

LURC Reform Commission

Meeting Minutes – September 22, 2011

Location: Husson University Center for Family Business – Bangor, ME

LURC Reform Commission Members in attendance:

- Bill Beardsley (chair); Sarah Medina (vice-chair); Hank McPherson; Tom Rumpf; Judy East; Lynda Quinn; Gary Lamb; Durward Humphrey; Don Kleiner; Don White; Elbridge Cleaves; Chris Gardner; Duane Lander.

DOC Staff in attendance:

- Dan Burke; Jeanne Curran.

Members of the Public in attendance:

- Clay Gordon (Ch. 7 News); Sen. Elizabeth Schneider (Sen. Dist. 30); Rep. Terry Hayes (H. Dist. 91); Fred Hardy (Franklin County Commission); Tim Leet (MCCA); Rod Carr; Rep. Pete Johnson (H. Dist. 27); Marian McCue (New Maine Times); Alexandra Fields (Environment Maine); Sally Stockwell (Maine Audubon); Cathy Johnson (NRCM); Jay Fields (MPBN); Steve Wight (Mahoosuc Land Trust); Lindsay Bourgoine (AMC); Jeff Romano (MCHT); Norton Lamb; Carolyn Manson (ME Tourism Association); Karen H. Raye; Sen. Kevin Raye (Sen. Dist. 29); Chris Cote (Sen. Pres. Office); Bryan Wentzell (AMC); Tom Abello (TNC); Rep. Bob Duchesne (H. Dist. 13); Steve Kahl (Sewall Co.); Kevin Miller (BDN); Gordon Mott; Amy Browne (WERU-FM); Patrick Strauch (MFPC); Jon Pottle (Eaton Peabody); Carlisle McLean (Office of the Governor); Gordy Smith (Verrill Dana); Lynne Williams; Gerald Weinand (Dirigo Blue); Meredith DeFrancesco (WERU-FM); Robert L Bulay (sic?); Mike Lane (Preti Flaherty); Susan Davis (Friends of ME Mountains); Cathy Mattson (Friends of ME Mountains); Rep. Jeff McCabe (H. Dist. 85); Ken Lamond (Family Forestry); Betsy Duncan (Ecology); Mike Turcotte; Meghan Hayward (WABI); Kenn Tompkins (WABI); Danielle Waugh (WLBZ); Richard Trott (Trott Forest Products); Rich Trott (Trott Forest Products).

Opening Remarks

Bill Beardsley

- Called meeting to order and introduced Sen. Kevin Raye.

Sen. Raye

- Wanted to bring some context as today's meeting gets under way.
- Appreciates willingness of each member to participate in this endeavor. Everyone is here today to represent a cross section of those residents affected by LURC regulation. Each member will bring open mind and constructive spirit and will consider the opinions of others. This is an opportunity to consider the full range of issues and options regarding LURC.
- He is not wedded to one particular outcome and believes the legislature is open and eager to hear recommendations from the group.
- Regrets that some think this process/group has a predetermined outcome. Believes the varying positions on this group will bear out the full range of options and lead to a viable outcome.
- Wished the group the best throughout the process.

Bill Beardsley

- Dan Burke and Jeanne Curran (DOC Staff Members).
- Handouts given to the group. "Our Assignment" and "Our Report". Stressed importance of uniform standards for timber harvesting, wildlife habitat, and site development.
- Maps on display
 - LURC jurisdiction with NH superimposed;
 - Landownership map – drives home fact that this land is 95% privately owned;

- Continuum – how does this reform process fit in a grander scheme? Development has been set at a 1970s level. This continuum hopefully explains the options available in between the two extremes (doing nothing and abolishing LURC. Believes those extremes are not the focus.
- Ground rules for group members:
 - Members can talk with whomever they want. When talking with people, talk as individuals; don't try to speak for the group.
 - Need to keep minutes and set agendas.
 - General thought is that group should have working meetings then go into public comment sessions in the afternoons.
- The group must look at the mission of LURC – the statement of purpose – in the enabling legislation. There should be an effort not to “kill the messenger” but to change the message instead.
- Outcomes for today's meeting – list of core issues; look at statement of purpose; consensus of agreed upon outcomes.
- Group has been entrusted with a big responsibility – must honor that trust.

Self-Introductions

Hank McPherson

- President of McPherson Timberlands.
- LURC needs reform.
- Supports and is committed to the four duties of the group spelled out in the Resolve.

Tom Rumpf

- Associate State Director at The Nature Conservancy.
- This is a great challenge. This is a difficult assignment but the group needs to find effective lasting change.
- Wants transparency and open inquiry throughout process.
- Wants process to be inclusive and wants the group to agree upfront on facts.

Judy East

- Regional planner at Washington County Council of Governments.
- Here to listen and has no preconceived notions of outcome.
- From a planning framework, group must define a vision for character of place. Without such vision, development will define character. Concerned about that ultimate result as being bad for the UTs and Maine.

Lynda Quinn

- Somerset County Commissioner; also an educator for all of adult life;
- Comes to group with open mind, despite having seen the “evils” of LURC.

Sarah Medina

- Seven Islands Land Co.,
- Experience dealing with the recreation and tourism industries.
- Has followed LURC for a long time. Has seen LURC do a lot of good things but also some bad things.

Gary Lamb

- Greenville town manager;
- Group needs to identify problems;
- Wants input from LURC staff, commissioners, and the public early and often.

Durward Humphrey

- Director of Katahdin Valley Health Center; comes to the process as a resident of UT.
- Has dealt with LURC since 1971 as small landowner and user of services.
- Has a strong interest in LURC and a strong belief that original purposes and mission are outdated.

Don Kleiner

- Professional guide with training as a land planner;
- Here to listen and wants to see the continuum pan out during the process.

Don White

- President and CEO of Prentiss & Carlisle.
- Served on review committee for the CLUP and believes that its tone is more in tune with a blueprint for a national park than for privately held land.
- LURC needs significant changing/updating to change that tone.

Elbridge Cleaves

- Worked as a forester when LURC came on the scene in the 1970s, currently serves and president of the Woody Wheaton Land Trust in Forest City.
- Has spent a lot of time dealing with good and bad aspects of LURC; wants to see a regulatory process emerge with predictability and balance.

Chris Gardner

- Washington County Commissioner.
- There is a great amount of work needed and that this process is the right thing to do. Hopes differences in opinion can be worked out.
- Wants to see some form of local control established.
- LURC is out of touch and land planning needs a new direction.

Duane Lander

- Resident of Moosehead Lake region. Has worked in the woods his whole life and has experience in recreation business, employing a large number of people in the Moosehead region.
- Without change, the Moosehead region will resemble a park.
- Has had difficulties when dealing with LURC staff even though they are good people.
- Has talked with 50 people about LURC and 49 of those people have said it needs to be changed;
- Customer service with LURC is a problem; that there are too many inconsistencies between state agencies and with the regulatory system.
- The environment is important and must be protected but controversy is stifling Maine.

Bill Beardsley

- Commissioner of DOC; worked in forestry for much of his life;
- Some changes already in place – Rod Falla, the new permitting and compliance division manager, works out Greenville. Staff in Augusta and elsewhere now report to him.
- LURC statement of purpose in the enabling legislation is preservation focused;
 - LURC staff is not diverging from the purpose of LURC, so group should focus on the mission.

Meeting Scheduling

Bill Beardsley

- Schedule has been set for Thursdays, every two weeks; next meeting scheduled for Solon Town Offices, then in Ashland; then in Medway; then maybe Dover-Foxcroft.
- Plan to have public comment following some of these work sessions.

Gary Lamb

- Public comment sessions should occur early and often – after every working session.

Chris Gardner

- One meeting should be in Washington County. 800,000 acres of UT there. Calais Community College would be ideal

Sarah Medina

- Washington County should be a meeting location. Comments should follow each meeting.

Bill Beardsley

- Thoughts on Solon? It's right in the middle of Somerset County.
- Will look into Downeast options.

Tom Rumpf

- Public comments after each session would be a good idea.

Duane Lander

- Bangor is a central location; convenient; serves as the gateway to logging industry.

Judy East

- Airline Café, on border of Hancock and Washington counties, is a potential spot.

Sarah Medina

- What does group need to accomplish at the listening sessions?
 - Should hear what public has as solutions to problem.
 - Should hear what public has as reactions to suggestions from this group.
- Open to idea of public comment sessions that aren't associated with group meetings where not all members are present.

Don Kleiner

- Some public comment sessions should be in the evening to accommodate work schedules.

Gary Lamb

- Members of the group should make every effort to attend all meetings. Having only a few members attend one or two should not happen.

Don White

- Listen to CLUP sessions online. Lots of heated community involvement. Expect the same here.

Durward Humphrey

- Should be more listening sessions.
- Move meetings up north.

Hank McPherson

- These dates have all been vetted; it is important to keep everyone's schedule in mind; people are busy and can't change schedules that easily.

Judy East

- Pragmatically impossible to make every single meeting;

Bill Beardsley

- Should people with special skill sets or experiences be invited by the group to present? If so, who gets invited?

Elbridge Cleaves

- It would be a good thing to invite people with expertise in LURC or DEP into the work sessions.

Duane Lander

- Security could be an issue, especially at later meetings. Might get out of hand and need to be careful.

Bill Beardsley

- There is no way around having the public present, the resolve says that public can attend any and all meetings.

Gary Lamb

- LURC staff should be invited to present first.

Chris Gardner

- LURC is trying to self correct now that it is under fire. Group should hear from the LURC commissioners.

Bill Beardsley

- Elizabeth Swain (long serving LURC Commissioner) and John Williams (former director of LURC) might be good candidates. Current staff – Catherine, Samantha, Rod – could give solid presentations on the future of planning and permitting.

Tom Rumpf

- Key staff and commissioners would be good. The group would benefit from question and answer time.

Hank McPherson

- The main reason this group exists is to reform land use planning. Group should be careful not to rehash the old arguments of keeping or abolishing LURC. If staff or commissioners do come in, they should focus on what they think about reform.
- Maybe invite attorneys and engineers who have dealt with LURC.

Bill Beardsley

- Need to cautious not to reinvent acrimony around old public hearings on LURC projects.
- Group will have time to revisit this issue after lunch.
- Move the discussion back to location of meetings.

Don White

- Move the Dover-Foxcroft meeting over to Greenville.

Bill Beardsley

- Keep in mind that the focus for the last meeting should be writing our report. Coming back to Bangor might be a good idea. At that point, public comment will be less helpful, maybe even distracting. Our timeline is fairly short.

Gary Lamb

- More evening sessions need to be accommodated.

Chris Gardner

- More than reasonable to have a meeting in Washington County.

Judy East

- Agreed with Chris Gardner.

Bill Beardsley

- Drop Medway as a location and move it to Calais. Last meeting will then be in more centralized area.

Statement of Agreement (Jeanne Curran at easel)

Sarah Medina

- Group should agree on positive outcomes to this process.
- Begin by looking at the purpose statement in the enabling legislation.
 - “Sound principles of zoning planning exist”

- “Balance regional economic development with environmental protection”
- “Allowable development without compromising protections of water quality, wildlife, significant natural and scenic resources.”
 - LURC is not meant to stop development, but the focus of the staff is on protection of environment. There must be a balance for regional economic development. Not everything out there is so special as to afford special protections. Some places can be developed without compromising the area.
 - Maine relies on tourism – but tourism relies on needed infrastructure to attract tourists.

Tom Rumpf

- Focus should be on opportunities to enhance development that is compatible with the natural resource economy.

Chris Gardner

- Regulation needs to have people’s control of the process. The current process is insufficient. There is no way to effect change within a region. State control is not accountable to the people living and working in the regions. It shouldn’t take hearings in Portland to put in a shed in Washington County.

Bill Beardsley

- Focus on positive outcomes here.

Sarah Medina

- Instead of “development” put in “economic viability”.

Don White

- The idea of standing is important to the planning process. Also, officials need to be elected so as to introduce accountability.

Tom Rumpf

- Not sure total local control of LURC jurisdiction is a good idea.

Sarah Medina

- Agreed with TR.
- However, local community members need to have significant input in the process.

Lynda Quinn

- Input does not necessarily mean power – “impact” instead of “input” would be better.

Judy East

- Most of LURC jx. is zoned as management districts; management for the economic viability of timber industry or tourism, not necessarily residential development.

Gary Lamb

- Looking at the language in the purpose statement, can’t get over “preventing inappropriate” language. Even a change to “allowing appropriate” development would be much better.

Elbridge Cleaves

- The jurisdiction is not solely governed by LURC regulation. The differing objectives of landowners govern as well. Regulatory footprint should not be minimized but it is not the sole driver.
- Should maybe leave in the “scenic” protections, maybe “scenic” is not the right word, but something similar should be included.

Durward Humphrey

- Must deal with disconnect between major state agencies first. There is so much inconsistency and duplication among permitting at LURC, DEP, etc.

Don Kleiner

- There is a customer service aspect to the regulatory process. So much frustration stems from faulty customer service and a lack of communication.

Sarah Medina

- This exercise was meant to focus on a higher level. Stay at a higher level. Should industry be left in the uniform standards debate? It doesn't have the same jurisdiction- wide uniformity as forestry or water quality standards.

Hank McPherson

- A lot of this comes down to the purpose statement – this mission statement should be rewritten – the overarching objective is to find a balance between development and conservation.

Don White

- The elimination of duplicative processes should be included.
- Also, group should agree that whatever results should be something that will stand the test of time.

Durward Humphrey

- Purpose and scope section in enabling legislation needs to change significantly.

Sarah Medina

- No one wants to see environmental protections weakened. Are there any more bullet points out there? Some would argue that LURC has been a hindrance to development or economic viability.

Bill Beardsley

- The purpose statement in the enabling legislation is riddled with the word “prevent”. Just changing the wording would go along way.

Tom Rumpf

- Environmental standards need to be preserved. The current bullet point does not capture that essence.

Sarah Medina

- There are people out there who think that this group is here to dismantle environmental protections. We need to assure them that is not our intent.

Bill Beardsley

- 95% of this is privately owned land. Private owners can deal with some of these issues.

Don White

- The idea that this is privately held land is huge. It is not a park.

Elbridge Cleaves

- The problem is that all land is not equally endowed. Some land is junk. How can opportunity to develop be spread equally around when these differences exist?

Tom Rumpf

- Those differences are why it is important to have state involvement in regards to environmental protection.

Hank McPherson

- This balance between private property and public values – are we going to invent a process that regulates private land or is driven by the market values? People own this land because of market values.

Judy East

- Underlying is the fact that development in furthest reaches of the jurisdiction often requires significant infrastructure be built or upgraded. This cost is paid for by public funds.

Bill Beardsley

- The notion of private property intimates that owners can do something with it. Regulation should not destroy opportunity for economic use.

Chris Gardner

- Successful regulation occurs in municipalities right now. The process works in these communities. What's different in LURC? The difference is that there is no input, no local control. People are o.k. with reasonable regulation. LURC doesn't operate this way. LURC is insulated. Decisions are made in Augusta, not close to the regulated community.

Tom Rumpf

- These aren't municipalities; they are unorganized townships without a form of local government.

Chris Gardner

- There is a form of government – the counties. People accept county governments. They have for decades. There is fire service, road service, etc. The only thing missing is control of planning and zoning.

Break – 11:15 to 11:30 a.m.

Sarah Medina

- Another point was made that didn't get on the sheet: any process must balance cost of public infrastructure versus the ability of private owners to develop land.
- Here are the things we agree on:
 - “Sound principles of planning persist”
 - “Maintain strong environmental protections”
 - “Encourage regional economic viability”
 - “Residents and property owners have significant input and impact”
 - “Standards will remain uniform across all regions for forest, wildlife, and agriculture”
 - “Excellent customer service and communication”
 - “Well thought out and not reactionary processes”
 - “Evaluate public values with private enterprise”

Chris Gardner

- Maintain “uniform” environmental protections instead of “strong”?

Tom Rumpf

- Can't weaken environmental protections

Don White

- Change to “encourage” uniform environmental protections?

Bill Beardsley

- The resolve tells us to “ensure” uniform standards.

Don White

- “Promote” instead of “encourage” regional economic viability?

Tom Rumpf

- There are broader state interests here. Part of it is maintaining environmental standards; another part of it is economic development.

- One of Maine's assets is this vast contiguous tract of forestland – the only one like it east of the Mississippi River. This interest should be addressed but unclear how to do it.

Sarah Medina

- Agreed, there are broader values at stake, on a statewide level.

Don White

- The UTs are unique and do bring value. It is unfair to make UTs responsible for statewide interests. They should not be responsible.

Tom Rumpf

- Similar protections are in place for the coastal areas. Look at shoreland zoning.

Hank McPherson

- These statements of agreement recognize public values.

Bill Beardsley

- The resolve says group is to provide recommendations on planning and zoning. Doesn't specifically mention permitting or appeals. Don't know if this is an oversight. We need to be sensitive to the fact that there might be some ambiguity.

Judy East

- Permitting and appeals should necessarily be included. (Group recognized general consensus as to this point.)
- This is a unique area to Maine, to the Northeast, the nation.

Don White

- Uncomfortable about "uniqueness". That implies that this area should be preserved.

Hank McPherson

- Everyone should ask whether the regulated community should be able to communicate with the regulators.

Tom Rumpf

- Agreed, interested persons should be able to contact LURC commissioners.

Duane Lander

- Too early in the meetings to be talking about these details now. This idea of ex parte communications should be tabled for now.

Bill Beardsley

- Can group agree on a vision for Maine honoring a natural resource economy? That's why companies like Jackson Labs do business here – for quality of life. They take advantage of the things we have here in Maine even if the business climate (taxes, regulation, etc.) are not ideal.

Lunch – 12:00 noon – 12:45 p.m.

More on Information Gathering

Bill Beardsley

- Does the group have specific requests for information?
 - Other past LURC Commissioners or staff?
 - Group should have this input early

Chris Gardner

- More presentations aren't necessary. That isn't the focus of this group. These would just amount to an internal review if done by LURC staff. We don't need to know what they've done.

Bill Beardsley

- Offer more statistics/info, etc?

Sarah Medina

- We were all appointed because of varied experiences and will bring those to the table. Like to think any invitees would do the same. Elizabeth Swain is just that type of person.

Elbridge Cleaves

- A company like SW Cole would be very constructive on how to streamline.

Tom Rumpf

- Environmental community should be included

Don Kleiner

- Would like to see written statements from the invitees so we can use our time to ask questions about their thoughts.

Bill Beardsley

- Need to choose carefully.
 - Existing LURC staff?
 - League of Conservation Voters?
 - Elizabeth Swain?

Don White

- Written input rather than presentations might be better. If the group has more, we can always ask them to supplement. This group's time is best spent reviewing the problems and developing solutions.

Tom Rumpf

- Eliciting written recommendations might be a good idea.

Hank McPherson

- Inviting 2 or 3 attorneys with experience in LURC matters. They could give real answers to questions about the process.

Don White

- Need guidance on the legal aspects of the process – invite an attorney who has experience.

Duane Lander

- Concerned about public relations with the small property owner and LURC. Local issues and the little guy should be a big concern. Folks are upset about the process.

Tom Rumpf

- Maybe Rod Falla should come in and address the situation with individuals who want to build.

Duane Lander

- LURC is a bad word in parts of the state. Call it anything else and you might solve a lot.

Bill Beardsley

- Attorneys would fit in but not at the next meeting.

Don Kleiner

- This group is charged with building something that works for the entire state.

Durward Humphrey

- Should keep strictly to the points laid out in the legislation – invite no one who won't address those points.

Don White

- Orlando Delogu?

More on the Statement of Agreement

Sarah Medina

- Got the Consensus statement typed up:
 - “We agree:
 - That our vision is to honor Maine’s natural resource economy;
 - That sound planning, permitting, zoning, and appeals principles will persist
 - To maintain strong environmental protections
 - To encourage and facilitate regional economic viability
 - That residents and property owners in the UT will have significant input and impact
 - To ensure uniform standards across all regions for forest management, wildlife, agriculture and water quality
 - To provide excellent customer service and communications
 - To recognize private ownership and public values and costs (broad state interests/uniqueness)
 - That what the LURC Reform Commission develops will stand the test of time.”

Judy East

- In the private ownership/public values line, move “and costs” to end of statement – to read: “to recognize private ownership/public values (broad state interest/uniqueness of UT) and costs.”
- Private landowner’s impact on public costs is huge.

Chris Gardner

- Counties have a choice as to whether to accept these costs, like a road. There will be a negotiation process. A county can say that a landowner has to get that road up to a certain standard before the county will take it over.

Bill Beardsley

- Consensus? (The group agreed.)

Core Issues

Bill Beardsley

- Digging into the core issues. Let’s get TR to come up with a new statement of purpose, at least a working draft, so that the agreed upon values/ideas get “codified” so to speak.

Hank McPherson

- When looking at these core issues, should the group look at the original Gifford Bill or the other LDs that were submitted?

Bill Beardsley

- Those didn’t pass through the legislature. The group needs to refer to the duties and issues in the resolve that we have in front of us.
- Let’s go around and have each member give their view of land use planning in the UTs.

Duane Lander

- Control should be local or regionalized.
- There should be a division between large developments and small projects. The small landowner should be able to go to a local body and get a permit by rule. (meeting environmental standards). At a larger level with a big development, that is a different subject.

Chris Gardner

- No secret that he has taken public stances against LURC. Believes LURC isn't being cooperative.
- Put local control back in the hands of the people as is fiscally sound and reasonable to do.
- The system of LURC is disconnected. People feel they are being ruled, not governed.
- There are other concerns – costs. Maybe large projects go to the state and small projects go local.
- There are all sorts of variations. Now that LURC is at the table, views might not be as extreme as abolishment.
- One thing is for sure: LURC cannot remain the same with only a slightly modified purpose statement.

Elbridge Cleaves

- The state has to be more involved.
- There is opportunity to build-in predictability and efficiency for delivery of service. Building permits are hard to issue from a distance.
- Don't hear a lot about compliance and enforcement. These go hand in hand with permitting.
- Very concerned with divvying up responsibility – coordination, funding, costs.

Don White

- The biggest flaw is that planning, zoning, permitting, and appeals should not be under the same roof.
- Next, must find some way to put in elected oversight. That brings in accountability.
- LURC is overworked. Why are there duplicative processes?
- This should be science based not emotion based.
- Needs to move out of Augusta. Regional focus.
- Larger projects to DEP; Forestry to Maine Forest Service
- “Adjacency” and “demonstrated need” principles to be revised or taken out of the approval criteria.

Don Kleiner

- There needs to be some statewide standard.
- However, this is a region and regions have personalities. Not convinced that county level is the appropriate level to deal with this type of planning.
- Watersheds – politically impossible but a good way to think.
- Somehow move things closer to the people while maintaining statewide oversight.

Durward Humphrey

- Bring it closer to local people
- Bring the language down to lay-mans terms.
- Get rid of the disconnect between agencies
- Bring common sense back to the table.
- The law needs to be tweaked, the problem is not with LURC staff – they are interpreting what they are given.

Gary Lamb

- Clearer application standards and review criteria.
- More consistent standards, maximizing permit by rule.
- Intervenor status is much too lenient
- Install a local appeals process.

Sarah Medina

- Ought to be a statewide agency handling major projects – DEP maybe?

- Thinks planning and zoning, permitting should be locally controlled – open to counties or regions. This would work for small scale projects.
- Each region is different; planning should be a regional, not statewide basis.
- Legislative oversight should be increased. Staff should be moved out into the regions. There is a different attitude for people who live and work in an area as opposed to Augusta.
- More uniform ways to treat similar projects.
- Science based approach.
- More predictability needed – can predict what won't be allowed, not what will be allowed.
- Need to make it easier for folks to understand what is necessary to get a permit – this will help bring people who want to open businesses in ME.
- Makes perfect sense for things to spun off to other agencies.

Lynda Quinn

- The state can't do much of anything and now they are thinking about giving it to counties, which can't afford it. Then the planning process will run amuck. This is going to be a long haul and expensive.

Judy East

- From a general planning perspective – the state has grown and there are residents in the UT that were not there in the 1970s. This explains the mission creep that's been seen with LURC's responsibilities and actions.
- Uniformity across regulations, equally to conserve resources as well as predictability to landowner/developer
- In terms of any devolution to the counties, concerns are about costs, technical and legal capability. If planning and review processes go the counties, there needs to be some sort of body with accountability.
- There needs to attention paid to a regional vision within each county or region.
- The UT is way too big for one small entity.

Tom Rumpf

- Supports improving LURC not abolishing it. This is a historical thing. There is a resistance to being ruled from away. Maine was a colony of a colony.
- Customer service is a problem.
- Predictability is a problem.
- Open to considering a regional approach.
- Need to find incentives for LURC staff to provide excellent customer service.

Hank McPherson

- The view is that planning and permitting are separate, shouldn't have to appeal to the people who denied you.
- LURC should be a separate independent entity – something similar to how municipalities do it. Planning boards are volunteer groups with individuals who are interested in their local community and are capable of a lot.
- Any project triggering site review, major projects, should be overseen by elected boards. This would incur costs. The state incurs them now, not sure how it should work on a local level.
- Appeals should be independent.
- In the end, planning stay the same but needs to be reviewed from time to time, not a 40 year basis.
- Costs of transferring LURC responsibilities is not cost prohibitive.

Bill Beardsley

- Predictability needs to increase – permit by rule.
- Major projects should be transferred but still permit by rule. Look at wind project regulation.
- Question remains: What type of recommendations will bring stability?
- Statewide planning efforts, with input from county or regional bodies.
 - There should be some ability for counties to be more or less restrictive. This would allow elected officials some input and accountability.

- It would nice to have some county input on appeals. Don't know how to implement.
- What next? Tackle something else, hear from the public?

(Group consensus to hear comments from the public)

Robert Bulay (sic?)

- Landowner in the UT.
- Became familiar with LURC rules and ultimately had good experiences working with the staff.
- Any way to get more money for LURC? That could solve some of the customer service problems.

Amy Browne

- Asked how many members of group live in the UT.
- Asked about irony of members calling for longstanding solutions while being political appointees.

Rep. Bob Duchesne

- Offered perspective on successes and failures of other blue ribbon committees.
- Must take a broader view. Unsuccessful committees clung to their individual opinions and no consensus was reached.
- Success hinges on lots of talking and listening.
- "You are the team that owns the whole problem"

Sen. Elizabeth Schneider

- The issues are complicated. Must get facts, not anecdotes.
- Any outcome should not have undue burden on property tax payers.
- Legislature should have been more responsible. LURC was often the scapegoat.

Rep. Pete Johnson

- Constituents complaining. Knows something must be done. Don't know what the answer is.

Cathy Johnson

- Encouraged the audio broadcast of subsequent discussions.

Fred Hardy

- Franklin County Commissioner
- Local control was bounced around lot – pleased about that.
- Likes the discussion of landowner rights.
- Cost to the county should be a big concern.

Steve Wight

- Former LURC commissioner
- Impressed with what he's seen so far today.

Adjourn at 2:30 p.m.