



Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) Update Summary Report: Initial Outreach for the Pre-Process FINAL REPORT

November, 2025



**BUREAU OF RESOURCE INFORMATION AND LAND USE PLANNING
LAND USE PLANNING COMMISSION**
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, CONSERVATION & FORESTRY

22 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333

Table of Contents

Background and Objectives	2
Methodology.....	2
Summary of Feedback.....	4
Issues and Concerns Summary	4
Data Needs Summary	7
CLUP Update Process Summary.....	8
Who Is Talking About What?	9
Implications, Recommendations, and Next Steps	10
Appendix A. Detailed Overview of Interview and Group Meeting Participants	11
Appendix B. Themes identified through qualitative analysis.	15

List of Abbreviations

BP	Building Permit (residential)
Commission	Land Use Planning Commission
CLUP	Comprehensive Land Use Plan
DP	Development Permit (non-residential)
LUPC	Land Use Planning Commission
Service Area	The Commission’s Service Area, which includes the unorganized and deorganized territories of Maine as well as certain towns and plantations.

Background and Objectives

The enabling legislation for the Maine [Land Use Planning Commission](#) (LUPC or the Commission) charges the Commission with preparing “an official comprehensive land use plan...for the unorganized and deorganized areas of the State.”¹ The statute further clarifies, “The commission must use the plan as a guide in developing specific land use standards and delineating district boundaries and guiding development and generally fulfilling the purposes of this chapter.” The most recent Comprehensive Land Use Plan (Plan or CLUP) was adopted in 2010. Many of the major policy objectives stated in the 2010 CLUP have been achieved, or significant progress has been made toward them. At its December 2024 regular business meeting, the Commission approved initiating an update to the CLUP.

The Commission has outlined a phased approach for a CLUP update. The first phase, or pre-process, includes gathering information to help identify priority issues and inform the structure and process for the second phase. The second phase is the actual process to update the CLUP and includes much broader outreach to landowners and interested parties, developing goals and policies, and completing the draft plan. The third and final phase is the adoption process that involves review by the Commission, leadership at the Department of Agriculture, Conservation, and Forestry (DACF), and the Maine Legislature.

To begin the current pre-process, Commission staff interviewed individuals and groups who have unique insights or expertise in topic areas relevant to the Commission’s Service Area and the CLUP. The purpose of this preliminary outreach is to identify potential issues, concerns, and process recommendations. This report presents the findings by summarizing opinions and synthesizing common themes into topic groups, based on the staff’s analysis. This input will help inform later phases of the CLUP pre-process.

The individuals and groups selected for interviews and the information in this report are not intended to reflect a comprehensive assessment of the issues and concerns related to the Service Area or planning for the CLUP. There will be many additional opportunities for people to share their perspectives or provide feedback during the pre-process, and the information presented here will be further expanded and refined as the process unfolds.

Methodology

Commission staff reached out to over 50 individuals and groups via phone calls, emails, or meetings. From that outreach, staff conducted 31 interviews and participated in five group meetings with the Regional Planning Organizations (RPOs), Maine Forest Products Council (MFPC), environmental organizations, and Maine Sporting Camps Association (see Table 1). Letters about the CLUP update were also sent to leaders of Maine’s five tribal governments. Additionally, the Commission’s five-year review of its Location of Development Rules (Adjacency Rules), conducted in 2024 in the Millinocket region, informed the questions asked of participants, see Appendix A.²

¹ Title 12 M.R.S. § 685-C

² Land Use Planning Commission [Location of Development \(Adjacency\) Rule Revisions Summary](#)

Table 1. Interviewee Representation

Interest Area	Number Interviewed	Group Meetings
County Officials	10	
Economic Development	5	1 ¹
Landowners	2	1 ²
Local Perspective / Residents	6	
Environmental		2 ^{3,4}
Recreation	3	1 ⁵
Agriculture	1	
Adjacency Rules 5-Year Review		5
Total	27	8

¹ Meeting with Regional Planning Organizations, with 11 organizations in attendance.

² Maine Forest Products Council meeting with 24 members in attendance.

³ Meeting with The Nature Conservancy, Appalachian Mountain Club, Maine Audubon, and Natural Resources Council of Maine. One individual from each organization was in attendance.

⁴ Meeting with the Maine Association of Wetland Scientists (MAWS), over 25 individuals in attendance.

⁵ Maine Sporting Camp Association meeting with 4 members in attendance.

Interviews were conducted between January and August of 2025.³ Questions focused on the following elements:

1. Issues of concern
2. Data important for the CLUP update
3. Important considerations for the update process

Interviews and meetings were conducted in person or remotely by telephone and video conference. Most lasted approximately 60 minutes, and notes were recorded for all of them.

Notes were discussed by staff and qualitatively analyzed with the software QualCoder.⁴ Statements were evaluated and determined to fit under the three categories of investigation (issues of concern, data needs, and CLUP update process) and were assigned a code or theme. This categorization was challenging because many of the issues are complex and interrelated. Statements relating to more than one topic were assigned to all applicable topics. This analysis does not quantify the number of similar comments made or weigh the responses. In many cases, reported comments were made by a single individual.

³ The Millinocket region interviews for the [Adjacency Rules](#) 5-year report were conducted in 2024.

⁴ Curtin, C. (2024) QualCoder 3.6 [Computer software]. Retrieved from <https://github.com/ccbogel/QualCoder/releases/tag/1.9>

Summary of Feedback

Based on the analysis, staff identified nine themes related to issues and concerns, two categories of data for the CLUP update, and four themes related to the CLUP update (see Appendix B for theme definitions). Themes are summarized below.

Issues and Concerns Summary

Economy. Interviewees described the economy as changing and shifting for the Service Area and the surrounding region. Several interviewees commented on economic and labor market changes for sectors like forest products, fisheries, and tourism. One person noted “the forest products industry is moving in different directions” and “the whole industry looks different than it did in 2008.” Another interviewee noted that many of the smaller forest landowners are aging out with no one to take their place and continue their forest management efforts. One interviewee highlighted that the CLUP should be supportive of new and existing industries by providing flexibility. Another noted that the Commission should allow for other values and types of development, like renewables and mining, because they create value for a landowner. One group highlighted that it is increasingly difficult to make sporting camps viable, and several have recently closed. It was noted that potential changes to the economy in rural Maine are particularly concerning for communities that rely on one industry for a significant portion of their employment, such as fisheries or a forest products mill. One interviewee also noted the closure of healthcare facilities due to a lack of funding.

There were several comments about employment in and around the Service Area. Several noted a lack of sustainable, year-round jobs with livable wages, while some highlighted worker shortages due, in part, to a lack of housing stock and affordable housing in towns, rural hubs, and the nearby unorganized territories. One interviewee noted that a large portion of the workforce is unemployed, and workforce training is needed. The lack of childcare services for working parents was acknowledged, and a limited pool of contractors cannot meet the demand for construction services related to building and restoring second homes. Broadband coverage for home-based workers was also discussed, and although access is improving, participants noted that there are still areas without coverage.

Environmental Impacts. Environmental impacts from development and recreation were discussed. Multiple interviewees raised concerns about development causing water quality issues, especially from development along shorelines, as well as noise and light pollution, and increased potential for toxic waste or other impacts from development such as mining, landfills, and energy production. One interviewee stated that development is never denied by the Commission and that too much priority is given to economic development with less consideration for environmental protection. Multiple interviewees commented on environmental impacts from recreation activities. Examples of comments include:

- Motorized vehicles create noise pollution, such as all-terrain vehicles (ATVs) and boats.
- Large off-road or all-terrain vehicles that damage trails.
- An influx of users during the COVID-19 pandemic highlighted issues with increased pressure on recreational resources, such as property damage or environmental impacts.

- A lack of thoughtfully planned recreational resources, or slow permit processing times for projects such as campsites, may lead to illegal and improper use, improper river crossings, or unauthorized camping with no subsurface wastewater disposal systems.

Public Services. County officials and economic development groups expressed concern about the current and future demand for public services due to increased costs and a lack of qualified personnel to provide services. They noted that this is made more difficult with rising costs, large land areas that need to be covered, and townships that are more heavily populated. Interviewees commented that payment for services is shouldered by municipalities that provide the services or by year-round residents of the Service Area. Additionally, several comments were made about negative experiences with reimbursement for services provided to the Service Area, or expressed that Service Area residents were not contributing enough toward the cost of maintaining roads, solid waste removal, providing emergency response, etc.

Some interviewees are concerned about the state of existing infrastructure and about the effect of development on emergency services. Specifically, concern was expressed about road access to properties, available water to respond to fires, and communication infrastructure to request emergency services. There were several comments about confusion over responsibility for different services. Junkyards were identified as an issue by several interviewees, who expressed frustration about the lack of coordination and resources to address these in the Commission's Service Area. Several interviewees felt that more support from state agencies is needed to deal with these adequately. Commenters noted that new residents are unfamiliar with private roads and expect the county to maintain their roads.

Housing. Housing affordability and availability are common concerns among interviewees. They noted a shortage of affordable housing near economic centers, where most jobs are located. One interviewee commented that very few vacant homes can be found in the area. Multiple interviewees expressed concern that younger residents or lower-income households are pushed out or kept out of the area due to an influx of higher-income households looking for second homes or the conversion of housing to short-term rentals. One participant referred to this as "rural gentrification" and asked, "Where will people who make \$17 an hour live?". There is concern about the high cost of new construction, and that those who can afford to build are only building homes attainable to high-income households. An interviewee commented that leased lots have increased in price and are very expensive compared to previous years.

Location of Development. Some interviewees discussed the relative importance of where development is in the unorganized territories, and how it relates to nearby towns and infrastructure in rural Maine. The importance of accurately presenting the amount and types of development in the Service Area was noted, especially in any maps produced. Likewise, there is a need to think regionally and to identify "those places most appropriate for growth." Some interviewees noted a lack of readily available developable land in towns and rural hubs, which can put more pressure on the Service Area for development, leading to concerns about sprawl and population growth in the Service Area. On the other hand, in some places, housing in the Commission's Service Area helps provide enough people in the region to support healthcare facilities or schools. One participant noted that it is difficult to get people interested in subdivisions near organized towns because people move to the area for seclusion. County officials noted that providing services has become more difficult due to a lack of resources (see Public Services section above). Land subdivision was highlighted, specifically conversion of working forests to

residential development and land divisions creating sprawl under the current “two-in-five” statutory exemption, which allows two land divisions every five years with no regulatory review. Several interviewees commented that there are not enough incentives to direct development to the appropriate locations, and one participant stated that the LUPC has “toothless regulations” for development.

Service Area Character. Service Area Character includes comments that discuss quality of life issues or how the physical and cultural characteristics of an area seem to be changing. Interviewees commented about the abundance of unique and important habitats for plants and wildlife throughout the approximately 10.5 million acres of the Service Area and noted that many are still intact because there is limited development. One interviewee described the Service Area as a “baby bird factory” because the required habitat is so abundant. Interviewees commented that overall, more people are moving into the Service Area and rural hubs, and the housing economy currently favors higher-income households and rental units. Several interviewees raised concerns about increasing noise and light pollution as the population rises, and the potential negative effects on quality of life. Several participants raised concerns about potential changes to land ownership, which could mean changes in the economy, changes in the current practice of public access to private land, or the selloff or subdivision of large parcels for development. It was also noted that new residents have additional expectations for services generally not available in the area, such as paved roads, snow plowing, or curbside trash pickup. Several interviewees also discussed a shift away from traditional recreational uses, such as hunting and fishing, to motorized trail use, mountain biking, and other newer forms of recreational day use. Sporting camps and guided recreation were noted as heritage industries in Maine. Interviewees commented that several sporting camps have closed in recent years and that trends for traditional activities, like hunting, are down.

Land and Water Access. Several interviewees commented that many users do not understand that recreation in the Service Area is often on private land and access is granted by permission. One interviewee noted that the State seems to prioritize logging and forestry in the service area, rather than the recreation industry, and that there is hostility over the recreation industry. Some interviewees commented on the influx of users during the COVID-19 pandemic and the increase in conflicts that can occur as a result. One noted that landowners cannot accept a continued upward increase in ATV size and number on their properties. Others expressed concerns about access being taken away by the large landowners due to these stressors. Groups that manage recreational resources commented on the lack of funding and personnel to build and maintain trails and long permitting processes that can affect access. One interviewee commented that some recreational resources could be considered underdeveloped by individuals with limited mobility, and that previous discussions to increase access have not been successful. Several interviewees highlighted that development can restrict access, especially along shorelines, and that more privately owned land is being posted. One commenter noted that there has been an increase in “collaborative conservation” in recent years between landowners and conservation groups that should be recognized by the Commission.

Climate Change. Several interviewees mentioned climate change as a concern. They expressed concerns about how predicted changes to the length of shoulder seasons, storm frequency and intensity, water quality, fire danger, and insect pests and diseases could affect the recreation and forest products economies. Interviewees highlighted the need for more resilient infrastructure, including transportation to and from islands, the electric grid, and road crossings. Additionally, interviewees noted that the many

large, undeveloped areas of the Service Area will be important refugia as species migrate north due to climate change.

LUPC Process and Administration. Many interviewees identified issues related to LUPC processes and administration. Multiple comments related to staffing levels and high staff turnover, and called out long permit processing times, long callback waiting times, and a lack of enforcement capacity. One interviewee noted that permit applications are long and can be a disincentive to building. Requirements for new construction, such as wastewater disposal requirements, were noted as a significant barrier in the Commission's permit process, especially in remote areas that are more difficult for licensed contractors and inspectors to reach. Several interviewees were concerned about a lack of enforcement consistency or enforcement only for the most egregious cases. One interviewee commented that the Commission says yes to all development without enough consideration for the environment. A few interviewees stated that more education and outreach are needed from the Commission, especially about what LUPC is responsible for and what it means to be an unorganized and deorganized territory. A request was made to clarify rules relating to the Natural Resources Protection Act (NRPA) and when projects trigger permitting through the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP). One interviewee suggested the State look at actively developing areas in the UT differently, and several interviewees suggested that taxes should be assessed differently to support dedicated staff for those areas.

Data Needs Summary

Interviewees stressed the importance of using data accurately and that data should not be used to support preconceived narratives about where and how much development is occurring. One interviewee recommended creating a planning library on the LUPC website, with readily available permit data and more mapping tools.

LUPC Data. Participants identified the following permitting data as important for the CLUP update:

- Residential development (numbers and location)
- Non-residential development (types and location)
- Energy Development
- Subdivisions

Other Data Sources. Participants felt that the following external data would be helpful for understanding current trends and future outlooks:

- Conservation land in the Service Area (amount, type, and location)
- Infrastructure (transportation, electric transmission, broadband)
- Housing (trends, types, affordability)
- Land ownership
- Natural resources (water resources, forested land, wildlife habitat)
- Accurate demographic data
- Recreational trails
- Recreation Use
- Public services

CLUP Update Process Summary

Feedback about the 2010 CLUP. Feedback on the 2010 CLUP product was mixed. Some interviewees recalled feeling frustrated at the end of the update, both with the final Plan and the process. Some participants had positive feedback on the goals and policies of the CLUP, while others expressed dissatisfaction. Several interviewees commented that there was tension between environmental advocates and landowner rights advocates. The presentation of data during the update process was also contentious, with different groups presenting different stories with the same permit locations dataset, and it became difficult to understand the real story or the reality on the ground. One interviewee commented that stressors on the Service Area were well presented in the final document.

Public Engagement. Multiple interviewees highlighted the importance of public engagement, urging the Commission to consider who would be most impacted by the CLUP. One interviewee noted the importance of providing opportunities for residents and landowners to shape policies that affect them. Others suggested avenues for reaching target audiences, including but not limited to:

- social media
- newspapers
- local radio stations
- posters or flyers at locations such as storefronts
- North Maine Woods checkpoints
- county and local governments
- message forwarding through well-known organizations

In-person, virtual, and hybrid meetings were suggested, and several stressed that priority should be given to locations in or very near the Service Area. Several comments were made about who should be engaged in the update process, with more weight given to different groups, such as those who own land and live in the Service Area. One interviewee highlighted that people outside of the Service Area also have an interest, and many have a long history of recreating or leasing land. Several participants suggested messaging that informs CLUP process participants about the Commission, the Service Area, and the history of the Service Area to connect the past with the present. One participant suggested an online portal for regular engagement.

What should the CLUP update process be like? There were suggestions for resources to enhance staff capacity during the process, including potential event organizers (workshops, public meetings), facilitators, avenues for sharing messages with participants, and funding sources. There was broad support for a steering committee model, as well as Regional and topic-based subcommittees or a mixture of the two. Several participants suggested replicating the successful Moosehead Regional Planning and Community Guided Planning and Zoning process. Some felt that the current update should be shorter than the 2010 CLUP process, while others noted that there should be plenty of time for meaningful public engagement.

What should the next CLUP document look like? Commenters recommended that the next CLUP should generally be a document that is:

- Simple and concise
- Data-driven with open access to data sources
- Long lasting (10+ years)

Various interviewees commented that goals and policies should:

- Include education about the Commission and its Service Area;
- Support economic development that is connected to the land;
- Bolster protections for shoreland zones, water quality, noise production, and dark skies;
- Be flexible so that landowners and businesses can adapt to uncertain economic and environmental futures; and
- Not decrease land development potential or land values.

Who Is Talking About What?

Different interest groups discussed many of the same issues and concerns (see Table 2). For example, public services were discussed by county officials, economic development groups, residents of the Service Area, rural hubs, and conservation groups. Most groups discussed LUPC processes and administration. Conversely, some comments were made by only one representative of the groups interviewed.

Table 2. Overview of themes discussed by interest area.

Interest Area	Themes discussed
County Officials	Climate Change, Housing, Infrastructure, Location of Development, LUPC Process and Administration, Service Area Character, Public Services
Economic Development	Climate Change, Economy, Housing, Infrastructure, Land and Water Access, Location of Development, LUPC Process and Administration, Service Area Character, Public Services
Landowners	Economy, Environmental Impacts, Housing, Land and Water Access, Location of Development, Service Area Character
Local Perspective/ Residents	Climate Change, Economy, Environmental Impacts, Housing, Land and Water Access, Location of Development, LUPC Process and Administration, Service Area Character, Public Services
Environmental	Climate Change, Environmental Impacts, Land and Water Access, Location of Development, LUPC Process and Administration, Service Area Character
Recreation	Environmental Impacts, Housing, Land and Water Access, Location of Development, Service Area Character, Public Services
Agriculture	LUPC Process and Administration
Adjacency Rules 5-Year Review	Environmental Impacts, Housing, Land and Water Access, Location of Development, LUPC Process and Administration, Public Services

It will be important to identify and get feedback from additional representatives of the various individuals and organizations interviewed to date. Other perspectives not yet included will arise as

information is refined through further outreach and analysis in the CLUP update pre-process. The results from additional interviews, the public survey, and future workshops will further inform the scope and priority of issues, identify other data to consider, and provide additional input to structure the update process.

Implications, Recommendations, and Next Steps

This outreach and analysis highlights many of the current issues and concerns related to the Commission's Service Area, along with some of the conflicting values among different perspectives. It was helpful to get feedback on data, potential sources for capacity building, and the process to update the CLUP.

Although this project was not a comprehensive analysis of issues facing the Commission's Service Area, these initial interviews will help plan the next steps of the CLUP update. The staff will continue to refine understanding of each topic with additional outreach and informational sessions at Commission meetings during the fall of 2025 and beyond. Some of the issues and concerns raised by interviewees do not fall within the scope of the Commission's authority, though they may be indirectly affected by Commission policies and practices. It will be important to distill the Commission's role in identified issues and focus the CLUP update process on those areas within the Commission's purview.

Next Steps for Outreach. This process identified the initial topic areas of interest. Additional interviews may be scheduled as other groups or individuals reach out to staff. These results will help staff develop a broader-reaching public survey to be developed in the coming months. The topics and issues identified to date will provide a focus for the data provided and questions asked in the survey. Additional feedback will be collected through the informational sessions, the survey, and future workshops, with more perspectives added to the initial topics and new topics potentially identified. Staff are working on an analysis of how the issues and concerns within identified topic areas intersect and will work to build an overall picture of issue connectivity.

Next Steps for Data. Staff are reviewing and refining internal data to share throughout the CLUP update process and are searching for relevant outside data and information related to issues and concerns identified through initial outreach.

Next Steps for the Update Process. Staff are developing a website to provide public access to materials generated for the CLUP update process, including this report. The website will provide a place for members of the public to get information and provide input as the process moves forward. Additional information about the next steps and timing for the CLUP update is included in the August 6, 2025, Memorandum to the Commission.

Appendix A. Detailed Overview of Interview and Group Meeting Participants

Twenty-seven individuals and five groups provided input about the CLUP update and key issues for the Commission to address. The organizations listed here include landowners, county government officials, community members, and many organizations that serve and work in the Commission's Service Area. Participants represent an array of perspectives from throughout the State, including but not limited to local interest, recreation, land ownership, forest products, government, economic development, natural resources, and conservation. Four individual residents and one leaseholder interviewed are not named in the table. A detailed summary of attendance for the group meeting with the Maine Association of Wetland Scientists (MAWS) is not included because attendance was not collected at the meeting, and several participants joined the Zoom meeting as a group through one member's account, leading to an inaccurate head count. Over 25 members were in attendance.

Table A1. Overview of Individual Interviews

Interest Area	Region	Organization or Group	Name, Title
Agriculture	Statewide	Wild Blueberry Commission of Maine	Eric Venturini, Executive Director
County Government	Aroostook County	Government	Ryan Pelletier, County Administrator
County Government	Washington County	Government	Heron Weston, UT Coordinator
County Government	Oxford County	Government	Zane Loper, County Administrator, and Tony Carter, UT Coordinator
County Government	Penobscot County	Government	Scott Adkins, County Administrator; George Buswell, UT Coordinator; and Tina Morrison, Deputy UT Coordinator
County Government	Somerset County	Government	Tim Curtis, County Manager; and David Spencer, UT Administrator
County Government	Knox County	Government	Leticia vanVuuren, Geospatial Database Manager
Economic Development	Washington County	Sunrise County Economic Council	Charles Rudelitch, Executive Director

Interest Area	Region	Organization or Group	Name, Title
Economic Development	Eastern Region	Eastern Maine Development Corporation	Jennifer King, Chief Operating Officer and Amy Collingsworth, Katahdin Region Economic Development Director
Economic Development	Eastern Region	University of Maine at Augusta: East Millinocket Center	Deb Rountree, Director
Economic Development	Eastern Region	Former Legislator; Former Executive Director of the Maine County Commissioners Association	Charlie Pray
Landowners	Statewide	Maine Woodland Owners	Tom Doak, Executive Director
Landowners	Northern Region	Lease Holder	
Recreation	Northern and Moosehead Region	North Maine Woods	Bill Greaves, Executive director
Recreation	Western Region	High Peaks Alliance	Brent West, Executive Director
Recreation	Statewide	Bureau of Parks and Lands	Joe Higgins, Supervisor of Off-Road Recreational Vehicle Program
Local Perspective	Western Region	Dallas Plantation municipal officials	Linda Jones, 1 st Assessor and Katrina Gacki, Town Clerk
Local Perspective	Eastern Region	Resident	
Local Perspective	Moosehead Region	Resident	
Local Perspective	Western and Moosehead Region	Residents (two individuals)	

List of Attendees at the environmental perspectives meeting.

Eliza Townsend, Appalachian Mountain Club
Francesca Gundrum, Maine Audubon

Kaitlyn Nuzzo, The Nature Conservancy
Luke Frankel, Natural Resources Council of Maine

List of Attendees with known affiliations at the Maine Forest Products Council (MFPC) meeting.

Krysta West, Executive Director – MFPC
Patrick Strauch, Consultant, Director Emeritus - MFPC
Hannah Stevens, Seven Islands Land Company
Peter Johnson, Maine Sustainable Forestry Initiative
Andrew Brown, Wagner Forest Management Ltd.
Scott Morrison
Isac Quint
Jeff Barrett
Peter Triandafillou
Ray Ary, Weyerhaeuser
Jennifer Bakke
Chris Fife, Weyerhaeuser
Anthony Hourihan, Irving

Kevin Topolinski
Eugene Mahar, LandVest
Matt Jacobs, American Forest Management
Alex Ingraham, Pingree Associates
Karin Belanger, Prentiss and Carlisle
Brent West, High Peaks Alliance
Mike Jurgiewich, Wagner Forest Management Ltd.
John Steward, Acadian Timber
Steve Hanington
Bill Ferdinand
Katherine Carrier, Irving

List of Organizations at the Regional Planning Organizations meeting.

Androscoggin Valley Council of Governments
Greater Portland Council of Governments
Hancock County Planning Commission
Kennebec Valley Council of Governments
Lincoln County Regional Planning Commission
Midcoast Council of Governments

Northern Maine Development Commission
Southern Maine Planning and Development Commission
Sunrise County Economic Council
Maine Office of Community Affairs
Municipal Planning Assistance Program

List of Attendees at the Maine Sporting Camps Association Meeting

Harvey Calden, MSCA President, Tim Pond Camps
Jason House, MSCA Vice President and owner of Macannamac Lodge and Camps
Alan Theriault, MSCA Bookkeeper, OMM Outfitters and Eagle Lake Inn
Nathan Theriault, MSCA Treasurer, OMM Outfitters and Eagle Lake Inn

Table A2. Overview of meeting notes included from the Adjacency Rules 5-year review.

Town	Individuals Present
East Millinocket	General Assistance Administrator; Selectman
Island Falls	Members of the Select Board and Planning Board
Medway	Selectmen, Town Administrator, and Fire Chief
Millinocket	Town Manager, Town Assessor, and Code Enforcement Officer
Patten	Public Works Director, Town Manager, and First Selectman

Appendix B. Themes identified through qualitative analysis.

CATEGORY	DEFINITION	CODES	DEFINITION
Issues and Concerns	Themes that are issues or concerns for, or related to, the Service Area and that should be understood for the Comprehensive Land Use Plan (CLUP) planning process.	Service Area Character	Issues related to the perceived character of the Service Area.
		Location of Development	Issues related to where development is located within the Service Area, and what drives location selection.
		Economy	Issues related to the economic functioning of the Service Area.
		Housing	Issues related to housing in and around the Service Area.
		Environmental Impacts	Issues related to environmental impacts.
		Public Services	Issues related to services provided to landowners, residents, and users of the Service Area.
		Land and Water Access	Issues related to accessing land and water resources.
		LUPC Process and Administration	Issues related to the Land Use Planning Commission's activities, responsibilities, and internal processes.
Data	Data that is or will be important for the CLUP update.	Internal Data	Data collected and held by the Land Use Planning Commission.
		External Data	Data and information from sources outside of the Land Use Planning Commission.
CLUP Update	Themes to consider for the CLUP update.	2010 CLUP	Feedback on the 2010 CLUP update process and product.
		Engagement	Feedback and suggestions relating to engaging the public for the CLUP update process.
		Process	Feedback and suggestions relating to the update process model.
		Product	Feedback on the desired outcomes of the update process.