

The University of Maine

DigitalCommons@UMaine

Maine Women's Publications - All

Publications

10-1-1971

The Maine Voter vol. XIX, no. 2 (Oct 1971)

Maine League of Women Voters Staff

Maine League of Women Voters

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/maine_women_pubs_all



Part of the [Women's History Commons](#)

Repository Citation

Staff, Maine League of Women Voters, "The Maine Voter vol. XIX, no. 2 (Oct 1971)" (1971). *Maine Women's Publications - All*. 549.

https://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/maine_women_pubs_all/549

This Newsletter is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UMaine. It has been accepted for inclusion in Maine Women's Publications - All by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UMaine. For more information, please contact um.library.technical.services@maine.edu.



The MAINE VOTER

Published by The League of Women Voters of Maine

VOLUME XIX

OCTOBER, 1971

Number 2

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MAINE

BALLOT PREVIEW

Special Election - - - Tuesday, November 2, 1971

Referendum Question

"Shall the corporate and individual Maine Income Tax Law be repealed?"

Explanation: The Maine Income Tax Law was passed by the Maine Legislature in 1969 to provide revenue for state services. The tax was levied at a rate considered low, on the basis of ability to pay. It is deductible from the Federal Income Tax.

At the request of Mr. Scott Lamb, 10% of the number of voters who voted in the last gubernatorial election signed petitions asking for repeal of the income tax. The Maine Constitution provides that the question must therefore be voted upon by the people.

A YES vote will abolish the corporate and individual income tax. The state will be dependent upon other sources of revenue - sales tax, property tax, etc.

A NO vote will retain the corporate and individual income tax as a source of revenue for state services.

BALLOT REVIEW (continued)

Proposed Constitutional Amendments

(Each of the following Constitutional Amendments have been passed by a two-thirds vote of both houses of the Maine Legislature.)

1. "Shall the Constitution be amended as proposed by a resolution of the Legislature to reduce the voting age to eighteen years?"

Explanation: Since the 26th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution was enacted and approved by three-fourths of the state legislatures (including the Maine Legislature) the voting age has already been reduced to eighteen years for all elections held in Maine. However, we are required to vote on the question to change the word twenty to eighteen in the Maine Constitution.

A YES vote will show support of the enacted law.

A NO vote will show opposition to the law but will not mean any change in the right of 18-year-old persons to vote.

2. "Shall the Constitution be amended as proposed by a resolution of the Legislature providing that the term of office of the Governor continues until his successor has qualified?"

Explanation: This amendment concerns a disputed election in which it is not determined who the Governor shall be before the incumbent Governor's term expires. Recounts and court action could lengthen the dispute beyond the first Wednesday in January (following the November election) when a new Governor would normally take office. At present the Constitution limits the Governor's term of office to exactly four years. It also provides that a vacancy in the office of Governor be filled by the President of the Senate.

The Legislature passed the amendment to provide that in the event of such a disputed election, the Governor's office at the beginning of a term be filled by the incumbent Governor, who is elected statewide, rather than by the President of the Senate who is elected by the voters of a single senatorial district.

BALLOT REVIEW (continued)

2. A YES vote will allow the incumbent Governor to continue in office until his successor is determined.

A NO vote will mean that the President of the Senate will fill the vacancy in the Governor's Office in the event of a disputed election.

3. "Shall the Constitution be amended as proposed by a resolution of the Legislature pledging credit of the State and providing for the issuance of bonds not exceeding four million dollars for loans for Maine students in higher education?"

Explanation: Under a program already in effect the State of Maine and the U.S. Government guarantee to loaning banks the repayment of loans which Maine students obtain for higher education. This amendment would provide that sale of bonds for this purpose could be increased from one to four million dollars. These bonds would be issued only as needed to repay banks for those loans that are not paid back by the students.

A YES vote will permit the State to issue bonds not exceeding four million dollars only as needed to repay banks for student loans which are in default.

A NO vote will deny the increase in the State's guarantee capacity for the Maine student loan program for higher education.

President's Letter (continued from page 4)

place. It seems that the Maine League will have to think this matter through, perhaps with a little help from our friends in the Supreme Court. As usual, the League is ferreting out the facts of the matter, in a nationwide Election Systems Survey, which is being conducted in 300 selected towns and cities in the U.S.---- Bangor, Houlton area, Lewiston-Auburn, Orono, and Portland among

among them. The survey, funded by the Ford Foundation and done in cooperation with the National Municipal League and the LMV Education Fund, will delineate the laws and administrative procedures that separate the citizen from the ballot box. As League people say, when we know what our problems really are, we can begin to solve them.

Nancy Masterton,

President

PRESIDENT'S LETTER

Dear Leaguers:

Washington, D.C. was the place, September 22 and 23 the dates. Personnel were national Board members and Voters Service chairmen and Presidents from eighteen eastern seaboard state Leagues. Subject: Voters Service. State VS chairman Sukey Allen and I were there.

The Maine League's cooperation in the "Youth '72 Registration Drive" conducted last spring was spotlighted, as Sukey described League supervision of non-partisan registration of 18, 19 and 20-year olds in the halls and classrooms of Maine high schools and colleges. Of more recent note is the League's leading role in encouraging both the State Department of Education and the Secretary of State's Election Division to pronounce September 28 and 29 as Youth Registration Days in Maine high schools. School officials and Boards of Registration were urged by letter to cooperate in providing registration in or between classes during these two special days. Conference delegates were flabbergasted at the comprehensiveness of the plan, the minimal League woman-power involved, and the complete cooperation of the state agencies.

When at the 1970 national Convention the League adopted

a bylaw amendment which added under Program "action to protect the right to vote of every citizen," the issue of young voter rights was scarcely on the horizon. Today, however, the subject is on every Leaguer's mind. The question of whether college students are allowed to register and vote in their college towns is being decided on a state-by-state basis. Some states say yes, some say no. (Some students, prevented by law from voting in the town in which they attend college, find they can't vote in their home towns either in states lacking the absentee ballot.) In Maine, the Attorney-General's answer was no. A student does not establish residency, says the law, merely by attending a Maine college or university. Whether he can register and vote depends on his satisfying criteria set by the local Board of Registration. ('Tisn't easy.)

There's no doubt that ordinary citizen's rights are more equal than those of some Maine students, but remedying this fact introduces other problems. Doing away with residency requirements altogether (and Maine's are lenient compared to other states) opens the door to voting in more than one
(see page 3)

LAND USE POLICY----WHOSE RESPONSIBILITY?

An editorial in the local newspaper reads "The Kittery toll gate on the Maine Turnpike broke a record Monday afternoon for the number of cars passing through it going out of state....A lot of Mainers considered this a mixed blessing at best. Sure, it jingles a lot of cash registers for businesses catering to tourists. But it also clogs the highways, the beaches, the lakes and the seashore and sends property values up so much that the average Mainer finds it next to impossible to acquire a summer place in Maine of his own."¹

The Sunday newspaper quotes the Chairman of the Environmental Improvement Commission, "We knew that in the northeast there are 50 million people within a day's journey of Maine, but we didn't realize just how heavy the development pressure was weighing against us."²

In the eight-month period after the enactment of the Site Selection Law, the Environmental Improvement Commission considered 153 projects of which 80 were seasonal housing, 41 year round residential projects, and 32 commercial or manufacturing projects. Many of the subdivisions, resort complexes or housing developments are to be located near the ocean or an inland waterway. Increasingly, Maine people are finding their access to these same areas sorely limited. Popham Beach in Phippsburg was bought under the 1968 bond issue to relieve pressure on Reid State Park. Now, on some hot summer days visitors are turned away. The Maine family wishing to do weekend camping during July and August is fortunate to find a site in a State Park campground. Holiday periods produce waits of 24-48 hours outside some campgrounds. Many people are turning to backpacks and canoes hoping to find wilderness, but instead find lakes ringed with camps, and trail bikes instead of wildlife. Dumps and gravel pits intrude on river banks. Those who have invested in a permanent camp are finding that their lake is showing signs of accelerated aging, that their fresh mountain air contains a new "fragrance", that what works well in a low density situation may not work when all the new neighbors have moved in.

Recreation and housing developments are only a part of the pressure on the Maine Coast. The deep water harbors continue to receive the close attention of the oil industry which promises jobs and an increased standard of living. Further, a study prepared for the New England Regional Commission, the Zinder Report, estimates a 322% increase in demand for regional power in the next 20 years. Producing it will require an estimated 40,000 acres of land for generating sites, another 40,000 for EHV transmission lines, and large amounts of cooling water, indicating that our coast line will receive careful scrutiny in the selection of appropriate sites. How is Maine meeting this pressure? Can our current laws and state agencies protect our land and people from exploitation and speculation and, at the same time, provide for orderly development?

Public Interest vs. Private Rights

Prior to the passage of the Land Use Regulation Commission Law in 1969, the state did not directly control land use, but instead enabled local governments to enact and administer land use controls. At the local level the goal has been to resolve the conflict of public interest and private rights by striving for reasonable regulations promoting public health, safety, morals or general welfare. Unfortunately, in many cases, local governments have abdicated this responsibility, leaving the decisions to private individuals seeking short term economic gain. By 1969, out of a total of 495 municipalities, only 208 had planning boards, 98 had comprehensive plans, 71 had zoning ordinances, 58 had subdivision regulations, 102 had building codes, 40 had housing codes, 87 had mobile home ordinances, and 68 had miscellaneous construction codes. The absence of land use regulations becomes dramatically evident when only a negative vote on a loan guarantee prevents the construction of an aluminum plant in Trenton, or when a special town meeting in Wells is called to pass an ordinance to prevent the weekly dumping of 10,000 tons of garbage from Boston in the community.

side from private interests desiring private gain, why have the communities failed to employ basic land use controls? A study entitled Maine Law Affecting Marine Resources points to the following reasons or the lack of planning efforts by coastal communities:

- "1. Apathy
2. Failure to perceive the need
3. Fear of and revulsion at any public encroachment on private property
4. Lack of faith in honest enforcement
5. Inadequate municipal funds
6. Instances of poor municipal leadership."

Are our inland communities any different? Maine's capital city, Augusta, has rejected zoning four times since 1925. Does legislation giving local governments the choice in enacting land use controls protect our natural resources? Can we rely on local governments to use the tools of land use control effectively? If there is failure to meet this responsibility, should a higher level of government be authorized to do so?

Efforts at State Control

The State's first direct control of land use occurred in 1969 with the passage of legislation creating the Land Use Regulation Commission, which was authorized to zone in a very limited area of the unorganized territory. Recently, the 105th Legislature extended the Commission's jurisdiction to all unorganized and deorganized townships, and mainland and island plantations of the state, except Indian reservations. The Commission, composed of the Director of Parks and Recreation, the Forest Commissioner, the State Planning Director and four members representing the public, conservation, forest products industry and general land-owner interests, after public hearings, will determine land use guidance districts within its jurisdiction and designate each one as either a protection district (areas which would be jeopardized by development), a management district (lands used for forest products, agriculture or possible development), a holding district (reserve areas adjoining development districts) or a development district.

Whereas, the original Land Use Regulation Commission Law applied traditional urban tools to an undeveloped area of the state, the recent revision provides for a minimum number of flexible standards. The flexible concept of land use guidance incorporates certain aspects of the recommendations of five independent studies prepared by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (1968), the National Commission on Urban Problems (1968), the American Law Institute (1968), the American Society of Planning Officials (1967), and the Canadian Federal Task Force on Housing and Urban Development (1969). According to David Heeter, editor of Land Use Controls Quarterly, they all are remarkably in agreement in their findings and recommendations. The recommendations would produce a land use guidance system with the following characteristics:

- "1. It would be founded upon a flexible, dynamic concept of land use guidance, rather than a 'static', end-state concept' as is conventional zoning.
2. It would rely primarily upon police power regulations...
3. It would expand the purposes for which police power regulations may be used through supplementary techniques which:
 - a. encourage landowners to act in the public interest by offering them incentives, and
 - b. legitimize regulations which would otherwise be unconstitutional by paying compensation to affected landowners.
4. It would rely upon the public acquisition and disposition of land, rather than on police power regulations, to achieve certain objectives.
5. It would treat land usage as occurring in three stages--developing, developed and redeveloping...
6. It would be exercised only by local governments which have met state-imposed minimum requirements designed to insure that they are willing and able to effectively and responsibly plan for and guide the use of land
7. It would be administered by a single local agency. .
8. It would be monitored by a state planning and review agency in order to protect and promote extra-local interest, whether the interests of the state, regional or metropolitan areas, or local governments.
9. It would prohibit the use of guidance techniques for exclusionary purposes."4

Other state legislatures also have adopted legislation in accord with some of the above recommendations. By December 31, 1971 all land in Oregon cities and counties will be subject to a comprehensive land-use plan and zoning regulations. The governor's office will have the power to plan and zone in areas that do not meet the deadline. In the Minneapolis-St. Paul area, the Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission can make mandatory review of the plans of local governments (except counties) and special districts. Counties in Wisconsin must meet minimum standards for shoreline management; if a county fails to do so, the state may prepare and administer the ordinances. By March, 1971, 75% of the counties had complied with the law.

The 105th Legislature recently enacted similar shoreline legislation requiring each municipality to zone within 250 feet of the normal high water mark of any navigable body of water. The zoning must be approved by the Environmental Improvement Commission and the Land Use Regulation Commission before June 30, 1973. If a municipality fails to zone, or if the commissions determine the zoning to be insufficient to accomplish protection of the shoreline, the commissions will adopt suitable ordinances for the municipality. Will the distance of 250 feet be enough to protect the shoreline and prevent water pollution? Once local governments have approved zoning of the shoreline, will they enforce it? If not, does the state have the authority to do so? Since the Land Use Regulation Commission does not have jurisdiction in the organized portions of the State, what did the Legislature intend by requiring its approval in addition to the E.I.C.'s?

Still another law adopted by the 105th legislature gives direct control of coastal wetlands to the Wetlands Control Board, which is composed of the Commissioners of Sea and Shore Fisheries, Inland Fisheries and Game, Forestry, Health and Welfare, the Chairman of the E.I.C., and the Chairman of the State Highway Commission. After public hearings, the Board may adopt regulations regarding "dredging, filling, removing or otherwise altering any coastal wetland, or draining or depositing sanitary sewage into or on any coastal wetland or otherwise polluting same."⁵ Coastal wetlands are defined as "any swamp, marsh, bog, beach, flat or other contiguous lowland above extreme low water which is subject to tidal action or normal stream flowage at any time excepting periods of maximum storm activity."⁶

In an effort to establish standards for municipal control, the 105th Legislature tightened the criteria to be followed by planning boards,

or in their absence, municipal officers, in considering approval for proposed subdivisions. These include consideration of water and air pollution, soil types, water supplies, sewage and waste disposal, highway congestion, and the effect on natural beauty.

In addition, a minimum lot size of 20,000 square feet has been established across the state for developments lacking public sewer unless approved by the Division of Sanitation of the Department of Health and Welfare on the bases of percolation and other soil analyses.

The Special Session of the 104th Legislature (1970) won national attention by enacting the Site Selection Law, which further grants limited land use powers to a state agency. It authorizes the Environmental Improvement Commission to regulate developments which may substantially affect the environment and they are defined as any commercial or industrial development which:

- "1. requires a license from the E.I.C. or
2. occupies a land area in excess of 20 acres or
3. which contemplates drilling for or excavating natural resources, excluding certain types of gravel pits or pits of less than five acres or
4. occupies on a single parcel a structure or structures in excess of a ground area of 60,000 square feet."

The ten member commission, composed of two members each from manufacturing interests, municipal government, the public, persons knowledgable in matters relating to air pollution, and conservation interests, shall approve a development if it meets the following criteria:

- "1. Financial capacity. The proposed development has the financial capacity and technical ability to meet state air and water pollution control standards, has made adequate provision for solid waste disposal, the control of offensive odors, and the securing and maintenance of sufficient and healthful water supplies.
2. Traffic movement. The proposed development has made adequate provision for loading, parking and traffic movement from the development area onto public roads.
3. No adverse affect on natural environment. The proposed development has made adequate provision for fitting itself

harmoniously into the existing natural environment and will not adversely affect uses, scenic character, natural resources or property values in the municipality or in adjoining municipalities

4. Soil types. The proposed development will be built on soil types suitable to the nature of the undertaking "8

The burden of proof is on the applicant. If he is dissatisfied with the Commission's decision, he can appeal to the Supreme Judicial Court, with the Court's review limited to determining whether the Commission acted 'regularly and within the scope of its authority, and whether the order is supported by substantial evidence' "9 Does the Site Selection Law accomplish its purpose? Is it actually providing a "flexible and practical means to insure that developments will be located in a manner which will have a minimal adverse impact on the natural environment of their surroundings?" "10 How many hearings such as the one on the Searsport refinery can the State afford? Should we consider legislation similar to that passed in Delaware which flatly prohibits the location of heavy industry on the coast?

Since May, 1970, when the Site Selection Law went into effect one major loophole has surfaced. To avoid obtaining the approval of the E.I.C., a developer may string out a series of 19-acre developments, or he may develop two small parcels on either side of the road. The 105th Legislature refrained from strengthening the law, although several proposals were submitted. One bill would consider two or more separate parcels of land a single parcel if they comprised more than 20 acres and were separated by less than 1,000 feet. It further required a "certificate of Operations or Occupancy" to be obtained, indicating that any conditions imposed upon the development had been met. The piecemeal effect of the Law has not been remedied by the Legislature. Since each application is reviewed on its own merits without the guidance of a land use plan or policy, what will be the total long-range effect on the environment?

Efforts at State Planning

As Coleman Woodbury, consultant in the preparation of the Model State and Regional Planning Law (1955), observed, "In many ways the saddest aspect of ill-considered development projects is that very often they are aimed at a real need." "11 We are belatedly learning that two essentials must be considered in fulfilling this need: "first, the probable long-range

effects, both direct and indirect of the project, and second, a perspective in time and space that broad areas analysis and planning can and should provide "12

Planning in the State of Maine takes place at three levels of government: local, regional and state. Prior to 1954 when the enactment of legislation by Congress made federal funds available for urban, regional and state planning, little comprehensive planning at any level took place. The "701 Program" prompted the creation of the Department of Development of Industry and Commerce (now the D.E.D.) with a division to prepare a plan for the state. At the same time provision was made for two or more communities with planning boards to join in the preparation of a regional plan. Since then, federal funding has increasingly encouraged regional planning. Maine has responded with the organization of eleven Regional Planning Commissions covering most of the state, a Council of Governments which include planning as in the Greater Portland area, and various "Interlocal Cooperation" agreements, which offer the following:

- "A medium for voluntary regional planning,
- A medium whereby regional planning can be initiated by State Government,
- A medium whereby the whole range of regional governmental problems may be examined,
- A medium for the transfer of local governmental function to a specialized or general regional agency."13

Coordinating the regional efforts is the State Planning Office, created in 1968, and charged with the preparation of a comprehensive plan for the state. Since then, lack of financial resources has slowed land use plannings, although, with the assistance of federal funds, the State Planning Office has undertaken the preparation of a detailed plan for the most endangered area of the State-- the coastline. The Maine Coastal Development Plan which is part of a larger program for the entire New England coastal zone, will cover a 10 mile wide strip running the length of the coast. Phase I, completed in June 1971, established general procedure, methodology, and program for carrying out the coastal plan. A planning model for testing methods of coastal inventory and classification was selected, with the Upper Penobscot Bay as the site for the pilot study. Phase II concerns program procedures and the pilot test area, with the results to be indicative of the Plan as applied to the entire coast, and funding necessary. A complex coastal inventory will take place during Phase III, expected to be completed by the end of 1971. Phase IV involves

the physical, economic and institutional analysis and recommendations for implementation of the Plan, with a target completion date of December 1973. A major purpose of the Coastal Plan is to provide resource-based information so that both the ecological and economical consequences of alternative uses may be properly evaluated. Considering the tremendous amount of time and effort involved in the preparation of such a plan, is it realistic to expect one for the entire State in the near future? If not, what are the alternatives to piecemeal development under our current laws?

After Phillip Lewis, a Wisconsin landscape architect spent a year inventorying that state he concluded, "The flat rolling farmlands and the expansive forest have their share of beauty. But it is the stream valleys, the bluffs, ridges, roaring and quiet waters, mellow wetlands, and sandy soils that combine in elongated designs, tying the land together in regional and statewide corridors of outstanding landscape qualities."¹⁴ The State of Maine can also be divided into cohesive regions by her watersheds and this feature forms the basis for a new river basin study. To accomplish the study, Regional Planning and Development Districts, which generally follow river basin boundaries, will be designated by the Governor. The primary responsibility of the districts, which will incorporate present regional planning commissions, will be to prepare a comprehensive plan for each district. Implementation aspects will be a function of various other governmental levels. Since regional planning has met the same problems as those of the local level--poor or inexperienced leadership, lack of funds and basic distrust of all forms of land usage control to which is added 'independent community parochialism'¹⁵ and since the districts are advisory only in nature, can we expect progress in land use planning and controls through this new districting? Is it possible to develop a state or regional comprehensive plan which will be implemented by the local governments?

Taxation--Indirect Control

According to William Whyte, author of The Last Landscape, "The problem is not so much the multiplicity of local governments; it is the multiplicity of local tax districts."¹⁶ Herein lies a strong indirect control of land use. Mr. Whyte continues, "Local officials want plants and shopping centers for the jobs they create, but what they want chiefly are the additional tax revenues, and if they could get assurances that their communities would get a fair share of these revenues, they might not mind very much if the plants and shopping centers were physically located somewhere else: in some cases, they might be quite happy if they were."¹⁷ He recommends a widening of the tax base to a county, special district, and regional basis

with possible revenue sharing for purely local services. Other suggestions are subsidies to local governments to provide for growth inequities, and incentives for cooperation with regional plans. In Maine, the State school subsidy program and the State revenue sharing program (distribution of funds is scheduled for July, 1973) are two examples of efforts at equalizing revenue distribution. At this time, both programs are in jeopardy due to possible repeal of the state income tax.

The people of Maine took a step towards preserving open space through taxation when they approved the Constitutional Amendment providing for the taxation of certain open space land on the basis of use value rather than market value. Property affected by a recently enacted law, PL 548- "Farm and Open Space Land Law," will not be taxed accordingly until April 1, 1972. Still, each community faces the competition for tax revenues. When it comes to a choice between a shopping center and violation of a comprehensive plan with a subsequent change in a zoning ordinance, the community will, in all probability, choose the shopping center.

The local communities are aided in their search for additional revenues by the Department of Economic Development. The D.E.D., headed by a Commissioner appointed by the Governor with the consent of the Executive Council, is concerned with raising the standard of living through development which is compatible with the environment. The absence of a comprehensive state plan and lack of economic alternatives have hampered efforts to carry out this responsibility. A recent proposal for regional industrial parks strategically located throughout the state would attempt to make the location of new industry in Maine more feasible, and at the same time have as little environmental impact as possible. Each new industry desiring to locate in Maine may not be able to afford to meet Environmental Improvement Commission standards for site location, but if situated in a park could share the cost of protecting the environment with similar industries. Maine is now seeking funding from the New England Regional Commission to establish the first regional industrial park, Life Science Park, in Pownal, on land already owned by the state. In view of the reliance of local communities on the property tax, the concept of regional industrial parks might gain greater acceptance if it were accompanied by some type of tax reform or revenue sharing.

Federal Proposals

Just as the state slowly moves to fill the vacuum left by the

local communities in land use planning and controls, the federal government is also reacting to the despoilation of major tracts of land by proposing federal controls or guidance. Two bills currently before Congress, the Administration's National Land Use Policy Act of 1971 (S 922, H.R. 4332) and one proposed by Senator Henry W. Jackson (S 632), encourage states through various incentives (grants in aid) and penalties (reduction in federal aid) to establish land use plans. The Jackson bill would give authority to a Land and Water Resource Council composed of federal officials to review and approve state land use plans. The League of Women Voters of the U.S. has submitted a statement in support of another bill (S 582) which would establish policy and program for land and water resources of the nation's coastal and estuarine zones. Planning and management would be assigned to the states with the federal government providing financial and technical aid.

Do We Have the Will?¹⁸

Many Maine citizens resent an outside authority imposing rules and regulations on the use of their land. Townspeople fear the loss of control over the future of their community. Yet they have made little effort to control it themselves, holding to the conviction that "a man's land is to do with as he pleases." The result has been the exploitation and destruction of valuable tracts of land. Since the public interest has met with little protection at the local level, the state has begun to take on this responsibility. Such state agencies as the Environmental Improvement Commission, the Land Use Regulation Commission, the Department of Economic Development and the State Planning Office now have authority to directly control, or formulate policy on, certain aspects of land use. Their efforts are hindered by lack of comprehensive planning, funding, and implementation at the local level. The dependence of the local governments on the property tax as the main source of revenue serves to aggravate attempts to control land use. In response to substantial pressure in Congress, bills are now being considered which would establish federal controls and guidance for state and local land use planning. Until each individual property owner understands and accepts the need for land use controls, will the laws and comprehensive plans at any governmental level be effectively implemented and enforced? If we accept land use controls as a means of protecting our environment, how do we demonstrate to the independent, self-contained Maine citizen that the "real enemy of liberty and private property is unrestricted and use."¹⁹

Footnotes for quotes:

1. Morning Sentinel, September 8, 1971, "Mixed Blessing."
2. Maine Sunday Telegram, January 17, 1971, "An Interview with Donald Koons," pg. 3 D.
3. Maine Law Affecting Marine Resources, Vol. III, Harriet P. Henry, Research Director, David J. Halperin, Project Director, pg 531.
4. David G. Heeter, "Toward a More Effective Land-Use Guidance System," Land-Use Controls Quarterly, Vol. 4, No. 1, Winter, 1970, pg. 11.
5. Public Law 1971, Chapter 541.
6. Maine Revised Statues, Title 12, Part 5, C. 421.
7. Maine Revised Statues, Title 38, Chapter 3, Section 483.
8. Ibid.
9. Ibid.
10. Ibid.
11. Model State and Regional Planning Law, National Municipal League New York, 1955, pg. 7.
12. Ibid.
13. Maine Law Affecting Marine Resources, Vol. III, pg. 545.
14. William Whyte, The Last Landscape, Doubleday & Co., N.Y., 1968, pg. 192.
15. Maine Law Affecting Marine Resources, Vol. III, pg. 540.
16. William Whyte, The Last Landscape, pg. 31.
17. Ibid.
18. Orlando E. Delogu and David D. Gregory, Planning and Law in Maine, "Part 2: Powers and Devices for Controlling Land Use," Maine Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Maine Bulletin 654, pg. 36.
19. Orlando E. Delogu and David D. Gregory, Planning and Law in Maine, "Part 1: Private Property and Public Regulation in Maine," Maine Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Maine, Bulletin 653, pg. 3.

THE AUGUSTA WATCH

from STATEMENT TO THE MAINE LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE
FEASIBILITY OF AN OIL REFINERY IN THE EASTPORT AREA, October 7

"We are somewhat troubled to see the Legislative Research Committee considering a question that seems more appropriately the province of an agency already created by the Legislature. The Maine League of Women Voters has provided, and will continue to provide, the strongest possible support for the Environmental Improvement Commission as the appropriate state agency to consider the impact of industrial development. The EIC was created by the Legislature and, in spite of modest funding, has amply proven its capability, most notably during the long, complex, and costly hearings at Searsport on the Maine Clean Fuels application last spring. We wonder whether the present inquiry implies that the Legislature will be considering special legislation specifically permitting or prohibiting oil development in the Eastport area. Or what other legislation might be under consideration that would make worth while the time and expense of the present hearings."

NEEDED: TAX DOLLARS!

Needless to say, my \$25.00 budget has been exhausted. The State Board felt that a request for contributions of one dollar for such a worthwhile action program would be more than acceptable to our members. The

Repealers are raising \$10,000 to undo our twelve years of labor for the income tax.

There is a battle to be won; will you help?

State Tax Chairman

Dorothy Dunton

Site Location Series, "North of the Namaskeag"

Maine ETV 7:30 PM

Nov. 4, 11, 18 and Dec. 2, 9.

Follow the problems encountered by "Atlantic Canning, Inc." and the town of "Freeboro," Maine through a TV news special, town meeting, stockholders meeting and EIC hearing. Listeners will help make the decisions at the end of each program.

.. . . .
.\$\$. TAX DOLLARS \$.

To: Emily Farley, Treasurer
112 Parsons Road
Portland, Maine 04103

This is my contribution to help save the income tax.

Signed _____

THE FIGHT GOES ON

There is a peaceful little lake where the Dunton's usually spend their weekends through the summer. This year, however, they toured Maine Fridays through Sundays hauling a little red house marked LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS. Bangor Fair was our first one. A few catastrophes there introduced us to the typical fair. Our flyers somehow ended up in the wrong booth and we did not find them until the night the fair closed. After working hours to set the posts, we had to remove our ten foot NO REPEAL banner because it was frightening the racing horses. Kay Storch and her handy husband gave us a much appreciated hand along with Frank Murray, Ted Curtis and the Senior Citizens who helped get anti-repeal material distributed.

Skowhegan was next on the agenda, and we reluctantly erected the LWV house next to a dumping area for a food concession. In spite of all that, Sheila Seymour went ahead with her well defined plans with the assistance of the AAUW, ULI, and Senior Citizens.

Acton Fair moved our tour wouthward. Ellie LeMaistre and my husband erected the booth while the Kiwanis men looked on in wonder. All was ready to roll for the Portland gala, when Hurricane Doria moved in nearly drowning Joan O'Toole and batting the devil out of that NO REPEAL banner.

After soggy Acton, we moved into Lewiston to a nice spot near the exhibition building. The fair opened with two days of steady downpour. I saw Silver Leaman there ready to go off duty one night. She was elated, glassy-eyed, and "high" with excitement of reaching the public. Two young and attractive Lewiston girls were stopped by a policeman and asked if they had a license for soliciting on the mid-way. We were all surprised but quickly explained they were just distributing flyers.

Bill and I again loaded the house and went on to the Farmington Fair. Professor Fast was waiting somewhere on the fairgrounds to direct us to the location where the booth would be set up. We had never met but after I had parked, I walked down the midway and approached a man talking to a woman. I said, "Are you Mr. Fast?" And he was. Now I understand ESP. While the booth rests at Farmington, preparations are underway for the Cumberland, Topsham, and Fryburg fairs to complete the circuit.

The booth has also been to Presque Isle where the Houlton leaguers took over--driving 150 miles in order to man the booth. The same situation existed in Blue Hill where Mount Desert Leaguers distributed flyers and cards.

LOCAL PRESIDENTS

- Bangor -
Mrs. Peter Anderson
42 Harthorn Ave.
- Brunswick -
Mrs. Barker Pierce
72 Columbia Ave.
- Houlton Area -
Provisional
Mrs. Merle Fenlason
4 Hillview Avenue
- Lewiston-Auburn Area -
Mrs. Lois Wagner
4 Arbania St. -
Auburn
- Mt. Desert Island -
Mrs. Robert O. Binneweis
Hulls Cove
- Orono -
Mrs. Raymond Kroffa
104 Forest Ave.
- Portland Area -
Ms. Esther Lacognata
195 Ray St.
- South Portland -
Mrs. Albert E. Grant
55 Ocean House Road
Cape Elizabeth

VOTER HAS NEW FACE

It all began at our last convention when we learned that our budget was just not going to stretch to include printing six full size Voters. In this issue, we are beginning an experiment to try to overcome that budgetary problem and to do so in an eye-appealing, information packed way. You will find a Facts and Issues on Land Use that can be pulled out.

There was only one problem left. Would you like it? Do you find the new format easy to read? Are there any features you would enjoy seeing in the future?

We would welcome your comments and suggestions. Send them to the

Editor
23 Ohio St.
Bangor, Me. 04401

THE MAINE VOTER

VOL. XIX Number 2

Published six times a year in July, October, November, January, March and April by the LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MAINE, 23 Ohio Street, Bangor, Maine 04401.

Second class postage paid at
Bangor, Maine 04401

Editor: Jennie Magaro

President: Nancy N. Masterton,
36 Delano Park, Cape Elizabeth,
Maine 04107

Subscription price 50¢ per year as part of membership dues. Address all communications to: 23 Ohio St., Bangor, 04401