

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)

THE 1996 SITE LAW REFORM

Presented to:

The Joint Standing Committee on Natural Resources

in accordance with 1995 Resolves c. 21

**by the
Land and Water Resources Council**

Chair:

Evan Richert, Director of State Planning Office

Members:

**Robin Alden, Commissioner of Marine Resources
Kevin Concannon, Commissioner of Human Services
Ronald Lovaglio, Commissioner of Conservation
Thomas McBrierty, Commissioner of Economic & Community Development
Ed McGlaughlin, Commissioner of Agriculture, Food & Rural Resources
John Melrose, Commissioner, Department of Transportation
Bucky Owen, Commissioner of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife
Edward O. Sullivan, Commissioner of Environmental Protection**

Staff for this report:

Martha Kirkpatrick, Department of Environmental Protection

Consultants:

Mark Eyerman and Frank O'Hara, Planning Decisions, Inc.

February 1, 1996

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
I. PROPOSAL SUMMARY	1
II. BACKGROUND	3
III. PROPOSAL DETAILS	9
1. RAISE THRESHOLDS IN THE SITE LAW	9
2. MOVE TRAFFIC REVIEWS TO MDOT	10
3. ADDRESS STORM WATER RUNOFF	11
4. BUILD MUNICIPAL CAPACITY	12
5. STANDARDIZE REQUIREMENTS FOR MINING	13
6. COORDINATE WITH OTHER LAWS	14
7. ADDRESS COSTS OF DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS	15
8. IMPROVE THE PERMIT PROCESS	16

APPENDIX A: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

APPENDIX B: LIST OF SENSITIVE WATERSHEDS

I. PROPOSAL SUMMARY

The problem with the Site Location of Development Act can be stated simply. Too much is expected of it.

The Site Law was originally passed to provide comprehensive environmental reviews of large projects on a case-by-case basis. It was a response to a proposal for an oil refinery in Washington County. In fact the Site Law does a very good job reviewing such large proposals today -- and most developers and environmentalists would agree.

Many of today's environmental problems are the result of the "cumulative impact" of many small individual actions. Traffic congestion, lake degradation, habitat disruption, high municipal property taxes to service scattered houses, are all examples of problems caused by the cumulative impact of many small developments.

Over the years the Legislature has expanded the Site Law's jurisdiction and its review criteria to try to address cumulative impact problems. But a law requiring comprehensive, project-by-project review is not the best tool to address such issues. It creates high expense for some, and no review for others.

The better tools for addressing cumulative impact questions are local community planning and permit-by-rule measures. Both are more predictable, less expensive to comply with, and cover more developments.

The reform presented below shifts the emphasis of state land use regulation from the comprehensive project-by-project review of the Site Law to alternative measures such as local planning and permit-by-rule ordinances. In a sense, it proposes to "unpack" the Site Law. It recommends the transfer of responsibility for traffic planning to the Maine Department of Transportation; for protecting lakes and sensitive watersheds to a new stormwater law; for reducing the property tax impacts of scattered development to the subdivision law; for regulating gravel pits to the Borrow Pit law.

In each of these cases, limited regulations which directly address the question at issue more effectively accomplish the public policy goal. The result is that more developers are affected, but they must do much less. No longer would there be a situation in which one developer must go to great expense to correct a traffic problem or buffer stormwater discharges into a lake, while nearby developments do nothing and make the problem worse.

The unpacking of the Site Law would allow the law to go back to its original purpose, which is to review projects only of true state or regional significance. For such projects, the developer would have the option of combining the regulatory reviews into one comprehensive review, just as is done at present.

Success in this effort depends upon one critical factor. Municipal governments in Maine must step up and enhance their capacity to conduct reviews of projects of purely local significance. The proposal would create a transition arrangement whereby those communities ready to assume this responsibility today are given the authority; while those who are not ready are provided technical assistance and a period of time in which to prepare. A capital improvements bond issue for local governments to direct growth is also included in the package.

Through these mechanisms the Site Law and the state Growth Management Law are brought together to function in mutual support -- a relationship which is lacking today.

The actual details of the law are quite complex, and are summarized in this report. There is room for improvement in the recommendations made below, and it is hoped that the dialogue and discussion which ensues will help improve and strengthen the package.

But while the details can be debated and modified, the principal pieces -- the higher thresholds for the Site Law, the new stormwater law, the changes to the subdivision law, the traffic requirements, the municipal technical assistance -- are interlocking and essential. To drop any major piece from the reform has an inevitable effect on all other major pieces. For this reason the reform package is presented as a "package" -- a series of simultaneous reforms which must take place together for the desired effect to be achieved.

The Site Law has been debated for a long time. With this proposal, 1996 can be the year the questions are finally answered and the State can move forward.

II. BACKGROUND

A. THE LEGISLATIVE DIRECTION

In 1995 the Legislature enacted 1995 Resolves c. 21, "*Resolve, to Direct the Land and Water Resources Council to Develop Alternatives to the Site Location of Development Laws That Protect the Environment and Improve the Effectiveness and Efficiency of the State's Land Use Laws.*" The Resolve directs the interagency Land and Water Resources Council to report back to the Legislature by February 1, 1996 with "one or more alternatives to the site location of development law."

The law set out three fundamental tests for the reform proposal:

- o First, that the new system *maintain existing environmental standards*;
- o Second, that it *improve the coordination* of state and local land use laws; and
- o Third, that it provide for the maintenance of *high quality natural resources data*.

The Resolve further encourages the Land and Water Resources Council to consider:

- 1) Having municipalities review projects of local significance, where capacity exists;
- 2) Having the state to review projects of local significance where capacity doesn't exist;
- 3) Keeping state review for projects of state or regional significance (which could be triggered either by state initiative or public petition); and
- 4) Relying on the Maine Department of Transportation (MDOT) for traffic reviews.

In accordance with the resolve, the Land and Water Resources Council set up five working groups in the summer of 1995. Membership included conservation and development interests, state agencies, consultants, and local government representatives. The working groups addressed five issues: surface water quality, traffic, habitat and historic areas, and mining (non-metallic). The working groups submitted reports and recommendations to a Steering Committee, consisting of selected members of each of the groups. The Steering Committee served as a sounding board for Martha Kirkpatrick of the Department of Environmental Protection, prepared the proposal with the assistance of consultants from Planning Decisions, Inc. That proposal was reviewed, refined, and approved by the Land and Water Resources Council.

Participants in the working groups and steering committee are listed in Appendix A.

B. ISSUES SURROUNDING THE SITE LAW

The Legislative Resolve was the outgrowth of years of struggling with Site Law changes by the Energy and Natural Resources Committee. A Legislative Study Committee found in 1994 that the state's land use laws were poorly coordinated, and that the state's growth management goals were not integrated into the regulatory system.

The problem with the Site Law, and the reason it is so resistant to reform, can be stated as a paradox.

The Site Law covers *too many* projects -- developers of small 10 lot residential subdivisions, which clearly are of no regional or state-wide interest, are now required to go through the considerable effort of complying with the Site Location of Development Law;

And at the same time, the Site Law covers *too few* projects -- developers of medium-sized commercial projects (such as fast food restaurants) contribute greatly to problems with traffic and water quality degradation (through stormwater runoff), but because they do not trip the Site Law thresholds, are not required to meet even modest state requirements.

The result is:

- Unfairness -- some developers must do a lot, while others are required to do nothing;
- Ineffectiveness -- traffic congestion and lake pollution are getting worse, for a system which requires some to do a lot and others to nothing ultimately is ineffective. It is far better to require all to meet more modest requirements.
- High property taxes -- Small, scattered developments may avoid Site Law review, but at the same time they contribute to a pattern of growth which increases costs for both local and state governments for roads, schools, and other public services.
- Confusion -- The state is reviewing projects of purely local significance, while at the same time projects of regional significance sometimes escape serious review at either the state or local level.

C. PRINCIPLES OF THE REFORM

The Land and Water Resources Council has followed the following principles in developing the reform package.

- 1) *The state should only review projects of regional or state significance.*
- 2) *The criteria used in state review should also be limited to matters of state significance.*
- 3) *Local governments should review projects of local significance.*
- 4) *The capacity of local governments to conduct reviews and encourage a sound and affordable pattern of development -- as called for in the Growth Management Act -- should be enhanced.*
- 5) *Transitional arrangements must be made for the interim period while local governments are still building up their capacity.*
- 6) *The system should, in the end, be less burdensome for developers than the present arrangement.*
- 7) *Means other than the Site Law should be found to address cumulative impact problems relating to traffic, stormwater runoff, habitat protection, and location of development.*

D. ELEMENTS OF THE PROPOSAL

The specific proposals, laid out in Part III of this report, can be summarized as follows:

- 1) *To focus state reviews on projects of state significance and to minimize duplication by raising Site Law thresholds in municipalities with capacity.*
- 2) *To give the responsibility for traffic reviews to the Maine Department of Transportation, and to trigger the reviews by traffic rather than acreage thresholds. In other words, the amount of traffic a project generates will determine its review rather than whether the project is 2 or 3 acres in size.*
- 3) *To protect surface water quality by requiring:*
 - *that all developers use best practices for erosion and sedimentation control during construction. There is no permit attached to this law; its primary implementation will be through education and technical assistance; and*
 - *that developers of projects of more than 1 acre of paved surface (or one-half acre in a sensitive lake watershed) obtain a stormwater permit from the Department of Environmental Protection. This requirement will be waived in communities with comparable local stormwater laws, or which participates in an area stormwater management plan. Also, it does not apply to agricultural or forest activities.*
- 4) *To build the capacity for municipalities to plan for and regulate development through the provision of technical assistance and capital improvement grants.*
- 5) *To expand the existing program for medium-sized gravel pits to cover all gravel pits, and create a parallel, standards-based program for quarries.*
- 6) *To coordinate with other existing laws and programs, for example:*
 - *to improve controls for nitrate pollution in the Plumbing Code; and*
 - *to develop a mapping system to flag wildlife habitats.*
- 7) *To begin to address the property tax problem created by a scattered pattern of development. Developers of residential subdivisions outside of growth areas will have to identify the municipal property tax impacts of the development. In addition the Land and Water Resources Council will conduct a state-wide study of the costs of scattered development both to state and local taxpayers.*
- 8) *To achieve administrative efficiencies in the permit process. This includes simplified procedures for reviewing project modifications and amendments, procedures for combining multiple permit requirements into one omnibus permit, and the monitoring of progress over time.*

E. INTERDEPENDENCE OF THE ELEMENTS

Each of the above proposals is spelled out individually in the next section. Yet while each can be considered as an independent unit, they are interdependent in the way in which they mesh to achieve the reform goals.

For example:

- The proposed higher Site Law thresholds only apply to municipalities with local capacity. Unless the proposed actions are taken to increase local land use capacity, these higher thresholds will only have limited applicability.
- Likewise, the higher thresholds mean that fewer projects will receive stormwater pollution review under the Site Law. In order to accomplish the goal to "maintain environmental quality," a stormwater law must also be implemented.
- The proposed Site Law eliminates most residential subdivisions from state review. To ensure that this does not harm the environment, the proposed changes to the plumbing code and the subdivision law also need to be put in place.

This package is a product of an extensive dialogue among the development community, conservation groups, municipal officials, and consultants, businesses, and concerned individuals. Support from each is essential to the reform's success. If major sections of the proposed law are removed, the support of some of these constituencies will be endangered.

F. MEETING THE LEGISLATIVE MANDATE

This proposal succeeds in addressing the Legislature's mandate.

1. It maintains environmental standards. The new law addresses traffic concerns more fairly and increases the compliance with best practice stormwater practices. At the same time it reduces requirements for many developers because they address specific issues rather than the comprehensive standards of the Site Law.
2. It coordinates state and local land use regulation. The proposal is designed to increase the land use planning capacity of local governments, and to get the state out of the business of reviewing projects of local significance.
3. It ensures the collection of high-quality data. The State will develop and maintain high-quality, computerized GIS maps which show the location of growth areas, sensitive lake watersheds, and wildlife habitat, and will make this information available to developers so that they can make informed choices about project location and design.

Further, it follows the general institutional approaches recommended by the Legislature:

1. It moves jurisdiction of smaller projects to municipalities that are capable of reviewing them.
2. It retains state review in those cases where municipalities are not yet ready.
3. It retains state review for projects of state or regional significance.
4. It moves traffic impact analysis to the Maine Department of Transportation.

This will set the Site Law on a steady course for the future.

PART III. PROPOSAL DETAILS

1. RAISE THE THRESHOLD OF THE SITE LAW FOR MUNICIPALITIES WITH CAPACITY.

Proposed Thresholds	Existing Law	Where local capacity exists	Where no local capacity
Subdivision - Residential	5 lots and 20 acres	25 lots and 100 acres	25 lots and 100 acres
Subdivision - Industrial/-commercial	5 lots and 20 acres	5 lots and 20 acres	5 lots and 20 acres
Project - Industrial/-commercial	3 acres, impervious; or 20+ acres	7 acres, impervious; or 20+ acres	same as existing law
Metallic mining	covered	same as existing	same as existing

[threshold revisions contained in the Site Law section #482]

Local capacity is defined [Site Law #489-D] as a community which has:

a local planning board or review authority; and

site plan review, zoning and/or land use regulations which provide for project-specific reviews; and

adequate resources to administer project-specific reviews.

Regional coordination: The planning board of a neighboring municipality may petition the DEP Commissioner to review commercial/industrial projects of 3-7 acres when there are regional impacts [Site Law #489-D].

After the year 2003 (which ties to the Growth Management Act) local capacity will be presumed to exist for any community with more than 2,500 people, and the higher thresholds will apply in such communities whether or not they have all the tools listed above [Site Law #489-D].

Impact: *This will immediately reduce dramatically the number of small residential subdivisions which have to come in for Site Review, and which are of purely local concern. Over time, as more communities meet the capacity tests, fewer medium-sized (3-7 acre) commercial and industrial projects will have to come in for state review.*

2. MOVE TRAFFIC REVIEWS TO MDOT WITH PERFORMANCE THRESHOLDS.

Currently a small residential subdivision has to submit a traffic study because its acreage qualifies it for Site Law review, while a fast-food restaurant does not have to because its acreage does not qualify it for Site Review. Under the new proposal:

- o Any project which generates more than 200 "passenger-car-equivalents" per peak hour -- no matter what its acreage -- will have to do a traffic study and mitigate impacts.
- o Any project which generates 100 to 200 pce's -- again, no matter what its acreage size -- will trigger a "scoping meeting" involving the developer, the municipality, and MDOT. At this meeting, MDOT will consider the capacity of the municipality, and site-specific conditions to determine whether a traffic study and mitigation will be required.
- o Mitigation efforts may include multimodal measures.
- o DEP and DOT will coordinate permit issuance where a project needs both a Site Location Permit and a Site Location permit.

Therefore, a *transition* arrangement will involve:

- o A new threshold criterion requiring that projects of 100 or more pce's, regardless of size, come under the jurisdiction of the Site Law [Site Law #482].
- o The procedures for review will be the same as those described above -- 200+ requires a study and mitigation, 100-200 requires a scoping meeting [Site Law #484].
- o If the only reason a project falls under the Site Law is the traffic generation threshold, then the review is limited to traffic. If a project qualifies for Site Law review for other reasons, but does not generate 100 pce's, there is no traffic review [Site Law #484].
- o Projects in urban compacts and growth areas will only be required to mitigate for the effects of their own projects, and not neighboring developments [Site Law #482].

This transition arrangement will be sunsetted in 1999, at which time MDOT will conduct all traffic reviews [Site Law #481].

IMPACT: *This will make the system fairer; projects of equal traffic impact will be treated the same. As municipalities build capacity, fewer projects will be subject to state review.*

3. REDUCE WATER POLLUTION FROM RUNOFF

The Maine Environmental Priorities Project listed dangers to surface water quality as among the most serious facing the state. The principal cause of lake degradation is runoff from many small developments. In addition improper stormwater planning leads to greater damage from floods. As with traffic, the Site Law does not cover many of the projects causing the problem.

The law will have two parts. An **erosion and sedimentation** provision will require that all developers follow "best management practices" in construction [Stormwater Law #420-C]. No permit will be required. The implementation strategy will involve outreach and education, voluntary contractor certification, municipal technical assistance, and model local ordinances.

A separate **storm water law** would require approval of runoff control measures, as described below [Stormwater Law #420-D and 06-096CMR].

PERMIT THRESHOLD	1 acre <u>or</u> 20,000 square feet impervious in a sensitive watershed
EXEMPTIONS	Towns with capacity to review stormwater
	Agriculture and forest activities
REVIEW TIME	Buffers -- 15 days (permit-by-rule) Vegetative controls -- 30 days Structural controls -- 60 days
SUBMISSION	Site Plan
STANDARDS	For quantity and quality would be set forth in rules ¹

Sensitive watersheds have either public water supplies or documented pollution problems. A list is contained in Appendix B, totaling 260 lakes, or 8% of the land area of Maine.

NPDES coordination: In cases where an applicant also has to get a storm water permit from the EPA, DEP will coordinate to eliminate duplicative requirements and submittals.

IMPACT: *More developments would be covered by this law, but the procedure will be kept simple for small developments. As most large developers already follow best practices, the requirements of the law is not expected to pose a new burden to them.*

¹ The Department will establish a work group to assist it in developing regulations. As substantive rules pursuant to new law, these rules would be submitted to the Legislature pursuant to 5 MRSA Section 8071 *et seq.*

4. HELP MUNICIPALITIES TO BUILD CAPACITY.

The success of this proposal is dependent upon the ability of Maine municipalities to build capacity to review projects. To assist in this, we propose:

- o The development of a system of state **technical assistance** to local governments, in particular for the purpose of assisting with reviews of projects which once, but no longer, would be subject to Site Law review (i.e., commercial projects of 3-7 acres, residential subdivisions of 5-25 units).
- o To help provide "peer reviews" of the plans submitted by developers. For extensive assistance fees would be charged by the state, which the local governments could pay for by developer assessments. Municipalities could also use the same mechanism to hire regional councils or private consultants for peer review. The State Planning Office will be responsible for setting up the state response system and payment policy. The process will be designed to work closely with the Maine Municipal Association, where many local government officials turn already for technical help. [Site Law #489-E].
- o a **\$10 million state bond issue** to help local governments fund infrastructure improvements which would enhance the developability of designated growth areas; these funds would also leverage other state and federal sources;
- o the State Planning Office will work with state agencies to **coordinate existing infrastructure assistance programs** -- school construction, roads, CDBG, sewers -- with local plans to guide growth and economic development; and
- o exemptions to state regulatory reviews as described above, which would create incentives for communities which wish to attract development to develop their own regulatory capacity.

IMPACT: *The combination of regulatory exemptions, infrastructure funds, technical assistance, and the continued work of the Growth Management Program should help more municipalities achieve the capacity desired under the reform. The more communities achieve this capacity, the fewer the number of state environmental reviews which will be required, and the more efficient the overall system will be.*

5. MINING

In 1993 the Legislature created a new program for medium-sized gravel pits and removed them from the Site Law. This program requires that the owner/operator provide notice to the DEP, agree to follow standards set forth in the law (unless they request and receive a variance), and pay an annual fee which goes toward inspections. This law has been highly successful. Larger gravel pits (over 30 acres) still must meet the requirements of the Site Law. We propose to extend the approach of the medium-sized gravel pit law to address all mining except metallic mineral mining (which continues to be covered by the provisions of the Site Law).

Specifically, we propose to:

- o amend the medium-sized gravel pit law to cover all pits 5 acres or more;
- o create a parallel, standards-based program for quarries;
- o expand public participation in variance procedures; and
- o update and revise the standards in accordance with a Report submitted by the DEP to the Legislature earlier this session.

6. COORDINATE WITH OTHER EXISTING LAWS AND PROGRAMS

One of the principal goals of the Site Resolve was to have the state's land use laws operate more efficiently as parts of a system. Over time, the Site Law has become the repository for many concerns, not all of which are best handled in the context of one large-scale, comprehensive review. As part of the reform, we propose to address the following issues with laws and approaches better suited to their goals.

The changes involve:

- o **Coordination with the Plumbing Code.** The standards in the Plumbing Code for **the effects of nitrate from sewage systems on ground water** would be improved. The reform removes most residential subdivisions from Site Law review. This ensures that ground water will be adequately protected by other laws.
- o **Coordination with Natural Resource Protection Act.** **Peat mining** would be dealt with only in the Natural Resources Protection Act.
- o creating a **GIS state-wide map** which identifies general locations of **sensitive habitats**. This will be posted in town halls so that developers will know whether their site *may* have habitat issues to address through NRPA or other state laws. This approach can be expanded in the future to include **historic/archeological sites**. Both habitat and historic protection have relied in the past on the Site Law catching small residential subdivisions in sensitive areas. Since those subdivisions will no longer be subject to state review, this is an alternative method of helping identify potentially sensitive developments.

In addition there are two other areas which require further study:

- o the regulation of **ground water withdrawal** in smaller projects which will no longer be subject to Site Law review can be done in several ways. DEP will study the alternatives and report back with recommendations.
- o the regulation of **hazardous materials** is a consideration for ground water protection in the Site Law, and is also regulated for other purposes by several other state and federal agencies. DEP will convene a group to see whether these multiple approaches can be combined into one regulatory structure.

7. BEGIN TO ADDRESS THE COSTS OF SCATTERED DEVELOPMENT PATTERNS.

The spreading out of homes is costing the taxpayers of Maine millions of dollars in both local and state taxes for new roads, new schools, and increased maintenance. The Legislature made it a state goal through the Growth Management Act to reduce the incidence of scattered, unplanned development. But as of yet there is little public awareness of the economic consequences of this kind of development.

We propose to raise the public consciousness and awareness through a simple requirement in the Municipal Subdivision Law. **In order for a municipal reviewing board to approve any residential subdivision of more than 5 lots² which is located outside of a growth area identified in the local comprehensive plan and found consistent with state laws by the State Planning Office, the municipality must identify the additional costs which the development will create.**

If a study is required, the municipality may either require the developer to do it, or require the developer to pay the municipality to hire someone to conduct the study. One copy of the study must be sent to the State Planning Office.

This is an informational rather than regulatory requirement. Its purpose is to both raise local awareness of the issue and to provide a data base to the State Planning Office for conducting a state-wide analysis.

In addition the **Land and Water Resources Council** will conduct a comprehensive review of the costs to the state in terms of school construction subsidies, road-building, and other relevant programs, which result from the scattered pattern of development. The report will be provided to the Legislature on January 1, 1997.

***IMPACT:** This is an educational and informational approach to an issue of great importance in Maine. National statistics indicate Maine's property tax burden is high; a referendum may be on the ballot this fall to roll property taxes back significantly. As Maine is a large state with few people, the per capita cost of services will inevitably tend to be high. But national studies would indicate that some of Maine's high property tax and service costs are avoidable; in other words, some result from a pattern of development which could be guided differently. It is important that this issue receive more public attention, and that better data and research be gathered. That is what this provision will cause to happen.*

² The cutoff of five lots was selected because research by Holly Dominie indicates that between one-fifth and one-quarter of residential projects developed in Maine are as small as 5 to 9 lots.

8. TO IMPROVE EFFICIENCIES IN THE PERMIT PROCESS

Omnibus permits. One potential problem with the Site Law reform is that it creates multiple permits for major projects where before there was one. For example, there is now a stormwater law in addition to stormwater requirements in the Site Law.

DEP has traditionally coordinated all permit requirements into one process for developers. The new Stormwater law explicitly exempts any project from that law which will be meeting the requirements of the Site Law [Stormwater Law 420-D]. When the traffic law is eventually transferred to MDOT, a similar approach will be taken.

Simplifying modifications and amendments. The Site Law reforms create the anomaly whereby a new proposed development of 6 acres may not have to come in for a Site Permit, while an existing development next door may have to come in for a permit modification in order to expand from 3 to 4 acres. The proposed transition provisions would eliminate review of changes to licensed projects that no longer meet the threshold for site review, so long as the changes would not themselves trigger site review.

Monitoring progress. The existing state Growth Management Act requires the State Planning Office to report to the Legislature every four years on progress in meeting the Act's goals. As part of that report, the State Planning Office will report upon:

- o The increase in the number of Maine municipalities with capacity to undertake land use reviews
- o The average time of review for projects under different laws
- o Recommendations for further improvements to Maine's land use regulatory system.

Effective Date of Law: January 1, 1997. This will ensure that all of the parts are ready to go at once. The one exception to this would be the borrow mining changes, which are ready to be implemented upon enactment.

**APPENDIX A: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS IN SITE LAW REFORM
PLANNING PROCESS**

LAND AND WATER RESOURCES COUNCIL

Ned Sullivan, Department of Environmental Protection
Ron Lovaglio, Department of Conservation
Bucky Owens, Department of Inland Fisheries & Wildlife
Robin Alden, Department of Marine Resources
Kevin Concannon, Department of Human Services
John Melrose, Department of Transportation
Evan Richert, State Planning Office
Ed McGlaughlin, Department of Agriculture

SITE RESOLVE STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Beth Ahearn, Maine Audubon
John DelVecchio, State Planning Office
Tom Doyle, Pierce, Atwood, et al.
Ken Elowe, Dept. Inland Fisheries & Wildlife
Tom Gorrill, DeLuca Hoffinan
Tom Greer, Pinkham and Greer
Kristen Gregory, Poland Spring Bottling
Andy Hamilton, Eaton, Peabody, et al.
Martha Kirkpatrick, Dept. of Environmental Protection
Esther Lacognata,
Jeff Madore, Dept. of Environmental Protection
Beth Nagusky, Natural Resources Council
Alan Stearns, The Maine Alliance
John Williams, Land Use Regulation Commission
Paul Minor, Dept. of Transportation
Clough Toppan, Dept. of Human Services
Kenneth C. Young, Jr., Maine Municipal Association
Evan Richert, State Planning Office
Mark Eyerman/Frank O'Hara, Planning Decisions

GROUNDWATER WORK GROUP

Facilitator: Mary James/Glenn Angell

John Hopeck, Dept. of Environmental Protection
Paul Dutram, Dept. of Environmental Protection
Dennis Merrill, Dept. of Environmental Protection
David Braley, Dept. of Human Services
Wallace Hinckley, Dept. of Human Services
Paul Hunt, Dept. of Human Services
Erik Carson, State Planning Office
Marc Loiselle, Maine Geological Survey
Tom Weddle, Maine Geological Survey
Paula Thompson, Maine Rural Water Association
David Sweet, Kennebunk, Kennebunkport & Wells Water Dist.
Kristen Gregory, Poland Spring Corporation
John Tewhey, John D. Tewey Associates
Matt Reynolds, John D. Tewey Associates
Tammy Gould, Board of Pesticides Control
Alan Stearns, The Maine Alliance
Barry Timson, Timson & Peters
Patty Aho, Maine Petroleum Institute
Esther Lacognata, Topsham
Bob Hamblen, Town of Windham
Peter Mosher, Dept. of Agriculture
Florence Grosvenor, DEP

SIGNIFICANT WILDLIFE HABITAT WORK GROUP

Facilitator: Ann Gosline

Mark Margerum, Dept. of Environmental Protection

Marybeth Richardson, Dept. of Environmental Protection

Ken Elowe, Dept. of Inland Fisheries & Wildlife

Art Speiss, Maine Historic Preservation Commission

Molly Docherty, Maine Natural Areas Program

Fran Rudoff, State Planning Office

Dr. Arnold Banner, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service

Brad Smith, Sportsmans Alliance of Maine

Jody Jones, Maine Audubon Society

Beth Ahearn, Maine Audubon Society

Barbara Vickery, Nature Conservancy

Deirdre O'Callahan, Preti, Flaherty & Beliveau

Michael Coffman, Environmental Perspectives, Inc.

Ted Johnston, Resource Policy Group

Mike Thompson, Woodlot Alternatives

Dan Fleishman, Southern Maine Regional Planning Commission

Kenneth C. Young, Jr., Maine Municipal Association

Deb Andrews, City of Portland Planning Dept.

Alan Stearns, The Maine Alliance

Tom Doyle, Pierce, Atwood, et al.

Mark Stadler, MDIF&W

Irene Belanger, Me Assoc. of Realtors

Will Johnston, LURC

SURFACE WATER QUALITY WORK GROUP

Facilitator: Marilyn Hotch

Jeff Madore, Dept. of Environmental Protection
Jeff Dennis, Dept. of Environmental Protection
Ken Libbey, Dept. of Environmental Protection
John Hopeck, Dept. of Environmental Protection
Linda Kokemuller, Dept. of Environmental Protection
Dennis Merrill, Dept. of Environmental Protection
Jeff Clements, State Planning Office
John Simon, Lewiston
Reneé Carter, CEO, Gray
Kathy Fuller, City Planner, Augusta
Fergus Lea, Androscoggin Valley Council of Governments
Betsy Bass, Congress of Lakes Association
Ron Faucher, Portland Water District
Sherry Hanson, Casco Bay Estuary Project
Beth Nagusky, Natural Resources Council of Maine
Bill Hoffman, DeLucca Hoffman Associates
Tom Greer, Pinkham & Greer
Mike Crawford, Environmental Engineering and Remediation
George Lord, Belgrade
Kenneth C. Young, Jr., Maine Municipal Association
Tamara Risser, Dept. of Human Services
Alan Stearns, The Maine Alliance
Scott Braley, Sebago Technics
John DelVecchio, State Planning Office
John Harker, Dept. of Agriculture

TRAFFIC WORK GROUP

Facilitator: John Reitman

Mark Margerum, Dept. of Environmental Protection
Paul Minor, Dept. of Transportation
Janet Myers, Dept. of Transportation
John DelVecchio, State Planning Office
Elery Keane, Kennebec Valley Council of Governments
Ken Gibb, City of Bangor
Joe Kott, Greater Portland Council of Governments
Madeleine Henley, Town of Bethel
Tom Gorrill, DeLuca Hoffman
Tex Haueser, City of South Portland
Kenneth C. Young, Jr., Maine Municipal Association
Alan Stearns, The Maine Alliance
Shawn Small, Civil Engineering Services
Andy Hamilton, Eaton, Peabody, et al.
Sara Hopkins, City of Portland

MINING WORK GROUP

Facilitator: Kathryn Monahan Ainsworth

Mark Stebbins, Dept. of Environmental Protection

Jeff Madore, Dept. of Environmental Protection

Frank Carroll, Limerick

John Butts, Associated General Contractors

Nigel Calder, Sheepscot Valley Conservation Association

Ted Johnston, Resource Policy Group

Dan Shaw, Shaw Bros. Construction, Inc.

Phil Grondin, R.J. Grondin, Inc. & Sons

Richard Johnson, Tilcon Maine, Inc.

Scott Leach, Lane Construction Corp.

John McGrath, Blue Rock Industries

Austin Jones, Union

John Willey, Great Bog Association

Patricia Jennings, Whitefield

Doug Foglio, Foglio, Inc.

Glen Chesley, Dept. of Transportation

David Michniewicz, Maine Water Utilities Association

Clifford Buck, Town of Readfield

Caroline Eliot, LURC

Michael Herz, Sheepscot Valley Assoc.

GENERAL MAILING LIST

Rep. David Etnier, So. Harpswell
Margaret & Ken Willie, Brunswick
Steve Westra, Town of Yarmouth
Jackie Cohen, Freeport
Alex Jaegerman, Portland
Richard Cahill, Gray
Donna Larson, Cumberland
Joe Ziepniewski, Scarborough
David Asherman, ABB Environmental Services, Inc.
David K. Bell, Maine Blueberry Commission
Stephen W. Cole, P.E., S.W. Cole Engineering, Inc.
Shane Flynn, MBNA New England
Robert B. Metcalf, Mitchell & Associates
Tim Glidden, Natural Resources Council of Maine
Ruth McNiff, Liberty
Tom Doyle, Pierce Atwood et al.
George Hunt, Hallowell

GROUNDWATER INFORMATION ONLY

Liz Champion, S.W. Cole, Inc.
Anne Hagstrom, Natural Resources Council of Maine
John Jemison, Univ. of Maine Cooperative Extension
Steven J. Miller, Islesboro Islands Land Trust
Annette Naegel, Island Institute

MINING INFORMATION ONLY

Liz Champeon, S.W. Cole, Inc.
Steven J. Wallace, Earth Tech

TRAFFIC INFORMATION ONLY

Don Cooper, Hancock County Regional Planning Commission

SIGNIFICANT WILDLIFE HABITAT INFORMATION ONLY

Martha Deprez, Greater Portland Landmarks
Liz Champeon, S.W. Cole, Inc.
Irene Belanger, Giroux & Perry

APPENDIX B: LIST OF SENSITIVE LAKE WATERSHEDS

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

MIDAS	BASIN	LAKE	TOWN	HR	BL	IT	WS
3890	1	ADAMS POND	NEWFIELD	HR			
5366	1	ADAMS POND	BOOTHBAY	HR	BL		WS
4336	1	ALAMOOSOOK LAKE	ORLAND	HR			
3788	1	ALLEN POND	GREENE	HR			
3604	1	ANASAGUNTICOOK LAKE	CANTON	HR			WS
9961	1	ANNABESSACOOK LAKE	WINTHROP	HR	BL		
3898	1	BALCH POND	NEWFIELD	HR			
5654	1	BASIN POND	FAYETTE	HR			
3992	1	BAUNEG BEG POND	SANFORD	HR			
9685	1	BAY OF NAPLES	NAPLES	HR			
3828	1	BERRY POND	WINTHROP	HR			
5464	1	BIG INDIAN POND	ST ALBANS	HR			
4468	1	BIRCH HARBOR POND	WINTER HARBOR				WS
1666	1	BLACK L	FORT KENT		BL		
5042	1	BONNY EAGLE LAKE	BUXTON	HR			
5594	1	BOULTER POND	YORK				WS
5008	1	BOYD POND	LIMINGTON	HR			
4328	1	BRANCH LAKE	ELLSWORTH				WS
5754	1	BRANCH POND	CHINA	HR			
3608	1	BRETTUNS POND	LIVERMORE	HR			
4452	1	BUBBLE POND	BAR HARBOR	HR			
5242	1	BUKER POND	LITCHFIELD	HR			
3980	1	BUNGANUT POND	LYMAN	HR			
5572	1	BURNT MEADOW POND	BROWNFIELD	HR			
5556	1	BURNTLAND POND	STONINGTON				WS
2216	2	CARIBOU,EGG,LONG PND	LINCOLN	HR			
5310	1	CARLTON POND	WINTHROP				WS
2218	1	CENTER POND	LINCOLN	HR			
3718	1	CHAFFIN POND	WINDHAM	HR			
465	1	CHAMBERLAIN POND	BELGRADE	HR			
5598	1	CHASES POND	YORK				WS
4822	1	CHICKAWAUKIE POND	ROCKPORT	HR	BL		WS
5448	2	CHINA LAKE	VASSALBORO	HR	BL		WS
5448	1	CHINA LAKE	CHINA	HR	BL		WS
4910	1	CHISOLM POND	PALERMO	HR			
5382	1	CLARY LAKE	WHITEFIELD	HR			
5190	1	CLEARWATER POND	FARMINGTON	HR			
3174	1	CLEMONS POND	HIRAM	HR			
5236	1	COBBOSSECONTEE LAKE	WINTHROP	HR	BL		WS
3814	1	COCHNEWAGON LAKE	MONMOUTH	HR			
3390	1	COFFEE POND	CASCO	HR			
3376	1	COLD RAIN POND	NAPLES	HR			
2146	2	COLD STREAM POND	ENFIELD	HR			
4846	1	COLEMAN POND	LINCOLNVILLE	HR			
4810	1	CRAWFORD POND	WARREN	HR			
3696	1	CRESCENT POND	RAYMOND	HR			
2220	1	CROOKED POND	LINCOLN	HR			
1674	1	CROSS L	T17 R05 WELS		BL		

MIDAS	BASIN	LAKE	TOWN	HR	BL	IT	WS
3708	1	CRYSTAL LAKE	GRAY	HR			
3626	1	CRYSTAL POND	TURNER	HR			
1665	1	DAIGLE P	NEW CANADA		BL		
5400	2	DAMARISCOTTA LAKE	NOBLEBORO	HR			
5400	1	DAMARISCOTTA LAKE	JEFFERSON	HR			
5400	3	DAMARISCOTTA LAKE	NOBLEBORO	HR			
4276	1	DAVIS POND	HOLDEN	HR			
5016	1	DEER POND	HOLLIS	HR			
3830	1	DEXTER POND	WINTHROP	HR			
5702	1	DUCKPUDDLE POND	WALDOBORO	HR	BL		
5724	1	DUTTON POND	CHINA ALBION	HR			
5386	1	DYER LONG POND	JEFFERSON	HR			
4606	1	EAGLE LAKE	BAR HARBOR				WS
5349	1	EAST POND	SMITHFIELD	HR	BL		
1776	1	ECHO L	PRESQUE ISLE		BL		
2216	3	EGG, LONG, CARIBOU PND	LINCOLN	HR			
5218	1	EGYPT POND	VIENNA	HR			
119	1	ELL POND	SANFORD	HR	BL		
7	2	ESTES LAKE	SANFORD	HR	BL		
7	1	ESTES LAKE	SANFORD	HR	BL		
2274	1	ETNA POND	STETSON	HR	BL		
5296	1	FAIRBANKS P	MANCHESTER		BL		
2118	1	FERGUSON LAKE	MILLINOCKET				WS
4268	1	FITTS POND	CLIFTON	HR			
269	1	FITZGERALD P	BIG SQUAW TWP		BL		
4370	1	FLOODS POND	OTIS				WS
5512	1	FOLLY POND	VINALHAVEN				WS
3712	1	FOREST LAKE	WINDHAM	HR			
5504	1	FRESH POND	NORTH HAVEN				WS
4128	1	GARLAND POND	GARLAND	HR	BL		
4132	1	GARLAND POND	SEBEC	HR			
5474	1	GOULD POND	DEXTER	HR	BL		
3908	1	GRANNY KENT POND	SHAPLEIGH	HR			
4812	1	GRASSY POND	ROCKPORT	HR			WS
2590	1	GREAT MOOSE LAKE	HARTLAND	HR			
5274	1	GREAT POND	BELGRADE			IT	
5648	1	GREAT POND	CAPE ELIZABETH	HR			
3534	1	HALEY P	DALLAS PLT		BL		
5460	1	HALF MOON POND	ST ALBANS	HR	BL		
3780	1	HALL POND	PARIS	HR	BL		WS
5276	1	HAMILTON POND	BELGRADE	HR			
82	1	HANCOCK POND	EMBDEN				WS
4318	1	HANCOCK POND	BUCKSPORT	HR			
4306	1	HARRIMAN POND	DEDHAM	HR			
4290	1	HATCASE POND	EDDINGTON				WS
2286	1	HERMON POND	HERMON	HR	BL		
3454	1	HIGHLAND LAKE	BRIDGTON	HR			
3734	1	HIGHLAND LAKE	WINDHAM	HR			

HR - high risk, low allocation
 BL - bluegreen algal blooms

Lakes Most at Risk from Development
 PRELIMINARY DRAFT

IT - increasing trophic state
 WS - municipal water supply

MIDAS	BASIN	LAKE	TOWN	HR	BL	IT	WS
367	1	HOBBS (LT PENNESSE.)	NORWAY	HR			
4806	1	HOBBS POND	HOPE	HR			
4628	1	HODGDON POND	TREMONT	HR			
3770	1	HOGAN POND	OXFORD	HR			
4274	1	HOLBROOK POND	HOLDEN	HR			
3942	1	HOLLAND POND	LIMERICK	HR			
3408	1	HORNE POND	LIMINGTON	HR			
4808	1	HOSMER POND	CAMDEN	HR			
4302	1	HURD POND	DEDHAM	HR			
5304	1	HUTCHINSON POND	MANCHESTER	HR			
3188	1	INGALLS POND	BRIDGTON	HR			
3448	1	ISLAND POND	WATERFORD	HR			
4322	1	JACOB BUCK POND	BUCKSPORT	HR			
5302	1	JIMMIE (JAMIES) P	MANCHESTER	HR			
5244	1	JIMMY POND	LITCHFIELD	HR			
4608	1	JORDAN POND	MOUNT DESERT	HR			WS
3998	1	KENNEBUNK POND	LYMAN	HR			
3416	1	KEOKA LAKE	WATERFORD	HR			
5014	1	KILLICK POND	HOLLIS	HR			
3884	1	KNIGHT POND	SOUTH BERWICK	HR			
3748	1	LAKE AUBURN	AUBURN				WS
2608	1	LAKE GEORGE	SKOWHEGAN	HR			
83	1	LILLY POND	ROCKPORT	HR	BL		
5550	1	LILY POND	DEER ISLE	HR			
8065	1	LITTLE COBBOSSEE	WINTHROP	HR			
3730	1	LITTLE DUCK POND	WINDHAM	HR			
5024	1	LITTLE OSSIPEE	WATERBORO	HR			
5706	1	LITTLE POND	DAMARISCOTTA	HR			WS
5250	1	LITTLE PURGATORY PON	MONMOUTH	HR			
3714	1	LITTLE SEBAGO LAKE	WINDHAM	HR			
3714	4	LITTLE SEBAGO LAKE	WINDHAM	HR			
3714	2	LITTLE SEBAGO LAKE	WINDHAM	HR			
3784	1	LITTLE WILSON POND	TURNER	HR			
1682	1	LONG L	T17 R04 WELS		BL		
5780	1	LONG LAKE	BRIDGTON	HR			
447	1	LONG POND	MOUNT DESERT	HR			
3084	1	LONG POND	DENMARK	HR			
3418	1	LONG POND	WATERFORD	HR			
4316	1	LONG POND	BUCKSPORT	HR			
4390	1	LONG POND	SULLIVAN				WS
4622	1	LONG POND	MOUNT DESERT	HR			WS
2216	1	LONG,CARIBOU,EGG PND	LINCOLN	HR			
3806	1	LOON POND	SABATTUS	HR			
5176	1	LOVEJOY POND	ALBION	HR	BL		
4610	1	LOWER HADLOCK POND	MOUNT DESERT				WS
103	1	LOWER NARROWS POND	WINTHROP	HR			
3760	1	LOWER RANGE POND	POLAND	HR			
4820	1	MACES POND	ROCKPORT	HR			

MIDAS	BASIN	LAKE	TOWN	HR	BL	IT	WS
1802	1	MADAWASKA LAKE	WESTMANLAND	HR	BL		
1802	2	MADAWASKA LAKE	WESTMANLAND	HR	BL		
758	1	MANHANOCK POND	SANGERVILLE	HR			
5312	2	MARANACOOK LAKE	WINTHROP	HR			
5312	1	MARANACOOK LAKE	WINTHROP	HR			
3776	1	MARSHALL POND	OXFORD	HR			
2226	1	MATTANAWCOOK POND	LINCOLN	HR			
1686	2	MATTAWAUMKEAG LAKE	ISLAND FALLS	HR			
4852	1	MEGUNTICOOK LAKE	LINCOLNVILLE	HR			
4852	2	MEGUNTICOOK LAKE	LINCOLNVILLE	HR			
5280	1	MESSALONSKEE LAKE	SIDNEY & BELGRADE	HR			
3762	1	MIDDLE RANGE POND	POLAND	HR			
155	1	MILTON POND	LEBANON	HR			
4814	1	MIRROR LAKE	ROCKPORT				WS
1820	1	MONSON P	FORT FAIRFIELD		BL		
4838	1	MOODY POND	LINCOLNVILLE	HR			
5790	1	MOOSE HILL POND	LIVERMORE FALLS				WS
3134	1	MOOSE POND	SWEDEN	HR			
3838	1	MOUSAM LAKE	SHAPLEIGH	HR		IT	
5476	1	MOWER POND	CORINNA	HR			
2344	1	MT BLUE POND	AVON				WS
3422	1	MUD POND	WATERFORD	HR			
3931	1	MURDOCK POND	BERWICK	HR			
5222	1	NEQUASSET POND	WOOLWICH	HR			WS
3802	1	NO NAME POND	LEWISTON	HR			
5480	1	NOKOMIS POND	PALMYRA				WS
5214	1	NORCROSS POND	CHESTERVILLE	HR			
3500	1	NORTH POND	NORWAY	HR			
3616	1	NORTH POND	SUMNER				WS
5344	2	NORTH POND-AKA LITTL	SMITHFIELD	HR			
4850	1	NORTON POND	LINCOLNVILLE	HR			
3706	1	NOTCHED POND	RAYMOND	HR			
3692	1	NUBBLE POND	RAYMOND	HR	BL		
2614	1	OAKS POND	SKOWHEGAN	HR			
894	1	ONAWA L	ELLIOTTSVILLE		BL		
3458	1	OTTER POND	BRIDGTON	HR			
3694	1	PANTHER POND	RAYMOND	HR			
5708	1	PARADISE POND	DAMARISCOTTA	HR			
3388	1	PARKER POND	CASCO	HR			
5458	1	PATTEE POND	WINSLOW	HR	BL		
5704	1	PEMAQUID POND	WALDOBORO	HR			
3434	1	PENNESSEEWASSEE	NORWAY	HR			
401	1	PEQUAWKET LAKE	BROWNFIELD	HR			
3716	1	PETINGILL POND	WINDHAM	HR			
3940	1	PICKEREL POND	LIMERICK	HR			
5254	1	PLEASANT (MUD) P	GARDINER		BL		
3822	1	PLEASANT POND	TURNER	HR			
5254	2	PLEASANT POND	RICHMOND	HR			

PRELIMINARY DRAFT

MIDAS	BASIN	LAKE	TOWN	HR	BL	IT	WS
5254	1	PLEASANT POND	RICHMOND	HR			
157	1	POVERTY POND	NEWFIELD	HR			
744	1	PUFFERS POND	DEXTER	HR			
80	1	PUSHAW LAKE	ORONO	HR			
4832	1	QUANTABACOOK POND	SEARSMONT	HR			
3526	1	QUIMBY POND	RANGELEY	HR	BL		
3300	1	RANGELEY LAKE	SANDY RIVER PLT				WS
3690	1	RAYMOND POND	RAYMOND	HR			
3445	1	RICH MILL POND	STANDISH	HR			
5034	1	ROBERTS WADLEY POND	LYMAN	HR			
5038	1	ROUND POND	LYMAN	HR			
3796	1	SABATTUS POND	GREENE	HR	BL		
3700	1	SABBATHDAY LAKE	NEW GLOUCESTER	HR			
5352	1	SALMON L (ELLIS P)	BELGRADE	HR	BL		
768	1	SALMON STREAM POND	GUILFORD				WS
5238	1	SAND POND	MONMOUTH	HR			
5174	1	SANDY POND	FREEDOM	HR	BL		
3440	1	SATURDAY POND	OTISFIELD	HR			
5596	1	SCITUATE POND	YORK	HR	BL		
5786	1	SEBAGO LAKE	WINDHAM				WS
2264	1	SEBASTICOOK LAKE	NEWPORT	HR	BL		
441	1	SECOND POND	DEDHAM	HR			
5682	1	SENNEBEC POND	UNION	HR			
5686	1	SEVEN TREE POND	WARREN	HR			
9943	1	SEWALL POND	ARROWSIC	HR	BL		
3976	1	SHAKER POND	ALFRED	HR			
4896	1	SHEEPSCOT LAKE	PALERMO	HR			
2612	1	SIBLEY POND	CANAAN	HR			
5540	1	SILVER LAKE	BUCKSPORT				WS
5716	1	SOUTH POND	WARREN	HR			
5410	1	SPECTACLE POND	VASSALBORO	HR			
2598	1	STARBIRD POND	HARTLAND				WS
3234	1	STEARNS POND	SWEDEN	HR			
5492	1	SWAN LAKE	SWANVILLE	HR			
3750	1	TAYLOR POND	AUBURN	HR			
3392	1	THOMAS POND	CASCO	HR			
3444	1	THOMPSON LAKE	OXFORD	HR			
5424	1	THREECORNERED POND	AUGUSTA	HR	BL	IT	
5416	1	THREEMILE POND	WINDSOR	HR	BL		
9931	1	TOGUS POND	AUGUSTA	HR	BL		
2336	1	TOOTHAKER POND	PHILLIPS	HR	BL		
5307	1	TORSEY (GREELEY) P	MOUNT VERNON	HR			
3382	1	TRICKEY POND	NAPLES	HR			
3758	1	TRIPP POND	POLAND	HR			
4906	1	TURNER POND	SOMERVILLE	HR			
5172	1	UNITY P	UNITY		BL		
98	1	UPPER NARROWS POND	WINTHROP	HR			WS
4342	1	UPPER PATTEN POND	ELLSWORTH	HR			

HR - high risk, low allocation
 BL - bluegreen algal blooms

Lakes Most at Risk from Development
PRELIMINARY DRAFT

IT - increasing trophic state
 WS - municipal water supply

MIDAS	BASIN	LAKE	TOWN	HR	BL	IT	WS
3688	1	UPPER RANGE POND	POLAND	HR			
3680	1	VARNUM POND	WILTON				WS
5034	2	WADLEY POND	LYMAN	HR			
5282	1	WARD POND	SIDNEY	HR			
3410	1	WARDS POND	LIMINGTON	HR	BL		
227	1	WASSOOKEAG LAKE	DEXTER				WS
5040	1	WATCHIC POND	STANDISH	HR			
3236	1	WEBBER POND	SWEDEN	HR			
5408	1	WEBBER POND	VASSALBORO	HR	BL		
5372	1	WEST HARBOR POND	BOOTHBAY HARBOR	HR	BL		
3772	1	WHITNEY POND	OXFORD	HR			
5336	1	WHITTIER POND	ROME	HR			
5538	1	WILLIAMS POND	BUCKSPORT	HR			
3920	1	WILSON LAKE	ACTON	HR			
3682	1	WILSON POND	WILTON	HR			
3832	1	WILSON POND	WAYNE	HR			
2698	1	WOOD POND	ATTEAN TWP				WS
5240	1	WOODBURY POND	MONMOUTH	HR			
9713	1	YORK POND	ELIOT	HR			
1842	1	YOUNGS LAKE	WESTFIELD				WS