

MAINE STATE LEGISLATURE

The following document is provided by the
LAW AND LEGISLATIVE DIGITAL LIBRARY
at the Maine State Law and Legislative Reference Library
<http://legislature.maine.gov/lawlib>



Reproduced from scanned originals with text recognition applied
(searchable text may contain some errors and/or omissions)

STATE OF MAINE

Inter-Departmental Memorandum Date July 5, 1977

Joseph E. Brennan, Attorney General Dept. Attorney General

Sarah Redfield, Assistant Dept. Attorney General

From

Subject Master plan

I have reviewed the master plan with much interest and enthusiasm. It is certainly well-organized, thoughtful and a commendable start, though I believe many of the major issues likely to confront the Authority are not decided.

I would note that I have had the opportunity to review Lloyd Irland's comments dated June 13, 1977. I am basically in agreement with many of the points he raises, particularly in paragraphs 4 and 5. There appears to be a tendency to avoid difficult issues. For example, I don't think the long term value of the lease of Kidney Pond Camps is addressed. Similarly, the question of closing (or opening) of roads is not explored fully. Nor is there any discussion of future acquisition of additional lands for the Park or for related purposes. Also, the impact on the Park of possible adjacent uses is not discussed; for example, the Bureau of Public Lands now owns the townships on the northern boundary, is this relevant?

One of my major concerns centers around the concept of carrying capacity. It is not clear to me in each instance where this term is used whether it refers to camping capacity, biological/ecological capacity, aesthetic capacity, or just the current capacity. This seems to me to be a vital issue for the Park and I would suggest that the discussion of current and potential use levels be more open and explicit. To the extent possible, I'd suggest a discussion of alternatives, including increased, same, decreased levels for park as a whole, for each zone, for different seasons, for specified periods of time, etc.

A second major concern arises in relation to that part of the plan which deals with "scientific forestry." Although I am aware that we will eventually have a separate plan for this part of the Park, I think that the master plan should set the tone for what is to come. The current draft seems to be saying that this part of the Park will be managed the way other forest lands of the State are. I do not believe this was Baxter's intent. It seems that this section should state explicitly that the goal is not short term economic gain, but rather long term exemplary management. I do not feel that the fact Baxter mentioned revenues derived from the sale of timber is to be construed as the major goal of this area. In this regard, I would, however, suggest that the Authority consider whether it feels that monies derived from these forestry operations should be used for the Park as a whole or for further development of the forestry concept.

In addition to these overall comments, I have various specific questions and comments which are listed here in order of their appearance in the draft.

Page 3, ¶2. The Park was completed in 1962 insofar as direct gifts from Governor Baxter; however, there is still the continuing possibility of further acquisition pursuant to the applicable trust instruments.

Page 4, ¶2. Although he approved of the Authority, Governor Baxter did not provide for the Park's administration by the Authority. The Authority is a creation of the legislature, not of the trust.

Page 5. ¶1. There is at least some question as to whether the 1955 instrument is a "revised deed of trust."

Page 6. ¶3. The trust also provides the potential for additional purchases, see above.

Page 6. Perhaps it would be appropriate for this section to bring the reader up to date, e.g. a very brief review of the park's history since Baxter's death. It might be a good place to mention some of the controversial issues in which the park has been involved, e.g. budworm spraying, blowdown restoration, snowmobiles, Indians.

Page 7. Objective #3. I find myself wondering about fire as part of ecological succession. Also, the concept of land use zones appears here almost out of nowhere. It might be easier for the reader if this section simply referred to "different areas of the Park" and the zones were explained more fully later.

Page 7. Objective #4. What is "unnecessary"?

Page 8. 2nd ¶. I think it would be helpful to explain "unfeasible" in more detail since its apparently the basis for the entire "zoning" idea

Page 8. 3rd ¶. It would be easier to follow if there were a summary description here of each of the zones.

Page 8. 4th ¶: Why 1/8th of a mile? Are there some areas where more/less might be appropriate?

Page 8. ¶7. This paragraph, if my numbers are correct, seems to contemplate doubling the amount of roads (from 1.5 to 3%). Is this what the Authority plans to do? The whole issue seems to be inadequately addressed; the problem is not so much the land area occupied or to be occupied by roads, as it is with the uses that roads connote. Also, is it desirable from a planning standpoint to have more day use facilities, more parking lots, more administrative facilities, or do we get to this later? Also, "flexibility" in management is fine, but the plan should be addressing these management decisions so as to provide guidance for is and future Authorities.

Will page 9 #1 I'd suggest "so as not to disturb the natural wild state. "ample" and "reasonable" mean more/less turnouts, wider/narrower r

more roads? page 9. #2. What improvements are contemplated? Does this mean no

page 9. #3. "Small park areas" brings me back to the basic philo-
sophical question about roads discussed earlier. I think the plan should
address the possible alternatives re: roads in a general sense and reach
a decision as to their advisability, increase, etc.

page 9. #4. There is too much jumbled in together here. Certain
activities are allowable only in connection with certain circumstances
pursuant to P. & S. L. 1955, c.2. The State is authorized to clean,
protect and restore areas of the park damaged because of acts of nature.
It is not clear to me that this contemplates chemical spraying to mainta:
roadside visibility. This paragraph refers to many of the most controver:
aspects of the Park; these deserve more careful analysis and attention.

Page 9. #4, 2d ¶. This paragraph is confusing. If its not an obje
why do it?

Page 9. #5. What are the contemplated unusual circumstances?

Page 10, ¶ 1. This is very hard to understand. Why were these size
chosen?

Page 10. #1. What does modernization mean here?

Page 10. #3. This is important. Is it a policy that belongs in
beginning? What might these "exceptional" circumstances be? Who will do
the "extensive" study? When?

Page 10. #5. No matter what the "zone" we are still bound by the
trust. I have some questions as to how "small dams" and modest "communica
structures" relate to this and to the earlier statement of the priority of
wilderness.

Page 11. #9. How does this relate to #3?

Page 11. ¶3. I have a problem with the joint use of the terms manag
ment and unimpeded.

Page 11. #1 How many campsites? How many people?

Page 11. #2. Is it "appearances" v. "reality"?

Page 11. #3. Is there anything else that is "absolutely necessary?"
I assume this paragraph precludes budworm suppression.

Page 11. #4. Protected from what?

Page 12. #5a: What emergency involves resource protection? Fire? If so, why not say so?

page 12. #5b: I think there should be some discussion of the alternative of no structures, no communications facilities. If the Authority wishes to reject the alternative, fine; but I think it should be considered.

page 12. #10. This seems to be self-contradictory.

Page 12. #13. Is this consistent with the concepts expressed in #1, #7.

Page 12. #14. The idea of individual unit master plans seems to have appeared here for the first time. When are these to be done? What will be in them that cannot be in this? Again, these are major decisions re: limitations on use and alternatives should be discussed.

Page 12. #16. This is consistent with P. & S. L. 1955. c.2; however I think since it is discretionary with the Authority there should be more detailed discussion of when "control" will occur.

Page 13. Zone IV: See general comments above

Page 14. Zone V ¶3. This paragraph isn't clear. I'm confused by the overlapping(?) of zones?

Page 14. #2 and #4. Why? What is the Park's goal here?

Page 17, 2nd ¶. See general comments above re: carrying capacity. What is the meaning or significance of the last sentence of this paragraph?

Page 17. Natural Resources #1. Who will do the inventory? When?

Page 17. Air and Water #1. Where will state and federal law be appropriate? Shouldn't there simply be an explicit policy of nondegradation? Why will a pond be reclaimed? This is a significant issue in relation to the natural wild state concept and should perhaps be addressed in more detail.

Page 18. Geology #2. This implies more such facilities. I'm not sure we've ever said this before.

Page 18. #4. See #2 above. How rare? Is the natural geologic configuration enough reason not to locate a road or whatever there?

Page 18. #5. The problem is everywhere - is natural wilderness a priority over man made facilities?

Page 18. Vegetation #2. Why? Is this applicable in all zones, cf. Zone III #3. What else is to be included by "not limited to."

Page 18. #3. What methods do you contemplate by "least impact" v. "best possible?" Is there ever a time when fires will be left to burn? Again, this is a major issue subject to debate and the alternatives should perhaps be discussed in greater detail though the 2d paragraph is a good start. Also #4 seems to be getting at the point.

Page 18. #4. Prescribed burning is not natural. There are two separate ideas in this section.

Page 18. #5. This avoids the decision almost entirely.

Page 18. #6. What is this for?

Page 20. Chemicals. Investigation by whom? Health of people or for

Page 21. All this seems to imply more roads but is that "the plan"?
Page 22, #1 doesn't seem to say so, but what does "in general" mean. See comments above.

Page 22. #3. This may be another controversial issue, the moving of logging equipment through the Park. It merits at least a discussion of alternatives.

Page 22. #4. See comments above, re: capacity

Page 22. #5. Is this bad?

Page 22. #7. See comments above re: "management unit plans"

Page 22. #9. Restoration of gravel pits should be required.

Page 23. #1. This is perhaps the most important point and yet is very unclear. See comments above re: carrying capacity.

Page 23. #2. Doesn't this overlook the idea that good planning might mean closing a trail?

Page 23. #3. I am concerned about the use of the "most modern techr" I suspect this means at the highest point of the art, but it should be clear that it will not include any materials not consistent with a wilderness use

Page 23. #4. Add: If normal maintenance does not maintain stability use will be reduced.

Page 23. #6. Will better design justify increased use?

Page 23. #8. Is this a policy, i.e. to have more even use without increasing overall use? If so, how does it relate to Zone III policies.

Page 23. #10. Even use may preclude variety.

Page 24. There may be some value in discussing "mountaineering" to rock or ice climbing. Also, are there any criteria for where new trails will

Page 25. See general comments above.

Page 28. ¶ 3. I thought you were concerned about a conflict between BSPA and IFW.

Page 28. ¶ 2. The use of the word priority in so many contexts has me confused.

Page 28 #4. Where is the authority for the judicious alteration of vegetation? What are the limits?

Page 29. #6. But not a priority over the sanctuary for the wildlife

Page 29. #8. What does this mean?

Page 29. #9. Yes. How does this fit in with #2? (Also, perhaps #13

Page 29. #13. Is this the interpretation of maintaining the balance of nature? It seems to me that the 1955 interpretation talks about maintaining the balance of nature among wildlife, not wildlife in relation to man's hunting thereof. This merits more discussion.

Page 30. #14. See above. Why shouldn't ponds be allowed to evolve? Admittedly Baxter allowed fishing, but it was not the priority, was it?

Page 31. This may be a good place to discuss the feasibility of acquisition and/or use of neighboring lands for certain recreational experience. See earlier comments as to public lands and also as to potential for acquisition.

Page 31. #2. How will automobile sightseeing be discouraged? Will short routes across Park be eliminated?

Page 32. Capacities. See all previous comments in this regard. I assume all procedures suggested by #5 are subject to the proviso that wilderness and ecology will not be adversely effected; presumably one can engineer anything.

Page 32. #4. What are special areas? C.f. "zones"?

Page 33. #10 #2. Do not forget the statutory mandate of 12 MRS § 90 that BSPA duties not be construed so "as to permit the collection of a fee for entering the premises of the park by residents of the State."

page 33. Perhaps there should be some detailed discussion here about day use. What if anything is the policy re: buses?

page 34. #2 "and consistent with natural wild state, etc."

page 35, Facilities #2. Is the use of "facilities" here facilities in the park. If so, "consistent with the plan" should be added.

Page 36. It might be helpful to the general reader to include a brief description of the Park administration, i.e. who is the Authority, when do they meet, what is the director's role and what is the advisory committee, etc.

Page 37. Adjacent land. But what does this mean for us? What is the Authority likely to do if a campsite is opened just outside the park, ten campsites?

Page 37. Public relations. What is the plan for improving public relations?

Page 37. Use trends. Is there anything we can do? Should we? Should we stop the brochures about Baxter? Stop helping people do stories about it? These alternatives at least merit discussion.

Page 38. Economics ¶ 2. I don't know what the point of this is. Is the Park Authority going to make its decisions on economic impact? What level priority is this?

Page 40. I am very concerned with the problems inherent in separate "unit management plans". They will be difficult to assess unless all can be viewed together. For example, "carrying capacity" of a trail in Zone III will influence parking in zone I and facilities in zone II,

SR:jg