



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, CONSERVATION & FORESTRY
LAND USE PLANNING COMMISSION
22 STATE HOUSE STATION
AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333-0022

AMANDA E. BEAL
COMMISSIONER

STACIE R. BEYER
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

Memorandum

To: LUPC Commissioners
CC: Stacie R. Beyer, LUPC Executive Director
From: Tim Carr, Senior Planner
Eric Sanderson, Senior Planner
Date: December 6, 2024
Re: Update for the Five-Year Report on the 2019 Adjacency and Subdivision Rulemaking

Introduction and Background

In 2019, the Commission adopted a significant rulemaking package referred to as the Adjacency and Subdivision Rulemaking. As part of the adoption, the Commission committed to periodic review of the implementation and effects of the rules. In 2020, Commission staff, in conjunction with stakeholders, developed the Adjacency & Subdivision Implementation Tasks: Reporting System Workplan (2021 Workplan). The Commission approved the work plan in January 2021. Following the [2021 Workplan](#), a report reviewing relevant zoning petitions; permitting of residential subdivisions, resource-based commercial uses, and major home-based businesses; and permitting involving hillside development and wildlife passage standards has been produced annually covering the years 2020 - 2023. Known as the Annual Adjacency and Subdivision Rulemaking Report, the [report for 2023](#) was presented at the February 2024 Commission meeting. The 2021 Workplan also included a commitment to review the implementation and effects of the rulemaking in 2024, five years after rule adoption.

This agenda item is an update regarding the staff's progress on the five-year report. It focuses on outreach completed over the summer and fall of 2024. The primary purpose of the outreach was to learn more about development patterns occurring in municipalities – and about subdivision permitting trends in particular. Staff also asked local officials about other topics related to the report including: services provided to the UT (and any concerns about cost), housing, and general economic trends.

Outreach Summary

Meetings Attended

To hear from Rural Hub officials, residents, and service providers, LUPC staff attended six Forums for Local Government hosted by the Maine Municipal Association (MMA) in October and November of 2024. These forums were an opportunity to learn about and discuss issues pertaining to communities near the Commission's service area. These meetings were held in Franklin County (Farmington), Aroostook County (Presque Isle), Hancock County (Ellsworth), Penobscot County (East Millinocket), Somerset County (Madison), and Washington County (Machias).

Staff also attended several meetings with individual municipalities in the LUPC Eastern Region to help evaluate the feasibility of a regional planning effort. These meetings were held in East Millinocket, Island Falls, Millinocket, Medway, and Patten. While the meetings were set up for a different purpose, staff took the opportunity to ask questions about development in each municipality in addition to other topics pertinent to both regional planning and the five-year report.

Municipal Survey

In the Fall of 2024, staff developed a short survey for distribution to officials, staff, and community members in Rural Hubs inquiring about municipal development patterns and the impact of development in the UT. The survey questions are attached (See Attachment A). On October 25, 2024, the survey was sent through the Maine Municipal Association (MMA) to the following Rural Hubs:

Ashland, Bethel, Bingham, Calais, Caribou, Carrabassett Valley, Dover-Foxcroft, Ellsworth, Farmington, Fort Kent, Gouldsboro, Greenville, Guilford, Houlton, Island Falls, Jackman, Jonesport, Kingfield, Lincoln, Lubec, Machias, Madawaska, Medway, Milbridge, Millinocket, Milo, Oakfield, Old Town, Patten, Presque Isle, Princeton, Rangely, Rumford, Saint Agatha, Unity, Van Buren, and Waterford.

Preliminary Results of Outreach

Through the MMA forums, the Eastern Region trip, and the survey, staff have heard from 36 communities on a range of issues. These communities include 14 of the 39 Rural Hubs. The MMA forums and meetings with Eastern Region municipalities have included selectmen/assessors, town managers and other town staff, municipal police and fire, county commissioners, county sheriffs, state police, representatives from regional planning agencies, and state legislators. Meetings have involved over 130 people, and seven people have responded to the survey to date.

Because the outreach has involved some meetings covering many topics of general regional concern (of which land use is one), the preliminary results include information that is relevant to the Commission but not directly applicable to the five-year report. In addition to these items, there were other topics covered at these meetings, such as concerns about rural policing and funding jails, that have been left out of this update. A high-level list of results is provided below, split into those relevant to the five-year report, and those more generally relevant to the Commission's work and which may be of interest to Commissioners because they represent themes staff heard across multiple meetings.

Relevant to the Five-Year Report

General Development Patterns

1. Residential development has occurred but has been focused primarily on renovations and rehabilitation; very few new dwellings have been built in the past five years.
2. Commercial development has been very limited, however:
 - Recreational trail development is increasingly important.
 - Mixed-use residential and commercial development is planned or underway at former mill sites.
3. The lack of land for sale has hindered residential and commercial development in towns and the UT.
4. Towns are not seeing businesses being located on their borders in the UT.

Subdivision Development and Design

1. Subdivision permit activity in the municipalities staff heard from has been low over the past five years or more. Most have seen no new subdivisions and no subdivision amendments adding a significant number of lots, even looking beyond the past five years. A few municipalities have seen one or two significant subdivisions over the past five years or more.
2. Subdivision development may be limited for reasons that include:
 - Availability of land - some towns indicated that there may not be land available for the development of residential subdivisions;
 - Buyers may not be looking for a lot in a typical subdivision (less desirable); and
 - Cost – subdivision development has become increasingly expensive, compared to incremental housing development, due to:
 - the cost of creating infrastructure like roads, and
 - the cost of creating a design that is appealing but meets regulatory requirements.
3. Subdivision design and emergency services – Fire and EMS service providers requested that subdivisions have:
 - Dry hydrants or cisterns,
 - Roads with adequate area for emergency vehicles to maneuver and turn around, and
 - Knox Box-style systems on gates to allow easier emergency access.

Services

Overall

1. Costs are increasing dramatically for all services; with a few exceptions, reimbursements are generally not keeping pace.
2. Staffing/Volunteering is a significant issue.

3. Mutual aid agreements have benefits but also significant costs; sharing services can be complex with disagreements among towns and with counties on cost sharing and other aspects.
4. UT may be seen as “neutral territory” which could play a role in setting up regional services.

Fire/EMS

1. Backcountry emergency response costs are increasing with the growth in use of recreational trail systems for mountain biking, ATVs, snowmobiling, and hiking. Recreational infrastructure is frequently located in the UT.

Solid Waste

1. Facilities often serve surrounding UT; a general concern is that as more people move to the UT, costs will further increase and reimbursement will not keep pace.
2. Construction waste from residential renovations has increased significantly over the last 5 years; there was a spike in projects and waste during the COVID-19 Pandemic.
3. Variability in costs and solid waste disposal funding mechanisms across the Rural Hubs:
 - County reimbursement
 - TIFs
4. Some communities are working together on solid waste disposal, such as the Municipal Review Committee communities and the Hampden disposal facility.
5. There is general concern about running out of landfill space.

Road Maintenance

1. Towns are struggling to keep up.
 - Maintaining roads to desirable tourist destinations such as KWW is a burden and towns are not yet seeing economic benefits from tourism to offset costs.
 - Damage to roads from logging and other heavy trucks is significant.

Housing

1. Access to housing has become a critical issue in many places for a variety of reasons:
 - Existing housing stock is limited and aging in many towns.
 - Land availability is limited for development.
 - Increased demand from in-migration is leading to increased values/prices.
2. Housing in the UT:
 - Should be used to supplement the housing supply in towns and include a mix of housing types (affordable, workforce, second homes, primary homes, etc.).

- Shouldn't turn over the apple cart by allowing housing in places that are too remote, or in a sprawling pattern along roads.
3. Workforce housing:
- Seems to be a problem in places where second home ownership and in-migration as the result of the Covid-19 pandemic created a supply shortage.
 - Should be planned in certain places where seasonal workforce is needed for recreation or other businesses.

Relevant to LUPC but not the Five-Year Report

Concerns that staff heard that are relevant to the LUPC but not the five-year report include:

1. Rural police coverage (reduced rural patrol coverage by the State Police).
2. Road maintenance-related issues – replacing culverts and repairing roads following bad storms is expensive, and the reimbursement process is complex. Sometimes LUPC plays a role when reimbursement requires that counties submit copies of permits.
3. Difficulty in hiring municipal or county staff (especially code enforcement officers). Some counties (e.g., Somerset, Aroostook, and Franklin) are exploring regional CEO programs, where a Regional Planning Organization would host an employee who could work for multiple small towns having difficulty retaining their own CEO.
4. Some towns need more year-round residents in the area to sustain essential services like schools or medical facilities.
5. Recreation is a major draw and important to the tourism industry; examples: motorized and non-motorized trails, hunting, fishing, snow-sports, water activities, etc.
6. Increased storm intensity in recent years has damaged trail systems and rebuilding has been increasingly costly for local organizations.
7. Many places are incorporating recreation and tourism into their comprehensive planning efforts but also are trying to diversify where possible, and to encourage other historically important sectors (e.g., forest products, agriculture, or small-scale manufacturing).

Staff will continue to collect survey results, respond to requests, and have discussions with local officials as opportunities present themselves.

Next Steps

Staff will continue to work on the five-year report, with the goal of presenting the final report to the Commission in the spring of 2025. This winter, the focus will shift from outreach to data analysis and report writing. This work will include:

- Comparing general development trends within the LUPC's service area before and after the 2019 rule change;
- Case studies to illustrate:

- the relationship between development in primary and secondary areas and provision of services
- the application of subdivision design standards
- the application of wildlife passage standards
- changes to primary and secondary locations since the rule change
- outcomes of any zoning and permitting approvals or disapprovals that have caused concerns, such as any adverse impacts on natural or recreational resources; and
- Analyzing the effectiveness of the hillside standards (Chapter 10, Section 10.25,E,2) based on data collected during the summer of 2024.

Attachments:

Attachment A: Survey Questions Sent to Rural Hub Municipalities

Attachment B: 2021 Workplan

Attachment A

Survey Questions Sent to Rural Hub Municipalities

5 Year Location of Development Report - Municipal Rural Hub Survey

The Land Use Planning Commission (LUPC or the Commission) needs your help!

In 2019, the Commission approved new rules affecting where new zones could be designated for residential subdivisions and businesses. Five years later, the Commission is studying the effect of this important rulemaking and comparing development activity in the unorganized territories with nearby rural towns. In particular, we want to know about your experience permitting residential subdivisions over the last five years.

Please consider filling out the survey below, or contact Eric Sanderson at Eric.Sanderson@maine.gov or (207) 441-4020 if you have any questions or want to discuss this topic. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes to complete.

* Required

1. Please share the name of your community: *

2. Since 2019, has there been new development in your community?

- Yes
- No
- Not Sure
- Other

3. If there has been development since 2019, what type? Please check all that apply.

- Residential - Single and/or Two Family
- Residential - Multifamily
- Commercial (retail, restaurant, office, etc.)
- Mixed Use (both residential & commercial in one building)
- Industrial/Light Industrial
- Recreational Lodging
- N/A - There hasn't been any development
- Not Sure
- Other

4. Have you seen an increase in second home ownership in your community since 2019?

- Yes
- No
- Not Sure
- Other

5. If you answered "yes" above that you've seen an increase in second home ownership since 2019, please describe the changes observed.

6. How has housing affordability changed in your area?

- It has gotten more affordable
- It has gotten less affordable
- Relatively no change
- Not Sure

7. If you answered that affordability in your community has changed (either becoming more affordable or less affordable), please describe the changes observed.

8. To the best of your knowledge, how many new subdivisions (or amendments to existing subdivisions that add new lots) have been approved in your community in the last 5 years?

- 0
- 1-5
- 6-9
- 10+
- Not Sure
- Other

9. Does your community have requirements pertaining to open space for subdivisions, wildlife passage around development, or new development on hillsides?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure
- Other

10. If you answered "Yes" that your municipality has requirements for subdivision open space, wildlife passage around development, or new development on hillsides, please describe the regulations that are in place.

11. What factors do you believe are influencing the level of development in your community since 2019?

12. Has your community had increased demand for services (Fire, EMS, solid waste, etc.) for the unorganized territories nearby?

- Yes
- No
- Not Sure
- Other


13. If you answered "yes" to the above that your community has seen an increase in demand for service by unincorporated territories nearby, please describe the changes observed.

14. Is there any additional information that would be important for the Commission to know about changes in population, development, housing affordability, or demand for service in adjacent unorganized territories in your community since 2019?

15. Would you like to be contacted by the Commission to discuss development patterns in your community further? If so, please leave your name and contact information below:

Further questions or inquiries on the survey can be directed to Eric Sanderson - Eric.Sanderson@maine.gov or (207) 441-4020

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Microsoft. The data you submit will be sent to the form owner.

 Microsoft Forms

Attachment B

2021 Work Plan

**Adjacency & Subdivision Implementation Tasks:
REPORTING SYSTEM WORKPLAN
(January 13, 2021)**

INTRODUCTION

The following describes the LUPC staff proposed workplan to summarize and assess outcomes of what was referred to as the 2019 Adjacency & Subdivision rulemaking. That rulemaking:

- made changes to the ‘adjacency principle;’
- improved subdivision standards; and
- added other standards regarding an impact-based approach for residential and non-residential development, home- and farm-based businesses, scenic byways, and hillside development.

Due to a number of factors, not all outcomes or aspects of performance can be measured or assessed quantitatively. In some instances, the workplan describes other information or assessments that may be informative substitutes.

Workload

This workplan includes an assessment of the workload anticipated to achieve each research and assessment task. While the Commission previously committed to certain tasks, and the additional tasks are valuable and appropriate, it will require the devotion of time and resources. Specifically, anticipated workloads are indicated as one of three levels:

Workload	Description
+	<u>Negligible effect on LUPC workload:</u> information is already collected by the LUPC; summaries are easily achievable;
+ +	<u>Some increase to LUPC workload:</u> data collection or analysis will require a moderate amount of backfilling, summary, or linking of data; or additional staff time will be required on a regular basis;
+ + +	<u>Significant increase to LUPC workload:</u> significant staff time or agency resources will be necessary to complete the task.

Experience implementing the rules and carrying out this workplan will further inform the Commission’s perspective, provide perspective on the workload, and may suggest whether refinements are appropriate.

CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS TO COLLECTING OR INTERPRETING DATA

This workplan and the related assessments are and will be influenced or otherwise limited by a number of factors. In order to provide context and to inform expectations, the following items describe several factors.

1. A number of changes included in the 2019 rulemaking do not warrant specific data collection or assessment. Examples include but are not limited to: basic change in terminology (e.g., home-based business, common open space); new defined terminology; format of citations and basic restructuring of the rule. These elements will be monitored for issues consistent with the agency's normal administrative responsibilities and efforts.
2. Assessment of some portions of the rule are not feasible, often due to the absence of data. Examples include but are not limited to:
 - a. Assessing the success or failure of some standards based on a ratio of approvals versus denials is constrained because it is not always possible to know the number of people who did not apply due to their knowledge of the applicable standards; and
 - b. Effects on the rate of parcelization¹ and exempt lot creation is limited due to the lack of any data² and limits to agency authority.

Whenever possible, other data will be considered provided that the data is viewed as a valuable substitute or proxy (in-part or in-whole).

3. To varying degrees, outcomes from current or prior rules may be influenced by outside factors, such as direct or indirect markets, landowner goals, and other regulatory programs. These factors are not within the Commission's purview and often change or fluctuate over time. Ultimately, assessment of any and all data should consider applicable factors to the extent possible.
4. Comparisons to historical permitting trends can become less informative as the Commission's rules evolve regularly. Further, in some instances, comparing recent outcomes to past trends may not offer valuable perspective due to the number of variables.
5. Impacts and benefits from development often occur at a slower rate than anticipated.
6. Development review and the approval process may occur in stages – zoning approval, subdivision approval, and development approval.
7. Construction activity and completion of any one site may take months, while full buildout may not occur for several years.
8. Habitation and regular use will likely be sporadic and indistinct.
9. Affects to local or regional resources, or the strain on community services, could be subtle or abrupt, but attributing impacts to a single cause or source likely will be difficult.

¹ The LUPC has limited access to parcel data in municipalities or plantations within its service area, who are not required by law to share parcel data with the LUPC.

² When a property owner uses a subdivision exemption(s) to create a lot division(s), there is no requirement to report the action to LUPC. While such divisions are recorded in the registry of deeds, currently the LUPC does not have the capacity to research, either periodically or on an ongoing basis, when and how exempt lots are created. (See Chapter 10, Section 10.25,Q,1,g for the list of exemptions.)

PURPOSE

To monitor, assess, and report on the outcomes of the 2019 rule revisions concerning adjacency and subdivision.

GOAL 1: Periodically assess the effectiveness and outcomes of the rulemaking³.

Strategies:

- a. Review rule revisions at predetermined intervals [see letter (i), below] with attention to emerging patterns of development and any potential long-term implications.

Predetermined review intervals/research and assessment tasks:

Workload

Task

- | | | |
|-------|-------|---|
| + + | (i) | Conduct a review of the effectiveness of the revised application of the adjacency principle: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Five years after adoption (<i>i.e.</i>, 2024).- Following the approval of five petitions for rezoning to create new, or expand existing, development subdistricts in any single county. Group by resource-based and non-resource-based development [excluding certain resource dependent zones (D-PD, D-PR, and D-RF), deorganizations, and FEMA map revisions].- Conduct a review of the effectiveness and effects following the approval of 100 residential lots created through subdivision (excluding lots created in a concept plan). |
| + + + | (ii) | Survey rural hub towns potentially impacted by new development activity (e.g. located near, or serving, new development), and other municipalities as needed, to identify any long-term implications of the revised rules. |
| + + + | (iii) | Identify and describe the status or buildout of residential subdivisions or commercial development in subdistricts established after the effective date of the revised rules. |
| + + | (iv) | Summarize permitting and rezoning data in five-year increments, or in other date ranges if applicable and as needed. |
| + + + | (v) | Assess whether the hillside development standards effectively minimize views of development from scenic resources. |

³ “The Commission is committed to monitoring the effects of this policy change. In addition to collecting data about rezoning and permit approvals as part of the normal course of work, the Commission will initiate a review of the effectiveness of the application of the adjacency policy: five years after the adoption of the rules; upon the approval of five petitions for rezoning to create new, or expand existing, development subdistricts in any single county; or upon the approval of 100 residential subdivision lots outside of concept plans, whichever comes first.” June 17,2019 Chapter 10 basis statement, page 25.

- b. Annually track and report relevant development activity, with focus on identifying specific locations that may experience rezoning or permitting activity, flagging any issues that may emerge, and capturing lessons learned along the way.

Annual research and assessment:

<u>Workload</u>	<u>Task</u>
++	(i) Regardless of whether the rate and location of development triggers a formal review, as described above in strategy a,(i), staff will summarize outcomes to the Commission, and will likely include a summary in the annual performance report to the Legislative Committee on Agriculture, Conservation and Forestry.
++	(ii) Maintain a general summary of other outreach conducted by staff.
++	(iii) Work to measure or otherwise describe the number of potential projects that do not result in a permit application or zoning petition. Including:
++	- On a quarterly basis, check in with staff for anecdotal information regarding pre-application meetings / discussions that likely will not result in an application or petition; and
+	- Monitor use of the Commission’s mapping and informational resources.
+++	(iv) Analyze travel distances for emergency services from point of origin to new development zones. If applicable and practicable, also analyze distances by road and in a straight line from new development subdistricts to: the boundary of the nearest rural hub; and the center of the nearest rural hub.
++	(v) Reach out to potentially impacted rural hubs or municipalities during active permitting or rezoning processes to solicit comments, and then summarize feedback in annual reports.
++	(vi) Analyze implementation of the new wildlife corridor requirements, for residential subdivision designs and certain commercial development, to determine if wildlife corridors are being incorporated into designs as intended.
+	(vii) Share reports with stakeholders and the public.
+++	(viii) As appropriate or needed, the staff will check in with stakeholders.

ADDITIONAL GOALS, STRATEGIES, and TASKS

GOAL 2: Guide development subdistricts to appropriate locations, siting most development where there is existing development and where services can be provided efficiently.

Strategies:

- a. Replace the one-mile rule of thumb with a more refined and predictable system to locate non-resource-based commercial and non-recreation-based residential subdivision development closest to services.

Annual Research and Assessment:

<u>Workload</u>	<u>Task</u>
+	(i) List all petitions processed for new or expanded (non-resource dependent) development zones. List to indicate:
+	- permit number, acres, Minor Civil Division (MCD), county, subdistrict, purpose, locational criterion (primary, secondary), lake management classification, disposition; and
++	- existing and resulting lake shoreline and area density calculations, and distance to the nearest rural hub;
+	(ii) Summarize approved petitions by subdistrict, county, and locational criterion;
+++	(iii) Assess the likelihood that the outcomes for approved and disapproved zoning petitions would have been any different according to prior rules and policies. Describe any likely different outcomes; and
++	(iv) If applicable, describe outcomes of any approvals or disapprovals that have sparked reason for concern.

- b. Allow subdistricts for resource dependent commercial uses to be located away from services, provided they do not undermine the quality of the surrounding natural or recreational resources, and do not create a burden for service providers.

Annual Research and Assessment:

<u>Workload</u>	<u>Task</u>
+	(i) List of all petitions processed for new or expanded resource dependent development zones. List to indicate: permit number, acres, MCD, county, subdistrict, purpose, locational criterion (resource or feature development is located near), and disposition;
+	(ii) Summarize approved petitions by subdistrict, county, and locational criterion;

Adjacency & Subdivision Implementation Tasks:
 REPORTING SYSTEM WORKPLAN

- + + (iii) Assess the likelihood that the outcomes for approved and disapproved zoning petitions would have been any different according to prior rules and policies. Describe any likely different outcomes;
 - + + (iv) Identify and describe any adverse impacts on natural or recreational resources that have been identified;
- c. Allow subdistricts for recreation-based subdivisions near certain management class lakes that are already developed, and near permanent trails serving motorized vehicles, nonmotorized vehicles, or equestrian users.

Annual Research and Assessment:

<u>Workload</u>	<u>Task</u>
+	(i) List all petitions processed for new or expanded D-RS subdistricts for recreation-based subdivisions. List to indicate:
+	- permit number, acres, MCD, county, subdistrict, purpose, applicable resource (lake or trail), lake management classification, disposition; and
+ +	- existing and resulting lake shoreline and area density calculations, distance to the nearest rural hub, and distance from a public road.
+	(ii) Summarize approved petitions by subdistrict, county, and locational criterion;
+ +	(iii) Assess the likelihood that the outcomes for approved and denied zoning petitions would have been any different according to prior rules and policies. Describe any likely different outcomes;
+ +	(iv) If applicable, describe outcomes of any approvals or denials that have sparked reason for concern.

GOAL 3: Revise land use standards to improve flexibility and suitability for residential subdivisions proposed in the Commission’s rural service area.

Strategies:

- a. Encourage more lot creation through subdivision, rather than through exempt lot creation, by updating and broadening options for subdivision designs.

Annual Research and Assessment:

<u>Workload</u>	<u>Task</u>
+	(i) List all subdivisions processed. List to indicate: permit number, acres, MCD, county, subdistrict, net change in lots, purpose (for lease or sale), subdivision layout, and disposition;

- + (ii) Summarize approved subdivisions, by county and locational criterion, and by layout and density;
- + (iii) Comparison to historic data (20-year annual average of the net change in lots approved through subdivision); and
- + + (iv) If applicable, describe outcomes of any approvals or disapprovals that have sparked reason for concern.

GOAL 4: Increase flexibility for resource-based development in locations that do not undermine the quality of the surrounding natural or recreational resources or create a burden on the service providers in the region while simultaneously limiting the potential for similar development in locations near sensitive resources.

Strategies:

- a. Establish detailed and customized standards for new and existing allowed uses that accomplish or otherwise improve existing protections of natural and cultural resources. (For example, standards that protect views from development on hillsides, provide for wildlife passage and road associations, and require deeded access by road, etc.)

Annual Research and Assessment:

Workload

Task

- + (i) Summarize the number of applications (BPs, DPs, or SPs) where Section 10.25,E,2 (Hillside standards) applied; and
- + + (ii) Summarize the amount and type of hillside development that occurred near scenic byways.

- b. Allow new, and continue to allow existing, resource-based commercial uses to be located away from services, provided they do not undermine the quality of the surrounding natural or recreational resources, and do not create a burden for service providers.

Annual Research and Assessment:

Workload

Task

- (i) List all applications for resource-based uses processed. List to indicate:
 - + - permit number, MCD, county, subdistrict, use, resource dependency, general characterization of the type of activity (new site/use, expanded site/use, other), disposition; and
 - + + - distance to the nearest rural hub.
- + (ii) Summarize the number and type of permits by Use Listing: (i.e., natural resource processing, natural resource extraction, recreation

Adjacency & Subdivision Implementation Tasks:
REPORTING SYSTEM WORKPLAN

supply, recreation day use, home-based businesses, agricultural processing, agritourism). For each use listing, identify each business type (e.g., peat extraction; canoe rental)

- + (iii) Summarize approved permits, by use, county and resource;
- + + (iv) Assess the likelihood that the outcomes for approved and disapproved zoning petitions would have been any different according to prior rules and policies. Describe any likely different outcomes.
- + + (v) If applicable, describe outcomes of any approvals or disapprovals that have sparked reason for concern.