Recently, the Dover-Foxcroft Planning Board presented the results of eight years of work focusing on the development of a regulatory framework to govern land use within the town. The product of this work comes in the form of three draft documents produced by the PB: a revised general Land Use Ordinance, a LUO pertaining to Mega-Projects: Water Extraction and a LUO pertaining to Mega-Projects: Transportation Corridors. Transportation Corridors include activities like the East-West Highway, gas and petroleum pipelines, major electrical transmission lines and wind farms. These ordinances are intended to protect the town’s interests if a major development project is undertaken.

The Planning Board members are to be commended for the considerable and thoughtful work that went into the preparation of these documents. The proposed ordinances are very thorough and very detailed, covering most areas of legitimate concern to the town. However, as comprehensive as these proposed ordinances are, one must ask the question: ‘What do they mean’? You might think that the answer is obvious: they mean what they say, its printed in black and white. But, let me draw your attention to another well-known document printed in black and white and familiar to all: The Constitution of the United States of America. Now, ask the same question: ‘What does it mean’? Despite being written down in black and white, the meaning of those words has been the subject of significant controversy ever since it was officially ratified in 1789. The recent battle over the Supreme Court gives powerful testament to this reality. Clearly, the meaning of a document depends on who is doing the reading.

The current drafts of the Land Use Ordinances use words like ‘unreasonable’ and ‘adverse’; and this language renders them open to interpretation. How do we define ‘unreasonable’ or ‘adverse’? More importantly, who makes those decisions? Under the new ordinances, the permitting process for a Mega-Project follows the same administrative route as other projects. If adopted, these ordinances remove the people from the final decision-making process; and future moratoriums on Mega-Projects will no longer be permitted.

A Mega-Project is, by definition, a project that will have profound impacts on our town, altering its fundamental character not only for today but for all future generations. Given the potential impact of such a project, it seems unwise to exclude the town’s largest stakeholder group – the residents – from the final decision-making process; nor is it fair to place the burden for such a decision on the backs of the members of the Planning Board, the Selectmen or the Code Enforcement Officer. A vote by the town’s residents would place responsibility for approving or rejecting a Mega-Project exactly where it belongs - with the people of our town.

Therefore, before passage, the proposed land use ordinances must be amended to include language that requires any Mega-Project proposal to receive a majority affirmative vote by the registered voters of the Town of Dover-Foxcroft before proceeding. There are other changes, including financial and disclosure requirements, that could further perfect the proposed ordinances by adding additional protections for our town and its residents. These changes require only simple amendments to the current draft documents. Until they are made, I recommend that you vote NO on all the proposed land use ordinances on November 6th, 2018.

Nick Calderone
Dover-Foxcroft, ME
I have 600 dollars into this closing of our Private, NO Public access, portion of Shore Rd. South -(OK'd by the town managers)-Still without any clear legal picture of how area of local status this town left our road in. So we have a number of questions for the Town Lawyers:

A. The no Public access portion starts at our property 2012.
B. 7 folks waving the 100 yr. old deeds to camps, written before the Park Road was built. Argued there was only legal access was through our land-which now is no longer public. [No access to Greely's per a town change in our Deeds] for for maintaining these people's access. Why do we have to tolerate the danger, noise, and stink of vehicle traffic when it was the own that relinquished the public right-of-way? [Why counted to better other ways to get to those deed waives from the Park Road]
C. Town dumping this responsibility on us is not Right.
D. Who is "culpable" if someone or their vehicle is hurt/damaged transgressing our private property? (Expect Town Response)
E. Is the Town prepared to widen access to 18' all the way to the Park if we have to continue allowing vehicles to drive through our property. (Road is between dwellings and lake)
F. We want to hire the town lawyers grant legal access for everyone's camps west of Ken Grant using Timberlane/Park Rd.
G. "Camp no longer Camp" as Greedy landlords/business owners crowd out old family camps with "Cancerous" Rental Camps & boat mooring Bouys spreading up the shoreline in front of our camps. The town didn't stop that- How about helping the NICE buyers- I am not Greedy - Stifish or Opportunistic!!