beaver, lake and mountain and whitewater enough to satisfy generations of Americans. More and more, as northeastern U.S. develops, the Maine woods are becoming an almost unparalleled resource, both for tree production and for recreational opportunity. But who is to come forward to say that this resource must not be squandered? Can we guarantee that the next generations will be able to set out in a canoe and know that adventure is just around the bend?
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Dear Commission Members:

By this letter, I approve the Land Use Regulation Commission’s revised Comprehensive Land Use Plan that you adopted unanimously on March 3, 2010. The revised Plan provides a balanced, fair and flexible approach for promoting orderly growth and development in the 10.4 million acres of the jurisdiction for the next decade. I recognize that it is the result of 5 years of extensive public and stakeholder involvement and that it reflects the input from landowners, residents, various recreation and conservation organizations and the general public.

In approving this Plan, I take special notice that one of the most important and overarching goals of the revised Plan is to update LURC’s role regarding economic activity in the jurisdiction and to support economic development in appropriate locations. I also recognize your commitment to inclusive, collaborative stakeholder processes to find solutions that work for landowners and residents of the jurisdiction while protecting the public interests in this extraordinary area. It is important to continue to provide every opportunity for residents and landowners within the LURC jurisdiction to meaningfully shape new policies as they are developed and implemented.

In the revised Plan, you mention that considerable opportunities may exist for non-regulatory, voluntary approaches that provide landowners with flexibility and incentives to protect the principal values of the jurisdiction while achieving reasonable economic returns. You have assured me that you will actively explore collaborative processes as they may offer a path forward which not only maintains but improves landowners’ value while enhancing the protection of public interests. These assurances are integral to my approval of this revised Plan.

LURC’s important role in the planning and zoning of this unique and vital part of our state is critical to Maine’s future. Working forests, healthy and vibrant communities, and abundant recreational and natural resources are part of our heritage and must be safeguarded and enhanced for our generation as well as our children and grandchildren. I urge you to continue your hard work on behalf of the great state of Maine.

Sincerely,

John E. Baldacci
Governor
March 11, 2010

Dear Governor Baldacci,

We want to thank you for meeting with us earlier this week and appreciated the opportunity to present the Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) to you in person and answer your questions.

As you know, the Plan is the Commission’s policy document and the real work of finding solutions to the challenges and opportunities facing the jurisdiction will be undertaken in the years ahead through the implementation of the Plan. In this regard, you inquired about how we intend to move forward with implementation.

As we reflect on our process in developing the Plan and the issues that have been dealt with over the Commission’s 40 year history and our tenure, we are encouraged by collaborative processes that have been used in other settings and that are characterized by:

- Respect for diverse points of view
- Creative search for solutions that work for all parties
- Open sharing of information

History shows that collaborative processes can achieve unprecedented levels of success both from the perspective of the regulated parties and public interests. They can result in creative, equitable and enduring solutions.

Mindful of this, as we undertake the important work of implementation, we are committed to collaborative stakeholder processes that allow us to find solutions that work for landowners and residents of the jurisdiction while protecting the public interests in this extraordinary area and its resources. The issues facing the jurisdiction are complex and we certainly do not have the answers or even the tools necessary to address them all. We believe that stakeholder involvement and collaborative processes will not just be important but may well be essential to the success in effectively and equitably addressing the most intractable and fundamentally important issues the Commission confronts.

We recognize that collaboration requires willing partners and that the Commission cannot command collaboration. We can, however, offer and encourage this approach and are prepared to do so. We also understand that collaboration requires changing old mindsets, traditional behaviors and making a new start – this is very challenging but success in other arenas make it possible and that the results can be impressive. We are prepared to model this patient, open and inclusive behavior and encourage others to do so as well. We would like to initiate a collaborative approach for implementing the Plan as soon as possible. This would allow us to take the important next steps in addressing issues while clearly demonstrating our commitment to involving landowners, residents and other interests in an open dialogue.
We can assure you that we will make every opportunity for residents and landowners within the LURC jurisdiction to meaningfully participate and shape these efforts as new policies are developed and implemented based on the CLUP.

This is not to say we are abandoning our statutory charge – you may also be assured that we will adhere to it while working to implement the Plan – rather, we are looking to achieve the objectives of the LURC Act through more creative and effective means. In these regards, we are encouraged by collaborative processes, as they may offer a path forward which not only maintains but enhances landowners’ value while enhancing the protection of public interests.

We hope that this resolves any questions that you may have regarding our intentions as we go forward. We stand ready to answer any questions that you may have in this regard; and, again, truly appreciate the opportunity to serve the people of Maine as Commissioners of the Land Use Regulation Commission.

Sincerely,

Gwendolyn R. Hilton, Commission Chair

Steve Schaefer, Commission Vice-Chair
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