

Plum Creek's Moosehead Region Concept Plan: A Conflict Management Case Study

Conflict is inevitable in human affairs. Though often characterized as negative, conflict has important positive aspects including its ability to bring attention to a situation, foster greater communication between stakeholders, cope with goal incompatibilities and ultimately solve problems and preserve the social system.ⁱ Many of these positive aspects of conflict are found in the ongoing debate over the future of Maine's North Woods.

This paper uses a conflict-management lens to examine one current and highly-visible dispute within the larger North Woods conflict: the question of whether to approve the Plum Creek Moosehead region concept plan. While on a surface level this is a disagreement over the rezoning of a tract of private land, in fact this dispute is highly complex, involving multiple parties & issues, cultural differences, deeply held values, and disagreements over "the facts." I specifically examine the Conservation Framework contained in the concept plan, the private negotiations that led to its development, and the reaction to it from stakeholders.

I will begin by placing this specific dispute within the context of an ongoing conflict over the future of Maine's North Woods. I will then briefly describe the history and politics surrounding the concept plan, with particular focus on its Conservation Framework. Through an examination of the stakeholders, their interests and motivations, I explore why the Conservation Framework remains unpopular with multiple parties. Finally, I close the paper by describing how a collaborative learning process might help manage the larger conflict and increase the ability of stakeholders to reach a mutually-agreeable solution in future disputes.

Context: Crafting a Future for Maine's North Woods

The Northern Forest is comprised of 26 million acres of northern boreal and mixed deciduous forest stretching from New York to Quebec. It is the largest unfragmented wilderness area in the eastern United States. Ten million acres of the North Woods are found in Maine,

where the forest has historically been owned by the forest industry and harvested for pulp and paper products.

The past two decades have seen significant land ownership changes in Maine. With the rise of globalization during the 1980's, the paper industry largely moved to the tropics. Between 1994 and 2005, forest industry ownership in Maine declined from 60% of land ownership to 15.5% while ownership by investment firms increased from 3% to approximately 33%.ⁱⁱ Changing land use has had serious economic, cultural and ecological implications for the state.

As Maine struggles to deal with its changing economy and land ownership patterns, there is a high level of public demand for land conservation in the North Woods. The Maine identity is intimately connected to this forest landscape and Mainers treasure its recreational, economic, biological, and spiritual value. There are multiple and varied visions for the form such conservation might take. Options range from continued private ownership with working-forest easements to large-scale public ownership in the form of a National Park. Between these two ends of the spectrum is the potential for greater state ownership, private conservation purchases or conservation easements that preclude forestry. There is a wide variety of stakeholders involved in the conflict and a multitude of voices advocating for various alternative paths to the future.

The economic, social and environmental implications of change in the region result in a highly complex and high-stakes situation, complicated by the different ideologies and values of the stakeholders. Some groups consider the preservation of the ecosystem to be the highest end-goal while others hope for economic development that will bring jobs and prosperity back to the area. While these goals are not necessarily mutually exclusive, the extreme positions of public interest groups often frame them as such. The result is an ongoing conflict that can be described

through specific disputes. One of the most highly visible of these disputes in recent years has been over the Plum Creek concept plan for the Moosehead region.

Plum Creek's concept plan and the Conservation Framework

In December of 2004, Plum Creek, a real estate investment trust and the nation's largest private landowner, announced plans for residential development covering 426,000 acres in the unorganized territories of Maine's Moosehead Lake region. Plum Creek then began a "concept plan," a voluntary process through the state's Land Use Regulation Commission (LURC) wherein the landowner clarifies its long-term intent for development on its property. LURC can approve or deny the concept plan, which essentially rezones land. Most people interviewed for this paper applauded Plum Creek's decision to enter into this voluntary process rather than undertake multiple small-scale developments on its property. Smaller developments would not require rezoning but would fragment wildlife habitat, create infrastructure problems, and have unknown effects on the local economy. Appendix A contains a list of people interviewed and the questions they were asked. Appendix B contains a full description of the concept planning process.

Plum Creek's initial proposal met with strong public resistance throughout the state, especially from conservation organizations who were concerned with the large level of development in the proposal and the small conservation package. Unrelated to the concept plan but at the same time as its initial release (early 2005), Plum Creek entered into negotiations with The Nature Conservancy over the acquisition of two parcels of high biological value in the Moosehead region, Moose River – No.5 Bog and the Roach Ponds. As these negotiations progressed, the possibility for a much larger conservation transaction emerged. The Forest Society of Maine and the Appalachian Mountain Club joined the negotiations and the result is

the Conservation Framework. Plum Creek included the Conservation Framework in its final concept plan, which is presently under review by LURC. Reaction to the Conservation Framework by stakeholders has been mixed.

The Conservation Framework is a combination of fee acquisitions and conservation easements covering an area of 384,000 acres. There are two key components to the Conservation Framework. The first is the “balance easement” of 90,000 acres required by the concept planning process to be contributed by Plum Creek to balance out the residential development included in the plan. The second easement included in the Conservation Framework is a 266,000 acre working forest easement which was negotiated by The Nature Conservancy (TNC), the Forest Society of Maine (FSM) and the Appalachian Mountain Club (AMC). This working forest easement will be purchased by TNC *if the concept plan is approved* by LURC. The outright acquisition of Moose River – No.5 Bog and the Roach Ponds complete the Conservation Framework. This conservation package would be among the largest conservation transactions ever undertaken in the country and would connect the Moosehead region to an existing network of conservation lands stretching from the Quebec border to Baxter State Park.ⁱⁱⁱ Maps are available in Appendix C.

The Land Use Regulation Commission will begin public hearings on Plum Creek’s concept plan on December 1, 2007 and a decision on whether to rezone the land is expected sometime in the spring of 2008. A detailed timeline of events since Plum Creek’s announcement of its intent to undergo concept planning for its Moosehead properties in 2004 can be found in Appendix D.

The Stakeholders & their Motivations

The stakeholders involved in the Plum Creek concept plan dispute are largely the same as those involved in the larger conflict over the future of Maine's North Woods. Because of the relatively small nature of the natural resource community (resource users, recreationists and conservationists), many individuals have pre-existing relationships with one another. The one exception is Plum Creek, which became a Maine landowner in 1998. A variety of news articles and publications representing the views of stakeholder groups on the concept plan are included in Appendix E.

Plum Creek is the largest and most geographically diverse private landowner in the nation, with approximately 8 million acres of timberland in major timber producing regions of the United States and 10 wood products manufacturing facilities in the Northwest. Plum Creek owns and manages more than 929,000 acres of timberland in Maine therefore the proposed concept plan covers approximately half of their Maine landholdings.^{iv} Plum Creek likely agreed to negotiate the Conservation Framework because of the highly negative public reaction to the development included in its concept plan. It is likely that the company saw conservation beyond the required balance easement as a way to leverage additional development and gain greater public support, increasing the chance of approval of the concept plan by LURC.

The Nature Conservancy (TNC) is an international, nonprofit membership-based organization dedicated to the conservation of biological diversity. The organization has been involved in the conservation of over one million acres of land in Maine. TNC and Plum Creek, both national organizations, have had minor dealings in other states. In Maine, they had previously attempted to negotiate a smaller conservation transaction in the Moosehead region which failed. Soon after the concept plan was first proposed in 2005, two parcels of high

biological value (Moose River – No.5 Bog and the Roach Ponds) were identified as desired conservation acquisitions and TNC and Plum Creek began negotiations over those parcels.

As talks progressed, TNC saw the opportunity for a much larger conservation deal to be struck. The public backlash over Plum Creek's concept plan was a strong incentive for TNC to continue to negotiate with the company as it provided them with powerful leverage, which they used to get greater conservation. TNC is not taking a position on the larger concept plan; however the organization's deep involvement in the Conservation Framework has tied them to Plum Creek's proposal and led to sharp criticism from other environmental organizations. "They have put themselves in a very tough spot," noted one interviewee.

The Forest Society of Maine (FSM) is a statewide, Maine-based, nonprofit land trust focused on the conservation of *working* forestlands. The organization presently oversees more than 600,000 acres of conserved land. During the development of its initial concept plan, Plum Creek had asked FSM to hold the balance easement required by the concept planning process. As Plum Creek's discussions with TNC over additional conservation evolved, FSM remained engaged. FSM has publicly endorsed Plum Creek's concept plan.^v FSM was built to negotiate for easements on working forestlands and their incentive to negotiate in this case was largely a question of fulfilling their mission.

The Appalachian Mountain Club (AMC) is both a landowner in the North Woods and a membership-based nonprofit. They were involved only toward the end of the negotiation process. Their primary incentive to negotiate came from their ownership of abutting property and the opportunity to expand the network of conservation lands in the North Woods, in which they have invested heavily in recent years. They have been careful to distance themselves from endorsement of the larger concept plan.

Outdoor Recreationists including the Sportsman's Alliance of Maine, the Maine Snowmobile Association, ATV Maine, the Maine Bowhunters Association, and the Maine Professional Guides Association are interested in retaining the public access presently enjoyed by recreationists on Plum Creek's lands. With a firm stance against wilderness advocates working to "implement their vision for the north woods – a road-less wilderness that can't be used by hunters, trappers, or riders of snowmobiles and ATVs," they have publicly endorsed the concept plan, including the conservation framework which will allow public access.^{vi} They were not involved in the negotiations but are pleased with the outcome. They would become involved in future negotiations if there was a threat that public access or recreation might be limited.

The Natural Resources Council of Maine (NRCM) & Maine Audubon have been vocal in their opposition to the concept plan. Neither group was involved in the negotiation. Their objections are based on the environmental impact of the development aspects of the proposal. With approximately 11,000 members and an operating budget over \$2 million, NRCM is a major conservation player in the state and has launched a large scale media campaign against the proposal.^{vii} The membership base of both of these organizations resides largely in the southern part of the state, the geographic center of the environmental community. One interesting aspect in the North Woods conflict is this regional/ideological divide within the state.

These organizations have a strong incentive to continue to oppose the concept plan despite the inclusion of the Conservation Framework. Opposition plays well with their membership and they may gain more conservation concessions from Plum Creek as the process continues. If they were to endorse the proposal now they would lose all of their bargaining power. Their incentive to negotiate on the concept plan is not likely to change. If LURC

approves the proposal, they may then have an incentive to negotiate on the details of the development.

RESTORE & the Forest Ecology Network (FEN) are also vocal opponents of the concept plan. Largely perceived as being on the far left of the conservation spectrum, these organizations advocate for large-scale public ownership in the North Woods with development limited to small-scale projects surrounding gateway communities. They were not invited to participate in the negotiations surrounding the conservation framework and are publicly critical of the outcome of the negotiations. RESTORE and FEN are fundamentally opposed to almost all development in the North Woods and do not see compromise as an option at this time. While they might enter into a negotiation, it would likely be a stalling tactic.

The Land Use Regulation Commission (LURC) is the state agency with jurisdiction over the planning and zoning of the state's townships, plantations and unorganized territories, which have no local form of government. This area spans over half of the state, encompasses more than 10.4 million acres and includes the largest contiguous undeveloped area in the Northeast. LURC's mandate is to extend the principals of planning and zoning to: preserve public health, safety, and welfare; encourage the well-planned, multiple use of natural resources; promote orderly development; and to protect natural and ecological values.

As the government agency overseeing not only this dispute, but many important aspects of the larger conflict over the future of the North Woods, LURC is in a unique position to provide leadership and develop a process that will result in a more mutually agreeable solution for all stakeholders. Everyone who was interviewed noted the important and positive role that the LURC regulatory process played in this dispute, especially by providing an opportunity for

landowners like Plum Creek to undertake large-scale land planning with such a high level of public input.

It is important however to recognize that the LURC process promotes adversarial positioning as stakeholders maneuver to sway the ultimate decision of the Commission. The LURC process is a textbook perfect example of a “black box” decision making structure described in conflict-management literature, wherein public input is solicited and agency planners and decision makers incorporate such input as they deem appropriate.^{viii} The result of “black box” processes is often widespread dissatisfaction, as stakeholders fail to understand the logic in the final decision or the tradeoffs that were made. In high stake situations, adversely affected interests then take every opportunity to stall, overturn and or judicially test the decision that was made.^{ix} An issue-focused discussion among the different groups will lead to a better articulation of their true goals (as opposed to the public posturing a black-box process encourages) and more mutually-agreeable solutions.

Why don't all the stakeholders like the Conservation Framework?

Most people interviewed for this paper noted that the Conservation Framework significantly complicates LURCs approval of the concept plan. The non-balance portion of the conservation framework is essentially a private agreement between Plum Creek, FSM, TNC & AMC, but its implementation depends on public approval through LURC of the concept plan. One interviewee noted “It has created real difficulties for the LURC Commission and the public at large in trying to evaluate how this whole thing fits together,” while another said it has “complicated the regulatory process in enormous ways, almost all of which are negative.”

Interestingly, it is this issue of the insertion of the privately negotiated conservation transaction into the LURC process rather than its substance that most interviewees objected to.

One interviewee said that if the organizations involved “wanted to negotiate a deal that had some conservation value and it wasn’t hitched to the rezoning proposal... everyone would have said go for it.” Another noted that even though TNC hasn’t endorsed the concept plan, their participation in the Conservation Framework creates public confusion over the environmental impacts of the development aspects of the proposal. It seems likely that in other contexts the private easements included in the Conservation Framework would have been heralded as a triumph by most groups in the state, but in this context there is a feeling that it is being used by Plum Creek as a tactic to gain greater development concessions.

The non-transparent and non-representational nature of the negotiations also played a role in opposition to the Conservation Framework. Groups not involved in the negotiations cannot understand the tradeoffs that were made or how decisions were reached. While multiple negotiators solicited opinions and feedback from their colleagues in other organizations and agencies throughout the process, not all interests were represented at the table. In high stakes conflicts such as this, lack of representation during a negotiation almost always leads to lack of ownership over the settlement and continued opposition.

Despite the non-inclusive nature of the negotiations, all interviewees felt that the right organizations had been at the table. Organizations on opposite ends of the dispute said that the other side “wasn’t really interested in negotiating.” Not all groups were willing to compromise and therefore their participation may have made an agreement impossible. Other barriers to greater collaboration between stakeholders included:

1. Fear on the part of advocacy organizations that negotiation would dilute their environmental mission and loose the support of their members.

2. Limited resources and organizational capacity of smaller stakeholder groups to participate at the same level as well funded and well-established organizations.
3. Power disparities between the stakeholders. As the landowner, Plum Creek is operating from a position of power which makes some groups unwilling to enter into a negotiation process.
4. Disputes over knowledge including the true economic and environmental impact of the concept plan.
5. The adversarial nature of the LURC process described previously.

As it was, those involved in the negotiations noted that the process was not easy. One person at the negotiating table characterized the dynamic as “good cop bad cop” where external pressure created by those opposing the concept plan created leverage for conservation organizations inside the negotiations to get better terms. In contrast, someone not involved in the negotiations said “Plum Creek couldn’t have done a better job at dividing and conquering the conservation community.” These characterizations reflect differing perceptions of the power dynamics between Plum Creek and the larger Maine environmental community. Organizations involved in the negotiations felt some level of empowerment by the process and have a sense of ownership over the Conservation Framework. Those not involved in the negotiations resent having the Conservation Framework, which they had no role in creating, thrust into the debate over the concept plan and may feel disempowered by this outcome.

Looking to the future: Conflict Management and Collaborative Learning

While specific disputes may be settled, the widely divergent ideologies of the stakeholders involved in the North Woods conflict make permanent resolution unlikely. Where conflict resolution is not possible, conflict management is desirable. Conflict management

focuses on concrete changes in process, tone or information sharing that will improve a problematic situation.^x Recognizing that the state will continue to face controversial decisions regarding the North Woods, it is in the interest of all of the stakeholders to explore conflict-management techniques.

Collaborative learning is one way that conflict can be managed. The present LURC process encourages stakeholders to take extreme public stances over disputes and restricts information exchange to the inherently adversarial public hearing forum. This process obscures the true goals of stakeholders. When asked what their vision for the future of the North Woods is, all of the interviewees described some form of large-scale conservation. While this may be an indication of their conservation oriented professions, there has been consistent public demand for conservation in the North Woods. This indicates that there is a shared goal present among many of the stakeholders. Shared goals and a high level of interdependence between stakeholders are two key ingredients in a successful collaborative learning process.

A form of collaborative learning that might be incorporated into the LURC process is an ongoing, transparent, and highly participatory policy dialogue. Such dialogues are different from public hearings in their tone, type of participation from stakeholders, and ownership over the outcome. The primary objective of a policy dialogue is not to resolve the dispute but rather to clarify the issues, assess to what extent controversy exists, identify specific points of disagreement, explore the strength of commitment to various positions and search for shared interests and potential points of agreement.^{xi} A side benefit may be improved relationship between participants, though this is not a primary intent. An ongoing dialogue process could be formal or informal. It would increase communication and create learning opportunities for the

stakeholders, reducing misconceptions and assumptions about the preferred outcomes of other groups. The goal is not to reach a solution but to make progress in improving the situation.

Conclusion

Whether conflict is positive or negative largely depends on how it is managed. The dispute over the Plum Creek Moosehead region concept plan has been positive in raising the visibility of the need to address changing land use in the North Woods of Maine. It has added to the larger discussion of future paths for this region. At the same time, this dispute has resulted in a highly polarized and intractable situation which can only be characterized as negative. These negative aspects of the dispute are the result of different and competing values, an adversarial decision-making process, and lack of collaboration between stakeholders.

Appendix A: Interviews

Interviews were conducted with the following people for this paper.

Alan Hutchinson

Executive Director, The Forest Society of Maine

Jim St.Pierre

Executive Director, RESTORE: The North Woods

Tim Glidden

Director, Land for Maine's Future Program, Maine State Planning Office

Tom Rumpf

Associate State Director, The Nature Conservancy

Interview Questions

1. How do you feel about the negotiations that took place? Was this an effective process? How would you improve the process?
2. How was the decision on which organizations would have a seat at the table made? In retrospect, were those the right organizations? Would you have added others?
OR
Would your organization have wanted a seat at the table? Why or why not?
3. Do you think the outcome is legitimate? Does it change how you feel about Plum Creek's proposal?
4. How does your organization plan to address this issue as it moves forward?
5. Can other differences regarding the Moosehead proposal be resolved through compromise? Is there any potential for the parties to come to a mutually-beneficial agreement? If not, why not?
6. Given continued concerns by others in the environmental community, would you consider sitting down to negotiate again? Why or why not?
7. What is your vision for the future of Maine's North Woods?

Appendix B: Concept Plan Description and Review Process^{xii}

Concept Plans and the Commission's Criteria for Approval

Concept plans are landowner-created, long-range plans for the development and conservation of a large area. These plans are a clarification of long-term landowner intent that indicate, in a general way, the areas where development is to be focused, the relative density of proposed development, and the means by which significant natural and recreational resources are to be protected. The Commission established the concept plan process as a flexible alternative to traditional subdivision and development regulation, designed to accomplish both public and private objectives. Concept plans are initiated by a landowner and must be approved by the Commission.

The Commission's Review Process for Concept Plans

The Commission anticipates the review process for a concept plan proposal of such scope and scale to take many months. The major steps of the Commission's review process are as follows:

- **Receipt of initial application.** Upon receipt of the initial application, the application materials are made available for public inspection and review.
- **Deficiency review and determination of acceptance of application for processing.** The LURC staff performs an initial application content review and identifies any application deficiencies. The applicant has a chance to submit deficient information, as necessary. The staff then determines whether the application is acceptable to begin the review process.
- **Review of application by Commission staff.** The LURC staff undertakes a detailed review and analysis of the application. This will likely include meetings with the applicant, state and federal review agencies, and others to clarify issues and request more information as needed. The application is mailed to various state and federal agencies for review and comment. The staff may also engage independent consultants to gather information on issues that staff believes to be necessary and legally relevant.
- **Public hearings scheduled.** Once the LURC staff completes gathering and analyzing information and the application is deemed complete, the Commission will begin its formal public hearing process. The public hearing process will enable the Commission to gather information and ask questions of the applicant and others who may choose to testify, and will allow the applicant and others the opportunity to address the Commission and answer questions. The public hearing process includes posting the proposal to public hearing, providing notice of public hearings in newspapers and to interested parties, deciding on petitions to intervene, holding pre-hearing conferences, and hosting one or more public hearings to gather official public testimony regarding the proposal.
- **Commission decision.** After the public hearings, the hearing record remains open for at least 10 days to allow persons to submit written comments, and for at least an additional 7 days for filing rebuttal comments. After that time, the public hearing record may be

reopened by the Commission, as necessary. Once the hearing record is closed, the Commission makes a decision on the proposal.

Public Participation

The Commission will provide opportunity for public scrutiny of the proposed concept plan during the course of its review. A formal public review and comment period will also be established as part of the Commission's review process. The Commission will host one or more hearings to gather oral and written testimony from members of the public about the proposal.

The Commission welcomes public comments on this proposal at any time until the public hearing record is closed. The deadline for comments will be established once a public hearing is scheduled. Send your written comments to the Commission's Augusta office (Maine Land Use Regulation Commission, 22 State House Station, Augusta, ME 04333-0022) or e-mail LURC@maine.gov.

If you wish to receive postal or e-mail notices about upcoming meetings, hearings and important deadlines related to the Commission's review of this proposal, contact LURC's [main office in Augusta](#) (call 207-287-2631 or e-mail LURC@maine.gov). Please provide your name, postal or e-mail address, and daytime phone number and we will add you to a list of interested parties for this project.

Appendix C: Maps

Appendix D: Timeline of Events

- **December 14, 2004:** Plum Creek Timber announces it is planning a comprehensive Resource Plan for land the company owns in the Greenville and Rockwood areas comprising 40% of the company's holdings in Maine. The company also announces it has entered into discussion with the Maine Department of Conservation regarding the potential for new conservation transactions including the Roach Pond region.^{xiii}
- **March 18, 2005:** More than a dozen prominent Maine citizens submit a request to the Land Use Regulation Commission seeking a six-month moratorium on major developments within 41 unorganized townships in the Moosehead region. The moratorium would allow LURC to prepare an updated plan for the region, as called for by its own comprehensive plan, without the pressures of dealing with major development of the region at the same time.^{xiv}
- **April 5, 2005:** LURC receives Plum Creek's application for the rezoning of 426,000 acres in the Moosehead Lake region in order to implement a concept plan. See Appendix B.
- **April 20, 2005:** LURC responds to an inquiry from Plum Creek regarding whether the company should host or attend meetings to inform interested groups about the Moosehead Lake region concept plan. Recognizing that Plum Creek representatives are free to host or attend such meetings, LURC hopes the company will refrain from doing so in order to avoid confusion between unofficial Plum Creek Information session and the formal public participation involved in the LURC review process.^{xv}
- **May 4, 2005:** LURC denies the moratorium on development request.
- **June, 2005:** RESTORE and NRCM publicly announce opposition to the Plum Creek concept plan.
- **Mid-August, 2005:** LURC hosts four scoping sessions for the public to "present their views on issues the LURC should consider in its review of the Plum Creek concept plan proposal." Over 1,000 people attend and nearly 150 people speak. Hundreds of additional written comments are received through the mail.^{xvi}
- **October 31, 2005:** The LURC releases its Summary of Issues from the August scoping sessions. Concerns are diverse, including issues such as conservation, economics, natural resources, infrastructure, and impacts on the unique character and traditional use of the area.^{xvii}
- **Late October, 2005:** Vandals express their displeasure of Plum Creek's concept plan by targeting the homes and office of Plum Creek employees. A letter urging pursuit and

prosecution of the perpetrators is signed by Governor Baldacci and a half dozen environmental and sportsman's organizations.^{xviii}

- **November 5, 2005:** A statewide public opinion survey conducted by Critical Insights shows that Mainers oppose the Plum Creek plan 2 to 1 (41% to 20%). Every grouping - party affiliation, income level, northern or southern Maine - has more people who think it is a bad idea than think it is a good idea.^{xix}
- **March 30, 2006:** The Nature Conservancy, the Forest Society of Maine, and the Appalachian Mountain Club announce agreement on a Conservation Framework to conserve and maintain public access to 400,000 acres of Plum Creek's Moosehead lands. Plum Creek is anticipated to submit this Framework as part of its concept plan for Moosehead and the terms cannot be finalized until LURC has made its final decision on the overall concept plan.^{xx}
- **April 27, 2006:** Plum Creek resubmits its concept plan to the LURC, including the Conservation Framework and other changes based on public feedback from the LURC scoping sessions.
- **May, 2006:** The Moosehead Region Futures Committee, Maine Audubon, and NRCM request that LURC require Plum Creek to remove any reference to the Conservation Framework from its concept plan application materials. LURC subsequently sends letter to Plum Creek over concerns that a) The conservation framework is a non-regulatory agreement between private parties that may or may not be implemented. b) It depends on private parties' abilities to raise funds for acquisition. c) LURC would not be able to require that Plum Creek sell nor the private entities buy d) yet the framework states that the opportunity will only be available if LURC approves the rezoning application.^{xxi}
- **Spring, 2006:** NRCM releases *A Vision for the Moosehead Lake Region*, its alternative vision for the future of the Moosehead region. A map of NRCM's alternative vision is available in Appendix C.
- **October 24, 2006:** Plum Creek, The Nature Conservancy, the Forest Society of Maine and Appalachian Mountain Club announce the definitive purchase and sale agreement of the 345,000 acres included in the Conservation Framework for \$35 million, should the LURC approve Plum Creek's concept plan. This will help create the second largest conservation easement in the United States.^{xxii} See Appendix C for maps. The land and easements in this sale will not be reviewed by LURC because they are not part of the permanent conservation needed to offset the development Plum Creek is proposing, however they will be included in the concept plan.
- **October 28 & 29, 2006:** The Bangor Daily News and the Maine Sunday Telegram publish editorials that call for the private \$35 million agreement between Plum Creek and three

conservation groups to be clearly separated from Plum Creek's proposal to develop 975 house lots and two resorts. The editorials emphasize that the Land Use Regulation Commission (LURC) should not allow the private land deal to be confused with the rezoning application.^{xxiii}

- **November 28, 2006:** LURC announces that it has found Plum Creek's rezoning application for the Moosehead Lake Region "acceptable for processing." "Acceptable for processing" means that the Commission's staff has sufficient information to understand the proposal and to begin its formal application review.^{xxiv}
- **January 17, 2007:** Plum Creek informs LURC that it is contemplating more revisions to its application for rezoning in the Moosehead Lake region. Plum Creek requests that LURC reschedule the public hearing process that LURC adopted on January 5th. LURC puts a hold on the hearing process until further notice.^{xxv}
- **April 27, 2007:** Plum Creek submits a new rezoning and development plan to the Land Use Regulation Commission for 408,000 acres of its ownership around Moosehead Lake. The new plan:
 - continues to include 975 subdivision lots
 - doubles the amount of land zoned for development to 22,000 acres, which will actually allow for thousands of subdivision lots
 - continues to propose development of two major resorts, and increases the size of both along with satellite resort zones.
 - increases the number of "resort accommodations" from 750 to 1050
 - adds the development of energy facilities as an allowable use in the easement areas on the west side of Moosehead Lake
 - rezones 33 miles of shoreline for development
 - reduces the number of subdivision lots on shorelines
 - increases the acres of working forest easement from 72,000 acres to 90,000 acres.
- **July 27, 2007:** RESTORE and Forest Ecology Network (FEN) file a Motion to Dismiss Plum Creek's concept plan for rezoning in the Moosehead region. Plum Creek's proposal calls for a contract between LURC and the landowner that requires Plum Creek to agree to any zoning change during the next 30 years. Lawyers for RESTORE and FEN file the motion to dismiss on the basis that LURC does not have authority from the legislature to undertake contract zoning.^{xxvi}
- **October 10, 2007:** LURC votes to dismiss a motion by RESTORE: The North Woods and the Forest Ecology Network to dismiss Plum Creek's concept plan rezoning proposal.^{xxvii}
- **October 26, 2007:** Plum Creek files additional changes to its concept plan.
- **November 7, 2007:** LURC schedules public hearings on December 1 and December 16, 2007 in Greenville, December 2, 2007 in Augusta and December 15, 2007 in Portland.

Appendix E: News Articles and Publications by Stakeholders

Citations

-
- ⁱ Mitchell, C.R., “Evaluating Conflict,” *Journal of Peace Research*, n.1, v.17, 1980.
- ⁱⁱ Hagan, J.M., L.C. Ireland, and A. A. Whitman, Changing Ownership in the Northern Forest and Implications for Biodiversity. Manomet Center for Conservation Sciences, 2005.
- ⁱⁱⁱ Tetreault, M., “Plum Creek Conservation Pact Would be one of the Nation’s Largest,” *Portland Press Herald*, September 9, 2007.
- ^{iv} The Nature Conservancy, Press Release: “Conservation Framework Would Permanently Protect More Than 400,000 Acres in Maine’s North Woods,” March 30, 2006.
http://www.plumcreek.com/downloads/news/PlumCreek_Moosehead_Conservation.pdf (visited November 23, 2007).
- ^v Hutchinson, A., “Understanding Plum Creek’s Plan,” *Bangor Daily News*, September 19, 2007.
- ^{vi} Smith, G.A., Letter to Sportsman’s Alliance of Maine members, Fall 2007.
- ^{vii} NRCM webiste, <http://www.nrcm.org/financials.asp> (visited November 28, 2007).
- ^{viii} Wondolleck, J.M., “Importance of Process in Resolving Environmental Disputes,” *EIA Review* 38, December 1985.
- ^{ix} See viii.
- ^x Daniels, S.E. and G.B. Walker, “Understanding Conflict Situations,” Chapter 3 in Working Through Environmental Conflict: The Collaborative Learning Approach, Praeger, 2001.
- ^{xi} Gray, B., Collaborating: Finding Common Ground for Multiparty Problems, Jossey-Bass, 1989.
- ^{xii} Land Use Regulation Commission website <http://www.maine.gov/doc/lurc/> (Visited November 26, 2007)
- ^{xiii} Plum Creek Press Release, “Plum Creek Announces Timberland Purchase and Comprehensive Resource Plan for its Lands in Maine’s Greenville and Rockwood Areas,” December 14, 2004.
- ^{xiv} RESTORE, <http://www.restore.org/maine/ChronologyPC.html> (November 23, 2007).

^{xv} Letter from Agnieszka Pinette, LURC to James Lehner, Plum Creek.

<http://www.maine.gov/doc/lurc/reference/resourceplans/moosehead/2005-04-20meetings.pdf> (visited November 23, 2007).

^{xvi} LURC, <http://www.maine.gov/doc/lurc/reference/resourceplans/moosehead.html>, (November 23, 2007).

^{xvii} LURC, *Summary of Issues related to the Plum Creek concept plan proposal for the Moosehead Lake region*,

<http://www.maine.gov/doc/lurc/reference/resourceplans/moosehead/2005-10-31scopingsummary.pdf> (visited November 23, 2007).

^{xviii} Maine Governor's Office Press Release: "Statement on Vandalism Against Plum Creek Timber Company," November 1, 2005.

<http://www.maine.gov/tools/whatsnew/index.php?topic=Gov+News&id=9731&v=Article-2006> (visited November 23, 2007).

^{xix} Churchill, Chris. "Mainers aren't sold on plans for Moosehead," *Kennebec Journal*, November 5, 2005.

^{xx} The Nature Conservancy Press Release, "Conservation Framework Would Permanently Protect More Than 400,000 Acres in Maine's North Woods," March 30, 2006.

http://www.plumcreek.com/downloads/news/PlumCreek_Moosehead_Conservation.pdf (visited November 23, 2007).

^{xxi} Letter from Catherine Carroll, LURC, to Virginia Davis, Plum Creek attorney.

<http://www.maine.gov/doc/lurc/reference/resourceplans/moosehead/2006-06-26frameworkletter.pdf> (visited November 23, 2007).

^{xxii} The Nature Conservancy Press Release "The Nature Conservancy and Plum Creek Sign Agreement to Permanently Conserve Nearly 345,000 Acres in Northern Maine," October 24, 2006.

^{xxiii} Bangor Daily News "A Place for Conservation," November 5, 2006; Maine Sunday Telegram "Moosehead Conservation Deal Marks the end of the beginning," November 5, 2006.

^{xxiv} Memorandum from LURC to Interested Parties, November 28, 2006.

<http://www.maine.gov/doc/lurc/reference/resourceplans/moosehead/2006-11-28memo.pdf> (visited November 23, 2007).

^{xxv} Memorandum from LUR to Interested Parties, January 18, 2007.

<http://www.maine.gov/doc/lurc/reference/resourceplans/moosehead/2007-01-18memo.pdf> (visited November 23, 2007).

^{xxvi} Forest Ecology Network, RESTORE, *Motion to Dismiss*, July 27, 2007.

http://www.restore.org/maine/motion_to_dismiss.pdf (visited November 23, 2007).

^{xxvii} LURC Meeting Record, October 10, 2007.

<http://www.maine.gov/tools/whatsnew/attach.php?id=27022&an=2> (visited November 23, 2007).