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Introduction

PURPOSE
This Comprehensive Plan updates Greenville's 1999 Comprehensive Plan. It is designed to reflect the desires of citizens today, with consideration for current conditions, and future trends and needs. It charts a course for the next decade based on extensive data collection, research and analysis, predictions for the future, and most importantly, public input.

The Comprehensive Plan contains a vision for Greenville through the year 2024, goals, and policies, and makes recommendations for how they should be implemented. Once the Plan is adopted, the Town implements the recommendations with ongoing input from citizens. Since the Plan is advisory, actual changes, such as municipal expenditures or regulatory modifications, must be voted on by the citizens at future town meetings.

THE PUBLIC PROCESS
The Greenville Board of Selectmen appointed the Comprehensive Plan Committee in early 2011. The Committee met several times per month over a period of about two years to direct the development of the Plan. In addition to Committee involvement, many town officials, agency heads and others were consulted for their input and perspectives. A town-wide public opinion survey that included both full-time and part-time residents and businesses was conducted early in the process.
There were also Town Report articles, newspaper articles, WEB page notices and postings, public meetings and a final public hearing and vote in 2013. Copies of the Plan were made available to the public both electronically and hard copy.

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN
The Town Manager and the Planning Board should be responsible for monitoring implementation of the recommendations of this Plan. An update on the Plan’s implementation could be included in annual town reports. At a minimum, a complete evaluation should be conducted at least every five years. If the evaluation concludes that portions of the current plan are not effective or no longer relevant, changes may be made to the Plan.

The Comprehensive Plan is...
- A vision, or blueprint, for the future - for the next 10 years
- The townspeople taking charge of their future.
- A way to control town costs and increases in property taxes.
- A way to access outside sources of funding, such as for the industrial park, Village District infrastructure, and recreation facilities.
- A practical guide to managing growth and directing public policy.
- A legal foundation for local regulations.
**Introduction**

**THIS DOCUMENT**

**Part I. Recommendations: the Vision; Goals, Policies and Strategies**

The recommendations provide future direction for the Town for the next decade. The vision describes the community’s desired character through the year 2024. The goals, policies and strategies are designed to advance the vision. The goals express intent, the policies are directives, and the strategies are specific actions designed to implement the policies. The strategies are prioritized with respect to timeframe, and the entities responsible for implementation are identified. The recommendations also include a Future Land Use Plan (Chapter I-11) and a Capital investment Plan (Chapter I-12).

**Part II. Inventory and Analysis**

Part II contains the background information that provides the data and analysis to support Part I. Topics include population characteristics, housing, local economy, community facilities and services, transportation, recreation, municipal finance, natural resources, historic and cultural resources, agriculture and forestry, and land use.

**Appendix (Maps and Public Opinion Survey Results)**

*Appendix A* includes the results of the Public Opinion Survey.

*Appendix B* includes a number of maps (listed below) that are referenced in the text of the Plan.

- Map 1 Location within Piscataquis County
- Map 2 Aerial
- Map 3 Dover-Foxcroft Labor Market Area
- Map 4 Community Facilities/Recreation
- Map 5 Community Facilities Inset
- Map 6 Recreation Inset
- Map 7 Transportation
- Map 8 Transportation Inset
- Map 9 Water Resources
- Map 10 Critical Habitat
- Map 11 Known Archaeological Sites and Areas Sensitive for Prehistoric Archaeology
- Map 12 Forest and Farmland
- Map 13 Existing Land Use
- Map 14 Development Constraints
- Map 15 Soil Potential for Low Density Development
- Map 16 Zoning
- Map 17 Future Land Use
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Part I. Recommendations: The Vision, Goals, Policies and Strategies

**Explanatory Note:** The zoning districts in Greenville’s Land Use Ordinance are referenced throughout this document. These districts are displayed on the urban area Zoning Map below and on Map 16 (entire town) in Appendix B. Below, the Village District is bright yellow, the Residential District is green, the Commercial/Industrial District is brown, the Rural Development District is pink, the Scenic Corridor Overlay District is bright blue, the Rural District is white, and the other areas are either wetlands (red) or shoreland zones (shaded).
Chapter I-1 Vision for Greenville through the Year 2024

**A Prosperous Community of Civically Engaged People**

Greenville will be a prosperous community of independent, resourceful and resilient people of all ages. Positive changes will have occurred as a result of a caring community of actively involved citizens and neighbors. It will be a welcoming, safe, and great place to live, raise a family, work, play, retire and operate a business. There will be more people than in the past due to a vibrant economy and realization that Greenville is a great place to be. But even with more people, homes, businesses and traffic, Greenville will retain its authentic north woods character and exceptional quality of life based on pride, shared connection, and love for this special place as the gateway to the Moosehead Lake Region.

**A Region with Renowned Natural Resources and a Rich Cultural Heritage**

The Moosehead Lake Region’s natural and cultural resources will continue to be two of its greatest assets: Moosehead Lake and a natural landscape with rolling hills and majestic mountains; expansive forests; a variety of pristine waterbodies; outstanding scenery; abundant wildlife and fisheries, including the region’s iconic moose; and a rich Native American and north woods heritage. These assets will provide an exceptional quality of life away from the hustle and bustle of more populated areas and support a thriving natural resource based economy in activities such as outdoor recreation, nature-based tourism and forest products. The region’s extensive conserved land assures that much of the region will remain as it is into perpetuity, which provides certainty for those living and investing in the area.

**Prosperity through Collaboration and Public/Private Partnerships**

The Town of Greenville will be a leader in collaborating with its many public and private partners to achieve prosperity in the region. This leadership will be crucial because the town’s future will be intertwined with that of the region, given the area’s distance and relative isolation from more populated areas. Successful branding and marketing of Greenville and the region and more efficient delivery of necessary services will be two significant accomplishments through this collaboration.

**Long-term Economic Stability through Diversification**

Greenville will have a robust, diversified and sustainable economy that is based upon its human, natural resource and man-made assets - an economy that balances the community’s distinctive character with economic growth opportunities in the region. This strong, diverse and sustainable economy will assure long-term prosperity and resilience in an often uncertain future.

As a thriving service center and gateway for the region, Greenville will be providing a broad-range of goods, services, jobs and housing for local people, seasonal and part-time residents, and tourists. The region’s four-season nature-based recreation and tourism offerings will be exceptional with a variety of restaurants, accommodations, guides, outfitters, marinas, and other businesses combined with trail systems, public parks, wharfs, other public facilities, and popular events and activities, such as the...
international seaplane fly-in and sled dog races. There will also be indoor offerings, such as museums, nature and cultural centers, and maybe a theater, a convention center, and an indoor-sports and fitness center. Greenville’s diverse economy will also include forest products and other industries, many located in the industrial park area, manufacturing goods for local use as well as export. Perhaps there will be a facility producing cheaper, renewable energy for the community. Access to state-of-the-art communications, such as high-speed internet, will support telecommuting and other economic opportunities for area businesses and entrepreneurs.

Economic development will consist of new, expanded and revitalized businesses and industries, in a number of locations, but particularly in the Village District, Scenic Corridor Overlay District, and Commercial/Industrial District. Economic activity in Greenville will also be enhanced by growth outside the town, such as a revitalized, 4-season resort at Big Moose Mountain and development associated with Plum Creek’s Moosehead Lake Concept Plan. Greenville’s diversified, economic base will supply a variety of job opportunities, bringing money into the community, and providing a strong, resilient tax-base enabling the community to cost-effectively provide necessary services.

**An Attractive, Authentic and Efficient Community**

Greenville will be a prosperous community with more people and development because it possesses what local people and those from away find so special and worth investing in for the future. It will be an attractive, authentic and efficient community that offers an exceptional quality of life in a unique and beautiful place. Greenville’s citizens will have reached a consensus on how best to assure that economic development enhances the unique character of the area, thereby achieving a mutually prosperous future for everyone.

Greenville’s Village District will be the heart of the community showcasing the region’s north woods character and culture. The Village District will be a vibrant and well-designed place bustling with social, civic, cultural and commercial activity – an area encompassing the downtown and extending along Pritham Avenue to the town line, north along the Lily Bay Road to Scammon Road, and south along the Moosehead Lake Road to the Scenic Corridor Overlay District. Revitalization of the infrastructure and buildings with consideration for historic and cultural enhancements will foster business growth and job creation with new development tucked harmoniously in between existing structures. The Town Office, hospital, school, parks, and many other public and semi-public uses will be important contributors to the Village District’s vitality. While some housing will be within the Village District’s mixed-use areas, other homes will be located in quiet residential neighborhoods in the Residential District. Expansion of public sewer and water will allow even more development in these areas, as well as in the Commercial/Industrial District which includes the Town’s industrial park.

The Scenic Corridor Overlay District along the Moosehead Lake Road will also showcase the region’s iconic north woods character with thriving homes and businesses, and impressive views of the forests and surrounding mountains. The Rural Development District will feature homes and businesses in more rural settings, not far from the Moosehead Lake Road, Lily Bay Road, and other main roads. Lastly, the

---

1 See Map 17 Future Land Use for the location of these districts.
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Rural District, consisting of areas distant from public highways and roads, will not change much, but will continue as large expanses of commercial forestland interspersed with clusters of residential uses along the shores of the larger ponds.

Housing for a Variety of Lifestyles and Needs
Greenville will have a variety of housing options, including those for year-round and seasonal residents of all ages. There will be housing affordable to local people, including those with modest or fixed incomes. Families with children will be able to live near the school and town recreational programs and facilities. There will be a variety of living options for middle-aged and older residents, including single family homes and affordable, senior-housing complexes and assisted-living facilities located in-town and easily accessible to services. Substandard housing, including the town’s older housing complexes will have been upgraded. There will also be a selection of housing for second-home and part-time residents and visitors, such as rustic camps, lake-front homes, in-town apartments, and condominiums.

Services and Facilities Affordably Meeting the Needs of the Community
Greenville will have the broad range of public services and facilities necessary for a remote service center community. The population and tax base will be large enough to support affordable, good-quality public services and facilities. Mutually beneficial regional services will be provided efficiently, cost-effectively and equitably among the partners. The vision for the future includes the following: a revitalized and expanded Village District – much of it with centralized water and sewer; high-quality, regionally-coordinated emergency services; a modern hospital with expanded public health and wellness facilities and programs; an excellent K-12 school system; cost-effective, regional solid waste disposal and recycling; public parks and other recreation facilities and programs; many public-event programs; and a municipal government with enough staffing, equipment and space to provide excellent service.

A Full-Service, Regional Transportation Hub
Greenville will be an integrated, regional transportation hub with highway, rail, air, public transportation, motorized and non-motorized trails, and water transportation facilities and services to support economic prosperity for the Moosehead Lake Region. Highways, roads and streets will be designed to serve traffic safely and efficiently. The Moosehead Lake Road Scenic Corridor and the Moosehead Lake Scenic Byway will be designed to attract people to the village of Greenville and the region. The Village District will have a safe, pedestrian-friendly infrastructure that also serves motor vehicles and through traffic, and maybe the Town will have finally resolved whether there exists a need for a bypass. There will be improvements to the airport that enhance access to Greenville. Seaplanes will be actively using the seaplane bases along the shores of Moosehead Lake and there will be bus, shuttle, taxi, and rental car services. Industries will be using rail service with a rail siding in the industrial park, and perhaps an intermodal facility as well. There will be trail heads and services in Greenville that connect to region-wide networks of multiuse and non-motorized trails connecting areas of particular interest. There will be wharfs, boat launching ramps, marinas for water transportation, and the Kate will continue to be a cultural highlight of the Moosehead Lake Region.
Chapter I-2 Regional Coordination Summary

Regional coordination and collaboration with public and private sector partners is vital to the future well-being and prosperity of Greenville and the Moosehead Lake Region. Recognizing this fact, this Plan recommends that the Town of Greenville take a collaborative, leadership role in planning, promoting and implementing positive actions for the future. This role does not suggest that Greenville shoulder an unfair portion of the financial burden, but that it actively seeks and promotes partnerships where there is mutual benefit, support, and equitable sharing of responsibilities. The following is a summary; specific recommendations are included in each of the chapters referenced below.

**Economy (Chapter I-3)**

Greenville’s vision is to be a thriving service center community that provides a broad-range of goods, services and jobs for people living in and visiting Greenville and the Moosehead Lake Region. This Plan recommends that the Town maintain a proactive economic development program with support from the Town’s Economic Development Committee. The Program should involve working with public and private sector entities to promote, implement, and fund economic development initiatives. Collaboration will be crucial to achieving success, and this Plan recommends that the Town begin by convening an economic summit to formalize partnerships and develop detailed plans for moving forward.

Additionally, this Plan recommends that Greenville take advantage of any opportunities for the town through the Moosehead Lake Concept Plan and redevelopment of the Big Moose Mountain resort. The Plan also recommends pursuing the development of a convention center, with a preferred location in Greenville.

**Housing (Chapter I-4)**

As the regional service center, Greenville plays a significant role with respect to housing to include: (1) encouraging and promoting adequate workforce housing to support economic development; (2) encouraging and supporting the efforts of regional housing coalitions, and both public and private sector developers in addressing housing needs; and (3) continuing to serve the need for multifamily and rental housing, including subsidized housing, within the region.

**Public/Community Services and Facilities (Chapter I-5)**

The Town of Greenville seeks cooperative and equitable regional participation in the efficient delivery of adequate, affordable services. Since the Town provides many services for those from outside Greenville, such as some Town Office services, emergency services and recreation programs and facilities, it is important that there are equitable arrangements to fund these services with neighboring communities, the county and the state. The most significant areas of regional coordination currently include the following:

- Emergency planning and services (police, fire, rescue, ambulance): Greenville, C.A. Dean Hospital, area communities, the county, several state agencies, and the U.S. Border Control.
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- School Union 60: Greenville, Beaver Cove, Shirley, Willimantic and Kingsbury Plantation; tuitioned students from Rockwood.
- Landfill Closure: Greenville, Shirley, Beaver Cove and Piscataquis County paying off debt associated with closure.

In the future, Greenville will monitor and respond to the impacts and demands of development in the town and region, including development associated with the Moosehead Lake Concept Plan. The Town will continue to seek opportunities for coordination, such as regional involvement in solid waste disposal using Greenville’s new transfer station.

Parks, Recreation and Open Space (Chapter I-6)
Greenville’s economic development initiatives involve promoting the Moosehead Lake Region for nature-based recreation and tourism, and Greenville as the gateway. This means improving, expanding and diversifying recreational opportunities in the region, such as enhancing public access to Moosehead Lake and other great ponds, expanding regional trail systems, establishing trailheads associated with the Moosehead Lake Concept Plan, and ongoing land conservation efforts. These activities require collaboration between adjacent communities, county and state agencies, and many other entities. The Town will also continue to work with School Union 60 to provide complimentary recreation and sports programs, including utilization of the gym and other facilities, and funding partnerships.

Transportation (Chapter I-7)
Greenville’s transportation infrastructure is essential to the livability and economy of the town and the Moosehead Lake Region. The town serves as an integrated regional transportation hub with highway, rail, air, public and other transportation facilities and services. For this reason, this Plan strongly advocates for high priority status for federal and state funding for these systems to include (1) adequate maintenance of state highways – including in the Village District; (2) improvements to the Greenville Airport; (3) support for future connections and use (both freight and passenger services) of the Montreal, Maine and Atlantic Railroad, including rail siding and an intermodal facility; (4) support for public transportation services; and (5) support for enhancements to the Moosehead Lake Scenic Byway.

Natural Resources (Chapter I-8)
Greenville’s quality of life and economic vitality are dependent upon the region’s extensive and outstanding natural resources, including Moosehead Lake and many other waterbodies, vast working forests and conservation land, extensive wildlife and fisheries habitats, clean and abundant groundwater resources and striking scenery. Collaboration with regional and state natural resource agencies, advocacy groups, private entities, neighboring communities and others will be important to protecting water quality and critical natural resources. These efforts include monitoring water quality, education, funding assistance, and support for land conservation.

The vast conservation land associated with the Moosehead Lake Concept Plan provides considerable protection for water quality and critical natural resources in the region - many of which overlap with those in Greenville. The Town will monitor and participate as appropriate in oversight and management.
of these areas through the Forest Society of Maine (easement holder), State of Maine (back-up easement holder), Maine Land Use Planning Commission, and Plum Creek as the landowner.

**Historic and Archaeological Resources (Chapter I-9)**

Promotion of the region’s historic and cultural heritage is important to the town and one that is enhanced through collaboration with the Moosehead Lake Historical Society and Museums, the Natural Resource Education Center, and the Moosehead Marine Museum in their efforts to promote the cultural heritage of the region and to preserve important cultural resources.

**Future Land Use (Chapter I-11)**

The Future Land Use Plan advances Greenville’s vision for improving the quality of life and economic prosperity of the town and region by strengthening the town’s role as the regional service center and gateway to the Moosehead Lake Region. Recognizing that population growth and economic development are needed to support Greenville as a service center community, this Plan promotes Greenville as the growth area for the Moosehead Lake Region. Greenville’s growth areas are well-suited for additional development given their location in and near existing services and at the hub of the region’s transportation network.

The Future Land Use Plan also takes into consideration the importance of its significant rural areas with working forests, agricultural land, and generally undeveloped areas that also serve as habitat for wildlife and fisheries. Many of these areas are contiguous with forestland and conserved land in adjacent communities and areas, and the Plan recommends seeking land use continuity with these areas.

Future planning for growth and development will require the Town to monitor regional trends, such as build out of the Moosehead Lake Concept Plan and potential development of a Big Moose Mountain resort. The Town will also want to work with the Maine Land Use Planning Commission and neighboring towns, as appropriate, in planning, managing and regulating land use within the region and particularly in areas adjacent to Greenville.

---

**Chapter I-3 Economy**

**OVERVIEW**

Improving the economy of Greenville is a top priority. More jobs, more economic activity and growth in the population are needed. These recommendations suggest the Town of Greenville take a proactive, leadership role in bringing other public and private partners together for a unified effort that will be more successful in improving the local economy.

2 Cross reference note: Recommendations related to economic development are also included in other chapters, as applicable – such as Public Facilities and Services, Recreation, Historic and Archaeological Resources, Transportation, and Land Use.
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GOALS

1. Promote an expanded and diversified economic base that builds on the regions’ natural resource-based assets, increases job opportunities, and provides the foundation and stability necessary to support long-term economic viability for Greenville and the Moosehead Lake Region.

2. Promote the Moosehead Lake Region, with its cultural heritage and reputation for life and experiences in the Maine woods, as a major tourist and recreational destination, with Greenville as the gateway.

3. Promote Greenville as the regional service center that provides jobs, goods and services, and serves as the economic, social and cultural hub of the region.

4. Promote year-round and seasonal population growth to maintain balanced demographics, including younger and working-age people, and retirees, to foster a strong and stable community.

5. Plan for, finance, and develop an efficient system of public facilities and services to accommodate anticipated growth and economic development.

POLICIES

1. Take a leadership role through a proactive economic development program with substantial collaboration and support from interested partners to promote the common goals of improving the economy and quality of life in Greenville and the region.

2. Proactively collaborate with public and private sector partners to achieve the following:
   a. Strengthen Greenville as a regional service center that provides jobs, goods and services, and serves as the economic, social and cultural hub of the region.
   b. Support the development of high quality jobs and strengthen the property-tax base by increasing commercial and industrial activity that is environmentally sound and consistent with the character of the community.
   c. Strengthen the Region as a four-season, nature-based tourism and outdoor recreation destination, with Greenville as the gateway.
   d. Promote a strong local economy by encouraging people to purchase products and services locally.

3. Provide the infrastructure and services necessary to support economic development, and advocate for improvements to the regional and state infrastructure (telecommunications, highways, airport, rail, sewer, water, power, schools, Village District infrastructure, parks and recreation, industrial park, business assistance, etc.). (See Chapter I-5 Public/Community Services and Facilities, Chapter I-6 Parks, Recreation and Open Space, Chapter I-7 Transportation, and Chapter I-12 Capital Investment Plan)

3The order of goals, policies and strategies does not reflect priority. Priority is reflected in the recommended timeframe.
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4. Maintain a land use planning and regulation system designed to promote economic development consistent with the character of the community (See Chapter I-11 Future Land Use Plan).

5. Advocate for an educational system that encourages people of all ages, but particularly young people and families, to live in Greenville, and provides the education necessary to build a skilled workforce.

6. Promote adequate workforce housing for a range of household incomes to support desired population growth and economic development. (See Chapter I-4 Housing)

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

1. Proactive Economic Development Program: Establish and maintain a viable, proactive Town of Greenville economic development program through a multi-pronged approach designed to build a program that is self-supporting, as follows:
   
   a. Maintain an active Greenville Economic Development Committee.
   
   b. Seek funding and capacity through creative public/private partnerships.
   
   c. Take advantage of state and regional programs to promote economic activity, such as assistance through the Piscataquis County Economic Development Council, Eastern Maine Development Corporation, Maine Development Foundation, the State of Maine (Department of Economic and Community Development, Office of Tourism, etc.), and others.
   
   d. Utilize targeted mechanisms (project-based) such as Community Development Block Grants, USDA Rural Development Funding, Tax Increment Financing, and private funding to undertake specific activities and provide support for ongoing economic development efforts. Seek funding mechanisms for build-out of the industrial park, a new manufacturing or energy-generating facility associated with the Greenville Steam plant, and revitalization of the Village District.
   
   e. Meet with Plum Creek officials and other partners, such as the Forest Society of Maine and the Maine Bureau of Parks and Lands, to take advantage of opportunities available through the Moosehead Lake Concept Plan. Encourage Plum Creek to market Greenville as the gateway and service center hub for residents and visitors to the development. Assure that infrastructure (trail heads, roads, signage, etc.) are designed to encourage economic activity beneficial to Greenville.

   Responsibility for Implementation: Board of Selectmen, Economic Development Committee, Town Manager; Timeframe: Initiate immediately and then ongoing

2. Strong, Effective Public/Private Partnerships: Utilize existing and new public/private partnerships to more efficiently and effectively achieve common goals, as follows:

   a. Build partnerships with Moosehead Lake Region Chamber of Commerce, private sector businesses, the Moosehead Historical Society and Museums, Moosehead Marine Museum, the

---

4 More detail on recommendations may be found in other chapters, such as Chapters I-5, I-6, I-7 and I-12. The Village District is depicted on Maps 16 and 17.

5 The Capital Investment Plan (Chapter I-12) identifies funding mechanisms and priorities.
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Natural Resources Education Center, the Forest Society of Maine, the Appalachian Mountain Club, the snowmobile and ATV clubs, and other organizations, to promote the region for its recreational and cultural offerings and other quality of life assets. This effort will also involve nearby communities, such as Shirley, Beaver Cove, and Rockwood, Piscataquis County, and the Land Use Planning Commission.

b. Convene an economic development summit for the Moosehead Lake Region to develop mutually beneficial goals and strategies for collaborating to improve the economic climate of Greenville and the Moosehead Lake Region. Agreement on the Moosehead Lake Region and Greenville brand and a marketing strategy should be a part of this effort. Consider convening the summit on an annual basis to maintain momentum on initiatives.

c. Support the development of a regional conference center in the Moosehead Lake Region, with a preference for a Greenville location.

d. Advocate for the reopening of the resort on Big Moose Mountain; once open, seek opportunities to promote Greenville.

e. Identify unfilled niches where there may be opportunities for expanded/new businesses, and encourage business development.

f. Take advantage of other regional initiatives to promote economic activity, such as the Moosehead Lake Scenic Byway.

6. Support efforts to enhance the visibility of moose by working with the Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife and landowners to maintain a stable moose population, while maintaining highway safety.

Responsibility for Implementation: Board of Selectmen, Economic Development Committee, Town Manager; Timeframe: Build partnerships immediately; convene summit in 2013; explore other opportunities as appropriate.

3. Village District Revitalization: Support ongoing revitalization of the Village District (an area encompassing the downtown and extending along Pritham Avenue to the town line, north along the Lily Bay Road to Scammon Road, and south along the Moosehead Lake Road to the Scenic Corridor Overlay District), through the following:

a. Village District Concept Plan – develop a concept plan for revitalization to include public and private sector improvements. Seek grant funding, such as a Community Development Block Grant (planning grant) to develop the master plan, and set the stage for grant funding to make improvements.

b. Work to improve and maintain the public infrastructure with more efficient and safe traffic circulation, better signage, more parking, better facilities for pedestrians, and improved maintenance of public properties, including parks and recreational facilities.

c. Strongly advocate for MaineDOT improvements to state infrastructure - particularly Pritham Avenue, the Moosehead Lake Road, Lily Bay Road and Pleasant Street to include: adequate roadways, overpasses and underpasses; adequate shoulders for bicycles and pedestrians; and intersection improvements at the intersection of Pritham Avenue and Moosehead Lake Road.
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d. Work with the Maine Water Company and Greenville Sanitary District to maintain and expand services within/near the Village District to support economic development.

e. Encourage more economic activity within the Village District by modifying the Land Use Ordinance to support higher densities for commercial and residential uses, and development designs that more effectively and efficiently use space (See Future Land Use Plan).

f. Ensure that shoreland zoning regulations support Village District goals of increasing densities to allow for economic development and expansion (See Chapter I-11 Future Land Use Plan).

g. Promote building and site designs that enhance the historic and cultural character by working with property owners, businesses, the Moosehead Historical Society and Museums and others.

h. Identify specific parcels that could potentially accommodate more development, and work with willing property owners to explore opportunities.

**Responsibility for Implementation:** Board of Selectmen, Town Manager, Economic Development Committee, Planning Board; **Timeframe:** Develop concept plan starting in 2014/15; address infrastructure needs on an ongoing basis; amend Land Use Ordinance in 2014/15.

4. Enhancement of the Moosehead Lake Road Scenic Corridor Overlay District: Support increased development consistent with the character of Greenville, as follows:

a. Continue to support the Moosehead Lake Region Visitors’ Center, and encourage the Natural Resources Education Center in their efforts to enhance and expand the Center.

b. Amend the Land Use Ordinance to allow more flexibility while assuring that development enhances the character of the gateway to the village. (See Chapter I-11 Future Land Use Plan)

c. Promote building and development designs consistent with the historic and cultural character by working with property owners, businesses, the Moosehead Historical Society and Museums, and others.

d. Consider infrastructure improvements, such as signage, gateway landscaping and provisions for sewer and water, etc.

**Responsibility for Implementation:** Board of Selectmen, Town Manager, Planning Board; **Timeframe:** Address infrastructure needs on an ongoing basis; amend Land Use Ordinance in 2014/15.

5. Completion/Build-out of the Industrial Park Area: Work towards completion and full build-out of the Industrial Park as follows:

a. Determine necessary infrastructure, such as water, sewer, roads, three-phase power, high-speed wireless internet and rail siding, and pursue funding largely through non-property tax revenues, such as tax increment financing, grants, and private sources.

b. Reassess the types of business and industries that would be most desirable and likely to locate in the park, and consider incentives, such as providing preapproved/permitted lots and/or assisting in financing, such as through tax increment financing. Adjust the marketing strategy, as appropriate, and market industrial park lots on the Town’s WEB page, and through the Piscataquis County Economic Development Corporation and other regional and state agencies, as appropriate.
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c. Continue to support reopening and/or reuse of the former Greenville Steam plant property.

_Responsibility for Implementation: Board of Selectmen, Economic Development Committee, Town Manager, Planning Board; Timeframe: Address infrastructure and marketing needs on an ongoing basis_

6. Other Infrastructure Improvements Necessary to Support Economic Development:

a. As a top priority, seek and maintain up-to-date communications, such as town-wide high-speed internet and adequate cell-phone service. Consider opportunities to provide free/low-cost high-speed wireless internet as an incentive for businesses, industries and others locating in Greenville.

b. Take advantage of any opportunities to reduce the cost of electricity, such as new energy production facilities, alternative energy options, locally produced wood pellets or other fuels, or local cooperatives or utilities.

c. Improve and maintain public facilities and services including the transportation infrastructure (highways, airport, rail service, and public transportation), and recreation facilities and programs to support economic development. (See Chapters I-5, I-6, I-7 and I-12)

_Responsibility for Implementation: Board of Selectmen, Town Manager; Timeframe: Ongoing_

7. Ordinance Provisions to Support Economic Development: Assure that regulations are aligned with economic development goals. Review and modify ordinances as appropriate to reflect the desired scale, design, intensity, and location of future economic development. Consider the following:

a. Review and amend the Land Use Ordinance to encourage desired economic development, particularly in the Village District, Commercial/Industrial District, and the Scenic Corridor Overlay District.

b. Allow more compact development in the Village District and Commercial/Industrial District, particularly where water and sewer are or will be available. (See Chapter I-11 Future Land Use Plan).

_Responsibility for Implementation: Planning Board; Timeframe: 2013/14_

8. Career and Workforce Development: Support career training and education in areas that build on the region’s strengths to provide personal benefits for residents and a more highly-skilled workforce attractive to business and industry. Educational opportunities might include: adult education through the Greenville public school system, internships through area businesses, an outdoor leadership school, elder hostels, a magnet school, or a satellite facility associated with a college or university. Areas of focus could include outdoor recreation management, nature-based tourism, medical services, natural resource management, environmental education, etc.

_Responsibility for Implementation: School Board and Staff, School Committee, C.A. Dean Hospital; Timeframe: 2013/14 and ongoing_

9. Develop Local Offerings and Buy Local Campaign: Promote local purchasing to keep money circulating within the community.
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a. Encourage local merchants to work together to establish a buy local campaign, and assist by continuing to maintain a local directory on the Town WEB page.

b. Identify gaps in the local businesses, such as those identified in the opinion survey (locally-grown food, farmers markets, tourist attractions, theater, etc.)

Responsibility for Implementation: Town staff, Economic Development Committee; Timeframe: Ongoing

Chapter I-4 Housing

OVERVIEW
An adequate supply of good-quality housing affordable to all Greenville’s residents is critical to the well-being and health of the community. An analysis by the Maine State Housing Authority found that housing, and in particular rental housing, in Greenville is generally “unaffordable” to year-round residents. A major contributing factor is a real estate market geared towards seasonal and second home residents who are able to afford more expensive single-family homes and rental units, thereby limiting the supply of affordable homes and rentals available to local people. Another contributing factor is the lack of vacant land in the village; most vacant lots are located outside the village where housing is more expensive. Further, the seasonal economy often provides only part-time employment for some year-round residents making them even less able to afford adequate housing.

The condition of some of Greenville’s housing stock, including some of the aging housing complexes, is also of concern according to housing studies conducted within the past decade.

GOALS
1. Encourage and promote affordable, decent housing opportunities for all Greenville’s citizens.
2. Encourage the development of good-quality housing that will serve to strengthen the Town’s tax base.

The state defines “affordable housing” as follows: An owner occupied unit is affordable to a household if its price results in monthly housing costs (mortgage principal and interest, insurance, real estate taxes and basic utility costs) that do not exceed 28% to 33% of the household’s gross monthly income. A renter-occupied unit is “affordable” to a household if the unit’s monthly housing costs (including rent and basic utility costs) do not exceed 30% of the household’s gross income.

An unsuccessful CDBG application during the 2000s was made to upgrade 15 single-family homes and 12 housing complex rentals, which suggests that substandard housing may continue to be an issue.
Part I. Recommendations

POLICIES

1. Encourage a wide-range of housing options to meet the diversity of needs and incomes of Greenville’s year-round, seasonal and second-home residents.

2. Encourage and promote adequate, workforce housing to support economic development in the community and region.

3. Encourage and support the efforts of regional housing coalitions, and both public and private sector developers, in addressing affordable and workforce housing needs.

4. Continue to serve the region’s needs for multifamily and rental housing, including subsidized housing.

5. Ensure that land use controls encourage the development of quality, affordable housing, including senior housing and rental housing.

6. Encourage the rehabilitation of the town’s housing stock, and seek outside sources of funding to support necessary rehabilitation.

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

1. Affordable/Workforce Housing Committee: Appoint an affordable housing/workforce housing committee to undertake many of the following recommendations and other actions, as needed.

2. Affordability Housing for the Community: Monitor and track residential development to determine housing trends and the affordability of housing for year-round residents. Take steps, such as modifications to the Land Use Ordinance and development of affordable housing.

3. Housing Rehabilitation: Continue to upgrade the housing stock through the following actions:
   a. Seek Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding and other funding opportunities for housing rehabilitation and/or replacement.
   b. Explore the need to upgrade aging, multifamily housing complexes to include in-place emergency shelter facilities.
   c. Direct income-eligible residents to Penquis and other public/private entities that provide assistance for upgrading substandard housing.

   Responsibility for Implementation (#1, #2 and #3): Selectmen, Town Manager, Affordable/Workforce Housing Committee; Timeframe: Appoint Committee immediately to monitor housing trends, and provide information about housing assistance through public/private entities, such as Penquis on an ongoing basis; prepare CDBG grant application in 2014/15.

4. Planning and Land Use Regulation: Review and amend, as needed, the Land Use Ordinance to address the following:
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a. Assure that density, lot size, setback, and road width requirements in the Residential and Village Districts encourage development of affordable/workforce housing. Consider incentives, such as density bonuses.

b. Assure that density, lot size, setback, and road width requirements in the Rural Development and Rural Districts allow development of affordable/workforce housing subject to site suitability, and provide performance standards to preserve rural character.

c. Continue to allow two-family units throughout the town, subject to site suitability.

d. Continue to provide locations in growth areas where mobile home parks are allowed pursuant to 30-A M.R.S.A. Sec. 4358(3)(M) and where manufactured housing is allowed pursuant to 30-A M.R.S.A. Sec. 4358(2). Consider amending these provisions as needed to be consistent with the town’s vision for the future.

e. Allow condominiums, timeshares, sporting camps, motels, hotels, bed and breakfasts, campgrounds in a number of areas within the community. These uses should be permitted within the Rural District, provided they meet certain performance standards designed to preserve rural character and they do not negatively impact public facilities/services.

f. Encourage creative well-designed residential developments through the use of regulatory incentives, including a reduction in dimensional requirements for clustered development that preserves open space or otherwise enhances the landscape.

g. Protect residential neighborhoods from incompatible commercial and industrial uses through provisions such as screening and buffers, adequate space between structures, outside storage of materials, off-street parking requirements, limits on noise and lighting, and restrictions on allowable uses.

(Also see Chapter I-11 Future Land Use)

Responsibility for Implementation: Planning Board; Timeframe: 2013/14

Chapter I-5 Public/Community Services and Facilities

OVERVIEW

Community facilities and services are provided to protect the public health and safety, and insure the general welfare and wellbeing of residents and visitors. The adequacy of these facilities and services reflect the community’s desirability as a place to live, work, recreate, and/or locate a business.

Many of Greenville’s public services and facilities, such as Town Office services (voter registration, issuance of hunting and fishing licenses, and providing information about the area), emergency services,
and municipal recreation facilities, serve people residing full-time or part-time outside Greenville. Assuring equitable funding of regionally used services and facilities is an ongoing concern for the Town of Greenville. In some cases, cooperative agreements can actually reduce costs to the individual communities involved.

In general, Greenville’s municipal services and facilities, with some improvements and expansions, should be adequate to meet future needs. Future growth and development is not likely to outpace the Town’s ability to keep up with necessary improvements, and in fact, this growth may allow more cost-effective maintenance of underutilized facilities, such as the hospital, school and airport. The following recommendations address these issues and others for the next decade and beyond.

**GOALS**

1. Plan for, finance, and develop an efficient system of public facilities and services to accommodate growth and economic development, including expansion of Greenville as a regional economic service center.

2. Seek population growth through increased economic activity to improve the cost-effectiveness of providing public services and facilities.

**POLICIES**

1. Efficiently meet identified public facility and service needs.

2. Provide public facilities and services in a manner that promotes and supports growth and development, particularly in identified growth areas.

3. Support the efforts of other entities (Greenville Consolidated School, Moosehead Sanitary District, Maine Water Company, CA Dean Hospital/Ambulance, and others) to provide necessary public services and facilities. Encourage these organizations to operate efficiently and cost-effectively.

4. Seek cooperative and equitable regional participation in the delivery of efficient, affordable services.

5. Maintain a fair and equitable system of property taxation, and increase the valuation by encouraging economic activity and commercial development.

6. Recognize the limitations of the property tax, and explore creative funding mechanisms and outside sources of funding.

7. Maintain a steady commitment to funding capital improvements through reserve accounts, creative lease-back arrangements, outside funding sources, and other efforts that maintain and improve capital assets without major fluctuations in yearly budgets.

8. Assure that new development does not overtax community services. (Chapter I-11 Future Land Use Plan)
9. Advocate for maximum state funding for the Greenville Consolidated School (School Union 60).

**IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES**

1. Public Service and Facility Needs:

   a. Maintain or upgrade public administration, services, and facilities to accommodate growth and changing demographics. Periodically review needs and make changes, as needed.

   b. Conduct a comprehensive review of public facilities and services to identify opportunities to more cost-effectively provide necessary services. For example, consider joint use of facilities, equipment and/or staffing by town, school, water district, sewer district, state agencies, other public and private sector partners, etc.

   c. Continue to explore options for regional delivery of local services.

   d. Monitor growth and development in the region outside of Greenville and assess the demands and impacts on the Town of Greenville. Assure the equitable provision of services while seeking opportunities for improved service through cooperative efforts and agreements.

   e. Advocate for more equitable service from Piscataquis County that is based on Greenville’s proportionate share of county funding.

   *Responsibility for Implementation: Board of Selectmen, Town Manager, agency administrators; Timeframe: Ongoing*

2. Town Administrative Capacity: Seek to improve administrative capacity as follows:

   a. Review staffing and operations across departments (town administration, recreation, fire, police, etc.) to determine if there are opportunities for shared staffing, improved use of technology, or other options to more efficiently and cost-effectively improve service.

   b. Explore the need for part-time dedicated administrative support to the Town Manager to improve financial and administrative functions, such as bookkeeping and grant administration. This would allow the Town Manager to focus more on economic development projects. Other staff would also be able to provide better customer service at the counter. (Currently, the Clerk, Deputy Clerk, Code Enforcement Officer and Bookkeeper are taking time from their work to provide administrative assistance to the Town Manager)

   c. Explore the need for a part-time person to do General Assistance so that the one individual who does the bookkeeping, voter registration, human resources, insurance and counter customer service would have a more reasonable workload and be able to provide better service.

   *Responsibility for Implementation: Board of Selectmen, Town Manager, department heads; Timeframe: Ongoing*

3. Town Office: Explore the need for more town office space; consider the following:

   a. Office space for the Recreation Director (currently using the meeting room).
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b. Expansion of the meeting room. (If larger meeting room space is built elsewhere in the future, then some existing Town Office meeting room space could be converted into office space).

c. More adequate, fireproof storage space for records and documents, and cabinets for tax maps and other maps.

d. Digitizing property tax records and other important documents.

e. Plan for assessor’s office space in case this position is changed from consultant to employee.

   Responsibility for Implementation: Board of Selectmen, Town Manager; Timeframe: Consider as a part of #1 and #2 above.

4. Emergency Preparedness: Continue to improve emergency preparedness including communications, and emergency shelters (Greenville Consolidated School and Town Office). Work to address the need for “emergency in-place shelter facilities” for senior-housing complexes.

   Responsibility for Implementation: Board of Selectmen, Town Manager, Police Chief, other emergency preparedness partners; Timeframe: Ongoing

5. Police Department: Explore costs for a third full-time police officer if citizens demand full-time twenty-four hour coverage (police are currently on-call during the 3rd shift - nights). Continue to replace vehicles every four to five years, and upgrade computer and software equipment as needed.

   Responsibility for Implementation: Board of Selectmen, Town Manager, Police Chief; Timeframe: Ongoing

6. Fire Department: Explore the need for at-least a part-time, paid fire chief. Actively recruit and maintain volunteer firefighter ranks. Make energy-efficiency improvements to the fire station and replace the fire-service utility van and the ladder truck within the next ten years.

   Responsibility for Implementation: Board of Selectmen, Town Manager, Fire Chief; Timeframe: Ongoing

7. Public Works: Replace two Ford Sterling Wheelers (trucks) over the next decade. Pursue construction of a covered sand and salt storage facility, if state funding becomes available.

8. Solid Waste Disposal and Recycling: Seek to reduce the cost of solid waste disposal and recycling.

   a. Explore opportunities for partnerships with other towns, the county and/or the private sector.

   b. Explore opportunities to increase recycling to off-set waste disposal costs.

   (#7 and #8 above) Responsibility for Implementation: Board of Selectmen, Town Manager; Timeframe: Ongoing

9. Maine Water Company, Greenville Office: Support the Company’s efforts to do the following: systematically replace the distribution system, as needed; expand the system to meet the needs of new customers, such as new customers in the Town’s industrial park; and to be consistent with the Future Land Use Plan. Assist in obtaining grant funding for these efforts, as needed.
10. **Moosehead Lake Sanitary District**: Support the District’s efforts to improve and maintain the system, as needed. Encourage expansion of the system consistent with the Future Land Use Plan. Assist in obtaining grant funding for these efforts, as needed.

11. **C.A. Dean Hospital and Ambulance**: Support and collaborate with the Hospital and Ambulance Service to provide a range of medical services. Explore future needs, such as increased paramedic coverage and providing health-related recreation activities and facilities. Assist in obtaining grant funding for these efforts, as needed.

12. **School Union 60**: Work with the School Union to address the following:
   
   a. Continue to seek strategies for providing high-quality education as economically as possible. Fully utilize state funding, and aggressively pursue grants and other sources of funding, as appropriate. Assist in obtaining grant funding for these efforts, as appropriate.
   
   b. Address future use of the Nickerson School property for maximum community benefit.
   
   c. Consider educational alternatives, such as forming a charter school or magnet school, or partnering with other entities to increase enrollments, and take advantage of the rich natural resource and cultural heritage of the region.

13. **The Shaw Public Library**: Continue to support the Library Board of Trustees in improving the library, such as the construction of a new connector between the buildings (eliminates need for new handicapped accessible entrance and restroom) and other projects, as needed.

14. **The Greenville Cemetery**: Continue to support the Cemetery Corporation in considering the need for an expansion within the next 10-15 years, and in obtaining funding to cover capital expenses, such as a grant to cover the cost of replacing the water line (est. $4,000).

15. **Street Lighting**: Seek options to reduce the cost of street lighting.

16. **Capital Investment Plan**: Include any capital needs in the Capital Investment Plan (Chapter 12).

   (#9 through #16 above): Responsibility for Implementation: Board of Selectmen, Town Manager, agency and department heads; Timeframe: Ongoing

17. **Regional Wellness, Recreation and Rehabilitation Initiative**: Investigate opportunities to provide health-related recreational and rehabilitation programs, including a senior wellness program, in collaboration with the C.A. Dean Hospital. Explore as a long-range initiative the development of a regional wellness, recreation and rehabilitation center (senior center, gym, fitness rooms, indoor pool, etc.). Investigate sources of funding to support these services and facilities.

   Responsibility for Implementation: Selectmen, Town Manager, Recreation Director, C.A. Dean Hospital CEO; Timeframe: Ongoing, begin to explore regional center in 2014/15.
OVERVIEW
Outdoor recreation and public access to open space and water bodies is a strong tradition in the
Moosehead Lake Region. The region’s sparsely populated forests, mountains, lakes, rivers, streams, wildlife, fisheries, historic and archaeological sites, and spectacular scenery provide the setting for a wide-range of outdoor, recreational activities and nature-based tourism. The public has access to most of these areas because they are either publically-owned or conserved, or landowners allow public access.

As the gateway for the region, Greenville serves year-round and second-home residents, as well as thousands of tourists who visit the area. While many recreational offerings are provided by the state and private entities, the Town of Greenville plays an important role in providing municipal services and facilities to support recreation.

GOALS
1. Promote and protect the availability of outdoor recreational opportunities for all citizens, including managed access to surface waters.
2. Promote the Moosehead Lake Region as a year-round destination for nature-based tourism and outdoor recreation with Greenville as the gateway and service center hub.
3. Strive to provide affordable, recreation programs and facilities for everyone.

POLICIES
1. Maintain a Town recreation program under the direction of the Recreation Director with oversight from the Town Manager and input from the Recreation Committee.
2. Maintain/upgrade existing recreational facilities, as necessary to meet current and future needs.
3. Develop a long-range plan for the expansion of recreational offerings, based on identified needs, and seek a variety of partners, funding sources and other mechanisms to support programs and projects.
4. Continue to collaborate with the Greenville Consolidated School to provide complimentary recreation and sports programs, including utilization of the gym and other facilities, and funding partnerships.
5. Continue to collaborate with and/or encourage public and private sector entities in improving, expanding and diversifying recreational opportunities in the region, while seeking to enhance Greenville as the gateway and hub.
Part I. Recommendations

6. Continue to promote the development and maintenance of motorized, non-motorized, and multi-use trail systems that connect with regional trail systems.

7. Seek to achieve and/or continue to maintain at least one major point of public access to major water bodies for boating, fishing, and swimming, and work with nearby property owners to address concerns.

8. Preserve open space for recreational use, as appropriate.

9. Encourage the development of indoor recreational offerings to provide activities for year-round and seasonal residents, and tourists, particularly when weather conditions discourage outdoor activities.

10. Assure that land use regulations allow a variety of recreational facilities in a number of locations.

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

1. Collaboration: Promote the Moosehead Lake Region, with Greenville as the gateway, for a broad range of recreational opportunities through collaboration with public and private partners in the region. Include recreation in economic development plans (Chapter I-3 Economy).

   Responsibility for Implementation: See Chapter I-3. Economy Recommendations, also Recreation Director, Recreation Committee, recreation organizations; Timeframe: Ongoing

2. Greenville Parks and Recreation Program: Seek to maintain a Parks and Recreation Program designed to provide affordable recreation activities and facilities for everyone. Consider the following:

   a. Coordinate the Town’s recreation program and facility improvements in conjunction with the overall economic vision.

   b. Continue to fund the part-time recreation director position and seek opportunities to expand staffing when needed, such as during the busiest times of the year.

   c. Conduct a thorough review and reassessment of recreation programs and facilities to determine needs, priorities and potential sources of funding. Utilize the results of the opinion survey (Appendix A), the findings of this Plan, and investigate the demand for specific recreational programs to meet the needs of everyone.

   d. Continue to work with other entities, such as School Union 60 and C.A. Dean Hospital to provide programs and utilize facilities in an efficient, cost-effective manner.

   Responsibility for Implementation: Selectmen, Town Manager, Recreation Director and Recreation Committee; Timeframe: a. and b. ongoing; c. begin in 2013/14

3. Capital Investment Plan: Include any capital needs identified for recreation facilities in the Capital Investment Plan (Chapter I-12). Consider the following needs: (a) access to adequate gym facilities for both town and school functions; (b) new equipment at the skateboard park; (c) improvements at the Pine Grove Playground; (d) beach improvements (more sand/less rocks), wooden canopies to provide shade and parking at Red Cross Beach; (e) improved bicycle and pedestrian access under the Pritham
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Avenue railroad trestle to provide access to Junction Wharf; and (f) overall improved maintenance to recreation facilities.

Responsibility for Implementation: Selectmen, Town Manager, Recreation Director; Timeframe: See Capital Investment Plan; ongoing

4. Recreational Trail Systems: Work with public and private partners to extend and maintain a network of trails for motorized and non-motorized uses, which are connected to statewide and regional trail systems.

a. Support the efforts of recreational clubs, such as the Moosehead Riders Snowmobile Club, Moosehead ATV Riders Club, Appalachian Mountain Club, Maine Appalachian Trail Club, Maine Huts and Trails, State of Maine, and private businesses, in developing and maintaining trail systems.

b. Work with regional partners to develop a multi-use trail system that encircles Moosehead Lake with Greenville at its base. As a first priority, develop a new Greenville/Kokadjo trail with assistance from the Piscataquis County Economic Development Council and other partners.

c. Actively participate in the development of trails, trail connections and trail heads associated with the Moosehead Lake Concept Plan.

d. Monitor and address conflicts between motorized and non-motorized uses, including recreational vehicle use of public roads.

Responsibility for Implementation: Selectmen, Town Manager, Police Chief, public and private entities; Timeframe: Ongoing; (See also Chapter I-3 Economy)

5. Access to Major Water Bodies and Other Lake/Pond Issues:

a. Maintain and improve public access and boat launches on Moosehead Lake and at major ponds. Look for opportunities to assure public access to the town’s other ponds.

b. Advocate for expanded public access facilities to Moosehead Lake.

c. Encourage the state to provide overnight parking facilities at the Wilson Pond Boat Launch for users of the remote campsites on the pond.

d. Monitor mooring issues in Moosehead Lake and take action, if necessary.

Responsibility for Implementation: Selectmen, Town Manager, public and private entities; Timeframe: Ongoing

6. Land Conservation Partnerships: Work with area landowners and conservation organizations, such as the Forest Society of Maine, Appalachian Mountain Club, Nature Conservancy, Friends of Wilson Pond, and others to pursue opportunities to protect important open space and recreation land, as needed.

Responsibility for Implementation: Selectmen, Town Manager, public and private entities; Timeframe: Ongoing
7. **Landowner Education and Support:** Provide educational materials regarding the benefits and protections for landowners allowing public recreational access on their property. At a minimum, include information on Maine’s landowner liability law regarding recreational or harvesting use, Title 14, M.R.S.A. Section 159-A.

   a. Make available at the Town Office and/or through links on the Town Web page materials from the Maine Department of Agriculture, Conservation, and Forestry’s Landowner Relations Program.

   b. Encourage recreational clubs that utilize private land to provide landowner appreciation and education programs.

   **Responsibility for Implementation:** Town Manager, public and private entities; **Timeframe:** Ongoing

8. **Land Use Planning and Regulation:**

   a. Review and update, as needed, the Land Use Ordinance to allow a range of recreational activities and facilities consistent with economic goals and the Future Land Use Plan.

   b. Consider including provisions to allow the Planning Board to require that developers of large residential developments provide open space and recreational facilities for their residents.

   c. Consider the need to develop recreational corridors, such as along streams and ponds that could be developed as walkways or bikeways, at a later date. These corridors could be taken into consideration as development proceeds.

   **(See Chapter I-11 Future Land Use)**

   **Responsibility for Implementation:** Planning Board; **Timeframe:** Begin review 2013/14

---

### Chapter I-7 Transportation

**OVERVIEW**

Greenville’s transportation infrastructure is essential to the livability and economy of the town and the Moosehead Lake Region. The transportation system consists of state highways, local roads and streets, sidewalks and parking facilities, the airport and seaplane bases, the railroad, and very limited public transportation services. The following recommendations seek to assure that these systems function adequately, efficiently and at acceptable levels.

**GOALS**

1. Plan for, finance, and develop an efficient system of transportation facilities and services to accommodate growth and economic development.
2. Serve as an integrated, regional transportation hub with highway, rail, air, public and other transportation facilities and services for the Moosehead Lake Region.

POLICIES

1. Safely and efficiently preserve or improve the transportation system by prioritizing community and regional needs associated with safe, efficient, and optimal use of transportation systems.

2. Strongly advocate for high priority status for federal and state funding for adequate transportation systems (highways, air, public transportation, and rail) that connect Greenville as the hub for the region to the rest of Maine, Canada and beyond.

3. Promote fiscal prudence by utilizing a broad-range of funding mechanisms, such as federal and state funding, grants, tax increment financing, and public-private partnerships, to improve the transportation system.

4. Promote public health, protect natural and cultural resources, and enhance livability by managing land use to maximize transportation efficiency and minimize increases in vehicle miles traveled.

5. Assure that the local road system is adequate, including Town roads and roads in subdivisions that may become Town roads.

6. Meet the diverse transportation needs of residents (including children, the elderly and disabled) and through-travelers by providing a safe, efficient and adequate transportation network for all types of users (i.e., motor vehicles, pedestrians, bicyclists).

7. Promote economic activity and livability in the Village District by providing a safe, convenient and pedestrian friendly transportation infrastructure.

8. Support economic activity by adequately maintaining and managing the airport, encouraging seaplane services, and taking advantage of opportunities associated with the railroad.

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

1. Greenville as the Transportation Hub and Gateway for the Region: Advocate for transportation improvements and funding as high priorities for federal and state funding. Monitor, and respond as necessary, to transportation impacts in Greenville as a result of development outside the town, such as traffic increases at the intersection of the Moosehead Lake Road and Pritham Avenue.

2. State Highways: Actively participate in state transportation programs to assure that state highways (Routes 15/6) and state-aid highways (Lily Bay Road, Pleasant Street, East Road and Drew Road) are adequately maintained. Strongly advocate for state actions to address the following:

   a. Village District: address safety issues associated with conflicting uses (i.e., arterial highway for truck and through traffic versus downtown activity) through traffic management and infrastructure modifications (See Chapter I-3 Economy). As a part of Village District concept planning explore
options such as improving parking and signage, increasing corner clearance for trucks, designating
loading/unloading areas for businesses, improving pedestrian amenities (sidewalks, crosswalks, etc.)
to encourage walking instead of driving, and traffic routing using side roads or new interconnections
between businesses. The Town may want to consider a truck route/bypass as a long-term possibility
if traffic increases significantly in the Village District.

b. Pritham Avenue Underpass of Railroad: investigate options to address safety issues associated
with driver visibility and pedestrian access by reconstructing the roadway and/or railroad overpass.
c. Moosehead Lake Road between the downtown and Indian Hill: address safety issues for
pedestrians and bicyclists by providing wider shoulders and measures to reduce traffic speeds.
d. Lily Bay Road: address safety issues for pedestrians and bicyclists by providing wider shoulders
and measures to reduce traffic speeds.
e. Insist on adequate winter maintenance on state-maintained roads to assure safety for both motor
vehicles and pedestrians.
f. Moosehead Lake Scenic Byway: Support enhancement of the byway corridor and advocate for
improvements that promote Greenville as the gateway to the Moosehead Lake Region. Seek
improvements, such as signage, landscaping, scenic pull-outs, expansion of the Visitor’s Center,
elimination of overhead power lines that block views of Moosehead Lake from Indian Hill, utilizing
federal, state and/or private funding.
g. East-West Highway: Monitor the state’s consideration of the proposed highway and its impact on
Greenville.

3. Multi-Year Transportation Plan: Plan, prioritize and budget for capital improvements as follows:

a. Develop or continue to update a prioritized maintenance and improvement plan for the
transportation network. Inventory local road, parking, sidewalk, stormwater and signage conditions;
identify necessary improvements and their costs; identify funding options; prioritize improvements;
and develop a prioritized schedule. Utilize this multi-year plan to develop the annual budget.
b. As a part of Village District concept planning, address traffic issues that are a municipal
responsibility. (See Strategy #2.a. above)
c. Seek new funding mechanisms, such as grants, bonding, tax increment financing, and public-
private partnerships, to avoid falling behind in the long-term preservation of the infrastructure.

(Strategies #1, #2 and #3) Responsibility for Implementation: Board of Selectmen, Town Manager,
Road Foreman; Timeframe: Ongoing, consistent with other initiatives, such as village concept
planning

4. Air Transportation:

a. Greenville Airport:
   i. Update the Airport Master Plan and address the following needs: additional itinerant aircraft
   parking, transportation between the airport and the village, a longer runway to serve larger
   aircraft, and an additional parallel taxiway.
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ii. Encourage additional private and public sector investment in the airport facility.

iii. Manage the airport area for airport related uses, and consider the need for additional land for support services and commercial uses. Consideration should also be given to any impacts on adjacent residential uses. (Chapter I-11 Future Land Use Plan)

b. Seaplane Bases: Support seaplane base operations, as appropriate. Monitor potential conflicts with boat moorings, and the need for building/structure height restrictions, and take action if necessary. (Chapter I-11 Future Land Use Plan)

Responsibility for Implementation: Board of Selectmen, Town Manager, Airport Advisory Committee; Timeframe: Update Master Plan in 2014; other strategies ongoing or as needed

5. Railroad: Monitor and take advantage of opportunities available through railroad operators/owners (currently the Montreal, Maine and Atlantic Railroad), including both freight and passenger services. Continue to monitor the need for railroad access facilities, such as a rail siding and an intermodal facility, as economic growth continues, and support the development of these facilities as appropriate.

Responsibility for Implementation: Board of Selectmen, Town Manager; Timeframe: Ongoing

6. Public Transportation: Monitor public transportation needs associated with an aging population and other transportation-dependent populations. Also, consider public transportation needs of tourists, part-time residents and others.

a. Support public transportation services, such as Penquis Transportation, as appropriate.

b. Encourage private sector services, such as taxi, shuttle, rental cars, or bus services.

Responsibility for Implementation: Board of Selectmen, Town Manager, Town staff; Timeframe: Ongoing

7. Land Use Regulation: (See also Chapter I-11 Future Land Use Plan)

a. Review and modify local ordinances as needed to be consistent with local, regional and state transportation policies identified in this plan.

b. Maintain, enact or amend ordinance standards for subdivisions and for public and private roads as appropriate to foster transportation-efficient, growth patterns and provide for future street connections.

c. Update as needed the Land Use Ordinance to assure adequate, but flexible, requirements for sidewalks, parking, and loading and unloading facilities, taking into consideration the location within the Village District where more dense development is desirable or other areas where there is more space.

d. Review and modify Land Use Ordinances, as appropriate, to assure that new developments, such as senior housing, health care facilities, and Village District destinations are designed to accommodate public transportation. (Covered bus stops/handicapped access/waiting areas are examples.)
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1
e. Monitor the need to address boat moorings in the Moosehead Lake coves and take action, as necessary.

   Responsibility for Implementation: Planning Board; Timeframe: 2013/14

8. Road Construction Standards for Subdivisions, Developments and Public Roads: Update as needed street design and construction standards for roads/streets for subdivisions and developments, and particularly those that might become Town ways. Where appropriate, require that a developer proposing to locate a development on a substandard public road, contribute to the cost of bringing the road up to Town standards based on the impact the development will have on the adjacent public road.

   Responsibility for Implementation: Planning Board; Timeframe: 2013/14

9. Public Health, Natural and Cultural Resources, and Livability: Consider the following:

   a. Street trees, including street trees in parking lots for shade and aesthetics
   b. Street lighting and signage
   c. Noise impacts, including use of jake brakes
   d. Traffic speeds and their affect on safety and livability
   e. Amenities to encourage more physically active lifestyles, such as pedestrian ways, sidewalks, bikeways, bike racks, and wider shoulders to provide safe routes to school, recreation areas, and business and shopping.
   f. Negative impacts on natural resources (water quality, wildlife and fisheries habitats) from the transportation system

   Responsibility for Implementation: Board of Selectmen, Town Manager, Road Foreman, Planning Board; Timeframe: Ongoing, as appropriate

Chapter I-8 Natural Resources

OVERVIEW

Greenville’s quality of life and economic vitality are dependent upon the region’s extensive and outstanding natural resources – including Moosehead Lake and many other waterbodies, vast working forests and conservation land, extensive wildlife and fisheries habitats, clean and abundant groundwater resources and striking scenery. The following goals, policies and recommendations are designed to maintain and enhance these important natural resources.

8 Forestry and agriculture covered in Chapter I-10.
Part I. Recommendations

GOALS
1. Protect the quality and manage the quantity of water resources, including aquifers, lakes, great ponds, and rivers.

2. Protect other critical natural resources, including without limitation, wetlands, wildlife and fisheries habitat, shorelands, scenic vistas, and unique natural areas.

POLICIES
1. Protect current and potential drinking water sources.

2. Protect significant surface water resources from pollution and improve water quality where needed.

3. Protect and conserve other critical and important natural resources through education, monitoring of impacts, and land use regulations, where needed.

4. Protect the water quality of Moosehead Lake while promoting more intensive development in the village.

5. Support the use of the public sewer system where it is available as the preferred alternative to individual subsurface sewage disposal.

6. Collaborate with regional and state resources agencies, advocacy groups, private entities, neighboring communities and others to protect water quality and critical natural resources.

7. Support the enforcement of state and federal laws by making the public aware of these laws, and reporting violations, as appropriate. This does not imply that the Town should be responsible for enforcement of these laws.

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES
1. Regional Collaboration and Public/Private Partnerships: Work with and encourage the efforts of other public and private entities in protecting and conserving important natural resources, as follows:

   a. Encourage lake associations, volunteer lake monitors, state agencies and others to conduct water quality monitoring so that problems can be addressed expeditiously. In particular, monitor the water quality of water bodies most at risk from development, such as Sawyer Pond. Encourage ongoing water quality monitoring and management for Moosehead Lake.

   b. Encourage entities, such as the Natural Resource Education Center, the Moosehead Lake Focus Group, the Moosehead Lake Fisheries Coalition, the Friends of Wilson Pond, the Forest Society of Maine, and other similar organizations in their efforts to promote protection for water resources, and conservation of wildlife and fisheries habitats, and other important natural resources. Consider the following:
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i. Use information from resource agencies, such as the U.S. Natural Resource Conservation Service, Piscataquis County Soil and Water Conservation District, Congress of Lakes Association, state agencies, University of Maine Cooperative Extension, Small Woodlot Association of Maine.

ii. Provide educational materials at key locations regarding the threat of invasive species, such as signage at boat launches and sea plane bases; and conduct boat and seaplane inspections.

iii. Programs and funding opportunities to protect water quality through grants, internships or other mechanisms to include watershed surveys, remedial work on ditches and driveways, planting of buffers, and other efforts.

iv. Information for landowners on conserving threatened or endangered habitats, and other important habitats utilizing materials from the Maine Natural Areas Program, Beginning with Habitat Program, Maine Inland Fisheries and Wildlife Department, and others.

c. Encourage ongoing protection for critical natural resources through purchase of land or easements from willing sellers, or landowner agreements.

Responsibility for Implementation: Board of Selectmen, Town Manager, and other entities as listed above; Timeframe: Ongoing

2. Education (Town, specifically): Distribute or make available to residents, landowners, and developers information about local, state or federal regulations, best management practices, and policies designed to protect and conserve important natural resources. Information could be available from the Town Office, links posted on the Town’s WEB page, included on signage, or distributed through permitting and code enforcement activities. Consider the following in these efforts:

a. Information on the proper maintenance of septic systems and importance of maintaining buffers and other best management practices as a part of code enforcement, and information on cost-share programs, such as those through Penquis CAP and the Maine Department of Environmental Protection to do remedial work and upgrade substandard septic systems.

b. Distribute, or make available, information to those living in or near critical natural areas about current use property tax programs (Tree Growth, Farm and Open Space), the Beginning with Habitat Program9, and applicable local, state or federal regulations.

c. Provide local contact information for water quality best management practices from resources such as the Natural Resource Conservation Service, the Maine Volunteer Water Quality Monitoring Program, University of Maine Cooperative Extension, County Soil and Water Conservation District, Maine Department of Environmental Protection, Maine Forest Service, and/or Small Woodlot Association of Maine.

Responsibility for Implementation: Board of Selectmen, Town Manager, Town Office staff, Code Enforcement Officer; Timeframe: Ongoing

9 The Beginning with Habitat Program is a habitat-based landscape approach to assessing wildlife and plant conservation needs and opportunities. The goal is to maintain sufficient habitat to support all native plant and animal species currently breeding in Maine by providing information depicting and describing various habitats of statewide and national significance. See Map 10 Critical Habitat.

   a. Continue to host on-site best-management practices training through the Maine Department of Environmental Protection (DEP).

   b. Encourage public works employees and private contractors to become certified in DEP Best Management Practices.

   c. Adopt water-quality protection practices and standards for construction and maintenance of public roads and properties, and require their implementation by the community’s officials, employees and contractors.

   d. Refer to the MaineDOT Waterway and Wildlife Crossing Policy and Design Guide when planning future road construction or rehabilitation projects with the goal of maintaining critical fish and wildlife passage.

   Responsibility for Implementation: Board of Selectmen, Town Manager, Code Enforcement Officer, Public Works Department; Timeframe: Ongoing

4. Federal and State Regulations: Support the enforcement of federal and state laws by having information available at the Town Office, and authorizing the code enforcement officer to make referrals and report violations to the appropriate authorities.

   Responsibility for Implementation: Board of Selectmen, Town Manager, Code Enforcement Officer; Timeframe: Ongoing

5. Local Land Use Regulations:

   a. Retain current standards and criteria for maintaining air quality, surface and groundwater water resources, and protection for public water supplies. Continue to require adequate stormwater, erosion, and sedimentation control. Continue to protect “significant sand and gravel aquifers” through the Groundwater Overlay District.

   b. Retain current provisions for protecting important waterfowl and wading bird habitats and other significant fisheries and wildlife habitats, shoreland vegetation, and visual as well as actual points of access to waterbodies."

   c. Retain the current Village Shoreland Overlay District provisions to allow additional growth that is continuing to protect the existing pattern of development in areas with public water and sewer, while protecting the water quality of Moosehead Lake.

   d. Ensure that local ordinances are consistent with applicable state and federal laws, such as the state subsurface wastewater treatment law and plumbing code, state shoreland and subdivision statutes, the DEP stormwater runoff performance standards, laws governing public water supplies and aquifer recharge areas, and laws regarding critical natural resources, such as the Natural Resources Protection Act.

   e. Maintain an up-to-date floodplain management ordinance that is consistent with state/federal standards so that the Town can continue to participate in the National Flood Insurance Program.
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f. Designate critical natural resources as Critical Resource Areas in Chapter I-11 Future Land Use Plan.

g. Through the Land Use Ordinance, require subdivision or non-residential property developers to look for and identify critical natural resources that may be on-site and to take appropriate measures to protect those resources, including but not limited to, modification of the proposed site design, construction timing, and/or extent of excavation.

h. Require that the Planning Board or Code Enforcement Officer include as part of the review process, consideration of pertinent Beginning with Habitat maps and information regarding critical natural resources. Identification of critical natural resources will require on-site verification.

i. Consider incorporating low-impact development standards designed to minimize impacts on water bodies by keeping stormwater on-site through natural vegetation and use of porous materials to allow infiltration into the soil, and other techniques designed to prevent runoff.

j. Continue to control phosphorus export to great ponds through (1) the Critical Watershed District, which regulates land use activities within 750 feet of specified lakes, and (2) phosphorus control standards for subdivisions based on the methodology and standards developed by Maine DEP, as updated. In addition, consider the need for phosphorus control standards similar to those required for subdivisions for major developments that have extensive impervious surfaces (parking, buildings, etc.), such as a shopping center, conference center or hotel.

Responsibility for Implementation: Board of Selectmen, Planning Board; Timeframe: 2013/14

6. Scenic Resources:

a. Review and amend the Land Use Ordinance as needed to encourage/ require the following:

   i. Maintain the scenic character of the Moosehead Lake Road gateway corridor while allowing for business growth.

   ii. Evaluate the consistency and character of signage and improve, if needed.

b. Consider regulatory and/or non-regulatory measures to do the following:

   i. Maintain the visibility of the night sky through use of full-cutoff, exterior light fixtures and other measures.

   ii. Minimize the visibility of development on hills and ridges through placement of structures below the ridgeline and with building materials and colors that harmonize with the environment.

   iii. Address visual and noise concerns associated with cell towers and wind turbines.

(See Chapter I-11 Future Land Use Plan)

Responsibility for Implementation: Board of Selectmen, Planning Board; Timeframe: 2013/14
Chapter I-9 Historic and Archaeological Resources

OVERVIEW

The people of Greenville treasure their history and cultural heritage, which serves as a basis for community pride and provides a significant attraction for tourism. The Moosehead Historical Society and Museums, Natural Resource Education Center, and Moosehead Marine Museum are at the forefront of preserving and enhancing appreciation for the region’s historic and cultural heritage. The following recommendations support their efforts and seek to preserve the most important of these resources.

GOAL

Preserve the historic and archaeological resources that are so important to the cultural heritage of Greenville and the Moosehead Lake Region.

POLICIES

1. Protect to the greatest extent practicable the significant historic and archaeological resources in the community.

2. Support the Moosehead Lake Historical Society and Museums, the Natural Resource Education Center, and the Moosehead Marine Museum in their efforts to promote the cultural heritage of the region and to preserve important cultural resources.

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

1. Promotion and Education:

a. Support the Moosehead Lake Historical Society and Museums, the Natural Resource Education Center, and the Moosehead Marine Museum through the following:

i. Continue to include links to their WEB pages and having information available at the Town Office.

ii. Work cooperatively on projects as needed and provide support in efforts to obtain grants and other sources of funding.

b. Support promotion of the region’s cultural heritage through programs and exhibits, including operation of the “Kate”.

c. Encourage owners of historic and archaeological sites to research the significance of their properties and seek National Register of Historic Places listing, if appropriate. Publicize the availability of investment tax credits for income producing, depreciable, “certified” historic structures.
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d. Encourage and support the improvement of historic buildings and facades in the Village District through programs designed to revitalize the area.

e. Provide information to property owners on building and site designs that enhance the historic and cultural character of the town.

f. Foster appreciation for historic and archaeological resources through the following:

i. A program to place identification plaques with the year the structure was built on historic structures; structures might have to meet certain criteria in order to qualify.

ii. Walking and/or driving tours that include noteworthy historic structures and sites.

Responsibility for Implementation: Town Manager, Moosehead Lake Historical Society and Museums, the Natural Resource Education Center, Moosehead Marine Museum; Timeframe: Ongoing

2. Identification of Resources: Encourage the Moosehead Lake Historical Society and Museums to identify significant historic and archaeological resources. (The Maine Historic Preservation Commission recommends that a comprehensive professional survey be completed to identify significant historic and archaeological structures and sites. Archaeological surveys should be conducted along the banks of Prong Pond, Rum Pond and the Wilson Ponds.)

Responsibility for Implementation: Town Manager, Moosehead Lake Historical Society and Museums; Timeframe: Ongoing

3. Regulatory Protection: For subdivisions and large non-residential developments (conditional uses) continue to require consideration of identified historic and archaeological resources, and seek input from the Moosehead Historical Society and Museums, the Maine Historic Preservation Commission, or some other professional, as a part of the permitting process, as needed. In addition, review and amend the Land Use Ordinance as needed to do the following:

a. For known historic archaeological sites and areas sensitive to prehistoric archeology, require subdivision or non-residential developers to take appropriate measures to protect those resources, including but not limited to, modification of the proposed site design, construction timing, and/or extent of excavation.

b. To incorporate maps and information provided by the Maine Historic Preservation Commission into the review process.

Responsibility for Implementation: Planning Board; Timeframe: 2013/14
Chapter I-10 Forestry and Agriculture

OVERVIEW

The Moosehead Lake Region’s vast forests have supported local and regional economies for several hundred years. Today, these forests continue to support commercial forestry and provide areas for outdoor recreation and nature-based tourism. In Greenville, commercial forestry is very significant with about 56% of the town enrolled in the Tree Growth Property Tax Program. Commercial agriculture is limited to only one commercial farm operation at this time. Nevertheless, many people have gardens, tap trees for maple syrup, or raise a few horses or other livestock for personal use. The following recommendations support maintaining forestry and agriculture for the future.

GOAL

Conserve important forest and agricultural resources.

POLICIES

1. Support conservation of important forests and farmland for timber and agricultural production.

2. Support forestry and farming and encourage their economic viability.

3. Promote the use of best management practices for timber harvesting and agricultural production to conserve natural resources.

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

1. Economic Development Plans: Include commercial forestry operations, agriculture, and land conservation that supports these activities, in local and regional economic development plans. In particular, encourage the development of new agricultural and forestry activities, such as landscaping and Christmas tree operations, farmers markets, livestock and vegetable operations, greenhouses, and support services for these activities.

   Responsibility for Implementation: Town Manager, Greenville Economic Development Committee; Timeframe: Ongoing

2. Forestland and Farmland Owners: Provide information at the Town Office to do the following:

   a. Encourage owners of commercial forests and farmland to enroll in the current use tax programs (Tree Growth, Farm and Open Space).

   b. Encourage landowners to implement professionally developed forest management plans and soil and water conservation plans, and to take advantage of programs and funding available through the following: U.S. Department of Agriculture; Maine Department of Agriculture, Conservation and
3. Land Use Planning and Regulation:

a. Amend the Land Use Ordinance, if needed, to:

   ii. Allow activities that support forestry and agriculture, such as firewood sales, sawmills, log buying yards, sand and gravel extraction, farmers’ markets, road-side stands, greenhouses, pick-your-own operations, and uses associated with nature tourism and outdoor recreation.

   ii. Encourage non-resource based development in growth areas instead of in forest and farmland.

   iii. Encourage conservation of forest and farmland through clustered and open space development designs.

b. Consult with the Maine Forest Service district forester when developing any land use regulations pertaining to forest management practices as required by 12 M.R.S.A. §8869.

c. Consult with County Soil and Water Conservation District staff when developing any land use regulations pertaining to agricultural management practices.

Responsibility for Implementation: Planning Board; Timeframe: 2013/14, as needed

(See also Chapter I-11 Future Land Use Plan)

Chapter I-11 Future Land Use Plan

OVERVIEW

The Future Land Use Plan advances Greenville’s vision for improving the quality of life and economic prosperity of the town and region by strengthening the town’s role as the regional service center and gateway to the Moosehead Lake Region. In this role Greenville seeks to provide a broad range of goods, services, jobs, housing options, and opportunities for social and recreational interaction. Further, this Plan supports the region’s nature-based economy in forestry, outdoor recreation and tourism through mechanisms to manage and conserve the natural resources that are so critical to the region’s well-being.

\[10\] The State of Maine has identified Greenville is a “regional service center”. A “regional service center” is a municipality identified according to a methodology established by rule that includes 4 basic criteria, including level of retail sales, jobs-to-workers ratio, the amount of federally assisted housing and the volume of service sector jobs. (30-A MRSA §4301, sub §14-A)
More specifically, the Plan identifies areas proximate to services where growth and development can be encouraged, and from a regional perspective promotes Greenville as the growth area for the region.

The Future land Use Plan establishes the direction and framework for orderly growth and development for the next decade. It includes both regulatory and non-regulatory approaches. It provides the legal foundation for land use regulation and integrates capital investments and other Town policies and actions to provide a coordinated approach to achieving the vision.

The Future Land Use Plan builds on the Town’s existing regulatory approach which utilizes the Land Use Ordinance that was first adopted in 1988, and then significantly revised in 2001. The 2001 Ordinance was based upon the 1999 Comprehensive Plan.

The following goals, policies and implementation strategies establish the framework for the Future Land Use Plan which is described in more detail in the narrative that follows.

**GOALS**

1. Encourage orderly growth and development in appropriate areas of the community, while protecting rural character, making efficient use of public services, and minimizing development sprawl.

2. Encourage population growth and new economic opportunities in Greenville to improve prosperity in the community and region.

3. Enhance the “quality of life” in Greenville by maintaining a welcoming, attractive, comfortable community that reflects the community’s pride in itself and makes it inviting to those from away.

4. Enhance and protect the community and individual property rights by encouraging compatible and environmentally sound development.

5. Control municipal and education expenditures by encouraging new growth and development in the areas most cost-efficiently served.

**POLICIES**

1. Support the locations, types, scales, and intensities of land uses as stated in the vision.

2. Encourage growth and development that is compatible with existing uses and patterns of development, particularly in areas with existing or potential access to public sewer and water.

3. Continue to encourage growth and development that might otherwise occur outside the Town of Greenville by also providing rural development areas that are adjacent to growth areas and/or are easily accessible to state highways.

4. Require that access to back land (i.e. land that does not have frontage on a public road or private right-of-way) is retained as land is developed.
5. Discourage development in very rural areas to protect forest resource integrity and other important natural resources, particularly when such development would be expensive for the Town to serve.

6. Direct development to areas with suitable soils, slopes and drainage, and discourage development on floodplains, steep slopes, highly erodable soils and in wetlands.

7. Assure that new development does not negatively impact surface water resources, significant sand and gravel aquifers, important fisheries and wildlife habitat, and important historic and archaeological resources.

8. Ensure that developers provide adequate facilities (roads, sewer, water, etc.) for their developments, so that the costs of improvements associated with their developments do not become a burden to taxpayers.

9. Preserve the traffic moving capacity, safety, and scenic attributes of the Town’s highways, roads and streetscapes - particularly on major corridors.

10. Support the level of financial commitment necessary to provide needed infrastructure, particularly in growth areas.

11. Maintain user-friendly, equitable, and efficient permitting procedures, especially for growth areas.

12. Maintain tax policies, to the extent legally allowable, that are consistent with the goals and objectives of the Land Use Plan.

13. Monitor and coordinate land use planning, regulation and development in the region with the Maine Land Use Planning Commission, adjacent towns, and other entities, as appropriate.

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

1. Future Land Use Plan Implementation:

   a. Assign responsibility for implementing the Future Land Use Plan to the Planning Board and other Town officials as appropriate.

   b. Using the descriptions provided in the Future Land Use Plan narrative (which follows), maintain, enact or amend local ordinances as appropriate to:

      i. Clearly define the desired scale, intensity, and location of future development.

      ii. Establish or maintain fair and efficient permitting procedures, and explore streamlining permitting procedures in growth areas.

      iii. Clearly define protective measures for critical natural resources and, where applicable, important natural resources.

Responsibility for Implementation: Board of Selectmen, Town Manager, Planning Board; Timeframe: 2013/14 and ongoing
2. **Capital Investments to Support Future Land Uses:** Include in the Capital Investment Plan (Chapter I-12) anticipated municipal capital investments needed to support proposed land uses. Direct a minimum of 75% of new municipal growth-related capital investments into designated growth areas (Village, Residential, Commercial and Industrial, Airport and Rural Development Districts) identified in this Future Land Use Plan.

   *Responsibility for Implementation: Board of Selectmen, Town Manager, Agency/Department Heads; Timeframe: 2013/14 and ongoing*

3. **Regional Coordination:**
   
a. Meet with neighboring communities and the Maine Land Use Planning Commission to coordinate land use designations and regulatory and non-regulatory strategies.

   *Responsibility for Implementation: Board of Selectmen, Town Manager, Planning Board; Timeframe: 2013/14 and ongoing*

4. **Code Enforcement:** Provide the Code Enforcement Officer (CEO) with the tools, training, and support necessary to enforce land use regulations, and ensure that the CEO is certified in accordance with 30-A MRSA §4451.

   *Responsibility for Implementation: Board of Selectmen, Town Manager, Code Enforcement Officer; Timeframe: 2013/14 and ongoing*

5. **Track Development, Monitor Effectiveness of the Future Land Use Plan, Adjust as Needed:**
   
a. Track new development in the community by type and location.

   b. Periodically (at least every five years) evaluate implementation of the Plan to determine the following:
      
      i. The degree to which Future Land Use Plan strategies have been implemented.

      ii. The percent of municipal growth-related capital investments in growth areas.

      iii. The location and amount of new development in relation to community’s designated growth areas, rural areas and critical resource areas.

      iv. The amount of critical resource areas protected through acquisition, easements or other measures.

   c. If this evaluation concludes that portions of the current Plan and/or its implementation are not effective, the Planning Board can propose changes as needed.

   *Responsibility for Implementation: Board of Selectmen, Town Manager, Planning Board, Code Enforcement Officer; Timeframe: 2013/14 and ongoing - evaluate by 2018*
FUTURE LAND USE PLAN NARRATIVE

Greenville’s approach to guiding future growth and development utilizes the Land Use Ordinance and the provision of public services including sewer and water in village areas. The Town also encourages owners of commercial forest and farmland to enroll in Tree Growth, and Farmland and Open Space property tax programs. The Land Use Ordinance is a ‘unified’ ordinance which includes town-wide and shoreland zoning, and subdivision regulations.

This Plan responds to anticipated development trends by encouraging and providing opportunities for population growth and economic development within Greenville. Even though year-round population growth based on past trends is projected to be very modest over the next decade, the Town anticipates there will continue to be a demand for new housing, with at least half the demand coming from future part-time residents. Future commercial and other development may also be slow based on past trends, but past trends do not take into consideration development in Greenville as a result of the Moosehead Lake Concept Plan or revitalization of the Big Moose Mountain resort.

Given the desire to concentrate development region-wide and to the benefit of Greenville, this Plan identifies growth areas where development can be encouraged. Greenville’s growth areas are well-suited for additional development given their location in and near the existing service center and at the hub of the region’s transportation network.

Greenville’s existing Land Use Ordinance and its growth area designations are generally adequate in area and location to support orderly residential, commercial and industrial growth over the next ten years. This Plan makes recommended refinements of the existing ordinance to further support the vision and goals for future growth and development.

Growth areas include the Village, Residential, Rural Development, Commercial/Industrial and Airport Districts. With the exception of the Rural Development and Airport Districts, these districts are located within the built-up areas with infrastructure including sewer and water in many locations, roads and streets, and other facilities and services. The Rural Development District functions as a regional growth area designed to support less intensive uses that require a more rural setting. This district is located adjacent to the other growth districts and/or is generally proximate to major thoroughfares and Town roads. There are many areas within the Rural Development District that have suitable soils and topography for additional growth and development. Nearly all municipal capital investments envisioned in the Plan are to be located within the growth areas.

Rural areas are mostly working forestland, with the exception of a few areas of homes and camps adjacent to or near ponds. Rural areas are not located adjacent to main roads and there are very few Town roads in these areas, which makes them less likely to be developed in the future.

---

12 Based on trends over the past decade (U.S. Census), it is estimated there will be a need for approximately 172 new housing units over the next decade, and at least half of these will be for part-time residents. Outside of Greenville in the Unorganized Territories, including Beaver Cove, it is estimated there will be an increase of at least 32 new housing units/year, and about 94% will be for part-time residents.
This Plan recognizes the importance of Moosehead Lake and the other water bodies, the vast forests resources, the areas’ wildlife and fisheries habitats, and the natural scenic landscape of the area that are crucial to maintaining the region’s nature-based economy. It also recognizes the vast tracts of conserved land that nearly surround the town and span a significant portion of the region.

From a regional perspective, encouraging development in Greenville’s growth areas serves to conserve critical and important natural resource areas within and outside of Greenville. Within Greenville, critical and important natural resources are protected through a number of regulatory and non-regulatory mechanisms. Regulations include shoreland zoning, aquifer protection zoning, scenic corridor zoning, floodplain regulations, cluster and open space development provisions, and performance standards in the Land Use Ordinance. Non-regulatory approaches include education and volunteer efforts to protect water quality, and fisheries and wildlife habitats. Additionally, the Town encourages use of the Tree Growth, and Farm and Open Space Property Tax Programs. The public water supply wells and recharge areas are located almost entirely in conserved lands outside of Greenville.

The following maps accompany this Future Land Use Plan: Future Land Use, Zoning, Water Resources, Critical Habitat, Development Constraints and Soil Potential for Low Density Development.

**Growth Areas**

Growth areas are defined as areas suitable for orderly residential, commercial, or industrial development, or any combinations of those types of development and related infrastructure, and into which most development projected over ten years is directed.

Growth area districts include the Village District, Residential District, Rural Development, and the Commercial/Industrial District. Each of these districts has corresponding shoreland zoning overlay districts. There is also an Airport District. These districts reflect the existing pattern of development with opportunities for infill and expansion depending on the area. The most densely developed areas are on public sewer and/or water, where regulations support development with small minimum lot sizes and other dimensional standards that allow for infill (See Table). Growth area districts are displayed on the Future Land Use Map. The following is a description of each growth area designation, and the Table at the end of this chapter describes the uses and dimensional requirements of each district.

**Village District (Growth Area)**

The Village District, which includes the downtown and other areas of mixed uses, serves as the cultural, civic and commercial core of the community. The Town Office, police and fire services, school, hospital, recreational facilities, churches, civic organizations, residences, multifamily housing, and the majority of retail and commercial uses are located in the Village District. As displayed on the Future Land Use and Zoning Maps, the District includes the downtown, areas along Pritham Avenue including Greenville Junction, areas along the Lily Bay Road, areas east of the downtown and the Indian Hill area. Public sewer and/or water are available to many, but not all areas of the Village District.

The Village District is the primary growth area for the community, where future development is most desired with the goal of creating a vibrant town center that is attractive to tourists, second home owners, year-round residents, businesses and others. A multi-pronged approach is needed to
accomplish this to include public and private sector infrastructure investments (roads, parking, sidewalks, lighting, landscaping, recreation facilities, and water and sewer expansion) and land use regulations that support growth and development in the area. The Capital Investment Plan (Chapter I-12) addresses necessary capital investments, and the following addresses land use issues, including the location of public sewer.

The District is intended to support higher densities than elsewhere, compatible mixed uses - residential, public and semi-public uses, and selected retail and other light commercial uses. The Land Use Ordinance currently allows a maximum density of two dwelling units or two principal non-residential buildings per 10,000 square feet where town sewer is available and one dwelling unit or one principal non-residential building per 20,000 square feet where town sewer is not available. These dimensions also serve as minimum lot sizes. Many existing lots in the downtown are much smaller than the minimum lot size.

The Village Shoreland Overlay District which abuts Moosehead Lake includes public wharfs, beaches and parks; seaplane bases; state natural resources agency facilities; and other waterfront uses as well as homes, restaurants, shops and other commercial uses. Much of the core of the downtown is within the shoreland overlay. The dimensional requirements are similar to the underlying district except that the maximum density is one unit per 10,000 square feet with sewer and there is a height restriction of 35 feet. Shorefront setbacks and frontage requirements are consistent with existing patterns – minimum setbacks for commercial uses are 25 feet and residential uses are 75 feet, and minimum shore frontages for commercial are 100 feet and residential are 200 feet.\(^{12}\)

A major constraint to increasing development in the Village District is the lack of vacant land in areas with access to public sewer - although some lots with existing uses could potentially be converted to more intensive uses. Any significant extension of the public sewer would be very expensive and might not be feasible until there is a large development, such as a convention center, or at least, a phased ongoing effort to provide sewer in a developing area.

Lastly, Greenville’s vision for the Village District is for an attractive and vibrant place bustling with social, civic, cultural and commercial activity. Preserving, enhancing and showcasing the region’s iconic north woods character and culture are necessary to achieve this vision. However, the community needs to develop a consensus on how best to assure that future economic development enhances the unique character of the area.

The following refinements are suggested for the Village District (these may not be allowed in the Village Shoreland Overlay District due to state shoreland zoning restrictions):

1. In the interest of encouraging economic activity, work to develop a consensus on the appropriate level of design review standards for commercial development. This effort should entail maximum public involvement.

\(^{12}\) These dimensional requirements were approved by the Maine Department of Environmental Protection (October 16, 2012 letter Shoreland Zoning Program) – town vote anticipated for June 2013.
2. Amend dimensional standards to allow higher-density development. Consider modifications to the following, particularly in areas with access to public sewer: maximum allowable lot coverage; maximum allowable residential and non-residential density; minimum lot size requirements; and building, structure and sign setbacks. Also, consider adopting height limitations for buildings and structures outside of the shoreland zones as a mechanism to control density and address use of Moosehead Lake by seaplanes (Shoreland Zoning has a 35 foot height restriction).

3. Amend the Clustered or Planned Development provisions to promote higher-density residential and non-residential developments consistent with Village District land use patterns.

4. In areas without access to the public sewer, consider allowing higher densities and smaller minimum lot sizes through clustered development designs with engineered waste disposal systems.

5. Potentially applicable to all of the above, consider any benefits to having different requirements based on the type of use (e.g. residential, commercial, mixed-use), type of construction (e.g., new construction versus rehabilitation of an existing structure), and characteristics of the specific location within the Village District (e.g., downtown versus outlying areas).

6. Amend, as needed, performance and design standards to assure that private parking, unloading/loading areas, sidewalks, traffic circulation, fire protection, stormwater control and other issues are addressed in conjunction with allowing higher densities, while at the same time seeking to create more walkable mixed-use areas.

7. Review the list of uses to assure that those uses that are desired are clearly allowed, such as a convention center. Additionally, the ordinance should be amended to require that multifamily development is a conditional use subject to review by the Planning Board.

8. Consider expanding the Village District, as needed, to respond to growth and development trends.

Residential District (Growth Area)

The Residential District is consistent with the community’s vision, and includes existing and potential residential neighborhoods within, adjacent and near the Village District as displayed on the Future Land Use Map and Zoning Map. Most residences are single family homes, although there are some duplexes, apartments in older homes, and multifamily housing complexes. The District allows medium density residential development in a manner designed to promote a wholesome living environment. Non-residential uses include home occupations, bed and breakfasts, and some public/semi-public uses as long as they are compatible with residential neighborhoods. Minimum lots sizes and other dimensional requirements are similar to the Village District to allow for medium density development. (See Table)

A major portion of this district is adjacent to Moosehead Lake and zoned as Residential Shoreland Overlay. The Shoreland Overlay is consistent with state law and includes a reduced shorefront setback along the west side of West Cove where there are many pre-shoreland zoning, nonconforming residences. Shoreland performance standards protect water quality and other necessary natural resources in these areas.

While many residential areas in this district have public sewer and water, there are two fairly large areas that do not have these services. The first area is located on the west side of the Lily Bay Road generally
north of the Scammon Road intersection. At the northernmost end of the Residential District are the Highlands, a densely developed area with many single family homes on small lots. Just south of the Highlands there are a number of relatively large lots that could support additional residential development. The sewer extends almost up to the Scammon Ridge intersection. The second area is the upland portions of the West Cove Point peninsula that extends into Moosehead Lake. Most of the undeveloped portion of this area is a paper subdivision. Sewer could be made available in this area according the Sanitary District.

Regulatory modifications for this area might include:

1. Increase the maximum lot coverage from 40% to 50%, or more in areas served by sewer. If allowed, require that parking, fire protection, stormwater runoff, and other issues are addressed.

2. Consider allowing Clustered Development consisting of uses allowed within the Residential District.

3. Relax the provisions for home occupations, while continuing to protect residential neighborhoods, such as guide services, Avon sales, and other similar activities. These occupations would not increase traffic or require parking, and the majority of goods and services would be provided off premises. This change would allow these types of occupations to have appropriate signage.

Potential capital investments in this District include expansion of water and sewer to those areas not currently served and ongoing upgrade/maintenance of streets and sidewalks.

Commercial/Industrial District (Growth Area)

Consistent with the Town’s vision for improving the economy and job opportunities, the Commercial/Industrial District provides suitable areas for commercial and industrial activities, such as manufacturing, warehousing, and research facilities – all uses which would be compatible with existing public, commercial and industrial uses. Residential uses are prohibited to prevent conflicts. The Greenville Steam plant, the Town’s Industrial Park and the Moosehead Sanitary District are located in this district. There is considerable vacant land in this area and there is access to rail and State Route 6/15. Existing land use regulations require a minimum lot size of 20,000 square feet with sewer and 40,000 square feet without sewer (See Table).

Given the desire to maximize efficient use of the land in this area, the Town should consider allowing more flexibility in how the area is developed. For example, the Land Use Ordinance could be amended to reduce the minimum lot size and other dimensional requirements, particularly for uses that could function adequately on smaller lots. Clustered mixed use developments could also be allowed to support more creative and efficient use of the land.

The only real development constraint in this area is wetlands, which are zoned as resource protection. The primary capital investment for this area is to complete the infrastructure within the Town’s industrial park. Depending on future uses, an intermodal facility and railroad siding might also be desirable.
Part I. Recommendations

The regulations within this district must dovetail with the Town’s economic development plans (See Chapter I-3. Economy), and the district’s uses should be reviewed and modified as needed to reflect the uses that are identified in economic development plans. For example, the ordinance should clearly accommodate desired uses, such as natural-resource based industries, energy production and other potential uses for the Greenville Steam facility, and uses associated with a railroad siding and an intermodal facility. Additionally, the Town may want to consider if other ordinance modifications are needed to correspond with incentives such as tax increment financing, grants, and or pre-permitting of lots.

Airport District (Growth Area)
The Airport District is designed to accommodate those uses, which because of situational or operational characteristics are appropriate to locate at or in close proximity to a general aviation airport. This district is for aviation uses as well as certain manufacturing and related light industrial uses that generally would be considered compatible with an airport complex. Uses that would be seriously affected by noise and potential hazards associated with airport operations, such as residential uses, are prohibited.

The Town’s vision is to increase use of the airport by aircraft, including larger aircraft, and with other related uses. The updated Airport Master Plan will provide details on the infrastructure improvements. The Town’s Land Use Ordinance should be amended to be consistent with the new Airport Master Plan. The Ordinance should also be amended to allow facilities associated with taxis, shuttles and rental cars because there is a need for these services.

Given the importance of the airport, and potential future growth in this area, the Town should also consider the need to expand the Airport District and/or the need for an Airport Overlay District based on Federal Aviation Administration recommendations designed to prevent uses and activities that would hinder air traffic, such as towers or other tall structures.

Rural Development District (Regional Growth Area)
The Rural Development District is important to the Town’s vision for expanding its service center and gateway role within the Moosehead Lake Region (See Future Land Use Map and Zoning Map). This District is designed to encourage growth that might otherwise occur outside of Greenville as well as a share of the projected residential and commercial growth envisioned for the Town of Greenville. The Rural Development District includes corresponding shoreland zones, the Scenic Corridor Overlay District and portions of the Groundwater Protection Overlay District.

This district accommodates rural residential and commercial development that requires a more rural setting and larger lots than available within the Village and Residential Districts. Typical uses include second homes, camps, accommodations and services associated with nature-based tourism and outdoor recreation, and forestry and agricultural uses. Cluster/open space development designs are encouraged, and there are performance standards to protect important and critical natural resources. Great ponds, important wetlands, rivers and streams are primarily protected through shoreland zoning. A small portion of this district is included in the Ground Water Protection Overlay District where activities that pose as threats to groundwater are prohibited.
Most of the Town’s subdivisions, many with vacant lots are located in this district. It is anticipated that these lots will accommodate some of the new housing that is anticipated over the next decade.

The Scenic Corridor Overlay zone includes land areas within 500 feet on either side of the Moosehead Lake Road from the Shirley town line to Greenville’s Village District (See Future Land Use Map and Zoning Map). The district is designed to accommodate commercial activities that require more space than is available in the village and that need to be adjacent to the Moosehead Lake Road, the major gateway to the town and the Moosehead Lake Region. Attractive development designs (e.g., signage, landscaping, controls on glare and lighting, provisions for vegetative buffers and parking in the rear) and access management strategies designed to address highway safety and capacity (e.g., shared driveways, limits on curb cuts and a 200 foot minimum road frontage requirement) are required in this district. Minimum building setbacks from the right-of-way of the Moosehead Lake Road are currently 75 feet for residential buildings and 150 feet for commercial and other non-residential structures.

Over the past several years, the scenic corridor standards have prevented development or development designs that would have been desirable along this corridor. The following modifications to the district should be considered to improve development opportunities while at the same time maintaining the scenic character of the area:

1. Review and modify the buffer, landscaping, screening, signage, and setback requirements to allow more flexibility while still requiring an attractive entryway to the village. Utilize performance standards that allow a developer to demonstrate how the design of the development will enhance or be consistent with the character of the corridor (i.e. scenic views of lake and mountains, forested landscape, screening of waste disposal and/or storage facilities, etc.). Continue to regulate lighting to minimize glare and light pollution.

2. Consider modifications to the ordinance to allow expansion and enhancement of the Moosehead Lake Visitor’s Center in its efforts to promote Greenville and the Moosehead Lake Region.

The Town might also consider potential changes to the Clustered Development provisions for the Rural Development District to further encourage clustering, including use of engineered waste disposal systems.

The Table at the end of this chapter describes the uses and dimensional requirements of this district.

**Rural Area**

The designation of rural areas is intended to identify areas deserving of some level of regulatory protection from unrestricted development for purposes that may include, but are not limited to, supporting agriculture, forestry, mining, open space, wildlife habitat, fisheries habitat and scenic lands, and away from which most development projected over ten years is diverted.

**Rural District**

The Rural District, as depicted on the Future Land Use Map and Zoning Map, consists primarily of working forestland, much of it enrolled in Tree Growth and several small agricultural parcels enrolled in Farmland and Open Space. The few public roads in the area lead to private roads that serve residential
development adjacent and near Sawyer Pond, the Wilson Ponds and Prong Pond. This district is intended to support forestry, agricultural and open space uses interspersed with single family dwellings not in excess of one dwelling unit per 40,000 square feet, and natural resource based uses, home occupations and other low-intensity recreational and commercial uses with restrictions on size and impacts (See Table). Developments that preserve open space, scenic areas and important natural resources are encouraged through provisions for clustered/open space development. Provisions for this district also require that existing natural vegetation is maintained along public roads to the maximum extent practically feasible.

Important and critical natural resources, such as significant aquifers, important wetlands, great ponds, streams and rivers are protected through Shoreland Zoning, Critical Watershed Overlay Districts, Aquifer Protection Overlay Zoning and general performance standards. These overlay districts are displayed on the Future Land Use Map and Zoning Map.

The Rural District serves as important fisheries and wildlife habitat as a result of few roads, sparse development and location adjacent to very large tracts of conservation land in neighboring jurisdictions.

Other than upkeep of Town roads, no municipal capital investments are anticipated in this District.

No regulatory changes are recommended for this District.

**Critical Natural Resource Areas**

Critical natural resources are those most vulnerable to the impacts of development, and are protected through federal, state and local regulations. Local regulations include Shoreland Zoning (resource protection zoning and wetland zoning, in particular), Critical Watershed Overlay zoning, Floodplain Regulations, Groundwater Protection Overlay zoning, and performance standards in the Land Use Ordinance. Other non-regulatory mechanisms include water quality monitoring, volunteer efforts on the part of lake associations, educational efforts by the environmental organizations, etc. Fortunately for Greenville many critical and important natural resources are located in rural, undeveloped areas distant from public roads. The ordinance also includes performance standards designed to assure that development is compatible with surrounding land uses and the landscape. Critical natural resources are displayed on Maps 9 and 10 in Appendix B. The Town’s zoning is displayed on Map 16 in Appendix B.
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Other Regulatory Refinements to Consider

The following is a list of general and specific regulatory changes that were identified either in the inventory and analysis, or through the public opinion survey.

- Review and modify ordinances as appropriate to respond to current and new state laws.
- Consider new standards for wind power, adult businesses/entertainment, fireworks, and cell towers after it has been determined that there may be public support for these types of regulations.
- Revise the provisions governing signage to support more uniformity and flexibility, particularly for businesses not located along main roads, and to allow signs to be located closer to roadways than buildings and structures.
- Simplify conditional use permitting submissions, particularly where the information may not be necessary to the Planning Board’s review. Maintain the ability of the Planning Board to require additional information that it needs to adequately review applications.
- Consider the need for height restrictions for buildings and structures to maintain visibility and safety for sea planes in areas near Moosehead Lake.
- Consider requiring occupancy permits after looking at the process, standards and costs.
- Review road and parking standards to assure that they are adequate, consistent with desired land use patterns, and not overly restrictive, particularly in growth areas.
- Consider regulations governing moorings in Moosehead Lake, if needed.

Other Chapters with Recommendations on Land Use

Recommended Land Use Ordinance changes can also be found in the following chapters: Chapter I-3 Economy; Chapter I-4 Housing; Chapter I-6 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space; Chapter I-7 Transportation; Chapter I-8 Natural Resources; Chapter I-9 Historic and Archaeological Resources; and Chapter I-10 Forestry and Agriculture.

Land Use Ordinance Provisions Table

The following table contains existing and recommended changes to dimensional standards, permitted uses, and conditional uses for each of the aforementioned districts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Ordinance Provisions (Recommended Changes in italics or “*”)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Residential District</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum lot size – with sewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- without sewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. density – with sewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- without sewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum lot coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum road frontage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setbacks - front/side/rear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Uses (examples) (May require a Building Permit from CEO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional Uses (examples) (Require a Permit from Planning Board, and must meet performance and design standards)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: * Provisions that could be modified to increase development density and provide for more efficient use of public infrastructure, as described in the text.
Chapter I-12 Ten-year Capital Investment Plan

OVERVIEW

The Capital Investment Plan establishes a framework for long-range scheduling and financing of the major capital investments necessary to meet existing and future needs. A primary goal is to anticipate major expenditures, and to prioritize and schedule the funding of projects in a fiscally sound manner that minimizes drastic changes in tax levels. By anticipating future needs the Town is also better able to take advantage of creative approaches and outside funding opportunities. This Capital Investment Plan can provide the framework for a formal capital improvement program, which can then be used to guide the Town’s annual budgeting decisions.

A capital investment is usually defined as a major construction project or purchase that requires funds from sources other than normal operating expenses. Capital investments are usually relatively expensive ($20,000 or more), and depending upon the figure a Town wants to use, don’t reoccur annually, last a long time, and usually result in fixed assets. The Capital Investment Plan also includes reference to items that may require further study to determine needs, costs and other details that may lead to a capital investment.

There are three basic approaches to paying for capital needs: (1) Pay Out Now 100 Percent of Cost, usually through a town meeting appropriation; (2) Borrow and Pay Debt Service through a loan or bond; and (3) Save and Buy through reserve accounts. A balanced capital investment program may use all three of these approaches, plus other funding mechanisms depending upon circumstances. For example, Greenville currently leases highway equipment from itself as a way to assure continued funding for capital equipment, and to permit a comparison between purchasing equipment outright to the cost of leasing equipment from an outside company. The Town also makes annual contributions to several reserve accounts, such as those for Fire Department and Police Department. In some situations the Town relies on funds from the county and other communities to assist in capital investments, such as the recent closure of the landfill. Other sources of funding can include state or federal grants, trust funds, private grants and contributions, special assessments, impact fees from major developments, and tax increment financing.

This Capital Investment Plan’s goals, policies and implementation strategies are designed to dove-tail with the other recommendations of the Comprehensive Plan. The table describes, prioritizes and identifies funding mechanisms for the specific capital needs and projects that were identified in the Comprehensive Plan’s Inventory and Analysis.

This Plan also includes projects the Town would like to see developed, but where substantial other public and private investment would be required.
GOAL

Plan for, finance, and develop an efficient system of public facilities and services to accommodate growth and economic development.

POLICIES

1. Finance existing and future facilities and services in a cost effective and affordable manner.

2. Utilize a broad range of funding mechanisms, including grants and collaboration with other entities, to pay for capital investments.

3. Maintain an appropriate and affordable balance between providing public infrastructure to encourage development and having new development pay its own way in providing the infrastructure it requires.

4. Reduce Greenville’s tax burden by attempting to stay within LD 1 spending limitations.\textsuperscript{13}

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

1. Capital Improvements Program:
   a. Utilize this Plan as a basis for developing an ongoing Capital Improvements Program designed to prioritize and schedule funding for projects in a fiscally sound manner thereby minimizing drastic changes in tax levels, cost-effectively managing debt, and adequately maintaining the Town’s capital infrastructure and assets. Review and update the ongoing Capital Improvements Program on a periodic basis, and use it to develop annual budgets.
   b. Continue to use reserve accounts, bonds (loans), grants, state road subsidies, lease-purchase agreements, fundraising and general funds for capital improvements.
   c. Explore and utilize as applicable other funding mechanisms, such as user fees, tax increment financing, and impact fees (impact fees would require a capital improvement program).
   d. Seek to maintain adequate funding in existing and new reserve accounts for ongoing capital purchases (major equipment) based on depreciation values, to keep from falling behind.

   \textit{Responsibility for Implementation: Board of Selectmen, Town Manager, Budget Committee, Department Heads; Timeframe: 2013/14 and ongoing}

2. Road Management System: Continue the Road Management Program to inventory and schedule capital improvements (including paving and repaving) to spread the costs out over time.

\textsuperscript{13} LD 1 An Act to Increase the State Share of Education Costs, Reduce Property Taxes and Reduce Government Spending at All Levels (enacted 1/20/05). The purpose is to keep the percentage growth in taxes below the percentage increase in personal income. The tax cap is applicable to state, county, and local governments.
3. **Equitable Sharing of the Costs of Development**: Maintain an affordable balance between public and private involvement in funding infrastructure required by new development, such as sewer, water, sidewalks, parking, roads, etc.

   a. Review existing and potential Town requirements for developer contributions to capital projects to evaluate their effectiveness, and make adjustments, as appropriate.

   b. Work with the Maine Water Company and Moosehead Sanitary District to determine the best approaches to expanding water and sewer service.

   c. Consider approaches, such as tax increment financing, cost-sharing, impact fees, incentives, and other mechanisms designed to support/encourage new development that pays its fair share and improves the public infrastructure specifically needed for the development.

4. **Regional Coordination**: Explore opportunities to work with neighboring communities and the county to plan for and finance shared capital investments to increase cost-savings and efficiencies. Opportunities identified in this Plan include, but are not limited, to:

   a. Emergency services

   b. Transfer station (solid waste and recycling)

5. **Major Collaborative Projects**: Explore opportunities to work with public and private sector partners to plan for and finance the following projects:

   a. Moosehead Lake Region Conference Center

   b. Regional Wellness, Recreation and Rehabilitation Center
TEN-YEAR CAPITAL INVESTMENTS

The following tables display capital investment priorities as envisioned at this time. These priorities may change over time depending on a variety of circumstances, such as community opinions, opportunities presented by private entities, or opportunities for outside sources of funding.

Since collaboration among the various partners will be most effective in achieving results, both Town projects and projects where the Town might be a partner are included. All of these projects are considered important to the community, and should be considered high priorities for funding through grants and other non-municipal funds.

Given municipal fiscal constraints, these projects cannot all be assigned high priorities for Town financial investment, and in some cases, it may not be appropriate for funding through the Town. Consequently, one of the primary goals of the following tables is to provide guidance to Town officials on priorities for the Town in the form of general account funding, borrowing, and effort on the part of Town staff.
## Part I. Recommendations

### Ten Year Capital Investment Plan: Projects with Costs of $20,000 or More (Projects are not prioritized in any particular order)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity/Dept./Facility</th>
<th>Description (* means growth-related)</th>
<th>Ten-Year Est.</th>
<th>Funding Options and Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town Police Department</td>
<td>Upgrade computer equipment and software</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>Necessary, ongoing expense using general fund; grants may be available; 10 year timeframe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vehicle replacements: three 4-wheel drive trucks (new)</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>Necessary, ongoing expense using reserve account and general fund; 10 year timeframe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Fire Department</td>
<td>Energy efficiency improvements to Fire Station – insulation, overhead doors, lighting</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>High priority because of return on investment; general fund, grants, donations; accomplish within 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equipment: fire service van ($65,000); ladder truck ($100,000) or combined ladder/pumper truck ($175,000) [all costs for used equipment]</td>
<td>$165,000 - $240,000</td>
<td>Necessary, ongoing expenses (high priorities) using reserve account, bonding, grants, donations; 10 year timeframe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Management</td>
<td>Emergency Shelter - Greenville Consolidated School (generator and other capital needs)</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>High priority; grants (FEMA, other), town/school funds; accomplish within 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town, School, Private Entities</td>
<td>Emergency in-place shelter facilities at senior housing facilities (Dean Park, Pritham Ave., Nickerson Park, Chief ton Heights)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Low priority; no local taxpayer funds; grants (USDA, CDBG, etc.), private match (for-profit facilities), accomplish within 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Public Works Department</td>
<td>Vehicle replacements: two wheelers; two-ton dump/plow truck (new)</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>Necessary, ongoing expense using reserve account and general fund; 10 year timeframe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roads – capital investments (currently - $27,000 per year)</td>
<td>$270,000+</td>
<td>High ongoing priority, limited by funding; state funding, general fund, bonding; 10 year timeframe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Covered sand and salt storage shed (only with state funding)</td>
<td>$150,000+</td>
<td>Low priority unless considerable state funding (MDOT, MDEP) becomes available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Industrial Park</td>
<td>*Park infrastructure including water, sewer, 3-phase power throughout the park. (Study design, phasing, etc.)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>High priority emphasizing use of tax increment financing, grants and private funding; accomplish within 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Rail siding/intermodal facility</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Priority based on need with funding through tax increment financing, grants, private funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Airport</td>
<td>*Update Airport Master Plan; construct parallel taxiway in 2015; add more itinerant aircraft parking; consider lengthening runway for larger aircraft, if needed</td>
<td>$4-5 million</td>
<td>Low priority for Town’s 5% share, but high priority if private funding is available; federal share is 90% and state share is 5%; accomplish within 10 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town, Partners/Village District Infrastructure</td>
<td>*Concept design study to consider designs, costs and funding for improvements to include: intersections; streets; parking; signage; pedestrian/bicycle amenities; façades and buildings; landscaping; energy efficient lighting; bypass; etc.</td>
<td>$25,000 - $35,000</td>
<td>High priority using grants (CDBG, other), state/MDOT, TIF, private funding; no local taxpayer funds; accomplish within 10 years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

14 Rough estimates based on today’s dollars, i.e., not factored for inflation.
## Part I. Recommendations

### Ten Year Capital Investment Plan: Projects with Costs of $20,000 or More (Projects are not prioritized in any particular order)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity/Department/ Facility/Partners</th>
<th>Description (* means growth-related)</th>
<th>Ten-Year Cost Est.</th>
<th>Funding Options and Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town, Partners</td>
<td>Housing Rehabilitation – single family and multi-family housing; grant application to determine needs and costs</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Medium priority for Town share (10%-20%, may include in-kind); grants (CDBG, USDA), private; accomplish within 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Recreation Department/ Facilities</td>
<td>*Red Cross Beach – increased parking, beach improvements (more sand/less rocks), canopies/trees for shade</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>Medium-high priority for Town share, grants, in-kind, donations; accomplish within 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town, Snowmobile and ATV Clubs / Trails</td>
<td>*Expand multi-use trail(s) from the village northward and eastward to connect with regional trail system to include system encircling Moosehead Lake</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>High priority for Town share; grants, donations; accomplish within 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NREC, Town, Partners Moosehead lake Rd. Facility</td>
<td>*Natural Resources Education Center Moosehead Lake Road - facility expansion</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Low priority for Town share; but high priority for private, in-kind and grants (USDA and other); accomplish within 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byway Corridor Committee, Town, MDOT, Partners</td>
<td>*Moosehead Lake Scenic Byway Enhancements – scenic overlooks, trailheads, Lily Bay Road safety improvements, etc.</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Low priority for Town share; but high priority for grants (state, federal and other programs); accomplish within 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDOT, Town</td>
<td>Pedestrian/bicycle access under Pritham Avenue railroad overpass</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Low priority for Town share; but high priority for MDOT funding; accomplish with 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine Water Company/ Public Water Supply</td>
<td>*Replace some existing lines, and expand distribution lines to support future growth and development</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Ongoing, as needed; medium priority for Town share; water company capital account, grants, private.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moosehead Sanitary District/ Sewage Collection</td>
<td>*Expand sewage collection system to support future growth and development</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Ongoing, as needed; medium priority for Town; bonding, grants, private.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw Public Library Association, Library</td>
<td>New connector between buildings (eliminates need for new handicapped accessible entrance and restroom)</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>High priority through Library capital account, donations, grants; accomplish within 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenville Cemetery Corp.</td>
<td>*Possible need for additional cemetery space</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Low priority for Town share at this time; grants; timeframe uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Union 60/ Town</td>
<td>Demolish Nickerson building</td>
<td>$150,000-$200,000</td>
<td>Maine Brownfields funding (asbestos), grants, fundraising; accomplish within 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Vision is for new community/school recreation building on Nickerson building foundation</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Grants, fundraising etc.; accomplish within 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other capital projects - unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part II. Inventory and Analysis

Chapter II-1 Population Characteristics

OVERVIEW

Predicting future population changes is important to planning for housing, jobs, health care, social desires, education, and other community services. This chapter examines the characteristics of population growth (birth and death rates, in/out-migration), population age characteristics, population projections, non-resident population, educational attainment, income, poverty rates and occupations.

The following state perspective provides context for the analysis of the local population:^15

A few aspects of Maine’s demographic picture stand out: an older population with a large number of baby boomers, relatively few children, and low numbers of racial and ethnic minorities. These factors all combine to give Maine a rapidly aging population and slow population growth. Maine’s particular demographic challenges in the coming years will center on the aging population and slow population growth. As baby boomers begin to retire, employers will be faced with the possibility of more job openings than people to fill them. In addition, the skill sets of the younger generations may not match the openings available. Demand for health care workers of all sorts will rise as the baby boomers require more medical care. A larger and larger elderly population will depend on a smaller and smaller working population unless in-migration trends bring more workers to the state. In order for Maine’s population to grow and firms to find the employees they need, in-migration to Maine must increase.

Population projections for Maine predict continued slow growth through the year 2018, followed by a decline in the size of the population by 2023. Between 2003 and 2018 the growth rate will be 1.9%.

---

^15 Quote from Maine Population Outlook 2013 – 2028, Maine Land Use Team (March 30, 2010)
SUMMARY

Anticipated Population Changes and Implications

- Greenville’s year-round population will grow slowly and become increasingly older over the next decade. The population is projected to grow to 1,683 by the year 2018 and remain at that level through 2023. This is an increase of 37 above the 2010 population of 1,646. These projections are based on the past and do not take into consideration the Moosehead Concept Plan resort or any other major development that could significantly increase the town’s resident and non-resident population.
- Population growth will primarily come from people moving into town, which would significantly improve the viability of the community.
- Population growth outside but near Greenville, such as population growth in Beaver Cove and Harfords Point, contributes economically, socially and culturally to the Greenville community. Lower taxes in outlying towns make these areas particularly attractive for year-round and second homes, but there are concerns about the fair and equitable provision of services to these areas by the Town of Greenville.
- An increasingly older population means that there will be a corresponding decline in school enrollments, fewer people in the workforce and an overall older workforce, and shifting needs for housing, health and social services, transportation, and recreation. An older population can also mean more people willing and able to contribute to the community.

The Non-resident Population

- Greenville’s non-resident population – people who own second homes or stay at short-term lodging-accommodations is larger than the year-round population. The non-resident population is important to the social fabric and economy of the community.
- Greenville is the service center community for a vast and sparsely populated area, which means the daytime population increases significantly with people coming to work, shop, socialize, and seek health care and other services. This daytime population provides considerable economic benefits to Greenville.
- The Town supports its non-resident and daytime population by serving as a full-service, service center complete with a hospital, airport, municipal and other government services, health and social services, recreational facilities and programs, educational facilities and programs, and a broad array of businesses and employers. Greenville’s critical role as a service center for such a vast rural area is not only important, but can be challenging for such a small community.

Educational Attainment and Economic Prosperity

- Greenville residents overall have more formal education today than ten years ago - that is a higher proportion of residents have a high school diploma and/or a college degree. When compared to the county and state, Greenville residents have more formal education than countywide, and are more similar to statewide levels. Education attainment is a good predictor of the economic success of an individual. Potential employers seek an educated workforce when considering where to locate their business or industry.
- Since educational attainment and economic prosperity are closely linked, it is not surprising that Greenville’s population has overall higher incomes than countywide, but lower incomes than

16 About 70% of Greenville’s property tax bills are for non-resident property owners, Town Manager, June 2012.
statewide. Income levels in very rural areas are typically less than those in more developed areas where there are more job opportunities.

- However, Greenville had a higher proportion of households living below the poverty level (18.25%) than countywide or statewide. This higher poverty rate may be due to Greenville having a higher proportion of senior citizens living on fixed incomes and social security, and people taking advantage of the subsidized housing than many other communities.

**POPULATION CHANGE SINCE 1840**

Greenville’s year-round population steadily, and sometimes dramatically increased from 128 people in 1840 to a high of 2,025 in 1960 (Figure). The population then decreased to 1,623 by the year 2000, and then increased by 23 to a population of 1,646 for the 2010 Census. Population loss since 1990 may be attributable a number of factors, including young people moving away in search of work and a larger proportion of older people beyond childbearing age. Also, as the population aged there were more deaths and fewer births.

**POPULATION CHANGE SINCE 2000**

Greenville’s year-round population increased by 23 individuals between 2000 and 2010, a modest 1.4% increase. Population growth in the greater Greenville region was minimal, as well – 57 people, a 2% increase between 2000 and 2010 (table). Beaver Cove, Shirley and the Northeast Somerset Unorganized Territory (UT) actually experienced the greatest increases in population, while Northeast and Northwest Piscataquis UTs experienced population losses.
Population growth in surrounding communities, such as those with lakefront property (Beaver Cove and Harford’s Point), impacts Greenville in several ways. Growth in these communities is driven, at least in part, by significantly lower property taxes. In fact, year-round residents may choose to live in these communities instead of Greenville because of lower taxes, but these people are very much a part of the Greenville community. Issues related to the provision of municipal services to this population will be discussed later in the Plan.

Between 2000 and 2010 Piscataquis County’s population growth, one of the slowest in Maine, increased by 1.7%. Somerset County’s population increased by 2.6%, also less that the statewide rate of 4.2%.

Regional Population Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Piscataquis UT</td>
<td>Piscataquis</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>-74</td>
<td>-21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Piscataquis UT</td>
<td>Piscataquis</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver Cove</td>
<td>Piscataquis</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley</td>
<td>Piscataquis</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Somerset UT</td>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seboomook Lake UT</td>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenville</td>
<td>Piscataquis</td>
<td>1,623</td>
<td>1,646</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,802</td>
<td>2,859</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piscataquis County</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17,235</td>
<td>17,535</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somerset County</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,888</td>
<td>52,228</td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,274,923</td>
<td>1,328,361</td>
<td>53,438</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UT = unorganized territory
Source: U.S. Census, 2000 and 2010

NATURAL CHANGE VERSUS MIGRATION

Natural change is basically the number of births minus the number of deaths. Migration is the number of people moving into or out of an area. For Greenville there have been significantly more deaths than births over the past two decades resulting in a net loss in population.

During the 1990s there were 81 more deaths than births and during the 2000s there were 183 more deaths than births (table).

During the 1990s there was also a net loss of 180 people due to out-migration. This trend reversed during the 2000s with a net gain of 206 through in-migration. This means that during the 2000s Greenville’s population growth was primarily the result of in-migration.

Population Growth: Natural Change and Migration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Population Change</th>
<th>Births</th>
<th>Deaths</th>
<th>Natural Change*</th>
<th>Migration*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>-261</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>-81</td>
<td>-180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000s</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>-183</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes: Natural change = births +/- deaths. Migration (people moving into or out of town) = Total population change +/- natural change.
Sources: U.S. Census; Greenville Town Report; Maine Department of Health and Human Resources, Office of Data, Research and Vital Statistics.
MEDIAN AGE TRENDS

The trend of increasingly more deaths and fewer births is consistent with the aging of the population. Greenville’s median age was 38.2 in 1990 and increased to 52.3 for 2010 according to the Census. Greenville’s population has consistently been older overall than countywide and statewide based on the statistics displayed below.

POPULATION BY AGE

The graph below displays Greenville’s population for 2000 and 2010 by age category. The number of individuals for all categories below age 45 showed losses in population with the one exception of a 7 person gain in the 20 to 24 age category. Conversely, all age categories age 45 and above showed increases in population, except for the decrease of 13 people in the age 75 and over categories. If these demographics continue, there will be fewer and fewer people of child bearing age, and more and more people with higher rates of mortality due to age.
FUTURE POPULATION CHANGES

Maine Land Use Team (MLUT) population projections (April 2010) offer a possible scenario of future population based on past trends and other assumptions. In some ways, these projections represent what will happen under a business-as-usual scenario where migration rates, life expectancies, and sprawl patterns continue on their current trajectories.

Greenville’s population is projected to increase by 8 individuals, or by .5%, between 2013 and 2023, which compares to a projected decrease of 2.3% for Piscataquis County (see graphs). MLUT projects that the county will lose about 386 people during this time period.

Since these projections are based on past trends they do not take into consideration population changes as a result of new large developments, such as the Moosehead Concept Plan resorts and housing, or a resort on Big Moose Mountain.

Population Projections by Age

Projections by age group are not available for Greenville, so projections for Piscataquis County are used (graph). These projections for the year 2023 suggest that there will be more people over age 60; significantly fewer people in the age 45 to 60 categories; more people in the age 30 to 44
categories; fewer people in the 20 to 29 year old category; and relatively slight fluctuations in the school-age categories. These projections suggest an increasingly older population, overall.

**GREENVILLE’S NON-RESIDENT POPULATION**

Greenville’s non-resident population is very significant and important to the town. This population consists of people who own second homes, those who stay overnight on a short-term basis, and the daytime population which includes people who commute to Greenville for work and shopping, and those just passing through who stop to shop and/or utilize other services in town.

Second-home residents and people who live in neighboring communities are part of the social and cultural fabric of the Greenville community not only in their purchase of goods and services, but also in their knowledge, expertise, and cultural contributions to the community.

**Part-time and Short-term Population**

Greenville’s part-time and short-term population primarily consists of those coming to enjoy the region’s four-season recreational offerings who are second-home/part-time residents and short-term visitors staying at hotels, motels, campgrounds, bed and breakfasts, cabins and hunting camps.

The size of this population can be estimated by looking at the number of housing/accommodation units. There are a total of 1,166 of these units in Greenville, with the majority consisting on non-resident homes (935). The other 231 units generally accommodate short-term or transient visitors and include the count of units displayed in the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part-time and Short-term Units in Greenville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Accommodation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Units</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel/Motel Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B&amp;B Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campground Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabins/Hunting Camp Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Town Code Enforcement Officer, 2010

When fully occupied and assuming that at a minimum each unit is occupied by 2 people, this translates to a total population of 2,332. Obviously, this is a very rough estimate because this population is constantly changing over time and there are many variables. For example, part-time residents of second homes are probably a more consistent or stable group overall than those short-term visitors staying at more transient types of lodging. Taking this analysis a step further, with 80% of the total number of units as second homes, the second-home population would be about 1,870. This rough analysis confirms the significance of the town’s part-time and short-term population. This population is larger than, and at some times significantly larger than, the year-round population of 1,646 (2010 Census).

**Daytime Population**

Greenville’s daytime population increases considerably because it is a service center community for a vast and very sparsely populated area. This daytime population consists of the following groups: Greenville residents who live, work and shop in Greenville; non-residents who come to Greenville for work, goods and services; and the non-resident population discussed in the previous section. The daytime population also includes those tourists and other visitors passing through town - stopping to shop, get gas, eat at restaurants, and utilize town offerings.
EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT

Greenville residents are increasingly well educated. Between 2000 and 2010, the percentage of high school graduates increased from about 82% to 90% of the population age 25 or older. The percentage of those with a bachelor’s degree or higher increased from about 16% to almost 22% (graphs). In 2010, educational attainment for Greenville residents was higher than countywide levels.

Compared to statewide levels, Greenville had a slightly higher proportion of high school graduates and above, but a lower proportion of people with bachelor’s degrees and above.

Education attainment is a good predictor of the economic success of an individual. Also important for a community to consider is the fact that potential employers seek an educated workforce when considering where to locate their business or industry.

INCOME

Piscataquis County continues to be one of the less affluent counties in Maine. The U.S. Census calculated the County’s median household income as $33,944 for 2009. This compares to $46,541 statewide.

The median household income\(^\text{17}\) estimate for 2009 for Greenville was $36,313, higher than the median for the county, but with a $7,200 margin of error due to Greenville’s small population size (graph on next page).

Per capita income figures show similar trends (graph on next page).

\(^{17}\)“Median” means that half of all households had incomes above the figure listed and half had incomes below it.
POVERTY

Greenville had a higher proportion of households living below the poverty level (18.25%) than countywide (17.17%) and statewide (12.79%) (graph). Greenville has a higher proportion of senior citizens living on fixed incomes and social security and people living in subsidized housing than many other communities.

Certain populations of people are more likely to be living in poverty than others. These include elderly households on fixed incomes, elderly living alone, and single-parent households. The figures in the table below include the total number of people in each of these categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Category</th>
<th>Households #</th>
<th>% of All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Householder, no husband, with own children</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male householder, no wife, with own children</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Householder living alone</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>35.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with individuals age 65 and over</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>34.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Householder 65 and older living alone</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>15.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census, 2010
OCCUPATIONS

The largest occupational categories for Greenville were as follows: almost 29% were employed in sales and office occupations; and about 26% were employed in management, professional, and related occupations (table). Nearly 16% were employed in service occupations; around 13% were in construction, extraction, and maintenance; and about 13% were employed in the production, transportation, and material moving occupations. While Greenville had only 2.49% employed in farming, forestry, and fishing occupations, this was proportionately higher than at countywide and statewide levels. Greenville also had proportionally more people employed in sales and office occupations than countywide and statewide.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>% of All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management, professional, and related occupations</td>
<td>223</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service occupations</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and office occupations</td>
<td>244</td>
<td></td>
<td>28.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming, fishing, and forestry occupations</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction, extraction, and maintenance occupations</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production, transportation, and material moving occupations</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>843</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census, 2009

Percentage of Employment by Occupation, 2009, U.S. Census

- Greenville
- Piscataquis County
- Maine

- Management, professional, and related occupations: 26.45%
- Service occupations: 15.9%
- Sales and office occupations: 28.94%
- Farming, fishing, and forestry occupations: 2.49%
- Construction, extraction, and maintenance occupations: 13.29%
- Production, transportation, and material moving occupations: 12.93%
- Total: 100%
OVERVIEW

Greenville’s future prosperity is highly dependent on job opportunities and the overall health of the local and regional economy. A town is better able to successfully plan for future prosperity if it understands its economic strengths and weaknesses, potential opportunities and challenges, and the long-term economic trends that are affecting the community and region.

Global and State Perspective

Globalization, technology and demographics are the primary factors driving the economy today. These are the long-term “structural” economic trends that are most important to comprehensive planning for the next decade and beyond. These forces are resulting in fundamental changes, such as the shift away from manufacturing to a more service-oriented economy. The most significant demographic trend affecting the economy is the aging population and the impending retirements of baby boomers, which will profoundly impact labor markets and reshape long standing patterns of demand for goods and services.

Cyclical changes, such as periods of growth and recession, are less important to comprehensive planning because they are usually temporary changes that do not affect the long-term structure of the economy. Nevertheless, the current and ongoing economic slump is having a very significant impact at all levels of government and slow economic recovery is expected.

Long Term Economic Trends

Globalization: The service producing sector has accounted for most job growth for decades, while the manufacturing sector has steadily declined. Both of these trends are projected to continue, with globalization as the primary force behind this change.

Technological Changes: Coupled with globalization, technology continues to shape the economy, with the pace of technological change expected to accelerate. Changes in technology have increased the demands for skilled workers in terms of knowledge, skills, and abilities required for job performance. Increasingly, Maine’s competitiveness is determined by the quality and availability of human capital.

Innovation: Innovation is a necessity to succeed in the new economy. Much of the growth will have to come from entrepreneurship and initiative of Maine’s smaller businesses, and entrepreneurial startups.

Nature-Based Tourism

Maine’s Office of Tourism identified the state’s untapped tourism potential in the growing national market for nature-based tourism. The whole is greater than the sum of the parts is the concept for nature-based tourism. A nature-based approach is not only being directed to develop new marketing

---

18 “An Analysis of High-Demand, High Wage Jobs in Maine” (Maine Department of Labor, June 2008)
19 The Maine Land Use Team (The Maine Economy: Year-End Review and Outlook 2008)
strategies for Maine but most importantly will be used to coordinate a new layer of emphasis on product development for Maine’s tourism industry; one that will seamlessly connect things like hiking or canoe trails from one region to theaters, concert halls and historic downtowns in another region.

Challenges and Opportunities for Greenville
In summary, the structural changes occurring in the economy today, as outlined above, are impacting the Town of Greenville and the region, presenting both challenges and opportunities.

SUMMARY
Economic Realities: Strengths and Weaknesses
- Greenville’s economy has been affected by some of the trends described above, including the aging of the overall population and shift away from manufacturing towards a more service and retail based economy. Greenville’s unique economic challenge is its distance and relative isolation from more populated areas of the state where there are more people and more job opportunities. This circumstance also makes it less likely that services like high-speed internet and natural gas will come to Greenville in the near future.
- Greenville needs to increase its year-round population to support its existing infrastructure of schools, the hospital and other facilities and services. Significant population growth will only happen with increased job growth and economic activity. Greenville also needs to be a more affordable place to live. Currently, people are choosing to live outside of Greenville because the property taxes are lower in most neighboring areas.
- Greenville’s strengths are its uniqueness as a remote service center to the Moosehead Lake Region, an area renown for outdoor recreation, nature-based tourism, and forest resources. Additionally, the Town’s tax base consists of a wide range of businesses, cottage industries, and an extensive number of second homes.

Priorities for Economic Development
- Greenville’s priorities for economic development have included revitalization of the Village District; improvements to the industrial park; recreational facility improvements, such as at Junction Wharf; airport improvements; and support for a variety of activities, such as snowmobiling, ATVing, ice fishing, dog sledding, and the International Seaplane Fly-in. Many of these activities are undertaken by organizations in the region such as the Chamber of Commerce, Natural Resources Education Center and others. The private sector’s contribution to the community and region’s success must not be overlooked.
- Greenville also works with and utilizes the services of the Piscataquis County Economic Development Council on an ongoing basis to take advantage of opportunities for business promotion and financial assistance for economic development.
- Expansion and diversification of the economic base, both within and outside of Greenville, and a proactive approach to economic development by public and private interests will be necessary for economic prosperity. For example, the Moosehead Concept Plan resort and housing development, revitalization of the resort at Big Moose Mountain, and other similar projects have the potential to significantly improve the economy. Reopening of Greenville Steam and the potential for cheaper, local power generation would also be a benefit to the local economy, especially if a new manufacturing facility located nearby could take advantage of the cheaper energy. A new railroad siding spur into the industrial park to facilitate shipping of raw materials or finished products...
would make this site even more attractive. The Town will want to be prepared to take full advantage of these opportunities.

- Branding of Greenville’s offerings in the Moosehead Region is a mechanism to enhance tourism and outdoor recreation. This could be accomplished by working collaboratively with both the public and private sector, including local businesses, Piscataquis County Economic Development Council, Appalachian Mountain Club, Maine Huts and Trails, and others in the area.

- In order to move forward, the Town will have to invest more into its economic development program, including municipal staffing to focus on building on past accomplishments and taking advantage of new opportunities. The reactivation of the Economic Development Committee will be an important part of such a program.

**Greenville’s Village District**

- Greenville’s Village District serves as the civic, cultural and commercial hub of village activity. Greenville Junction to the west along Pritham Avenue to the town line, the Mill area to the north along Lily Bay Road to Scammon Road, and the Indian Hill area to the south along the Moosehead Lake Road are the spokes of the hub. All three of these areas are unique and integral to Greenville. Collectively, these areas and the downtown are referred to as the Village District.

- A number of improvements were made to the Village District during the late 1990s. The Village District is bustling with activity and thrives when tourism peaks – summer through early fall, and winters when there is snow. The Village District is less active during off-season times; early spring, and before snowfall in November and early December. Weather, such as a snowless winter or rainy summer, can impact many of the recreational activities that bring people to Greenville. Some businesses, such as restaurants will close down during off-peak seasons, and some businesses just do not survive the sometimes difficult economic climate in Greenville.

- Greenville’s Village District has many assets upon which to build, including its location along the shores of Moosehead Lake, its uniqueness in the region as the only service center, and its quaint village with some beautiful historic structures and cultural attractions. Issues that need to be addressed in the Village District include: improvements to existing buildings and facades, better facilities for pedestrians (sidewalks, street crossings, etc.), better signage, more parking, improvements to recreational facilities, safety issues associated with large trucks – particularly at the traffic signal, and an overall facelift. More businesses are also needed to create a more vibrant Village District.

**Community Support for Tourism**

- Outdoor recreation and nature-based tourism is a huge part of the local economy. The Town works hard to promote and support the Moosehead Region’s four-season recreational opportunities. Efforts include: providing public access to lakes (Greenville Junction Wharf), providing parks and recreational programs, opening streets in the Village District to ATVs, providing funds for the Chamber of Commerce and snowmobile trails, and generally providing a broad range of services to second-home residents and short-term visitors.

**Home Occupations**

- As a rural community, home occupations are a very important part of Greenville. In some cases businesses have started out as home occupations and then expanded into separate businesses.
Areas for Industrial and Commercial Development

- The Town has provided a number of locations for commercial and industrial development in its land use regulations. Greenville’s ordinance allows a broad range of businesses and industries in a variety of locations, including the industrial park, the Village District and in rural areas, as appropriate. The ordinance also includes performance standards designed to assure that development is compatible with surrounding land uses and the landscape.
- One regulatory constraint is the setbacks and other restrictions in the Scenic Corridor Overlay District that appear to be constraining business development along Route 15 south of the village.
- More details on these regulatory constraints are included in Chapter II-12. Existing Land Use.

Adequacy of Public Facilities for Future Economic Development

- Greenville’s strengths with respect to public facilities is its village area with sewer and water, an industrial park, access to rail and a major thoroughfare, the Junction Wharf and the downtown Boardwalk, and an airport.
- The biggest gaps in infrastructure include:
  o The lack of high speed internet in most areas.
  o Village area deficiencies: traffic and pedestrian configurations at the signalized intersection, need for more parking and better pedestrian amenities, improvements to commercial structures, aesthetics, improvements to recreation facilities, and more space for additional commercial growth, including possible expansion of sewer and water.
  o Expansion of commercial development opportunities along the Moosehead Lake Road while maintaining attractive gateway appearance.
  o Recreational improvements: Junction Wharf, Red Cross Beach, multi-use trails, etc.
  o Industrial Park improvements: expansion of water, sewer, roads, three phase power and railroad siding.
  o Airport improvements: completion of airport master plan improvements, updated master plan, eventual runway extension to 5,000 ft., etc.

Economic Development Incentives

- Greenville does not currently have any economic development incentive programs and does not utilize tax increment financing. The Town may want to explore the applicability and benefits of these types of economic incentives, such as tax increment financing for the industrial park, a new manufacturing facility associated with or near the Greenville Steam plant, and business development in the Village District.
- Greenville could also do more to promote business development through a more active economic development program with an economic development director on staff at the Town Office.

Using the Region’s Unique Assets to Promote Economic Growth

- The Greenville region has a wealth of outdoor recreational offerings and a strong cultural heritage based on forestry and life in the North Woods. The Town, the Moosehead Lake Region Chamber of Commerce, the Historical Society, the Moosehead Marine Museum, the Natural Resources Education Center, the Forest Society of Maine, the Appalachian Mountain Club, the snowmobile and ATV clubs, many private businesses, and other organizations work hard to promote the region for its recreational and cultural offerings, as well as other quality of life assets.

---

The chapters on Transportation, Recreation, and Land Use contain more detail on some of these needs.
Part II. Inventory and Analysis

GREENVILLE’S ECONOMIC BASE: YESTERDAY AND TODAY

The region’s vast and productive forestlands, Moosehead Lake and other water bodies, and rolling hills and mountains have served as the foundation for Greenville’s economy for well over a century. Today, Greenville truly serves as a gateway community to Maine’s north woods. With Greenville’s setting at the southern end of Moosehead Lake within these vast privately owned, publicly accessible, productive forestlands, it is not surprising that the economy is based primarily on the natural resource-based industries of forestry, outdoor recreation and nature-based tourism. Further, Greenville is the only service center community for a vast and sparsely populated area.

While the area’s natural resources are a great asset to Greenville, there are also significant economic challenges associated with the small year-round population, remote location and dependence on nature-based tourism. Greenville is very reliant on its non-resident population and short-term visitors who vacation on a seasonal basis and whose activities can be significantly constrained by a poor economic climate. Greenville is also very dependent upon the surrounding communities and unorganized areas; given this unique situation any economic analysis and economic development strategy must consider the region as a whole.

Greenville as a Service Center

Greenville is a service center community that provides employment, goods and services for a vast and sparsely populated area. Given its distance from other service center communities, its role is vital to serving the needs of the residents and visitors of the region. Greenville is unique for a town its size; most towns with populations less than 2,000 do not have a hospital, an industrial park, an airport, subsidized housing, or a local newspaper.

While these things make Greenville very self-sufficient, they do present economic challenges for a community with such a small year-round population. Greenville’s dependency on the surrounding, mostly unorganized areas creates a somewhat vulnerable situation for the Town. Greenville needs the natural resource base to support its economy both in forestry and tourism, but the Town has very little control over what happens in these areas. There is concern that state policies, particularly regarding land use and property taxation in the unorganized territories, may not always support Greenville’s efforts to maintain an economically viable community.

Forestry

Forestry is an important part of the economy in the region. Most of the forestlands in Greenville and the region are owned by Plum Creek Timber Company. Plum Creek also owns about 8,800 acres of forestland in Greenville. There are also smaller forestland owners, who derive income from the sale of logs, pulp and chips. Businesses in involved in forestry-related endeavors include forestry contractors, lumber dealers, a log house manufacturer, and a few other small-scale manufacturers of wood products.

---

21 See Chapter II-10. Community Character, History and Archaeology
22 See Chapter II-11. Forestry and Agriculture
Outdoor Recreation and Nature-Based Tourism

The region’s natural resource base of forests, lakes, wildlife, fisheries, scenic amenities, and overall “wildness”, in combination with a unique cultural heritage in the timber industry, make the Greenville area particularly attractive for outdoor recreation and nature-based tourism. Many of Greenville’s businesses cater to tourists and second-home residents. Tourism activity is characteristically greatest during the summer months, which accounts for the significant seasonal fluctuations in employment and other economic activity. The Town is working to expand the active tourism seasons to include winter sports (snowmobiling, skiing), fall activities (fall-foliage viewing, hunting), spring activities (fishing), and multi-season activities such as world class hiking (spring, summer and fall). The Moosehead Lake Chamber of Commerce and a number of other organizations are very active in promoting outdoor recreation and tourism within the region.

Plum Creek’s Moosehead Lake Concept Plan

Perhaps the most significant development for Greenville and the region is Plum Creek’s proposed Concept Plan (see sidebar).

The Concept Plan, located outside Greenville, is designed to address “working landscapes, ecological resources, intact contiguous working forests, recreation, economic development, and regional planning” for the next 30 years. While the plan does present some predictability for Greenville and surrounding communities, it will remain to be seen how quickly and how complete the proposal will unfold. Certainly, Plum Creek’s marketing of its development proposals will result in an increased awareness of what the region has to offer, which may increase economic activity in Greenville.

GREENVILLE BUSINESS INVENTORY

The majority of businesses and industries within Greenville and the region are relatively small with few or no employees, as many are owner-operated. This is particularly characteristic of service and retail sector businesses. The following table displays an inventory of businesses within Greenville and clearly illustrates Greenville’s role as a service center and a community that caters to the tourism and recreation industry.
### Part II. Inventory and Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>Address/Service Description</th>
<th>Town/Service Area/Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.E. Robinson (oil service)</td>
<td>Fiddleheads (grill)</td>
<td>Mike Theriault Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. W. Geeterslohl – Timber Frames</td>
<td>Flatlanders (restaurant)</td>
<td>Moosehead Building Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allagash Canoe Trips</td>
<td>FM Energy Solutions (furnaces)</td>
<td>Moosehead Cedar Log Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen Morrill Construction</td>
<td>Folsom Realty</td>
<td>Moosehead Cottage Resort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian Mountain Club</td>
<td>Folsom’s Flying Service</td>
<td>Moosehead Dock Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisan Barn (crafts)</td>
<td>Fred’s BodyShop (snowmobile/bobt)</td>
<td>Moosehead Enter (cable, video)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aucoin Masonry</td>
<td>Fred’s Guide Service</td>
<td>Moosehead Family Campground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auntie M’s (restaurant)</td>
<td>Fred’s Redemption</td>
<td>Moosehead Fitness Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back Hm Enterprises (consultant)</td>
<td>From Away Books</td>
<td>Moosehead Hills Cabins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BackDoor Soup Kitchen (restaurant)</td>
<td>Gabriel’s Studio (signs/Books)</td>
<td>Moosehead Lake Vacation Rentals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangor Savings Bank</td>
<td>Gallery on the Lake Photo</td>
<td>Moosehead Laundry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond a Century Health Foods</td>
<td>Gardenscapes</td>
<td>Moosehead Matters (newspaper)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond the Bend (furniture)</td>
<td>Greenville Cemetery Corp.</td>
<td>Moosehead Pet Kennels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bickford &amp; Son Plumbing</td>
<td>Greenville Inn</td>
<td>Moosehead Pet Supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Apple (gas/convenience)</td>
<td>Greenville Veterinary Clinic</td>
<td>Moosehead Rubbish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birch Point Builders</td>
<td>Hammond Lumber</td>
<td>Moosehead Sanitary District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birch Point Cabins</td>
<td>Hanson Landworks</td>
<td>Moosehead Secretarial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blair Hill Inn and Restaurant</td>
<td>Harris Drug Store</td>
<td>Moosehead Septic Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Thornton Constr.</td>
<td>Higgins Real Estate</td>
<td>Moosehead Sharpen/Machine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burky Law Office</td>
<td>Home Workshop (plaques)</td>
<td>Moosehead Taxidermy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.A. Dean Memorial Hospital</td>
<td>IMPACC (sales)</td>
<td>Moosehead Towing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinets (cabinetmaker)</td>
<td>Indian Hill Construction</td>
<td>Moosehead Traders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden National Bank</td>
<td>Indian Hill Motel</td>
<td>Moosehead Water Wells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cander's House B&amp;B</td>
<td>Indian Hill Trading Post (grocer)</td>
<td>Moosin Around Gift Shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain Sawyer House B&amp;B</td>
<td>Jack Whittier &amp; Son Welding</td>
<td>Morrell Lumber Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caron’s Signs</td>
<td>Jack’s Air Service</td>
<td>Mountain Ridge Woodwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Century 21 (real estate)</td>
<td>Jamieson’s (restaurant)</td>
<td>Moosetracks Family Cottages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalet Moosehead (motel)</td>
<td>Jay’s Towing</td>
<td>Mud Puddle Mercantile (gifts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Acouin Construction</td>
<td>Jodi’s Hair Horizons</td>
<td>My Girlfriends Closet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chieftan Heights/Highlds. (housing)</td>
<td>Jones Snowplow/Sanding</td>
<td>N. Country Master Carpentry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJ’s Fix –It</td>
<td>Joseph Richards Land Clearing</td>
<td>NAPA (auto parts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collins Electric</td>
<td>Kamp Kamp (Antiques, gifts)</td>
<td>Northeast Guide Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corner Book Shop</td>
<td>Kelly’s Landing Restaurant</td>
<td>Northern Associates Real Estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cozy Moose (cabin)</td>
<td>Kineo Video Electronics</td>
<td>Northern Maine Crafts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crazy Moose Fabrics</td>
<td>Kineo View Motor Lodge</td>
<td>Northern Nails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Memories Scrapbook</td>
<td>Knot Fade Away Hairdresser</td>
<td>Northern Woodlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosby &amp; Neal Funeral Home</td>
<td>Lakeside Landscaping-Building</td>
<td>Northwoods Camp Rentals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currier’s Flying Service</td>
<td>Lakeview Family Practice</td>
<td>Northwoods Expressions (signs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daigle’s Garage</td>
<td>Lander Associates Construction</td>
<td>Northwoods Healthcare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Bar</td>
<td>Lazore Electric</td>
<td>Northwoods Outfitters,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darryl Murray Construction</td>
<td>Lloyd’s Oil Burner &amp; Propane</td>
<td>Owen Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave’s Automotive</td>
<td>Lodge at Moosehead Lake</td>
<td>Ozzie Wilson (construction)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Park</td>
<td>Maine Computer Service</td>
<td>Paul Breton Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Di’s Coffee Shoppe</td>
<td>Maine Eye Care Associates</td>
<td>Pepin Ass. (machinery, design, parts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downeast Mortgage</td>
<td>Maine Guide Fly Shop</td>
<td>Phillip Washburn Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Road Electric Inc.</td>
<td>Maine Highlands Federal Credit U.</td>
<td>Phillips Brothers Constr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene Murray Landscaping</td>
<td>Maine Mtn. Candle &amp; Soap</td>
<td>Pleasant Street Inn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurich Insurance</td>
<td>Maine Woods Explorers</td>
<td>Plum Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavation Services</td>
<td>Martin, Richard Construction</td>
<td>Points North Recreational Guides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferland Accounting Service</td>
<td>Mason Inc. (construction)</td>
<td>Polly’s Day Care</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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**EMPLOYMENT AND THE ECONOMY**

Employment in rural Maine differs substantially from that of urban Maine. Rural areas, like Greenville, often have fewer jobs per capita, lower labor force participation, and higher rates of unemployment. Occupations in rural areas typically differ from those in urban areas, reflecting greater reliance on manufacturing. Since rural residents must commute greater distances to find work, benefits are diminished by increased commuting time, transportation costs, and lack of access to child care and services. Many of these characteristics are evident in the following data.

**Major Employers in Greenville and the Dover-Foxcroft Labor Market Area**

The largest employer in Greenville is the C.A. Dean Hospital (172 employees). Other major employers are the Greenville Indian Hill Trading Post (60 employees) and the Greenville Consolidated School (40 employees). The majority of employers in Greenville and the region have less than 20 employees. There are also a number of family businesses and home occupations. Greenville Steam, another major employer in Greenville, was closed around 2007/2008. It was then purchased by a new owner and was in operation for two years, but then closed again and is currently for sale.

Greenville is located within the Dover-Foxcroft LMA. LMA’s are based on commuter patterns. Major employers in the Dover-Foxcroft LMA outside of Greenville with more than 50 employees are shown in the table. The future of the major employers is mixed, particularly given the current recession and

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Employers (50+ Employees) in the Dover-Foxcroft LMA (outside Greenville)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bud's Shop'n Save, Dexter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSI Fixtures Inc., Milo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte White Ctr., Dover Foxcroft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayo Regional Hospital, Dover Foxcroft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Pride Cleaning, Sebec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSAD 41, Milo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dexter Health Care, Dexter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ortelius International LLC, Dover Foxcroft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dexter Middle School, Dexter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant River Lumber, Foxcroft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dexter Regional High School, Dexter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scavengers, Dexter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foxcroft Academy, Dover Foxcroft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedomocha Elementary, Dover Foxcroft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardwood Products Co., Guilford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw's Supermarket, Dover Foxcroft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibbard Nursing Home Inc., Dover Foxcroft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True Textiles Inc., Guilford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: Maine Department of Labor, September 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

23 See Map 3 Dover-Foxcroft Labor Market Area in Appendix B.
the projected slow growth in the population. A number of the major employers in the Dover-Foxcroft
LMA are healthcare providers (hospitals, nursing homes, etc.), which given the aging of the population
will probably continue to be major employers. Schools are major employers whose employment levels
may be impacted by decreasing enrollments. Employers in manufacturing, construction businesses, and
retail and service providers will all be impacted by overall economic trends.

GREENVILLE’S ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES
Greenville’s Town Manager has traditionally been responsible for the Town’s economic development
program. The Economic Development Committee also works on economic development initiatives. Past
economic development work has included Village District revitalization, development of an industrial
park, development of a business incubator facility, development of the airport, improvements to
recreation facilities such as the Junction Wharf, and sponsorship of a number of recreational programs
and events. The Town is also active with the Piscataquis County Economic Development Council in
promoting countywide economic development. There are also a number of organizations in the region
that are partners in economic development activities, such as those described below.

Moosehead Lake Region Chamber of Commerce
The Moosehead Lake Region Chamber of Commerce is an active participant in economic development
within the region. The Chamber has a full-time director with several part-time staff. The Chamber
operates the Moosehead Lake Visitors’ Center, sponsors a number of activities and events, and actively
promotes the region through booths at trade shows such as the Eastern States Exposition, and through
coordination with regional and state entities. The Chamber also works with area snowmobile clubs on
the snowmobile-trail program and events.

Piscataquis County Economic Development Council (PCEDC)
PCEDC, whose office is in Dover-Foxcroft, was established in 1998 by leaders from around Piscataquis
County who recognized the need for a cooperative economic development program. The Council’s
mission is to leverage local, county, regional, and state resources to promote and encourage private and
public investment within Piscataquis County with the goal of stimulating long-term sustainable
economic development and growth in the region. In order to better promote economic development in
Piscataquis County, the PCEDC focuses on attracting businesses to the county, retaining local businesses
and assisting in their growth, and developing and promoting the county’s unique culture and heritage.
More specifically, the Council assists in development of infrastructure including grant writing, etc.

Other partners in promoting the region include:
- Moosehead Historical Society and Museums
- Moosehead Marine Museum (restored steamship Katahdin)
- Natural Resources Education Center
- Moosehead Lake Coalition (Fisheries)
- The Forest Society of Maine
- Appalachian Mountain Club
- Moosehead Riders Snowmobile Club
- ITS Grooming
- Moosehead ATV Riders
- West Cove Ice Racing Association
- The Greenville Junction Depot Friends
- In-Town Trails Committee
Annual Events

There are a number of annual and ongoing activities that the Town and its partners sponsor to promote the region. These include the following:

- Snowmobile Trail Grooming (private and local snowmobile club, considerable town/state funding)
- Forest Heritage Days (Forest Heritage Days, org.)
- International Seaplane Fly-In (Greenville Seaplane Fly-in Association)
- Katahdin Cruises (Moosehead Marine Museum)
- MooseMania (Moosehead Lake Region Chamber of Commerce)
- Snowfest (Moosehead Lake Region Chamber of Commerce, Moosehead Riders Snowmobile Club)
- Independence Day Celebration (Moosehead Lake Region Chamber of Commerce, Town of Greenville)
- Greenville Gazebo Concert Series (Town of Greenville)
- Moose-on-the-Run 5K Road Race and 1K Fun Run (Dover-Foxcroft YMCA)
- Annual Ricky Craven Fishing Tournament Charity (Moosehead Lake Region Chamber of Commerce)
- West Cove Ice Racing (West Cove Ice Racing Association)
- 100-mile Wilderness Sled Dog Race (Wilderness Sled Dog Racing Association, Town assistance)
- USCC Snowmobile Race (Moosehead Riders Snowmobile Club)

Village District Revitalization (Late 1990s)

The Town of Greenville revitalized its downtown during the late 1990s as follows: construction of two downtown parking lots; improvements to the Thoreau Park; construction of a shorefront boardwalk; construction of a large wooden gazebo with the help of the local Masonic Lodge; face-lifts to business storefronts; and installation of welcome signs at entryways to the town. This work was accomplished with a $400,000 Community Development Block Grant, as well as Town funds and private donations.

The Greenville Downtown Revitalization Study established the basis for this work which included a market assessment and a survey of downtown merchants. The study noted the following: (1) there will be modest prospects for increasing the local retail sector based solely on the existing demographics; (2) 20% of retail and service customers come from other areas of Maine and another 20% come from other parts of New England; (3) 19.5% of downtown space is currently vacant and there is little demand for this space; (4) there appears to be a potential demand for up to 16,500 square feet of retail space; and (5) the demand for retail/service space is among local, primarily home-based businesses - which suggests the possibility of an “incubator” approach (i.e. multiple tenants share space and businesses services). Other recommendations included: increased education and outreach to bankers regarding various government programs which can leverage private lending; improved education for small business owners; and consideration for “micro-loan program” in conjunction with incubator project.

Greenville’s Industrial Park

Greenville’s Industrial Park is an 85-acre Town-owned industrial park located off Route 15 southwest of the downtown/village area. Industrial park occupants include: Pepin Associates (materials research and development), Moosehead Cedar Log Homes (log homes, fencing, and latticework), Pelletier’s Garage,
Ryder’s Junk Yard, Moosehead Rubbish and Recycling, a septic waste disposal business, and Greenville’s transfer station and public works garage.

The additional 30 acres of land available for development is to be divided into smaller lots. The park is not served by public water and sewer. The industrial park is adjacent to rail service, and a rail siding into the park would be desirable. Three-phase power extends to the transfer station in the industrial park, and from there is accessible to other areas of the industrial park.

The former Greenville Steam plant, a 15-MW biomass-driven steam-power plant, is located adjacent to the industrial park. The steam plant closed June 2011, but there is hope that it will open in 2013 under new ownership, ideally with some new manufacturing business located adjacent to Greenville Steam to use inexpensive “behind the fence” power.

**Greenville’s Business Incubator**

The Greenville Business Incubator is a Town-owned facility located at 76 Spruce Street. The facility, built in 2004 with a variety of federal, state, and local funds, consists of 10,000 sq. ft. steel-framed building on a cement slab. The Town leased the facility to the Composites Technology Centers (CTC) Corporation to administer the Advanced Technology Development Center (ATDC) Program as funded by the State of Maine for Composites. The CTC currently operates a similar facility in Sanford, Maine: the Greenville Business Incubator is a satellite of the Sanford facility and the University of Maine’s Advanced Engineered Wood Composites (AEWC) Center. The construction of this 10,000 sq. ft. facility was to be phase I of a larger intended project which was to result in an 18,000 sq. ft. facility.

The facility was built to be the home to new high-tech businesses primarily in the wood composites field that would then support additional similar businesses in other areas of Piscataquis County. The Greenville Business Incubator (GBI) was designed to allow manufacturers to lease space for their operations, to grow stronger through the use of modern space, low rent, and business planning assistance. GBI’s main tenant today is Pepin Associates (materials research and development).

**Greenville Junction Revitalization (mid-2000s)**

The Junction Wharf consists of a 3.4 acre peninsula which juts into the West Cove of Moosehead Lake, and is the only public boat launch on the southern end of Moosehead Lake. The park includes common green space, picnic tables and canopies, a small bathhouse, swimming beach, and a playground. The area was completely revitalized 2008-2011 to include reconstruction of the Junction Wharf, a repaved and expanded on-site parking area with more space for vehicles and trailers; new docks and boat launch area; off-site parking area at old railroad turntable (Jct. Wharf, ATVs, snowmobiles); tree planting (Canopy Grant), and new lighting.

**Airport Improvements**

A number of improvements have been made to the Greenville Airport. These include: (1) Airport Runway Reconstruction – both runways (2006-2009); (2) Airport Arrivals Building (2011); and (3) Airport Hangar Development (recently purchased additional land for future hangers because all previously created hanger lots are leased). (More information can be found in Chapter II-6. Transportation)
Tax Increment Financing District (TIF)

TIF is a sophisticated economic development tool used for a wide-range of economic development activities. Simply stated, it allows a town to direct property tax income from new development to a fund for specific economic development activities. To establish a TIF Program a town must define a TIF District (area where TIFs can be granted) and adopt policies for granting TIFs in accordance with state law. Some or all of the new property-tax income can be used in the TIF District or to support development within the District. A major fiscal benefit is that new valuation from the development is not added to the town’s total valuation. The higher the town’s valuation, the higher its proportional share of funding for schools, the more it pays in county taxes, and conversely the less it gets in state revenue sharing and general purpose school funding. Greenville does not currently utilize TIF.

Commuter Patterns

The most current commuter data (2000 Census) indicates that nearly 80% (565) of Greenville’s residents worked in Greenville. Of the other 20% of Greenville’s residents who worked outside of Greenville, 85 worked in Piscataquis County, 23 worked in Somerset County, and 39 worked elsewhere (table).

Greenville’s workforce was 898 people (2000 Census). Almost 63% (565) of the town’s workforce resided in Greenville, while the other 37% (333) commuted to Greenville for work. Nearly 30% (266) of Greenville’s workforce resided in Piscataquis County.

Labor Force and Employment

Greenville’s 2010 annual average civilian labor force was 792 people, and the unemployment rate was 11.9% (Maine Department of Labor) (table, next page). The labor force is the number of people residing in an area who are either employed or are receiving unemployment compensation, which means these figures do not include those who are unemployed and not receiving unemployment compensation, but who may still be looking for work. Greenville’s unemployment rate (11.9%) was higher than the total for the region (11.2%), higher than Piscataquis County (11.2%), higher than Somerset County (10.8%), and higher than statewide (7.9%). This is not surprising given Greenville’s very remote, rural location.
Labor force trends for the Dover-Foxcroft LMA between 2000 and 2011 indicate that both the overall size of the labor force and the number of employed people has fallen over this period reflecting the downward swing in the economy among other factors.

Correspondingly, unemployment rates have risen. Unemployment rates for the Dover-Foxcroft LMA, Maine and the U.S. are displayed in the second graph which clearly shows how unemployment has been higher in the very rural Dover-Foxcroft LMA, as compared to Maine and the U.S.

[Source: Local Area Unemployment Statistics, Center for Workforce Research & Information, 9/2011]
**Consumer Retail Sales**

Taxable consumer retail sales data can be used to evaluate Greenville’s retail sales activity (middle graph). Taxable consumer retail sales are those sales where a sales tax is collected, and do not include non-taxable items such as food eaten in the home. Non-taxable food store items typically represent about 25% of actual total sales in food stores. Total consumer retail sales for Greenville fluctuated between 2004 and 2010, with a high of almost $33 million in 2007, a low of $26.4 million for 2009, and $27 million for 2010 (see graph). These figures have not been adjusted for inflation. However, in real dollars (adjusted for inflation) overall taxable retail sales decreased by 24.8% between 2004 and 2010.

The table displays taxable consumer retail sales for Greenville as compared to Penobscot Economic Summary Areas (ESAs) and Maine. All of these areas show decreases in sales between 2005 and 2010 with Greenville and Millinocket showing the greatest decreases. Between 2009 and 2010, Greenville experienced a 2.32% increase in sales, which was approaching the statewide increase of 2.68%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Statistical District / Area</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenville</td>
<td>-13.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penobscot Economic Statistical District/Economic Summary Area (ESA)</td>
<td>Bangor ESA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bangor Sub ESA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dover-Foxcroft ESA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lincoln ESA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Millinocket ESA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penobscot ESA District Total</td>
<td>-3.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Total</td>
<td>-1.13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---

24 (Dover-Foxcroft ESA = Greenville, Abbott, Atkinson, Barnard Plt, Beaver Cove, Blanchard, Bowerbank, Bradford, Brownville, Charleston, Chesuncook Twp, Derby, Dexter, Dover-Foxcroft, Ellsworth, Garland, Guilford, Kingsbury, Lagrange, Lakeview Plt, Medford, Milo, Monson, Northeast Carry Twp, Onawa, Orneville Twp, Parkman, Sangerville, Sebec, Sebec Lake, Sebec Sta, Shirley)
Consumer Retail Sales by Category

All categories of consumer retail sales decreased between 2007 and 2010 as displayed in the graph. However, some retail sales sectors fared better than others. The building supply category was by far the largest between 2004 and 2008, but dropped significantly by 2009 and 2010, most likely due to a drop in home and business construction. The food store category, which only includes taxed items, remained somewhat stable, as did some of the other categories.

Key to Categories:

- Building supply: stores sell durable equipment sales, contractors’ sales, hardware stores and lumber yards.
- Food Stores: all food stores from large supermarkets to small corner food stores. The values here are snacks and non-food items only, since food intended for home consumption is not taxed. These items typically represent about 25% of actual total sales in food stores.
- General merchandise stores carry product lines generally carried in large department stores, including clothing, furniture, shoes, radio-TV, household durable goods, home furnishings, etc.
- Other retail: a wide variety of taxable sales not covered elsewhere, such as dry goods stores, drug stores, jewelry stores, sporting goods stores, antique dealers, morticians, book stores, photo supply stores gift shops, etc.
- Auto: all transportation related retail outlets, including auto dealers, auto parts, aircraft dealers, motorboat dealers, auto rental, etc.
- Restaurant and lodging - stores sell prepared food for immediate consumption; lodging includes only rentals tax.
Chapter II-3 Housing

OVERVIEW, STATE AND REGIONAL PERSPECTIVE

A town’s housing stock reflects the well-being and health of the community. An adequate supply of housing is needed to satisfy individual needs for shelter, as well as to provide the tax base to finance a significant portion of the community’s municipal services. This section includes an analysis of housing issues that are important to planning, including housing affordability, condition, supply and type. Chapter I-12. Existing Land Use examines the location and pattern of housing on the landscape and makes predictions on land use trends.

The most significant trend in Maine’s housing relates to the growth in the number homes despite slow year-round population growth. There has been a considerable increase in the number of new housing units in Maine over the past decade even though there has been relatively slow population growth. Several reasons for this phenomenon include: (1) fewer people per household resulting in the need for more housing units; (2) people upgrading by building new homes or buying manufactured housing; (3) people building second homes; and (4) people purchasing homes as an investment.

The demand for new housing has been a major factor affecting the affordability of housing. Housing was still generally affordable in many parts of Maine during the 1990s. Since then housing has become less affordable as a result of the increasing demand for housing as described above and the in-migration of more affluent people seeking year-round or second homes. Property values for shorefront property and homes with dramatic views increased dramatically as a result. While the recent housing slump has impacted housing values, it has also impacted incomes. First-time homebuyers, seniors on fixed incomes, and lower income residents have been the hardest hit by the cost of housing. Middle income families are also struggling to find affordable housing in many areas of the state.

SUMMARY

Future Housing Needs

- Even though very little year-round population growth is anticipated for the next decade, there will continue to be a demand for new housing as a result of an aging population with shifting needs in type of housing as well as the overall trend towards smaller household sizes. The demand for second homes may actually increase at an even faster rate than in the past.
- According to the Census, the number of housing units in Greenville increased at a rate of 17.2 units per year between 1990 and 2010. Projecting this forward ten years this translates to 172 additional housing units by the year 2020. Based on past trends, at least half of these new units will be second homes for non-residents. Outside of Greenville in the UT, including Beaver Cove it is estimated that there will be an increase of at least 32 new housing units per year, and about 94% will be second homes or seasonally used homes/camps.
- Regarding rental housing needs, a housing study done in 2001 made the following findings: (1) more affordable housing for low income and very low income families is needed; (2) some rentals
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were being used seasonally by non-residents, which reduced the supply of rental housing for residents; and (3) “upscale” rentals (or condominiums) for working professionals, such as hospital employees, were needed. It appears that these findings are still relevant today.

Housing Affordability

- Housing in Greenville is considered generally “unaffordable” according to the Maine State Housing Authority because the median purchase price of a home and median rent are unaffordable to households earning the median income. The situation is most severe for households seeking rentals. Low and very low income households, in particular, may be having a difficult time affording housing in Greenville. In the Dover-Foxcroft Labor Market Area\(^ {25} \) housing prices are considered “affordable” while rentals are considered “unaffordable”, according to MSHA.
- Greenville has 72 units of subsidized housing for seniors and 20 units of subsidized housing for families. Waiting lists for these units are generally short, but some seniors who would like to move into subsidized housing or leave Greenville altogether are unable to sell their single family homes.
- Plum Creek’s Moosehead Lake Concept Plan includes provisions to address affordable/workforce housing needs associated with its future development. The Planning Board recently approved a subdivision adjacent to the hospital to provide workforce housing that was a part of this proposal. The Plan also requires that there be workforce housing at the resorts for those working there.
- Greenville is the service center community for the region and the logical location for low and moderate income family, senior and assisted living housing. Greenville’s overall population is older than countywide and statewide, which suggests there will be a significant need for senior and assisted living housing in the future. As stated previously, a housing study done in 2001 indicated there is a need for affordable housing for low income and very low income families.

Year-round Use and/or Conversion of Seasonal Housing

- Many seasonal camps, particularly those on shorefronts, have been converted to homes that could be used year-round. This trend generally improves the structures and upgrades septic systems, and serves to increase property values and the local tax base. The downside is that local people are less likely to be able to afford the traditional family camp on the lake.
- The Greenville real estate market is geared towards seasonal residents who are able to afford more expensive single-family and rental units. These seasonal residents and/or visitors also contribute to a seasonal economy, leaving many year-round residents with only part-time employment who, therefore, find it extremely difficult to afford single-family or rental housing.
- One factor affecting the affordability of homes in Greenville versus housing in the unorganized territories (UT) is property taxes. Property taxes in Greenville are significantly higher in Greenville than in the UT; a situation that appears to be motivating people to live and/or build in the UT as opposed to Greenville.

Housing Conditions

- According to the most current Census data (2009), about 51% of Greenville’s owner-occupied housing is over 50 years old, and about 23% of Greenville’s renter-occupied housing is over 50 year old, which suggests there may be housing that needs to be upgraded (new wiring, winterization, lead paint remediation, septic upgrade, etc.).
- During the mid 2000s 28 substandard housing units were upgraded through a Community Development Block Grant. A second, unsuccessful CDBG application was made to upgrade an

\(^{25} \) Greenville is within the Dover-Foxcroft Labor Market Area, see Appendix, Map 3.
additional 15 single-family homes and 12 housing complex rentals, which further suggests that substandard housing continues to be an issue.

**Regulatory Impacts on the Development of Affordable, Workforce Housing**

- Greenville’s Land Use Ordinance allows a variety of affordable/workforce housing options in nearly all areas of the town. The ordinance allows higher density housing, including multifamily structures, in areas served by sewer and water. Multifamily housing is also permitted in the rural development district, and clustered housing is permitted in rural areas. Single mobile homes and manufactured housing are treated the same as stick-built housing and generally allowed throughout the town. Mobile homes parks are permitted in two of the Town’s districts. Congregate care, nursing homes and boarding homes are allowed in several districts. The most significant constraint to the development of higher density housing is the lack of undeveloped acreage within or near the water and sewer systems.

- Road frontage, lot width, building setback, maximum lot coverage, and maximum building height are dimensional standards that can affect the cost of housing. The dimensional requirements in Greenville’s ordinance are not overly constraining to the development of affordable housing. There is no minimum road frontage requirement in built-up areas, and the ordinance does allow some flexibility to reduce the front yard setback and building height requirements. The Town might want to consider accommodating more infill and higher densities in areas served by sewer and water by modifying some of the dimensional standards.

**CURRENT COUNT OF HOUSING (2011)**

According to Greenville’s property tax records there are a total of 1,922 housing units in Greenville, not including the 104 subsidized housing units. This count includes 987 resident homes, and 935 non-resident homes. This means that 46% of the town’s housing is non-resident second homes and/or camps. The 2010 Census found a total of 1,661 housing units, which is 365 units less than the tax record count suggesting a significant undercount in the Census data. Further, the 2010 Census identified 820 units for “seasonal, recreational or occasional use”, which is 115 units less than the town’s count. These discrepancies should be kept in mind when considering the information in this chapter, since most of it is from the Census.

**HOUSING OCCUPANCY**

According to the 2010 Census, 820 (49%) of the town’s housing units were occupied year-round, 691 (42%) were for “seasonal, recreational or occasional use”, and 150 (9%) were other vacant units. Of the 150 vacant units, 41 were for rent, 5 were rented but not occupied, 32 were for sale, and 72 were other vacant units.
Greenville has the same proportion of seasonal housing as county-wide (42%), and a significantly higher proportion of seasonal housing than statewide (table).

For Greenville, the proportion of seasonal housing is increasing - between 2000 and 2010 there was a 32% increase in seasonal housing as compared to a 12% increase in year-round housing. The number of vacant units (for rent, for sale and other) also increased - by 27 units, or by 22%.

When compared to nearby communities Greenville experienced the greatest increase in both the number of year-round units and the number of seasonal units between 2000 and 2010 (graph).

The table below displays the change in housing from 2000 to 2010 for the unorganized territories (UT) in the region and Beaver Cove. When combined, the total number of housing units increased by 317 housing units (6.4%) between 2000 and 2010. This compares to a 21% increase (283 units) in total housing units for Greenville. Also noteworthy is the fact that 94% of the total housing units for the UT jurisdiction were seasonal as compared to 42% for Greenville.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Occupancy (All Housing)</th>
<th>Occupancy Status</th>
<th>Greenville</th>
<th>Change 2000-2010</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>% Chg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year-round</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>89/12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seasonal,</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>167/32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recreational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Units</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,378</td>
<td>1,661</td>
<td>283/21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Change in Number of Housing Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notheast Piscataquis UT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Piscataquis UT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver Cove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Somerset UT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seboomook Lake UT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total UT and Beaver Cove</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UT = unorganized territory

Source: U.S. Census, 2000 and 2010
almost 71% of Greenville’s year-round housing was owner occupied, (2010 Census, table). For the 1990 Census, 75% of Greenville’s housing was owner occupied. Greenville’s owner occupied units increased by 73 units during the 2000s, while the number of rentals only increased by 16 units. The homeowner vacancy rate in Greenville was 5.2% (2010 Census), which suggests that there was an adequate selection of homes available for purchase at that time.

### OWNER AND RENTER-OCUPIED HOUSING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Tenure, Occupancy Status and Vacancy Rates (Year-round Housing)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy Status of Year-round Occupied Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupied Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter Occupied Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Occupied Units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census, 2000 and 2010

### HOUSING TYPES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Types (All Housing)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Type (units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multifamily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: *Includes both detached and attached single family housing.
Source: U.S. Census, 2000, American Community Survey 5-Yr. estimate 2010

### HOUSEHOLD SIZE

The decrease in average household size (persons per households) is a national trend that reflects an increase in single head of household families due to divorce or choice, and an increase in single-person households, including more seniors living alone and living longer. Smaller household size means that the demand for housing will increase faster than the growth in population.

These trends affecting household size are expected to continue over the next
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decade. Looking ahead, the implications are that even though there may be little or no year-round population growth, there will still be a need for more housing as a result of smaller household sizes.

FUTURE HOUSING GROWTH

According to the Census, the number of housing units in Greenville increased from 1,317 in 1990 to 1,661 units in 2010, which was an increase of 344 housing units, or 17.2 units per year. Projecting this forward ten years this translates to 172 additional housing units by the year 2020. It is likely that based on past trends, about half of these new units will be year-round homes and nearly half will be second or seasonal homes. Population projections suggest that there will be very little if any year-round population growth in Greenville by the year 2023; which means the increase in the number of new homes will be due to smaller household size and changing needs.

Housing growth outside Greenville is important to consider as well. About 317 units were added between 2000 and 2010 in areas of the UT near Greenville, including Beaver Cove, according to the Census (see prior table). This was an increase of 6.4%. About 94% of residences are used seasonally. Assuming these trends continue, this means that almost 32 units will be added each year. The rate of growth will likely be even higher as a result of the Moosehead Lake Concept Plan. The 30-year plan proposes 821 residential units and two resorts: a 404 unit resort at Lily Bay and an 800 unit resort at Big Moose Mountain. The project is also to provide workforce housing on-site at the resorts, and affordable housing in Greenville.

Given the uncertainty about how quickly the Plum Creek development will occur, and the extent that the firm’s marketing of the region will draw new development to the region in general, it is very difficult to arrive at an estimate about how much growth will occur either within or outside of Greenville.

HOUSING AFFORDABILITY

Adequate, affordable housing to a range of household incomes is essential to a healthy community. Changing demographics suggests there will be proportionately more middle-age people and senior citizens in the future, and there will be fewer young adults and children. Housing needs change as the

26 See Chapter II-1 Population Characteristics
population ages. Middle-age people, often at their peak earning capacity, may want larger homes, especially if they still have children at home. People approaching retirement age or concerned about living on a reduced income may be seeking smaller, lower maintenance, more energy efficient housing. Some seniors may want assisted living and, in some cases, nursing home care. People commonly affected by a shortage of affordable housing include senior citizens on fixed incomes, single parents, first-time home buyers, young families, and grown children seeking independence from parents.

Maine’s Comprehensive Planning and Land Use Regulation Act suggests that towns strive to make at least 10% of new residential housing within the range of affordability for low and moderate income households based on a five-year historical average of residential development. “Affordable housing” means decent, safe and sanitary dwellings, apartments, or other living accommodations for a household whose income does not exceed 80% of the median income. The objective is to assure a supply of housing that is affordable to households in three income groups:

- “Very low income households” with incomes that do not exceed 50% of the county median income.
- “Lower income households” with incomes between 51% and 80% of the county median income.
- “Moderate income households” with incomes between 81% and 150% of the county median income.

Further, an owner-occupied unit is “affordable” to a household if its price results in monthly housing costs (mortgage principal and interest, insurance, real estate taxes, and basic utility costs) not exceeding 28% to 33% of the household’s gross monthly income. A renter occupied unit is “affordable” to a household if the unit’s monthly housing costs (including rent and basic utility costs) do not exceed 28% to 33% of the household’s gross monthly income. Affordable housing types typically include, but are not limited to multifamily housing, rental housing, mobile homes, government assisted housing, group and foster care facilities, and accessory apartments.

Home ownership is considered “affordable” in the Dover-Foxcroft Labor Market Area but “generally unaffordable” in Greenville according to the Maine State Housing Authority (MSHA). The MSHA has developed an “affordability index” which is the ratio of home price affordable at median income to median home price (table). An affordability index of less than 1.00 means the area is generally unaffordable — i.e., a household earning area median income could afford the payment on a median priced home.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Homeownership: Housing Affordability Analysis for 2009</th>
<th>Greenville</th>
<th>Dover-Foxcroft LMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affordability Index</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Income</td>
<td>$41,064</td>
<td>$34,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Needed to Afford Median Price Home</td>
<td>$45,745</td>
<td>$25,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Price Affordable to Household at Mean Income</td>
<td>$117,594</td>
<td>$103,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households Unable to Afford Median Home Price</td>
<td>435 (56.7%)</td>
<td>3,349 (36.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: Maine State Housing Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27 See Map 3. Dover-Foxcroft Labor Market Area in the Appendix.
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(30 year mortgage, taxes and insurance) using no more than 28% of gross income. MSHA further calculated that there were 435 households (56.7% of all households) in Greenville that were unable to afford a home at the median price. This compares to 36.6% of households in the Dover-Foxcroft LMA.

The MSHA estimated that there are about 46 very, very low income households (30% of the household median income), 56 very low income households (between 30% to 50% of household median income), and 78 low income households (between 50% and 80% of household median income). These households would have difficulty finding affordable housing to purchase in Greenville.

One factor affecting the affordability of homes in Greenville versus housing in the unorganized territories (UT) is property taxes. Property taxes in Greenville are significantly higher in Greenville than in the UT; a situation that appears to be influencing people to build in the UT as opposed to Greenville.

Rental housing in Greenville and the Dover-Foxcroft LMA has been identified as being “unaffordable” according to the analysis done by the MSHA (table). The rental affordability index is the ratio of the 2-bedroom rent affordable at the median renter income to the average 2-bedroom rent. An index of less than 1 means the area is generally “unaffordable” – i.e., a renter household earning the median renter income could not cover the cost of an average 2-bedroom apartment (including utilities using no more than 30% of gross income). The index for Greenville was 0.86 and the index for the Dover-Foxcroft LMA was 0.81. The analysis also indicates that for Greenville there are about 134 households unable to afford the average 2-bedroom rent of $670.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rentals: Housing Affordability Analysis for 2009</th>
<th>Greenville</th>
<th>Dover-Foxcroft LMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affordability Index</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average 2-Bedroom Rent</td>
<td>$778</td>
<td>$703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter Household Median Income</td>
<td>$26,805</td>
<td>$22,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Needed to Afford Average 2-Bedroom Rent</td>
<td>$31,138</td>
<td>$28,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Bedroom Rent Affordable at Median Income</td>
<td>$670</td>
<td>$568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households Unable to Afford Average 2-Bedroom Rent</td>
<td>134 (56.6%)</td>
<td>1,148 (59.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Maine State Housing Authority

SUBSIDIZED HOUSING

Greenville serves as the regional location for federally subsidized multifamily housing with a total of 92 subsidized units (see table on next page). All units are income-based rentals, which generally means that tenants pay about 1/3 of their household income on rent. Four of Greenville’s housing complexes serve senior citizens (age 62 and older), including those with disabilities, for a combined total of 72 units. The Hylands has 20 subsidized family units. The next closest location of similar subsidized housing is in Monson, where there is one 24 unit elderly housing complex and two scattered sites.

The Maine State Housing Authority also lists three Housing Choice Vouchers for Greenville as of 2008.
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According to interviews with housing administrators the Nickerson Park and Pritham Park currently have short wait lists for subsidized units and there are about six vacant unsubsidized units. Chieftain Heights is currently being renovated, but the administrator does not foresee much of a wait list there. The Hylands normally has one to two families on its wait list.

According to the Comprehensive Plan Committee, there are seniors in Greenville who would like to move into senior housing but are unable to do so because they cannot sell their homes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federally Subsidized Housing in Greenville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chieftain Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Park Apartments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nickerson Park and Pritham Park⁴⁹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hylands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Units</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Maine State Housing Authority, January 2011

The Moosehead Lake Concept Plan includes an Affordable Workforce Housing agreement with Coastal Enterprises, Inc. (CEI) that includes the establishment and funding of affordable work force housing. The total loan ($1.75 million) and land donation (100 acres) are to be used by CEI to help capitalize a seven-year development initiative to create between 60 and 90 units of affordable, workforce homeownership housing in the communities of Greenville, Rockwood and Jackman. The agreement identified one project site in Greenville.

Source: Moosehead Lake Concept Plan

CEI is a private, nonprofit Community Development Corporation and Community Development Financial Institution based in Wiscasset, Maine. CEI’s mission is to help create economically and environmentally healthy communities in which all people, especially those with low incomes, can reach their full potential. Source: http://www.ceimaine.org

AGE OF HOUSING

The overall age of a community’s housing stock is an indicator of housing conditions. Older housing often requires more upkeep, and may need new wiring, winterization and lead paint remediation. Septic systems associated with older homes may also need to be repaired or replaced.

---

²⁸ Chieftan Heights and The Hylands, Janice Levine; Dean Park Apts., Alice Theriault; Nickerson and Pritham Parks, Durward Ferland – (Fall 2011)
²⁹ Nickerson Park has a total of 16 senior units and Pritham Park has a total of 24 senior units; only 28 of these (combined) are subsidized units.
According to 2009 Census, about 51% of Greenville’s owner-occupied housing units are over 50 years old, and about 23% of renter-occupied housing is over 50 years old (graphs).

The graphs also display the relative amounts of housing constructed each decade since the 1940s. For example, the construction of owner-occupied units built since 1940 peaked during the 1980s and has dropped off significantly since then.

A substantial proportion of renter-occupied units (97) was constructed during the 1970s, with additional rental housing constructed during the 1980s and 1990s. These numbers reflect the construction dates of the housing complexes.

**HOUSING CONDITIONS AND HOUSING REHABILITATION**

The housing needs study\(^{30}\) undertaken in 2001 identified opportunities to upgrade substandard housing in the towns of Greenville and Shirley. As a result of the study, the towns were awarded a Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) to rehabilitate a total of 34 homes. The work was accomplished around 2004 and consisted of rehabilitation of 28 single-family units, including mobile homes, in Greenville.

A second, unsuccessful CDBG application was prepared to upgrade an additional 15 single-family homes and 12 rentals in Greenville. The basis for the second application is still relevant in that it was designed to continue with the rehabilitation needs of single-family homes, including mobile homes, and to address the rehabilitation needs of 12 rentals in a senior housing complex (unclear whether this was more than one complex). Given the age of the town’s housing complexes this is not surprising.

\(^{30}\) Greenville Housing Needs Assessment, Ron Harriman Associates, January 2001
The second CDBG application also made the following observation: The Greenville real estate market is geared towards seasonal residents who are able to afford more expensive single-family and rental units. These seasonal residents and/or visitors also contribute to a seasonal economy, leaving many year-round residents with only part-time employment who, therefore, find it extremely difficult to afford single-family or rental housing.

INITIATIVES TO IMPROVE THE HOUSING STOCK

The following is a listing of programs designed to address substandard housing:

- Maine Community Development Block Grants (CDBG): The CDBG Program has a Housing Assistance Program designed to assist low-moderate income individuals in rehabilitating their homes. Rehabilitation could include same site replacement housing, relocation assistance, historic preservation, lead paint removal, asbestos removal, radon control, foundation work, water and septic improvements, and other health and safety repairs.
- Penquis\(^{31}\): Housing assistance includes the following programs: Energy Conservation and Heating Improvement, Environmental Inspection and Testing Services, Home Repair and Replacement, Housing Assistance, Housing Development Service, and Home Performance.
- Septic System Upgrades: By participating in the Maine Department of Environmental Protection’s Small Community Grant Program towns can assist homeowners in obtaining grants to replace malfunctioning septic systems that are polluting a water bodies or causing a public nuisance.

LOCAL REGULATIONS THAT AFFECT AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Greenville’s land use ordinance allows a variety of affordable/workforce housing options in nearly all areas of the town. The ordinance allows higher density housing, including multifamily structures, in areas served by sewer and water. Multifamily housing and mobile home parks are permitted in the rural development district, and clustered housing is permitted in rural areas. Single mobile homes and manufactured housing are treated the same as stick-built housing and generally allowed throughout the town. Mobile homes parks are permitted in two of the Town’s districts. Congregate care, nursing homes and boarding homes are allowed in several districts. The most significant constraint to the development of higher density housing is the lack of undeveloped acreage within or near the sewer system.

Road frontage, lot width, building setback, maximum lot coverage, and maximum building height are dimensional standards that can affect the cost of housing. The dimensional requirements in Greenville’s ordinance are not overly constraining to the development of affordable housing. There is no minimum road frontage requirement in the urban areas, and the ordinance does allow some flexibility to reduce the front yard setback and building height requirements. The Town might want to consider accommodating more infill and higher densities in areas served by sewer and water by eliminating or reducing the maximum lot coverage requirements and minimum setbacks.

\(^{31}\)Penquis is a public agency whose mission is to assist individuals and families in preventing, reducing, or eliminating poverty. Penquis primarily serves low and moderate-income individuals in Penobscot, Piscataquis, and Knox Counties.
Chapter II-4 Public/Community Services and Facilities

OVERVIEW
Community facilities and services are provided to protect the public health and safety and to insure the general welfare and well-being of residents and visitors. The availability and adequacy of these facilities and services reflect the community’s desirability as a place to live, work, recreate, and locate a business.

Many of Greenville’s public services and facilities are also important to people living and visiting areas outside of the community. This is particularly true for emergency services (police, fire, and ambulance), Town Office services (voter registration, hunting and fishing licensing, general information, etc.), schools, the hospital, the airport, the library, recreation facilities, and highways. The challenge for the Town of Greenville is to assure equitable funding of these regionally used services for the residents and landowners of Greenville, and the residents and landowners of the adjacent communities.

The following is an inventory and analysis of community services and facilities. Community facilities are displayed on Maps 4 and 5 in the Appendix. The condition and capacity of these services and facilities is examined to determine what improvements, if any, might be needed to serve anticipated population growth and economic development for the next ten years.

SUMMARY
Overall Adequacy of Municipal Services to Meet Changes in Population and Demographics
- In general, Greenville’s municipal services and facilities, with some improvements and expansions, should be adequate to meet future needs. Future growth and development is not likely to outpace the Town’s ability to keep up with necessary improvements, and, in fact, this growth may improve the community’s ability to more cost-effectively maintain underutilized facilities, such as the hospital, school and airport.

Partnerships with Neighboring Communities to Share Services to Reduce Costs and Improve Services
The Town of Greenville collaborates with others, as follows:

- Emergency Planning includes: The Greenville Emergency Management Director; Piscataquis County Emergency Management Agency; Greenville Police, Fire and Highway Departments;

---

32 State projections indicate that Greenville’s year-round population will to grow by 37 individuals between 2010 and 2023, such that there will be 1,683 people by the year 2023. These projections are based on the past and do not take into consideration the Moosehead Lake Concept Plan development (a 30-year plan) or any other major development that could significantly increase the town’s resident and non-resident population. However, given the slow anticipated economic recovery, rapid population and economic growth over the next decade are not likely.

33 Also see Chapter II-5. Parks, Recreation, and Open Space and Chapter II-6. Transportation
Charles A. Dean Memorial Hospital and Ambulance; the Piscataquis County Sheriff’s Office; and Maine Inland Fisheries and Wildlife, and the Maine Bureau of Forestry.

- **Dispatch** for all emergency calls is provided through the Piscataquis County Emergency Communications Center located in Dover-Foxcroft.

- **Fire Protection:** The Greenville Fire Department provides service to Little Moose Township, Harford’s Point, Big Moose Township, Lily Bay, Beaver Cove through to Kokadjo, and Frenchtown; the Department has mutual aid agreements with Brownville, Brownville Junction, Milo, Dover-Foxcroft, Sangerville, Guilford, Monson, and Shirley.

- **Police Protection:** The Greenville Police Department provides contract service to Beaver Cove and emergency service to other unorganized territories when requested; Greenville receives assistance from the Piscataquis County Sherriff’s Department and State Police; the Greenville Police Department provides an extra patrol to the U.S. Border Control.

- **Ambulance:** Back-up ambulance service is provided through the Mayo Regional Hospital and Ambulance in Dover-Foxcroft.

- **School Union 60** consists of Greenville, Beaver Cove, Shirley, Willimantic and Kingsbury Plantation; tuition students from Rockwood also attend School Union 60.

- **Solid Waste Disposal/Greenville Transfer Station:** Previous and potential future collaboration on solid waste disposal at the Greenville Transfer Station. No collaboration at this time.

**Public Water Service - Maine Water Company (Greenville Office)**

- The Greenville public water system has adequate capacity, with a protected water supply, to meet the water demands of Greenville for decades to come without significant investment in water supply or treatment facilities.

- The highest priority need is to systematically replace the water distribution system as it continues to age and to expand the distribution system to meet the needs of new customers, such as new customers in the Town’s industrial park.

- For significant investments in main replacement or main extension projects without raising water rates, the Maine Water Company would need to consider the use of Community Development Block Grants or other governmental funding programs in partnership with the Town. Planning for future line extensions should be consistent with the Future Land Use Plan.

**Public Sewer System - Greenville Sanitary District**

- The Greenville Sanitary District only does sewer extensions at the owner’s expense. While the District does not require that residences or businesses connect to the system, it does charge for service when a sewer main runs adjacent to a property.

- Any future line extensions should be consistent with the Future Land Use Plan. The District’s major capital expense in the future will be removal of sludge from the treatment plant which is estimated to cost about $500,000 and is to be completed during the summer of 2012. This will be paid for through the District’s budget and rates. Otherwise the District has adequate capacity for the future decade.

**Disposal of Septic Tank Waste**

- Individuals pay private haulers to dispose of septic tank waste (septage). Nearly all septage is disposed of at the Moosehead Sanitary District where there is considerable additional capacity for the future.

---

34 State statute (38 MRSA §1163) requires that the district’s extension policy is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan’s Future Land Use Plan.
Storm Water Management Facilities

- Storm water management facilities are generally adequate. Future development will have to be designed to include consideration for storm water runoff. One problem area was identified near the Town Office where storm water runoff is impacting adjacent properties.

Schools

- The Greenville Consolidated School (the Oakes Building) was recently renovated to include grades K-12, the administrative office, and a new wood pellet boiler. A few other minor (less expensive) improvements are also anticipated for the future, such as emergency shelter provisions.
- Now that the Nickerson Elementary School is no longer used as a school the district will need to decide what to do with the building.
- The school system could easily accommodate an increase in enrollments. The development of a charter school is under consideration, and could potentially increase enrollments.

Opportunities to Promote New Residential Development around the School

- Greenville’s school is located in the village (built-up area) surrounded by residential neighborhoods. While there is a limited amount of vacant land in the area, the Town might consider options to increase the density of residential development. Even though there are sidewalks in the area, few students actually walk or bicycle to school.

Emergency Response Systems

- Overall Emergency Preparedness – A plan is underway to upgrade the Red Cross designated emergency shelter (Greenville Consolidated School) to include a back-up power source (generator). This would allow the Town to be reimbursed by the Red Cross for use of the facility as a shelter. “Emergency in-place shelter” facilities (back-up power – generators) at the senior housing complexes are also needed.
- The Greenville Police Department will need a third full-time police officer if there is a demand for full-time twenty-four hour coverage (police are on-call during the 3rd shift - nights). The Department anticipates replacing vehicles every four to five years, and needs to upgrade its computer and software equipment.
- The Greenville Fire Department, which relies heavily on volunteers, may need a full-time fire chief at some point in the future depending on demands. Recruiting and maintaining volunteer firefighters is an ongoing concern, which in the long term could necessitate the need for full time firefighters. The Department anticipates the need to make energy efficiency improvements to the fire station and to replace the fire service utility van and the ladder truck.
- The C.A. Dean Ambulance may need additional staffing, such as a second full-time paramedic, within the next decade. In the longer term depending upon the amount of future development, there might also be the need for a full-time EMS crew.

Solid Waste Management System

- The Town opened its new transfer station in January 2012, and contracts for curbside pick-up of solid waste and recycling. The recycling rate is estimated to be around 20%.
While this system should have adequate capacity for the next decade, there may be ways to reduce the cost, such as through collaboration with other towns and the county, and increasing the recycling rate through incentives.

Telecommunications and Energy Infrastructure

- **High Speed Internet**: Greenville’s most significant telecommunications need is for adequate high-speed internet. The current system is grossly inadequate, and is a significant constraint to the community’s future viability economically, socially and educationally. True high speed internet is necessary for businesses and individuals, particularly in a community like Greenville that provides vital service to a vast rural area. Other telecommunications systems are adequate.

- **Energy Infrastructure**: Three phase power is available along most of the Moosehead Lake Road, in the industrial park and on to Rockwood, and along a portion of Lily Bay Road in the village. The cost of electricity needs to be reduced, possibly through use of alternative energy sources. Locally produced wood pellets or other fuels might be an option.

Local and Regional Health Care Facilities and Public Health and Social Service Programs

- Health and social services are generally adequate to meet the needs of the community, particularly considering the very rural and remote nature of Greenville. Where services aren’t available locally, residents may have to travel some distance for services, such as to Dover-Foxcroft or Bangor. Specialized health care services are often met by visiting doctors and dentists at the hospital.

Other Public Facilities and Services

- **The Town Administrative Capacity** could be improved through the following:
  - Dedicated administrative support to the Town Manager to improve financial and administrative functions, such as bookkeeping and grant administration, thereby allowing the Town Manager to focus on the Board of Selectmen, policies, projects, town meetings, and economic development. Existing staff would be able to provide better customer service. Currently, the Clerk, Deputy Clerk, Code Enforcement Officer and Bookkeeper are taking time from their work to provide assistance to the Town Manager.
  - A part-time person to do General Assistance so that the one individual who does the bookkeeping, voter registration, human resources, insurance and counter customer service would have a more reasonable workload and will be able to provide better service.

- Future growth and development, such as that associated with the Moosehead Lake Concept Plan could increase the demands on these administrative services, such as the number of voter registrations, the number of individuals seeking hunting and fishing licenses, and the number of people just looking for general information about the town and region.

- **The Town Office** houses the Town’s administrative offices, the police department and a meeting room. While in excellent condition, more space is needed as follows:
  - Office for the Recreation Director and the Assessor (currently using the meeting room)
  - Expansion of the meeting room
  - More storage space for records and documents, cabinets for tax maps and other maps, and adequate fireproof vault space for vital records and other documents.

- The need for additional space at the Town Office could be remedied by moving the Police Department in with the Fire Department, which would also increase opportunities for collaboration, and allow more privacy for the public in police operations. While this would require some renovations to the Fire Department building, there does appear to be adequate space.
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- The Public Works Department anticipates replacing two Ford Sterling Wheelers (trucks) over the next decade. Additionally, if state funding becomes available, the Town may want to pursue construction of a covered sand and salt storage facility.
- The Shaw Public Library is a need for a new connector building between the two buildings and other small projects relating to accessibility and the upkeep of the buildings.
- The Greenville Cemetery may need to be expanded within the next 10-15 years. A property survey is needed to confirm that there is adequate space. The Cemetery Corporation would also like to obtain a grant to cover the cost (est. $4,000) of replacing the water line.
- The Industrial Park needs additional infrastructure, including sewer, three-phase power and water to serve the entire park.

Village Area Investments
- Greenville’s investments in facilities have been and will continue to be directed to areas in and around the village area (built-up areas of town).

Shade Tree Program
- Greenville conducts tree planting and landscaping on a project-by-project basis, and will continue to do so in the future.

TOWN ADMINISTRATION
The Town of Greenville has a Town Meeting/Selectmen/Town Manager form of government. Citizens at annual and special town meetings, held in the Louis Oakes Auditorium of the High School building, determine annual town and school appropriations. An elected five-person Board of Selectmen/Assessors oversees Town government. The day to day operations of the Town are run by the Town Manager, who works for the Board of Selectmen. Other elected Boards are the School Committee, and the Moosehead Sanitary District Board. Appointed boards include the Shaw Library Trustees, the Recreation Committee, the Planning Board, the Appeals Board, the Greenville Economic Committee, the Budget Committee, the Airport Advisory Committee and the Transfer Station Development Committee.

The Town Manager serves as the Town Meeting/Selectmen/Town Manager form of government. Citizens at annual and special town meetings, held in the Louis Oakes Auditorium of the High School building, determine annual town and school appropriations. An elected five-person Board of Selectmen/Assessors oversees Town government. The day to day operations of the Town are run by the Town Manager, who works for the Board of Selectmen. Other elected Boards are the School Committee, and the Moosehead Sanitary District Board. Appointed boards include the Shaw Library Trustees, the Recreation Committee, the Planning Board, the Appeals Board, the Greenville Economic Committee, the Budget Committee, the Airport Advisory Committee and the Transfer Station Development Committee.

The Town Manager serves as the Tax Collector, Treasurer, Road Commissioner, Airport Manager, and Agent for the Overseer of the Poor. Other positions within the Town government include the Town Clerk, Police Chief, Fire Chief, Bookkeeper/Registrar of Voters, Town Forest Fire Wardens, Code Enforcement Officer (CEO) and Assistant CEO, Recreation Director, Plumbing Inspector and Election and Ballot Clerks. Town employees also include the public works crew, police officers and firemen.

Greenville is part of School Union 60, which is governed by a School Committee. Greenville elects five representatives to the School Committee.

Future Needs: The primary administrative need is for dedicated administrative support for the Town Manager and possible re-organization of administrative staffing to improve customer service. Currently, the Clerk, Deputy Clerk, Code Enforcement Officer and Bookkeeper are taking time from their work to provide assistance to the Town Manager. Dedicated administrative support to the Town Manager would provide improved financial management including bookkeeping, grant administration, and administration of other Town affairs thereby freeing up the Town Manager to focus more on policies.
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projects, the Board of Selectmen, town meetings, and presently, nonexistent economic development. Additionally, there is one person who does the bookkeeping, voter registration, human resources, general assistance, insurance and customer service at the counter. This person could provide better customer service if their workload was reduced through the hiring of a part-time person to do general assistance work.

The need for these administrative changes could increase significantly if, and when, there is more development in Greenville and the region. According to the Moosehead Lake Concept Plan community impact analysis Greenville’s Town Office staff could see larger numbers of people as a result of the development. In particular, the development could significantly increase voter registrations, and the number of individuals seeking hunting and fishing licenses. While the study notes that the town staff in Greenville is not obligated to serve residents of the Unorganized Territories, it has been service the Town has traditionally provided to the region.

Town Office/Police Department

The Town Office Building, located on 7 Minden Street, is a 3,100 sq. ft. building constructed in 2004 that houses the Town’s administrative offices, the Police Department and a meeting room. The administrative offices include the Town Manager’s office, Code Enforcement Office, and the Recreation Director’s office along with office space for the Clerk, Deputy Clerk, Bookkeeper, and the Assessor. The Police Department includes a booking/interview room, squad room, chief’s office and entry area.

Future Needs: While the Town Office is in excellent condition, there is a need for more space for administrative functions. Improvements that should be considered include: a separate office for the Recreation Director and an office for the Assessor (both are currently using the meeting room), expansion of the meeting room, adequate fireproof vault space for vital records and other important documents, and more storage space including cabinets for tax maps and other maps. Space constraints could be remedied by relocating the Police Department to the Fire Department building across the street where space is available. Renovation of this space for the Police Department would be necessary.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

Greenville’s Public Works Department is responsible for maintenance of roads, streets, storm sewers, sidewalks, parks and recreation areas, the library, and the airport. The Town Manager serves as the Road (Public Works) Commissioner. The Department has three full-time employees, and operates on an annual budget of approximately $310,000.

Greenville’s Public Works Department is housed at the public works facility at 95 Greenville Steam Road in Greenville’s Industrial Park. The 60’ x 75’ insulated steel structure was constructed in 2000/2001 and consists of two bays. The Public Works site is approximately five acres which includes space for the sand

Plum Creek Rezoning Proposal Infrastructure and Community Impact Analysis prepared by the Eastern Maine Development Corporation, April 2007
and salt pile and outside storage space for equipment and materials. The facility is in good condition and
should be adequate for the upcoming decade.

The Town owns and operates the following major pieces of equipment (insured value): 36

- 2001 Ford Sterling Wheeler, 13-yard plow truck ($65,000)
- 1986 Ford L-8000 single-axle, 6-yard dump truck used as a back-up ($40,000)
- 1992 670B John Deere grader ($55,000)
- 2006 GMC Topkick 5500 4x4 plow and wing; 3 to 4 yd. stainless dump ($40,000)
- 2006 JD 544J John Deere front-end loader ($95,000)
- 2004 Blanchet snowblower ($15,000)
- 2002 John Deere loader at the airport ($45,000)
- Blanchet snowblower at the airport ($40,000)
- 1996 JD 544G Front-end loader at the transfer station ($30,000)

**Future Needs:** The replacement schedule calls for the plow trucks to be replaced every 8 to 10 years,
the loader every 10 to 12 years, and the grader every 20 years. The Town maintains reserve accounts for
vehicle replacements, but generally also needs to utilize other accounts to fund replacements. The Town
has also established an accounting system whereby it leases major equipment from itself, so that it is
possible to continually compare the cost of owning equipment versus leasing it, and it also allows for the
continual contribution of funds into the account for future replacement.

The Town anticipates replacing the two Ford Sterling Wheelers and the GMC Topkick truck over the next
decade. One of the Sterlings would actually be kept to replace the current back-up vehicle (1986 Ford).

**Town Salt and Sand Storage**

A new salt shed with an asphalt pad and roof was constructed in 2011. The sand/salt pile is stored
outside.

**Future Needs:** While a covered sand/salt facility would be desirable, it will only be feasible if state
funding becomes available.

**STORM WATER MANAGEMENT**

Greenville’s storm water system is primarily confined to built-up areas. Most of the storm water system
catch basins are owned and maintained by the MaineDOT because they are associated with state routes
6/15 and the Lily Bay Road. Greenville’s Public Works Department is responsible for maintaining the
storm water system associated with local roads.

**Future Needs:** No major improvements are anticipated.

---

36 Maine Municipal Association Property and Casualty Pool listing for Greenville for the year 7/1/10 – 7/1/11
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EMERGENCY SERVICES

Emergency 9-1-1 System (E 911), Dispatch and Response Times

Greenville has a complete and functioning E-911 Addressing and Management System including an addressing ordinance, addressing agent and reporting system. Road signage and addressing are in place.

Dispatch for all emergency calls is provided by the Piscataquis County Emergency Communications Center in Dover-Foxcroft.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responder</th>
<th>Average Response Time for Greenville Calls (Estimates)</th>
<th>Back-up Responders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greenville Police Department</td>
<td>Daytime: 5-8 minutes Night-time: 10-20+ min.</td>
<td>Piscataquis County Sheriff’s Department and Maine State Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenville Fire Department</td>
<td>20-30 minutes</td>
<td>Mutual aid agreements with Brownville, Brownville Junction, Milo, Dover-Foxcroft, Sangerville, Guilford, Monson, Shirley, Piscataquis County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.A. Dean Ambulance</td>
<td>8-10 minutes</td>
<td>Mayo Regional Hospital Ambulance (Dover-Foxcroft)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Police Chief, Fire Chief, Asst. Fire Chief, EMS Coordinator

Emergency Planning and Hazard Mitigation

Emergency planning and hazard mitigation in Piscataquis County is most likely to involve natural disasters such as winter storms, flooding, wildfires, and severe thunderstorms. The most likely man-made disasters include railroad derailments, tanker truck accidents or a major structure fire. In Greenville another man-made emergency that the Town has tested and trained for is an emergency associated with the boat Katahdin on Moosehead Lake.

Flooding is not an extensive problem in Greenville, although there have been a few areas where it has damaged property. Greenville participates in the Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Program, which is designed to assure appropriate use of floodplains to reduce the risk of property loss. As a participating town, residents are eligible to purchase subsidized flood insurance, which is often required when applying for a loan or mortgage for property located on a floodplain.

Piscataquis County Emergency Management Agency (PCEMA)\(^{37}\)

In general, emergency management responsibilities are shared by all levels of government. The state Emergency Management Agency does not replace local police, fire, ambulance, Red Cross, or other emergency response groups, but serves to coordinate response and recovery in declared disasters when more than one agency is responding to a threat.

The Piscataquis County Emergency Management Agency (PCEMA) coordinates emergency response when a disaster extends beyond the mutual aid boundaries of a town, or when several towns are involved. PCEMA also serves as the link between towns and the state during a disaster. The county

\(^{37}\) http://www.piscataquis.us/Pages/ema.html
director also provides guidance, planning models, home study courses, and workshops on emergency management to local communities and their emergency management staff.

State law requires that towns and other political subdivisions use all their available resources to the maximum extent possible to minimize loss of life and damages to public and private property in an emergency. When the resources of local government, the private sector, and volunteer agencies are inadequate, or it is evident they will be exhausted, a request for assistance is made through the community’s normal mutual aid avenues. When these resources are also exhausted, the County Emergency Management Agency Director is notified and requests additional aid from the state.

**Greenville’s Emergency Management System**

Greenville’s Police Chief currently serves as the Town’s Emergency Management (EMA) Director who oversees the emergency management system and is the local representative working with the PCEMA. The county plan was developed in 2005 and includes a section for Greenville. Greenville’s portion of the plan has not been formally adopted by the Town of Greenville.

The Town’s EMA Director oversees informal coordination between agencies (Greenville Police, Fire and Public Works Departments; C.A. Dean Hospital and Ambulance; county agencies (Sherriff’s Department), the Red Cross, and state agencies (Maine Warden’s Service, Maine Forest Service, PEMA), as appropriate, during emergencies. Currently an informal Safety Committee (not a part of town government, but made up of representatives from the agencies listed above) meets on a quarterly basis to review and discuss emergency planning and coordination for the upcoming season.

Greenville has designated several locations as emergency shelters. The Red Cross designated shelter is the Greenville Consolidated School, but because it does not have a generator it is only used as a backup. Currently, the Town Office and Fire Department are the primary emergency shelters, also used as warming centers, where there are generators in case of power outages.

The EMA Director is working with the school to develop a plan and obtain funding for upgrading the school as the primary emergency shelter for the Town. One of the benefits of using the Red Cross designated shelter is that the Town would receive reimbursement for its use.

Emergency communications currently consist of a radio communications system at the Greenville Municipal Airport. The planned installation of a new radio repeater system on Moose Mountain will eliminate communication dead zones and provide a redundant system.

**Future Needs:**

- Upgrade the Greenville Consolidated School as the primary emergency shelter; and
- Develop “emergency shelter in-place” facilities at the senior housing complexes. Residents, particularly the disabled and elderly, would be better served if there were back-up power sources (generators) at these facilities. Owner/operators of the senior housing facilities should be encouraged and/or assisted in making these provisions.

---

**Greenville Emergency Management Director, Jeff Pomerleau, December 2011.**
POLICE PROTECTION

The Town created the Greenville Police Department in 1972. The Department provides 24 hour, 7-day-per-week police coverage with an annual budget of approximately $170,000. Police services are dispatched by the Piscataquis County Emergency Communication Center in Dover-Foxcroft, with a toll-free number for residents’ use. The Department responds to calls within Greenville and has a contract (per call basis – approx. $18,000) with Beaver Cove to respond to calls in that community. The Department also responds to emergency calls from other areas of the Unorganized Territory when requested by the County Sheriff’s Department because county deputies are often not readily available. The Department does not get reimbursed for these calls. The Department will occasionally call on the County Sheriff’s Department for assistance. The Maine State Police rarely provide service in Greenville.

Greenville’s Police Department consists of two full-time officers including the chief and one patrolman, eight part-time officers, and a part-time clerical assistant. This level of staffing may need to be increased if there is significant additional development, such as with the Moosehead Lake Concept Plan. Currently, the Department’s average response time during the day is five to eight minutes. Response time increases during the night to ten to twenty minutes or longer because officers are on-call at night. An additional full-time officer would be required to provide full-time 24-hour coverage.

The Department obtained a grant for a third full-time officer, with three years of funding through the grant and a fourth year to be funded locally. The Town voted against funding the fourth year at its June 2011 Town Meeting, so the Department was not able to get the full-time position.

The U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) also pays the Greenville Police Department to provide extra patrol (13 hours per week) to routes leading north and south around Moosehead Lake as a secondary safety net to efforts conducted at the U.S. Border Control.

The Police Department is housed in an office at the Town Office building. The Department includes a booking/interview room, squad room, chief’s office and entry area. There has been some discussion about relocating the Police Department to the Fire Department building across the street from the current Town Office, to make more space for town administrative offices and the recreation department. Moving the Police Department in with the Fire Department would also facilitate greater emergency services collaboration with more efficient use of equipment and space. Additionally, the Police Department would be able to provide more confidential service to the public. The Department is exploring opportunities for grant funding.

The following is a listing of the Department’s major equipment, with estimated values (insured value):[39]

- 2009 GMC Sierra Cruiser ($27,800)
- 2004 GMC Sierra 2500 Truck ($22,495)
- 2010 Polaris ATV Ranger ($11,500)
- Other equipment includes portable radios, a base radio system, DVD camcorder and GPS equipment.

The Department anticipates replacing the 2004 GMC in 2012 at a cost of around $23,000 to be covered by money in the Department’s vehicle reserve account. The Town typically adds $3,000 to $4,000 to this account every year. Vehicles are replaced as needed based on maintenance costs, which generally means replacing a vehicle every four to five years. The Department should also upgrade computer equipment and software at a cost of around $20,000 within the next ten years.

The Department has taken advantage of a number of grant programs, primarily through the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, to enhance its ability to serve the area, including funding to support increased enforcement and new equipment. One of these improvements is the installation of a new radio repeater system on Moose Mountain that will eliminate communication dead zones.

The number of police calls has increased dramatically since 2007 as is displayed in the graph. While to some extent the increase is due to better record keeping, there still has been a significant increase due to more thefts and prescription drug abuse cases.

**Future Needs:** Future considerations as described above include relocating the Police Department to the Fire Department building, increasing staffing to include a third full-time police officer, and replacing necessary vehicles and other equipment. An increase in population, homes and resorts could increase the need for expanded police coverage, particularly when some of the demand may come from new residents and tourists expecting higher levels of service.

**GREENVILLE FIRE DEPARTMENT**

Established by a vote of residents in 1913, the Moosehead Lake Fire Department is a division of the municipal government. Fire suppression and prevention, and rescue service are the primary functions of the Fire Department. Fire protection and rescue service is provided on a twenty-four hour basis. Currently, the Department is manned by a Fire Chief and 25 paid volunteers whose levels of training include hose handling, truck apparatus operation, structure tactics, Scott Airpack certification, cold water rescue, wilderness rescue, hazardous materials handling, cardiopulmonary resuscitation and heart saver techniques. In addition to responding to fires, the Department responds to vehicular accidents and operates the Jaws of Life extrication equipment.

---

40 Greenville Fire Chief, Joey Harris. January 2012
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The Fire Department provides service to all of Greenville, Little Moose Township, Harford’s Point, Big Moose Township, Lily Bay, Beaver Cove through to Kokadjo, and Frenchtown. The Department has mutual aid agreements with Brownville, Brownville Junction, Milo, Dover-Foxcroft, Sangerville, Guilford, Monson, and Shirley.

The Department operates on an annual budget of approximately $131,000. About $50,000 of the revenue to support this budget comes from mutual aid agreements. The formula for determining the cost for fire protection services for neighboring jurisdictions is based on the equalized property valuations for buildings in each jurisdiction.\(^{41}\)

The Department responds to about 76 calls per year. While there is some variation in the number and type of calls each year, the Fire Chief does not anticipate much change within the foreseeable future. However, the Infrastructure and Community Impact Analysis for the Moosehead Lake Concept Plan\(^{42}\) suggests that regional fire departments could see an additional 78.15 calls annually at full build out due to residential, resort and induced development. The study also suggests the Maine Forest Service could see additional calls as a result of more people involved with brush and debris burning.

The Town’s ISO fire insurance rating is 6/9 on a scale of 1/9 to 9/9, with 1/9 being the best. ISO is a means of setting fire insurance premiums based on the adequacy of local fire protection. A higher rating generally translates to a lower cost for fire insurance.

Water supply for firefighting is generally adequate, particularly in the village. Rural water supplies are usually handled through the Department’s tankers.

A major issue for the Department is recruiting new volunteer firefighters, and particularly younger volunteers. This will become increasingly critical as the current volunteers grow older. The challenges for volunteers include balancing volunteer participation with jobs, family and other commitments; the travel distances associated with jobs and response to calls; and the mandated training requirements. Also associated with government mandates, is the potential need for a full-time Fire Chief, who would be able to manage the administrative workload. A much longer-term solution might be a full-time Fire Department, particularly if the town and region experience a considerable amount of growth and development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fire Department Calls</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car Accidents</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Fires</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure Fires</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chimney Fires</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Calls</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild Land/Non-Permit Burn</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowmobile/ATV</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescues</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Materials/Fuel Spills</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical (First Responder)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual Aid</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Calls are listed by type as presented in the Town Reports; while some categories have been combined, there may still be inconsistencies in the data. Source: Greenville Town Reports

\(^{41}\) John Simko, May 2012.

\(^{42}\) Plum Creek Rezoning Proposal Infrastructure and Community Impact Analysis prepared by the Eastern Maine Development Corporation, April 2007
The Fire Department is housed at the Fire Station at 10 Minden Street (former town office). The Department took over the whole building in 2005. The Department consists of four bays, a meeting room, office, and recreation room. The primary need for the building is to make it more energy efficient. Most of the overhead doors and the windows have been replaced or upgraded, and radiant floor heat was installed in the bays. The Department is currently investigating spray foam insulation for the walls of the building, and several of the overhead doors still need to be addressed.

The following is a listing of the Department’s major equipment, with the estimated values (insured value).:

**Major Equipment:**

- 2008 GMC Truck ($32,000)
- 1977 Oshkosh Ladder Fire Truck ($23,000)
- 1998 Freightliner Pumper Tanker ($145,000)
- 2002 KME Custom Pumper ($190,000)
- 1988 Chevy Utility Van ($19,182)
- 1991 Ford KME Pumper ($110,409)
- Holmatro “Jaws of Life” w/attachments ($25,000)
- Talisman Thermal Imaging Camera ($10,000)
- Cascade System (air bottle compressor) ($20,000)
- The Department’s other equipment includes ATV trailers, snowmobiles, rescue sleds, a second “Jaws of Life”, Scott air packs, portable radios, turn-out gear, water rescue suits, and other equipment.

**Future Needs:** Potential future needs for the Department include energy efficiency improvements to the fire station ($65,000), replacement of 1988 utility van with a used fire service van at an estimated cost of $65,000, and replacement of the 1977 Oshkosh Ladder Fire Truck with a used ladder truck at a cost of around $100,000). Pumper trucks are considered thirty-year trucks. The 1991 Pumper will be 30 years old in 2021, but the Department hopes that it will last beyond that time. To fund capital needs the Department relies on its capital reserve account, grants, donations and its annual budget.

The Town may also want to consider the need for a full-time Fire Chief to better manage administrative requirements, and the need to recruit more volunteer firefighters.

**C.A. DEAN AMBULANCE SERVICE**

The C.A. Dean Ambulance Service, established by the C.A. Dean Hospital in 1969, provides 24-hour coverage and is overseen by a full-time EMS coordinator, who is also a paramedic. The service’s other staff are on-call, paid staff consisting of three additional paramedics, three EMT intermediates, six EMT

---
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44 Kevin Springer, EMS Coordinator, December 2012
basics and 3 ambulance drivers. The service is licensed at the basic level, and permitted to operate at the paramedic level.

The Ambulance Service operates two fully-equipped ambulances out of the hospital. Emergency dispatch is provided through the Piscataquis County Emergency Communication Center in Dover-Foxcroft. The average response time for calls within Greenville is eight to ten minutes. The Mayo Regional Hospital Ambulance, based in Dover-Foxcroft about 45 minutes away, provides backup service.

The Ambulance Service provides coverage for Greenville and surrounding areas, including vast, generally undeveloped areas to the north. Remote rescues are often coordinated with Greenville Fire Department, Maine Forest Service and Maine Inland Fisheries and Wildlife. Accessing remote areas can entail the use of snowmobiles, ATVs, and Life Flight and Forest Service helicopters.

The Ambulance Service receives about 400 calls per year, of which about half are emergency 911 calls and half are transfers to larger hospitals.

Future Needs: Additional staffing, such as a second full-time paramedic, may be necessary. If there was considerable population growth and/or development there might be a need for a full-time EMS crew.

SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL AND RECYCLING

Greenville opened its transfer station in the Industrial Park on January 3rd, 2012 in coordination with closure of the landfill in Moosehead Junction Township. Closure of the landfill began several years ago and is to be completed by the end of 2012. The Town will assume $1.2 million additional debt to complete this closure.

The transfer station is located on a five acre parcel that includes a steel building that houses the compactor and four roll-off containers. Metals and bulky materials (construction debris, white goods, and brush) are stored outside.

Greenville contracts with a private hauler for curbside pick-up of solid waste and recycling. The Town is paying approximately $37,000 for this service that consists of one day per week pick-up. The Town also hires the same contractor to offer a program whereby local road associations can obtain curb-side pick-up on private camp roads. Waste materials from the transfer station are picked up by private contractors and transported to several locations for processing.

As of January 2012, Greenville had no partners in its operation of the transfer station. Prior to this time, Shirley, Beaver Cove and the unorganized territories shared in the cost and disposal of solid waste. These communities are now using the Lily Bay Transfer Station. Greenville might consider partnering with these communities in the future if there were fair and equitable agreements on the sharing of construction and operating costs.

Exact tonnages of solid waste for Greenville are not available. However, it has been estimated that about 1,000 tons of solid waste per year was dropped off at the landfill in prior years, which includes material from Greenville, Shirley, Beaver Cove and the unorganized territories. Now that Greenville is
the sole user of the transfer station, it has been estimated that Greenville will generate about 500 tons of solid waste per year.

The Town currently contracts with a private company for a voluntary recycling program. Curbside pick-up of recyclables is done once a month. The program recycles mixed paper, magazines, junk mail, newsprint, cardboard, metal cans, some plastics, and universal waste. The Town is paying approximately $7,600 to the private company for curb-side pick-up of recyclables. The company’s costs are offset by the revenues from recyclable materials.

Recycling tonnage decreased from 308.7 tons in 2006 to 243 tons in 2010. The table displays the tons of recyclables that were handled through the landfill and the recycling center, which means they include material from Greenville as well as the towns mentioned above.

**Future Needs:**
Given the significant and increasing cost of solid waste disposal, the Town is actively investigating mechanisms to increase recycling. Currently, other than providing curbside pick-up, there are no incentives, such as a pay-by-the bag system for disposal of non-recyclable materials/solid waste.

The Town may also want to consider contracting with other communities and/or the county for use of the transfer station, if it is beneficial to the town. This should probably be considered from time to time as development increases in Greenville and the region. According to the Community Impact Analysis done for the Moosehead Lake Concept Plan, the existing transfer stations and statewide system should be able to absorb the current and projected waste quantities without any material impact on disposal capacity or market conditions, although the per ton cost of solid waste disposal is likely to increase.\(^{45}\)

The study further notes that construction and demolition debris from the residential and resort development will be around 11,575 tons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Tons of Materials Recycled (Landfill/Recycling Center)</strong></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Cardboard</th>
<th>Newspaper</th>
<th>Mixed Paper</th>
<th>HDPE #2 (plastic)</th>
<th>Light Iron</th>
<th>PET #1 (plastic)</th>
<th>Tin</th>
<th>Tires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011 partial</td>
<td>203.2</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>243.0</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>111.9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>298.2</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>112.6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>276.2</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>164.6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>298.6</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>191.1</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>32.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>308.7</td>
<td>108.1</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>123.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>873.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>268</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>592</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
<td><strong>122</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes materials from Greenville and participating towns
Source: Victor Horton, Maine Resource Recovery Association, 12/27/11

Greenville’s Public Water Supply\(^{46}\)

Greenville’s public water system is owned and operated as a public water utility by the Maine Water Company, a subsidiary of the Connecticut Water Company. The company’s Maine corporate office is

\(^{45}\) Plum Creek Rezoning Proposal Infrastructure and Community Impact Analysis prepared by the Eastern Maine Development Corporation, April 2007

\(^{46}\) Woodie Bartley; Knowlton, Richard L, Aqua America (Maine Water Company), November 2011
located in Rockport. The service territory is 45 square miles including Greenville and parts of Little Moose Township, and Greenville Junction. There are approximately 500 customers on the system (400 residential customers). The company’s Greenville Office is staffed by a full-time superintendent and a part-time assistant. Customer service, financial and other management functions are handled in the Rockport office. Maine Water Company also provides emergency response and project assistance to Greenville through its base of 45 employees in seventeen Maine municipalities.

Public water service is provided throughout most of the built-up area in Greenville, and in some cases extends beyond the built-up area (See Map 5 in the Appendix). Water lines extend along Pritham Avenue, Main Street as far north as McAffee Street and as far south as Indian Hill Trading Post, along Pleasant Street to the reservoir, and along many of the side streets to these roads. Expansions of service within the past 40 years has been to accommodate demand, such as to Greenville Steam, Pritham Park, Nickerson Park, Indian Hill Motel and Trading Post, the Chieftans and Highland Heights, Leisure Life Lodge and Restaurant, McAffee Street and Oliver Road. More recently the Company installed a new 1,200 foot line on Prospect Street as far as Washington Street, and a new line on Norris Street to Shaw Street to Greenville’s business incubator. This work has been part of continuing efforts to upgrade the distribution system.

The water source for the system is the Wiggins Brook aquifer located on State Public Reserve Land in Moosehead Junction Township (See Map 9 Water Resources in the Appendix). Water production needs are met by two gravel packed wells, each capable of pumping 300 gallons per minute. Water treatment includes pressure filtration to reduce iron and manganese, and disinfection with sodium hypochlorite (liquid chlorine). The water production and treatment process is computer controlled and fully automated. Design capacity exceeds 400,000 gallons per day and average daily production is 110,000 gallons. The system also includes a 330,000 gallon in-ground reservoir, constructed in 1992, and located off Pleasant Street. The reservoir stores three days of average demand and provides 1,500 gallons per minute of fire-flow capacity for two hours. Additionally, the company maintains approximately 60 hydrants.

The Maine Department of Environmental Protection lists one wastewater discharge license (issued in 2009) for Aqua Maine, Inc. (Maine Water Company) Greenville. The license is to discharge a monthly average of up to 0.0025 MGD of filter cleaning (backwash) wastewater from the drinking water treatment facility to ground waters in Moosehead Junction Township. The license allows the water used to clean the filters at the water treatment facility to be returned to the ground through a subsurface chamber system. (See Map 9 Water Resources in Appendix B)

Water rates in Greenville are above the state average, reflecting the small size of the water system and the investment necessary to comply with changes to the federal Safe Drinking Water Act since 1993. The typical residential customer pays $32 per month for 125 gallons of water each day. This rate is approximately $10 per month above the median price of all Maine water utilities according to a 2008 report of the Maine Public Utilities Commission.
Future Needs: The Greenville public water system has the capacity to meet the water demands of the Town of Greenville for decades to come without significant investment in water supply or treatment facilities. The highest priority need is to systematically replace the water distribution system as it continues to age, and to expand the water distribution system to meet the needs of new customers.

The current rate structure provides approximately $100,000 annually for capital improvements. Few significant water main replacement or extension projects can be completed within this annual amount. For significant investments in main replacement or main extension projects without raising water rates, the Maine Water Company would need to consider the use of Community Development Block Grants or other governmental funding programs in partnership with the Town of Greenville.

MOOSEHEAD SANITARY DISTRICT

The Moosehead Sanitary District, created by town meeting vote in 1971, is overseen by a five-person elected board. Staffing consists of a superintendent and one office support staff person. The District has an annual operating budget of approximately $280,000.

The system serves the built-up area of Greenville, which includes about 1,200 customers, and includes several lots in the Moosehead Industrial Park and the built-up area in Moosehead Junction Township located adjacent to Greenville Junction. Rates are based on a single user system (i.e. single family) of about $205 per year, where rates for other multi-family residences and other uses are based on their equivalency to a single user.

The District operates a secondary treatment system consisting of aerated lagoons with effluent disposal through spray irrigation that was opened in 1979 at the Marsh Farm site off Spruce Street (See Map 5 Community Facilities in Appendix B). The system has a design capacity of 170,000 gallons of effluent per day, actual average daily usage of 150,000 gallons per day. The District’s sewage treatment system was constructed in 1978. The long-term debt on the system had a balance of about $152,761 as of October 25, 2011. This debt is being paid for through the town’s property taxes.

The District owns 12.22 acres for use as a septage disposal site. The District is responsible for licensing and operation of this site. Storm sewers are completely separate from the sanitary sewer system and are maintained by the owner of the associated roadway - either the state or the town.

Wastewater Outfalls: The Maine Department of Environmental Resources lists two wastewater discharge licenses - both issued in 2009 as renewals, as follows:

- Moosehead Sanitary District – a license to operate a surface wastewater disposal system, with a design capacity of 0.17 million gallons per day (MGD), for the treatment and seasonal disposal of treated sanitary wastewater via spray irrigation of up to 33,938 gallons per acre per week for the spray field (Outfall #008A) (April 1 – November 30), as well as spray irrigation of up to 116,745 gallons per acre per week (Outfall #009A) (April 1 – October 31) and effluent snow making of up to

---
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61 million gallons per year (Outfall #SM1A) (November 1 – March 31) for the spray irrigation / snowmaking field, onto land in Greenville. There are also water-quality monitoring wells.

- Aqua Maine, Inc. (Maine Water Company) – a license to discharge a monthly average of up to 0.0025 MGD of filter cleaning (backwash) wastewater from a drinking water treatment facility to ground waters in Moosehead Junction Township.

**District Policies:** The District only does sewer extensions at the owner’s expense. The District does not require that residences or businesses connect to the system when adjacent to or near a sewer line, but does charge for service when the sewer is adjacent to a property.

**Future Needs:** The major capital expense will be removal of sludge from the treatment plant which is estimated to cost about $500,000 and is to be completed during the summer of 2012. This will be paid for through the District’s budget and rates.

### SEPTAGE DISPOSAL

Septage in Greenville is disposed of by private haulers, and over 95% of the material is disposed of at the Moosehead Sanitary District. The District is licensed to accept septage in two ways: one is via direct discharge to the District’s treatment lagoons at 1,700 gallons per day (this has yet to be used) and the other is through direct discharge to the District’s 12.22 acres of disposal fields at 557,232 gallons per year.\(^48\) Soil Preparation, Inc. (SPI), a private company, located in Plymouth, Maine is also licensed to accept at least 7 million gallons per year of septic tank waste.\(^49\)

### POWER AND COMMUNICATIONS

**Electricity** is provided by Central Maine Power Company (CMP). Three-phase power (CMP Circuit #834D2) runs along the Moosehead Lake Road from Shirley to CMP pole #75 where it leaves the main road and travels through the right-of-way parallel to the railroad. Three phase power remains in this right-of-way through most of the town, and provides service to Greenville Steam and the Greenville Industrial Park. The three phase system then leaves the right-of-way at or near CMP pole #55, U.S. Route 6/15. Three phase power also extends along Lily Bay Road from Route 6/15 to the Shoals Road.

**Communications** services consist of the following:

- Telephone: Fairpoint Communications
- Cellular Phone Service: Verizon and US Cellular both have cellular phone towers in Greenville
- Internet Providers: KYND Internet Services, COMMTEL, Great Works Internet, Fairpoint Communications, Premium Broadband (wireless)
- Cable Television: Moosehead Enterprises Cable TV; Satellite Cable TV

---

\(^48\) Moosehead Sanitary District, November/December 2011

\(^49\) Plum Creek Rezoning Proposal: Infrastructure and Community Impact Analysis prepared by the Eastern Maine Development Corporation, April 2007
**Part II. Inventory and Analysis**

**Town WEB Page:** Greenville has a well-developed WEB page (http://www.greenvilleme.com) that provides an extensive amount of information about town government and the community, and provides links to area organizations and businesses.

**Future Needs:** Greenville’s most significant and urgent telecommunications need is for adequate high speed internet. The current system is grossly inadequate, and is a significant constraint to the community’s future viability - economically, socially and educationally. True high speed internet is necessary for businesses and individuals, particularly in a community like Greenville that provides vital service to a vast rural area. Other telecommunications systems are generally adequate.

**SHAW PUBLIC LIBRARY**

The Shaw Public Library, housed in a brick building located at 9 Lily Bay Road, was granted to the Town in 1925 by Charles D. Shaw. The Library is operated as a non-profit corporation with a Board of Trustees. The Library operates on an annual budget of approximately $81,000, which is raised by the Town at the annual town meeting. Capital projects are usually funded through capital fundraising campaigns, donations and other library funds.

The Library is open weekly, Tuesday through Saturday, with morning, afternoon and evening hours, depending on the day of the week. The library is staffed by four part-time assistant librarians and a part-time head librarian. The Library’s collection consists of approximately 21,366 materials. The Library has a networked computer system, a computerized circulation cataloguing system, and access to the Internet with seven desktops and 3 laptops for public access computers. The Library provides a number of programs and services, including reference and genealogical services, books on tape and CD, “Maine Cat” statewide card catalog, story hours, workshops for home schooled children, traveling library services for senior citizens, adult and children’s summer programming, a book club, annual book sale, interlibrary loan, computer use classes, access to the MARVEL database and downloadable audio books and e-books.

The Library was recently expanded with the addition of a library annex. The building behind the Library was acquired and converted into library and office space. It now houses the children’s collection through the young adult level and had a computer lab and meeting space for public use and office space for staff use. Wireless Internet access is available in both buildings. The main library houses the adult fiction and non-fiction, the Maine collection, DVD and VHS movies and the periodicals and reference collections.

Current trends in libraries include a growing use of computers and digital media. E-Books have become very popular and libraries are beginning to offer them for their patrons. Libraries are becoming a place for people to gather and programming for all ages is a growing service need. The use of public access computers is still growing and the wireless internet access is also very popular. The library is constantly changing and adapting to the current needs of the public and will continue to do so.

---
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Future Needs: Future capital needs include a new connector between the buildings (eliminate the need for a handicapped accessible entrance and restroom for the main library), and other small projects relating to accessibility. These projects, and the fundraising for capital campaigns and grant writing, are conducted by the Shaw Public Library Association. The Town is responsible for the ongoing upkeep and maintenance of the buildings.

The community impact analysis conducted for the Moosehead Lake Concept Plan suggested that the Library might have an additional 669 new card holders due to new residents from plan and induced development from build-out of the development.\footnote{51}

THE GREENVILLE CEMETERY\footnote{52}

The Greenville Cemetery, located along Cemetery Lane off South Maine Street, is operated by the Cemetery Corporation, a private non-profit organization. The Corporation operates on an annual budget of around $25,000 to $27,000. The Town appropriates between $8,000 and $10,000 per year for cemetery maintenance and operation. This is about 1/3 of the cost, with the other 2/3s funded through operations and investment income.

Future Needs: It is estimated that there is approximately 10-15 years of space left in the cemetery. A reserve account has been established for expansion sometime in the future. The property needs to be surveyed to determine exactly how much space is available for the expansion.

Anticipated capital needs for the next decade include a new roof on the storage building and replacement of the waterline, which is well over fifty years old. The Corporation would like to obtain a grant to cover the cost (est. $4,000) of replacing the water line.

EDUCATION - GREENVILLE SCHOOLS\footnote{53}

Greenville is part of School Union #60, which includes the communities of Greenville, Beaver Cove, Shirley, Willimantic and Kingsbury Plantation. Rockwood currently tuition students to Union #60. The School Union Committee who oversees the school is made up of 16 members, with five members from Greenville.

The school’s staff consists of a full-time superintendent, who also serves as the special services director, a full-time principal, a full-time guidance director, 22 teachers and 14 support staff. The student/teacher ratio is about 11 to 1. School enrollment is about 239 students in grades K-12. The School is operated on a total budget of approximately $3,323,215 (2010-2011) and $3,311,285 (2011-12). The Town of Greenville’s raises about $2,300,000 each year for education.

\footnote{51}{Plum Creek Rezoning Proposal Infrastructure and Community Impact Analysis prepared by the Eastern Maine Development Corporation, April 2007}
\footnote{52}{Durwood Ferland, Greenville Cemetery Corporation, December 2011}
\footnote{53}{Beth Lorigan, School Union 60 Superintendent, January 2012}
The Greenville Consolidated School Campus
The School’s campus consists of the Oakes Building, the gymnasium, athletic fields and the former Nickerson Elementary School. The Oakes Building houses grades K-12 and the administrative offices. The Oakes Building, constructed in 1935, is a well-built structure with exceptional historic architecture. The Town recently undertook major renovations to the building including installation of new HVAC systems necessary to convert the existing steam based system to a forced hot water system, installation of an automated fire alarm system, upgrades to the bathrooms, new windows and other renovations to convert the building for use as a K-12 school. The project will also include the construction of a wood pellet boiler designed to heat the Oakes Building and the gymnasium more efficiently. Another very important improvement will be the installation of generator to run the building when there is no electricity. Once these renovations have been completed, a few smaller improvements will be needed, but in general the facility will be adequate for the foreseeable future.

The gymnasium, constructed in the 1960s, is a separate structure used for physical education, sports events and other activities. The building is considered to be in adequate condition at this time. The campus also includes athletic fields used for track and field practices, soccer, baseball and softball. Recent additions to the athletic facilities include a quarter-mile roller-oval, sand volleyball, outdoor basketball and tennis courts, and a combination ice-rink/skateboard park, most of which are maintained by the Town of Greenville.

As a result of the consolidation of all grades and the administrative offices into the Oakes Building, a decision has been made to demolish Nickerson Elementary School (built in 1963). The school has structural deficiencies and other issues. There has been discussion about building a new community/school recreation building to replace the Nickerson building.

School Union 60 Enrollments
Student enrollments have steadily declined over the past decade from a total of 303 students in 1999/2000 to 193 students in 2009/2010. Continued decline in enrollments is anticipated with a projected enrollment of 132 students by the year 2019/2020. These projections are based on past demographic and economic trends. An upswing in the economy and in-migration of families with children or in their child bearing years could result in increased enrollments. For example, the community impact analysis for the

\[2009-2010\text{ Enrollment Projections for Greenville (School Union 60), Planning Decisions, Inc., May 2010}\]
Moosehead Lake Concept Plan suggests that at full build-out of the development there could be an additional 241 students as a result of the plan development and induced development. According to the School Superintendent this increase in enrollments could be assimilated quite easily, and would help stabilize the school system. Further, the K-12 Oakes Building has supported many more students than this in the past and could do so again.

Future Initiatives: Charter School
A Charter Exploratory Committee is currently investigating the feasibility and opportunities for developing a charter school to improve the educational system, increase enrollments, and take advantage of the rich natural resource and cultural heritage of the region.

Tri-County Technical Center
The Tri-County Technical Center is a regional high school program providing occupational preparation courses for five area high schools, including the Greenville Consolidated School. The Center provides occupational preparation for employment and post-secondary education in professions, such as commercial truck driving, metals manufacturing, health occupations, graphic design and communications, criminal justice, computer systems repair, building trades, and automotive technology.

HEALTH SERVICES

Town and Town-Supported Services
The Town of Greenville provides and/or supports several public health/social services. The Town administers the General Assistance Program at about $4,000 per year. Greenville also has a Health Officer who monitors public health issues that might affect the community. The Town also provides annual subsidies to the Eastern Area Agency on Aging (Bangor), Penquis/Project Ride (Bangor), Womancare/Aegis (Dover-Foxcroft), and Pine Tree Hospice (Dover-Foxcroft).

There are several food cupboards. One is located in the Union Evangelical Church and is run by the Moosehead Associates, a volunteer organization that was started many, many years ago as a knitting group. Other food cupboards are located at the Church of the Open Bible and the Partnerships for Pantries of Greenville that comes from Guilford to Greenville one day a month.

C. A. Dean Memorial Hospital and Nursing Home/Northwoods Healthcare
Charles A. Dean Memorial Hospital and Nursing Home (C. A. Dean) is a 25-bed critical access hospital located off Pritham Avenue in Greenville. C.A. Dean is also the home to Northwoods Healthcare, a primary care practice with offices in Greenville, Monson and Sangerville. C.A. Dean is affiliated with Eastern Maine Healthcare (EMH) of Brewer. EMH is a network of hospitals and healthcare services throughout central, eastern, and northern Maine and includes the Eastern Maine Medical Center in Bangor.

55 Plum Creek Rezoning Proposal Infrastructure and Community Impact Analysis prepared by the Eastern Maine Development Corporation, April 2007
56 CEO, Eugene Murray, December 2011
C.A. Dean's hospital provides acute, skilled, and nursing facility beds. C.A. Dean also provides 24-hour emergency medical services, including an ambulance and a full service Emergency Department, three family practice locations, diagnostic services, laboratory, digital imaging, CT scan, ultrasound, mammography, rehabilitation services, as well as, podiatry, and general and orthopedic surgery. C.A. Dean was one of the first hospitals in the state to construct a LifeFlight landing pad to better serve its extremely rural population.

Looking to the future, perhaps the most significant issue for the hospital is the change in approach to the delivery of health care services and the methods of reimbursement as a result of the new federal health care legislation. The hospital is also undertaking a major capital campaign to update and upgrade its emergency room, operating room and other facilities.

Regarding future population change, the hospital will be able to accommodate future growth in population, and, in fact would be economically better off serving a larger population base. This is confirmed by a study for the Moosehead Lake Concept Plan\textsuperscript{57} that indicates that the increase in population from the development will provide a broader client base for the areas’ health care system, which may ensure more use and therefore a more cost-effective and improved delivery system. The study estimates that at full build-out an additional 1,198 additional emergency room visits could be expected from residential, resort and induced development. Additionally, ambulance calls could go up by a projected 161.4 calls per year.

\textbf{Other Healthcare and Social Services}

Other health care services utilized by Greenville residents include:

- Ted Rodgers Chiropractor (Greenville)
- Maine Eye Care Associates (Greenville)
- A dentist and other specialists are available at C. A. Dean Hospital

Greenville residents also access the following, as needed: Eastern Area Agency on Aging (Bangor), Penquis/Project Ride (Bangor), Womancare/Aegis (Dover-Foxcroft), Pine Tree Hospice (Dover-Foxcroft), and Community Health and Counseling (Dover-Foxcroft).

\textsuperscript{57} Plum Creek Rezoning Proposal Infrastructure and Community Impact Analysis prepared by the Eastern Maine Development Corporation, April 2007
OVERVIEW

Outdoor recreation and public access to open space and water bodies is a strong tradition in Maine, and one that is particularly important to the Moosehead Lake Region and Greenville. Greenville serves as a gateway and recreational hub for a vast area that extends northward to the Chesuncook and the Allagash Wilderness Waterway, eastward to the edge of Baxter State Park, westward to Long Pond and the Forks, and southward towards the more populated areas of central Maine. The region’s sparsely populated forests, mountains, unique geologic formations, lakes, rivers, streams, gorges, waterfalls, wildlife, fisheries, historic and archaeological sites, and spectacular scenery provide the setting for a wide range of outdoor recreational activities. The public has access to most of these areas because they are either in state ownership or on land where landowners, both private and non-profit, allow public access, often at minimal to no cost. There are also a number of private businesses that offer services to enhance recreational offerings and provide vitality in the region.

As the gateway community for the region, Greenville serves year-round and second home residents as well as thousands of tourists who are visiting the area. While many recreational offerings are provided by the state and the private sector, the Town of Greenville plays an important role in providing municipal services and facilities to support recreational activity.

Moosehead Lake Region
Outdoor Recreational Activities

- All Terrain Vehicle Riding
- Biking
- Boating, Canoeing, Kayaking, Rowing
- Camping, Picnicking
- Car and Ice Racing
- Cross Country Skiing, Snowshoeing
- Farm Tours - Maple Syrup, Deer, Buffalo
- Dog sledding
- Fishing: Lake, Pond, River, Ice Fishing
- Golf
- Hiking
- Horseback Riding
- Hunting
- Ice Skating, Ice Hockey
- Moose, Wildlife and Bird Watching
- Scenic Floatplane Tours
- Scenic Drives, Fall Foliage Tours
- Snowmobiling
- Steamship Cruises
- Swimming
- Whitewater Rafting

---

58 See Chapter II-10 Community Character, History and Archeology for Moosehead Historical Society and Museums, the Natural Resources Education Center and the Moosehead Marine Museum and Katahdin Steamship cruises. See Chapter II-4 Public/Community Services and Facilities for Shaw Public Library.

59 Some large landowners are members of the North Maine Woods Association which manages the recreational use of their landholdings. This organization operates a number of gates on the private road system and charges visitor fees for use of its roads and campsites. North Maine Woods also collects user fees on behalf of the State for use of state-owned lands. Plum Creek is not a member of the Maine North Woods Association.
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SUMMARY

Recreational Facilities and Programs Needed to Accommodate Projected Growth

- In general, the Town’s existing recreational facilities and programs, with improved maintenance, upgrades and expansions, may be adequate to meet future needs. Funding is an issue at this time, which means the Town will need to prioritize facility improvements and recreation programming.
- New sources of funding, including “pay to play”, grants and fundraising should be explored.
- As stated previously, future growth and development is not likely to outpace the Town’s ability to keep up with necessary improvements, and in fact, future growth may improve the community’s ability to more cost-effectively maintain and expand recreational facilities and programs.

Specific Recreational Needs

- The Greenville Recreation Department has identified a number of needs for the next ten years, including: (1) expanded hours for the Recreation Director; (2) access to a recreation facility (gym) separate from the one at the Greenville School for activities for children and teens; (3) new equipment at the skateboard park; (4) new equipment at the Pine Grove Playground; (5) resurfacing and new lighting and fencing at the tennis courts; (6) resurfacing the basketball courts; (7) beach improvements (more sand/less rocks), wooden canopies to provide shade at Red Cross Beach; (8) improved bicycle and pedestrian access under the Pritham Avenue railroad trestle to provide access to Junction Wharf; and (9) overall improved maintenance to recreation facilities.

Open Space Available for Public Recreation

- The availability of open space for outdoor recreation is a major asset for the Moosehead Lake Region. There is a considerable amount of public land and/or conservation land accessible to the public in the Moosehead Lake Region, and it is a major economic asset to the area.
- Greenville has a number of public recreational facilities in the village including two beaches, several parks, and the Junction Wharf. There are also public boat launches at Sawyer Pond and Lower Wilson Pond.
- Most of the land in Greenville is privately owned, including large tracts of working forests. In general, most of the large landowners allow public access for a variety of uses. However, as land becomes developed public access is often restricted and issues such as the relocation of the ITS snowmobile trail along the Scammon Road north of Lower Wilson Pond may present challenges.
- There are a number of opportunities available to the Town in the Moosehead Lake Concept Plan. The Plan includes approximately 363,000 acres of permanent conservation land that forever guarantees public access for traditional recreational pursuits. The Plan also includes a number of recreational amenities designed to expand and diversify outdoor opportunities for the public, including: permanent easements over approximately 57 miles of Plum Creek road networks; a permanent easement across more than 80 miles of snowmobile trails; an easement across 12 miles of the northern portion of the Mahoosuc-to-Moosehead trail project to be granted to Maine Huts and Trails; and trail easements on an aggregate of 121.8 acres to be granted to the State for public hiking trails, along with 5 trailhead parking areas. The Plan also provides funding to the State for the construction, repair and maintenance of the trails, trailhead parking areas and associated trail amenities; establishes a permanent stewardship fee on sales of property in the development zones that will fund additional recreational infrastructure; and makes a donation in the aggregate of 50 acres to the State for new recreational infrastructure like public boat ramps.
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The Town will should be proactive in working out the details of where these recreational amenities are located and designed so that they provide the greatest benefit to the community.

Land Conservation Mechanisms and Partnerships

- The Town does not have an open space fund or a formal partnership with a land trust.
- There are a number of non-profit land trusts active in the Moosehead Lake Region including the Forest Society of Maine, the Appalachian Mountain Club and the Nature Conservancy. The Forest Society of Maine has an office at the Natural Resources Education Center and will oversee most of the conservation land associated with the Moosehead Lake Concept Plan. The Appalachian Mountain Club has an office in downtown Greenville, and is also active in the region outside of Greenville. The Town may want to look for opportunities to partner with these organizations in the future, if important open space parcels are identified for future conservation in Greenville.

Public Access to Significant Water Bodies

- There is formal public access to Greenville’s most significant lakes and ponds, including the Junction Wharf and several other facilities on Moosehead Lake, and boat accesses at Sawyer Pond and Lower Wilson Pond. There is access to Upper Wilson Pond via the narrows that connects to Lower Wilson Pond. The Moosehead Lake Concept Plan calls for the creation of boat access to Upper Wilson Pond, as well.
- Private landowners, such as Plum Creek, allow public access to other water bodies, such as Prong Pond and Big Wilson Stream.
- The use of moorings in Moosehead Lake may be an issue the Town will need to address.

Recreational Trails

- There are many recreational trails in and around Greenville. Snowmobile trails have received a high level of maintenance over the past decades because of their long-standing importance to the local economy. The ATV system, while less developed, has expanded considerably over the past decade. These trails are generally well-maintained as a result of the efforts of volunteer club members. The ITS snowmobile system is maintained by a private contractor paid through Maine Department of Conservation and Town funds.
- Efforts are underway to develop a multi-use trail system, including a multi-use trail that would loop around Moosehead Lake. The Town recently completed a village perimeter trail for multiple uses, which interconnects with other trails. The Town should monitor ATV use of the Pritham Avenue portion of this perimeter trail to assure compatibility and avoid conflicts. The Town, local snowmobile and ATV clubs with assistance from the Piscataquis County Economic Development Council are working to fund and construct a new Greenville/Kokadjo permanent trail that replaces some of the existing snowmobile trail.
- Other non-motorized trails are located at the Greenville School and the Moosehead Lake Visitors Center. There are also many other informal trails, such as those associated with logging roads.
- The Town will want to monitor conflicting uses on trails, particularly impacts on non-motorized uses which are not always compatible with motorized uses.
TOWN PARKS AND RECREATION

Public parks and recreation programs and facilities are those owned and/or operated by the Town, including the school department. These programs and facilities are either provided to the public free or at minimal cost, and are open to residents as well as non-residents.

Recreation Department and Programs

The Greenville Selectmen appoint the six members of the Recreation Committee who work with the part-time Recreation Director (20 hours/week). The Town also employs several part-time counselors for summer programs, including lifeguards for the Red Cross Beach. The Department’s annual budget is around $50,000. The Department also does fundraising and provides scholarships for children to participate in programs.

Recreational programs offered over the past several years have included the following activities for youth: cheering, basketball, baseball, soccer, golf, T-ball, tennis, Little League Softball, swimming lessons, baby sitting classes, cooking classes, Destination Imagination (creative thinking and problem solving competitions), and a variety of special events (dances, Easter egg hunt, concerts, holiday parties, etc.).

The Public Works Department is responsible for maintaining most of the Town’s recreation facilities. The Town discontinued maintenance of the skating rink for the winter of 2011/12 primarily due the cost, which resulted in the loss of ice skating and the hockey programs.

The Recreation Department oversees maintenance and use of the tennis and basketball courts, the skateboard park/ice rink and the Red Cross Beach.

Future Needs: A number of short-term and long-term needs have been identified. Given the popularity of the Department’s programs, and the time involved in organizing the programs, it appears that there is a need to expand the Director’s hours. Additionally, there continues to be a need to provide activities for kids and teens during non-school hours. A major constraint to providing more activities is the lack of a recreation center (gym) separate from the school facilities. Conflicts between school activities and those of the Recreation Department have increased with the consolidation of the school into the Oakes Building. Specific facility needs are included in the following table.

---

60 Andrea Lane, Greenville Recreation Director, Fall 2011
Public Recreation Facilities in Greenville

The following is an inventory of public recreational facilities in the Town of Greenville. These facilities are displayed on Maps 4 and 6 in Appendix B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility/Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Future Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junction Wharf; Pritham Avenue</td>
<td>Moosehead Lake - boat launches, swimming beach, common green space, picnic tables, small bathhouse, playground, parking for about 24 vehicles plus trailers and 8 vehicles</td>
<td>Recently rehabilitated facility – good condition. Improve bicycle and pedestrian access, including under railroad trestle. Address geese defecating on the grounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preo Park; Preo Street</td>
<td>Moosehead Lake - canoe/kayak launch, picnic area, small amount of parking</td>
<td>Better maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross Beach; Craft’s Road</td>
<td>Moosehead Lake - beach, bathrooms, changing rooms, storage building, picnic area, parking</td>
<td>Better maintenance, improved parking, beach improvements (more sand/less rocks), wooden canopies to provide shade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoreau Park and Boardwalk, public dock, information kiosk; Pritham Avenue</td>
<td>Moosehead Lake - public dock, waterfront boardwalk, benches, picnic area, gateway to Moosehead Lake Town-maintained public restroom in Moosehead Marine Museum</td>
<td>Better maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Grove Playground; Prospect Street</td>
<td>Playground, open space, street parking, picnic tables</td>
<td>Replace outdated playground equipment, Boy Scout project underway to address this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenville Consolidated School Campus; Pritham Avenue</td>
<td>Gymnasium, two tennis courts, skate board park (formerly also used as ice skating rink), outdoor lighted basketball court, track, baseball/softball fields, running track, volleyball court, ball fields, soccer field, playground, nature trail</td>
<td>New equipment for skateboard park; resurface tennis and basketball courts; new lighting and fencing at tennis courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moosehead Lake Visitor’s Center; Moosehead Lake Road</td>
<td>Natural Resources Education Center, Moosehead Lake Chamber of Commerce, and Forest Society of Maine – visitor’s center, natural trail, cross-country trails, etc.</td>
<td>Overall facility expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawyer Pond Boat Launch; Scammon Road</td>
<td>150 ft. carry-in public boat launch, small floating dock at the end of the trail, parking for about 8 vehicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Pond Boat Launch; East Road</td>
<td>Boat ramp, floating dock, parking for about 10 vehicles with trailers</td>
<td>Overnight parking for remote campsites(^{62})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Town of Greenville staff, 2011/12

---

\(^{61}\) See Chapter II-10 Community Character, History and Archaeology for facilities associated with the Natural Resources Education Center, Historical Society and Moosehead Marine Museum.

\(^{62}\) There are five primitive camp sites on Plum Creek land along the shores of Lower Wilson Pond. These sites are maintained by the Friends of Wilson Pond Area.
TRAIL SYSTEMS

Regional Trails Systems
There are a number of formal and informal trail systems in Greenville and the Moosehead Lake Region for a variety of recreational activities such as walking, hiking, biking, canoeing, snowshoeing, horseback riding, snowmobiling and ATVing. Perhaps the most significant regional trails are the Appalachian Trail, which extends from Georgia to Maine and is part of the National Park System, the Northern Forest Canoe Trail (New York, Vermont, Quebec, New Hampshire, and Maine), and the Maine Interconnecting Trail System of snowmobile trails that extends throughout Maine and into Canada. There are also regional ATV trails, the Maine Huts and Trails, and the Appalachian Mountain Club huts and trail systems. The Moosehead Lake Concept Plan calls for expansion and enhancement of trail systems in the region.

In general, there appears to be a desire for more trails and a greater variety of trails, including multi-use trails, long-distance trails, interconnecting trails, trails for overnight and/or day use, scenic trails to waterfalls or scenic outlooks, village area trails, non-motorized and motorized trails, canoe trails, etc. These trails and trail systems are an important component of the region’s economy.

Multi-Use Trails in Greenville
There is growing interest in Greenville and the region for the development of multi-use trails. One of the advantages of multi-use trails is that construction and maintenance costs can be shared and/or serve multi-purposes. For example, trails and bridges that are constructed for ATVs are usually more than adequate for many other recreational uses, and can easily serve as snowmobile trails in the winter. One of the challenges of multi-use trails is managing conflicts between motorized and non-motorized users, which should be a consideration in construction and management of trail systems.

Village Area Multi-use Trail
The Town recently completed a portion of multi-use trail that starts from Depot Road near the Greenville Steam Road and extends around the southern portion of the village, and connects to Eveleth Hill Street near the Moosehead Lake Road. The trail is open to walkers, joggers, bikers, cross-country skiers, ATVers, snowmobilers, horseback riders, and other types of users.

This new section of trail connects with the in-town streets that have been designated for ATVs, and that are also used by snowmobiles. These streets include portions of Pritham Avenue, Moosehead Lake Road, and Lily Bay Road. The trail system is designed to create a village area loop, as well as connections to other ATV and snowmobile trails in the area. (See Maps 4 and 5 in Appendix B)

Moosehead Lake Multi-Use Trail
The vision for the Moosehead Lake Multi-Use trail system is one of a multi-use trail that creates a large loop from Greenville to Kokadjo northward up and around Moosehead Lake and back around to Rockwood and back down to Greenville. Food and fuel stops would be available at the small communities along the way. Current efforts are underway to work towards this vision through a collaborative effort involving the Town, the local snowmobile and ATV clubs, and the Piscataquis County
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Economic Development Council (PECDC). The project involves construction of a new Greenville/Kokadjo permanent trail that replaces some of the existing snowmobile trail. Once the exact route is identified, the PCEDC will assist the Town in obtaining funding for the construction of the multi-use trail, which could easily be over $100,000.

The following is a description of the snowmobile and ATV trails and clubs.

**Snowmobile and ATV Trails and Clubs**

**Snowmobile Trails**

The Moosehead region has what many consider world-class snowmobiling. The five snowmobile clubs in the region maintain hundreds of miles of local trails that interconnect to the Maine Interconnecting Trail System (ITS), which provides access to other parts of Maine, New Hampshire, and into Canada. ITS 85, 86 and 88 extend through Greenville. Many businesses in Greenville and the region cater to snowmobilers, including restaurants, lodging establishments, guide services, dealers and repair shops, equipment rentals, gas and fuel services, and others.

The local club based in Greenville is the Moosehead Riders Snowmobile Club, which has a clubhouse off Scammon Road. Volunteers from the Moosehead Riders maintain about 50 miles of club trails in Greenville and areas to the north of town extending to Kokadjo. The club has a Jeep Cherokee groomer and several drag sleds that it uses to groom club trails. Greenville ITS Grooming, a private company, grooms the ITS trails in the region (about 60 miles).

**All-Terrain Vehicle (ATV) Trails**

The ATV trail network in the Moosehead region has been developed over the past ten to twenty years. The Moosehead ATV Riders is a local club that offers a well marked trail system up the west side of Moosehead Lake. The region’s ATV system consists of over 99 miles of trails including portions of snowmobile ITS 88 plus sections of Pritham Avenue, Depot Street, Lily Bay Road, and the recently developed multi-use village perimeter trail. The club meets at the snowmobile clubhouse on Scammon Road, and many members are member of both clubs. The ATV club relies on volunteers to build and maintain trails using their own equipment.

**Snowmobile and ATV Trails and Clubs - Future Needs:**

In addition to the multi-use trail described previously, the clubs’ ongoing needs are funding for maintenance of the trails and more volunteers. Funding through the Department of Conservation and other grants along with member dues currently supports trail maintenance.

---

63 Tom McCormick, President – 695-4543 or ”mailto:thomick@hotmail.com
64 Ken Snowdon, President - 695-8928 Email: tominme@localnet.com
Non-motorized Trail Uses
Popular non-motorized trail activities include hiking, biking, cross-country skiing, snowshoeing and horseback riding. The multi-use snowmobile and ATV trails described above can be used for non-motorized uses. In addition to these trail systems there is the NREC nature trail, the trails at the school, and many informal trails, logging roads, rail beds in rural parts of Greenville and the Moosehead Region. Perhaps the most significant hiking trail in the region is the Appalachian Trail (AT) which passes southeast of Greenville and on to its terminus atop Mount Katahdin. There are many other noteworthy trails in the region, a few of which are noted here - including those associated with the B-52 Memorial Site on Elephant Mountain, Mount Kineo, Lily Bay State Park, Big Moose Mountain, Indian Mountain, Borestone Mountain, Big Spencer Mountain, Moxie Falls, and Little Wilson Falls.

There are private businesses in the region that have cross-country ski and/or snowmobile trail systems. There are also downhill ski trails at Moose Mountain (former Squaw Mountain Ski Resort).

PUBLIC ACCESS TO IMPORTANT WATER BODIES IN GREENVILLE
Public access to lakes, ponds and streams facilitates the use of these water bodies for a number of recreational pursuits, including boating, swimming and fishing. The availability of public access is one of the criteria the Maine Inland Fisheries and Wildlife uses to determine which lakes and ponds are stocked for sport fisheries. Fishing is a very important recreational pursuit in the region, and a more detailed discussion on fisheries can be found in Chapter II-9 Critical Natural Resources.

Moosehead Lake and the Town’s Other Ponds
As displayed in the previous table there is considerable public access to Moosehead Lake in Greenville, including Junction Wharf, the beaches, and the Thoreau/Waterfront Park. There are at least two state facilities that provide public access to Moosehead Lake at locations outside Greenville and further up the lake: the Rockwood Boat Launch on the west side of Moosehead and Lily Bay State Park on the east side of the lake. Private marinas offer docking facilities, and some of the lakeside resorts and restaurants offer docking and decks. There are also three seaplane services operating out of Greenville on Moosehead Lake. The Maine Forest Service and the Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife also have water access but these are not open to the public.

Public access to Moosehead Lake is generally considered adequate at this time. The issue of moorings in the coves has been investigated, but was determined not to be a big enough issue to warrant the development of an ordinance at this time. The primary concern was conflicts between the moorings and the steamboat Kate and the seaplanes.

There are state-maintained boat facilities at both Sawyer Pond and Lower Wilson Pond. A narrow channel from Lower Wilson Pond provides access to Upper Wilson Pond. In addition, the Moosehead Lake Concept Plan includes a new boat launch at Upper Wilson Pond. The town’s other ponds are only accessible over private land.
PUBLIC ACCESS TO OPEN SPACE

Public access to open space is a huge part of what Greenville and the region has to offer. Fortunately, there are a number of state and local parks, state public reserve land, and conservation land that provide public access. Many private landowners also allow public access for certain activities.

PRIVATE BUSINESSES

In addition to the extensive public and semi-public recreational amenities and offerings, there are many private, for-profit businesses providing recreational activities, facilities and accommodations. Private recreational services and facilities include: seaplane rides and excursions, wilderness outfitters, whitewater rafting companies, guide services, private beaches, lake cruises and boat rides, sporting camps, marinas, skiing (downhill/cross-country), golf courses, dog sledding and horseback riding stables.

Many businesses provide accommodations for tourists, such as bed and breakfasts, inns, motels, campgrounds, and restaurants, or provide opportunities for shopping, such as craft shops, art galleries, antique shops and souvenir shops. Indoor recreational offerings include pools and activity rooms at inns and motels. A listing of businesses in Greenville is included in Chapter II-2 Economy of this Plan.

The Moosehead Lake Concept Plan provides lasting, large scale conservation of approximately 392,000 acres. 96% of the land will be permanently conserved solidifying a nearly 2-million-acre network of conservation lands stretching from the Quebec border to Baxter State Park. Approximately 363,000 acres will be placed in permanent conservation, which will ensure that sustainable forestry is practiced, prohibit all residential development, and forever guarantee public access for traditional recreational pursuits.

The Plan includes a myriad of recreational amenities that can expand and diversify outdoor opportunities for the public, as follows:

- as development occurs, permanent easements will be granted over approximately 57 miles of Plum Creek road networks guaranteeing public vehicular access for recreational purposes;
- a permanent easement across more than 80 miles of snowmobile trails allowing for public use;
- an easement across 12 miles of the northern portion of the Mahoosuc-to-Moosehead trail project to be granted to Maine Huts and Trails;
- trail easements on an aggregate of 121.8 acres to be granted to the State for public hiking trails, along with 5 trailhead parking areas. There will be funding to the Bureau of Parks and Land for the construction, repair and maintenance of the trails, trailhead parking areas and associated trail amenities;
- a permanent stewardship fee on sales of property in the development zones that will fund additional recreational infrastructure; and
- a donation in the aggregate of 50 acres to the Bureau of Parks and Land for new recreational infrastructure like public boat ramps.

Source: Source: http://www.plumcreek
OVERVIEW
Transportation planning and land use planning must work hand-in-hand to protect highway safety and mobility, and enhance economic opportunity, community livability, and environmental quality. Provisions for other transportation modes are also part of the mix, including the airport, seaplane bases, railroad, public transportation, parking, and consideration for pedestrians and bicycles.

Greenville's transportation policies, such as those that are incorporated into ordinances and capital improvements planning, can help assure that future development does not increase traffic congestion or overtax existing roadways, and that future facilities are constructed adequately. Such policies can also seek to assure that transportation systems function cost-effectively at acceptable levels.

SUMMARY
Transportation System Concerns for the Future
The following issues/projects should be considered within the next ten years:

- Address traffic back-ups and safety issues in the Village District, particularly at the Moosehead Lake Road, Pritham Avenue, Pleasant Street, and Lily Bay Road intersections. Any increases in traffic as a result of development in Greenville and/or the region will exacerbate the problems. The Town should explore a broad range of options for addressing the issues.

- Provide more parking in the village.

- Consider bypass of the Village District.

- Address the cost of maintaining the transportation infrastructure, particularly paved roads.

- Improve pedestrian and bicycling amenities, including sidewalks and winter maintenance issues.

- Support enhancement of Maine’s Moosehead Lake Scenic Byway.

- Monitor the East-West Highway proposal.

- Continue to improve the airport and update the Airport Master Plan.

- Assure that land use regulations and transportation policies are aligned and support the Town’s vision for the future.

Conflicts Caused by Multiple Road Uses (Major Thoroughfare through the Village District)
- State Route 6/15 is a minor arterial highway that passes through Greenville’s village. The most significant negative issues are the conflicts between logging trucks, fuel trucks, and other large trucks, and automobiles and pedestrians. The Town has discussed a bypass of the Village District on a number of occasions in the past, but there was always concern about potential loss of business as a result. The Town may want to consider, and even plan for, a truck route/bypass as a long-term possibility, if traffic increases significantly. Short-term options might include exploring opportunities to: (1) improve parking and signage; (2) provide more corner clearance for trucks; (3) designate loading/unloading areas for businesses; (4) improve pedestrian amenities to...
encourage walking instead of driving; and (5) traffic routing using side roads or new
interconnections between businesses.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Amenities
- There are sidewalks in the village that serve shopping areas and other services, and that connect
to the school, recreation areas, and many residential neighborhoods. Pedestrian access from the
downtown to Junction Warf is constrained by the lack of a sidewalk, or even a wide road shoulder
along Pritham Avenue as it passes under the railroad overpass.
- Sidewalks could be improved along the Lily Bay Road and along Route 15 from the village to Indian
Hill. Enforcement of speed limits in these areas would also make walking and bicycling safer. Snow
removal and sanding of sidewalks along main roads continues to be a challenge.
- The shoulders along rural roads are generally narrow and unpaved, making walking and bicycling
challenging, particularly when there is a lot of traffic.
- The Town may want to consider options to improve facilities for pedestrians and bicycles,
particularly in the Village District to decrease traffic. Bicycling is also becoming an increasingly
popular sport and mode of transportation.
- Greenville’s Land Use Ordinance does not contain any specific standards to support bicycling
and pedestrians, other than subdivision standards that allow the Planning Board to require the
reservation of a 20-foot easement to provide continuation of pedestrian traffic to the next street.
The ordinance could be amended to include more consideration for pedestrians and bicyclists.

Maine’s Moosehead Lake Scenic Byway
- Enhancement of the Moosehead Lake Scenic Byway (Route 15 between Jackman and Greenville,
Lily Bay Road from Greenville to Kokadjo, and the Moosehead Lake Road from Pritham Avenue to
the Visitor’s Center), has the potential to improve tourism in Greenville and the region. The Byway
designation will provide funding opportunities for improvements, such as scenic overlooks, picnic
and rest areas, and information and directional signage.

East-West Highway
- A study has been funded to investigate the feasibility of a private, limited-access, east-west
highway, a project that might impact Greenville even though none of the proposed highway
corridors pass through Greenville. The Town will want to monitor this initiative.

Planning and Budgeting for Road Maintenance and Capital Improvements
- Greenville currently spends about $302,000 per year on road maintenance.
- In the past the Town had a ten-year capital plan, primarily for paving projects, that was updated
on an annual basis. This plan was eliminated due to budgetary constraints, and the Town now just
allocates its state road reimbursement ($27,000 per year) for this work, which does not allow the
Town to do very much. No local taxes have been used to fund paving for several years.
- Road paving and other capital projects should be coordinated with utility improvements.

Parking
- The Town has public parking areas, but still needs additional parking during busy times of the year.
- While parking standards do not constrain development in the Village District, they should be
updated to provide more guidance on how parking needs might be better met.
- More parking and improved signage could potentially improve traffic flow in the Village District.
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Public Transportation and Other Transportation Options

- Penquis, a public transit service out of Bangor, provides limited service to Greenville’s low income, elderly and disabled residents. Fortunately, there are many necessary services within Greenville.
- The only private business providing transportation services out of Greenville is Northwoods Wilderness Outfitters which runs a shuttle service between Greenville and Bangor.
- There are no taxis or other private services available. This is sometimes an issue for people trying to get to and from the airport.

Air Transportation

- Greenville’s municipal airport is located about two miles from the village. Most people drive to and from the airport. The airport is used by year-round and second-home residents, some local businesses, and visitors to the area, and is a vital link to other areas of the state, country and beyond. Many improvements have been made to the airport over the past decade.
- The Airport Master Plan should be updated within the next several years.
- Greenville’s Land Use Ordinance has zoned an area around the airport to provide adequate airspace for airport functions. Expanding this area should be explored, as needed.
- There are two seaplane bases on Moosehead Lake that are adjacent to the village. The Town might want to consider building/structure height limits in certain areas for safety reasons.

Access Management

- The Land Use Ordinance contains access management standards that require that all driveways and entrances are designed to assure safe and efficient access to and from public roads. Requirements include minimum sight distances, and adequate driveway configurations to facilitate smooth and safe traffic movements.
- Access standards for the Moosehead Lake Road include additional requirements, such as limitations on subdivision access and increased sight distances. Similar access standards could be considered for the Lily Bay Road, particularly given the likelihood of future development and increased traffic. Greenville’s standards are intended to supplement MaineDOT driveway and entrance permitting which is only applicable to state roads.

Consistency of Road Design Standards with Desired Land Use Patterns

- The Land Use Ordinance includes road design standards for subdivisions, which should be reviewed to assure (1) they support desired land use patterns, such as the interconnection of neighborhoods, and (2) that roads are adequate in size and design, but not overbuilt such that the negatively impact water quality or development costs.
- Many subdivisions have dead-end roads - in part, because they extend into very rural undeveloped areas. The Land Use Ordinance does not limit the length of dead end streets, but does allow the Planning Board to require “the reservation of a 50-foot easement in line with the street to provide continuation of the road where future subdivision is possible.” The Town may want to consider limitations on the length of dead-end roads, particularly where there are opportunities to provide loop roads and/or interconnections for future development on adjacent land. Two reasons to address this are (1) emergency access can be compromised when a dead-end road is blocked for some reason, and (2) interconnected development can provide for a more efficient road system, including fewer connections with major roads, in some cases.
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

The Public Works Department is responsible for most of the transportation system in Greenville; including 32.58 miles of local roads and streets, stormwater facilities associated with local roads, several public parking areas, street-side parking, several miles of sidewalks, and the airport. The Town Manager is the Road Commissioner who oversees the Department’s yearly budget of about $302,000. The Road Foreman directs daily operations. There are three full-time employees. The Public Works Department operates out of the Public Works Facility.

HIGHWAYS AND STREETS

The function and condition of Greenville’s highways and other public roads affect the property values, productivity of the Village District and other areas, and the overall safety and convenience of citizens, who depend on a well-maintained transportation system. Ownership and maintenance responsibilities of public roads are shared between the state and town. (See Transportation Maps 7 and 8, in Appendix B.)

State Highway System designation determines maintenance responsibility, as follows:

- **State Highways** form a system of connected routes throughout the state that primarily serve intrastate and interstate traffic; these roads are usually classified as arterials. The MaineDOT has responsibility for the year-round maintenance of State Highways, including the 5.57 miles of State highways in Greenville: Route 6/15 (Pritham Avenue and Moosehead Lake Road).
- **State Aid Highways** connect local roads to the State Highway System and generally serve intra-county rather than intra-state traffic. These roads are usually classified as collectors, and are usually maintained by MaineDOT in the summer and by towns in the winter. There are 7.95 miles of State Aid Highways in Greenville, including the Lily Bay Road, Pleasant Street, East Road and Drew Road. These last three roads provide access to the Greenville Airport.
- **Town ways, or local roads,** are all other public streets and roads not included in the State Highway or State Aid Highway system; these are maintained by municipalities or counties. There are a total of almost 18.43 miles of local roads in Greenville.

There are a total of 31.95 miles\(^{65}\) of public roads in Greenville. Local roads are listed later in this chapter.

\(^{65}\)Mileages are from the MaineDOT
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Statewide Highway Projects
The MaineDOT prioritizes roads into six categories: Route 15/6 south of the village area is a Priority 2, Route 15/6 to the west of the village area is Priority 3, and the Lily Road is Priority 4. These priorities are taken into consideration when determining priorities for maintenance and capital construction.

The only major state highway project that might affect Greenville is the east-west highway proposal.

Maine’s Moosehead Lake Scenic Byway
Maine has a number of designated scenic byways including the Rangeley Lakes Scenic Byway, the Old Canada Road Scenic Byway (Route 201), the Moosehead Lake Scenic Byway, and several others. The designation provides a number of benefits – it identifies important resources, sets goals for corridor enhancement, and establishes priorities for improvements based on a community-focused process. Once a plan is established, federal, state, and other funds can be leveraged to implement improvements. Plans generally focus on natural, scenic, cultural, archeological, historical, and recreational resources.

The Moosehead Lake Scenic Byway was established in the late 2000s as the Route 15 corridor between Jackman and Greenville. Since then, it has been expanded to include the Lily Bay Road from Greenville to Kokadjo, and the Moosehead Lake Road between the village and the Moosehead Lake’s Visitor’s Center. The entire length of the byway is about 70 miles. The Scenic Byway is noted for boating, camping, canoeing, kayaking, fishing, foliage viewing, hiking trails, waterbody and mountain views, skiing, snowmobiling, ATVing, and wildlife viewing.

The Byway’s Corridor Advocacy Group (CAG) consists of area stakeholders, and has staffing through the Piscataquis Tourism Development Authority (PTDA). The CAG has developed a Corridor Plan that identifies priorities and funding options for byway enhancements, such as scenic overlooks, picnic and rest areas, trailheads, information and directional signage, road safety improvements for bikers and pedestrians, expansion of the Moosehead Lake Visitor’s Center, and a number of other gateway and byway improvements. Enhancements to the Scenic Byway are directly tied to the overall economic development goals of the CAG and the PTDA, which seek to increase tourism in Greenville and the region.

Traffic Volumes: Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT)

Annual average daily traffic (AADT) is a measure of traffic volume determined by placing an automatic traffic recorder at a specific location for 24 or 48 hours; 24-hour totals are then adjusted for seasonal variations. The most heavily traveled highways in Greenville are Moosehead Lake Road (2,980 – 5,570 AADT), Pritham Avenue (3,100-4,640) and the Lily Bay Road (1,510-4840), as displayed in the following table, which shows traffic count data for 1999, 2004 and 2009.

Statewide annual vehicle miles traveled has declined since 2008: people are traveling less – perhaps due to the economy and cost of fuel. This also appears to be the case in Greenville. With a few exceptions

traffic counts were less in 2009 than they were in 2004 and 1999. For example, there were counts of
over 6,000 on Pritham Avenue in 1999 and 2004, but there were none that high in 2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATION*</th>
<th>ROAD *</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>AADT 1999</th>
<th>AADT-2004</th>
<th>AADT-2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>0006X</td>
<td>Rt 6/15 (Pritham Ave) E/O Spruce St</td>
<td>5950</td>
<td>5070</td>
<td>4210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>0006X</td>
<td>Rt 6/15 (Pritham Ave) W/O Spruce St</td>
<td>6380</td>
<td>5150</td>
<td>4220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>607</td>
<td>0006X</td>
<td>Rt 6/15 (Pritham) W/O Beech St @bridge @TL</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>3940</td>
<td>3100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>803</td>
<td>0006X</td>
<td>Rt 6/15 (Pritham Ave) E/O N Birch St</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>4340</td>
<td>3360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1007</td>
<td>0006X</td>
<td>Rt 6/15 (Pritham Ave) W/O Crafts Rd</td>
<td>6070</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>4040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1307</td>
<td>0006X</td>
<td>Rt 6/15 (Pritham Ave) W/O Lakeview St</td>
<td>6810</td>
<td>5870</td>
<td>4640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1800</td>
<td>0006X</td>
<td>Rt 6/15 (Moosehead Lk Rd) @ RR Overpass</td>
<td>3520</td>
<td>4940</td>
<td>4840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>0006X</td>
<td>Rt 6/15 (Moosehead Lk Rd) S/O Rt 6/15</td>
<td>5180</td>
<td>6150</td>
<td>5570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>0006X</td>
<td>Rt 6/15 W/O Rt 6/15 (Moosehead Lk Rd) @Br</td>
<td>6640</td>
<td>5810</td>
<td>4350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2207</td>
<td>0006X</td>
<td>Rt 6/15 (Pritham Ave) W/O N Green St</td>
<td>5280</td>
<td>4620</td>
<td>3640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2905</td>
<td>0006X</td>
<td>Rt 6/15 (Moosehead Lk Rd) S/O Minden St</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>4670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37701</td>
<td>0006X</td>
<td>Rt 6/15 (Moosehead Lk Rd) N/O Marsh Fm Rd</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>2980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37705</td>
<td>0006X</td>
<td>Rt 6/15 (Moosehead Lake Rd) S/O Marsh Fm Rd</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>3100</td>
<td>3010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>IR 306</td>
<td>Lily Bay Rd NE/O Rt 6/15 (West St)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>5690</td>
<td>4840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>IR 306</td>
<td>Lily Bay Rd NE/O Pleasant St</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>4320</td>
<td>4280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2305</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>Lily Bay Rd S/O Village St</td>
<td>3850</td>
<td>3160</td>
<td>3050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2402</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>Lily Bay Rd Ne/O Mill St</td>
<td>2910</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>2660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2601</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>Lily Bay Rd N/O Scammon Rd</td>
<td>1504</td>
<td>1710</td>
<td>1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2605</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>Lily Bay Rd S/O Scammon Rd</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>2250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36202</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>Lily Bay Rd NE/O Ridge Rd</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1520</td>
<td>1720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43902</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>Lily Bay Rd NE/O Russell Rd</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32504</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>Varney Rd SE/O Scammon Rd</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2603</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>Scammon Rd E/O Lily Bay Rd</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32502</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>Scammon Rd NE/O Varney Rd</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>Pleasant St E/O Lily Bay Rd</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32603</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>East Rd E/O Drew Rd</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37703</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>Marsh Farm Rd E/O Rt 6/15</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2801</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>Spruce St N/O Mayhew Manor Rd</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2805</td>
<td>827</td>
<td>Spruce St S/O Mayhew Manor Rd @ RXing</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1001</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>Crafts Rd N/O Rt 6/15 (Pritham Ave)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2903</td>
<td>1349</td>
<td>Minden St E/O Rt 6/15 (Moosehead Lake Rd)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2307</td>
<td>1353</td>
<td>Village St W/O Lily Bay Rd</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1603</td>
<td>1354</td>
<td>Washington St E/O Rt 6/15 (Moosehead Lk Rd)</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1301</td>
<td>1459</td>
<td>Lakeview St N/O Rt 6/15 (Pritham Ave)</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1304</td>
<td>1459</td>
<td>Eveleth Hill Rd SE/O Rt 6/15 (Pritham)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1540</td>
<td>1110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1404</td>
<td>1459</td>
<td>Eveleth Hill Rd SE/O Mayhew Manor Rd</td>
<td>1190</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>1230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1501</td>
<td>1463</td>
<td>Oliver Rd N/O Mayhew Manor Rd</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1507</td>
<td>1463</td>
<td>Mayhew Manor Rd W/O Oliver Rd</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801</td>
<td>1469</td>
<td>N Birch St N/O Rt 6/15 (Pritham Ave)</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1406</td>
<td>1474</td>
<td>Mayhew Manor Rd SW/O Eveleth Hill Rd</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32601</td>
<td>1546</td>
<td>Drew Rd N/O East Rd</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Count Location; **State Road ID #;
Source: Maine Department of Transportation Count Books, 1999, 2004 and 2010
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Major Traffic Generators
Major traffic generators in Greenville include: Indian Hill, C.A. Dean Hospital, Greenville Consolidated School, the Village District shopping areas, and the Kathadin Cruises (seasonal).

Traffic is generally heaviest during the day, during events (Greenville Fly-in) and during the height of tourist seasons. Village District stores are generally open at least 5 days per week during the day with expanded hours of operation during busy seasons. Restaurants and convenience stores often have longer hours. Indian Hill is open 8 am to 8 pm. The schools are busiest during the school year, including during the evenings and weekends for sports and other activities.

Bridges
The Town does not own or maintain any bridges. With the exception of several State-owned bridges and a railroad bridge (table), all the other bridges in Greenville are privately owned.

Future Bridge Needs: Route 15/6 underpass of the Canadian Pacific Railroad is too narrow to allow for adequate sidewalks and has limited site distance for oncoming vehicles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bridge Inventory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Cove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Pacific Railroad Crossing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansell Brook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Pacific Railroad Rte 15/6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Federal Sufficiency Rating: An indicator of the overall sufficiency of the bridge on a scale of 0 to 100 (100 = best, 0 = worst). The rating is computed with a federal formula using an array of condition and inventory data, and is used to identify bridges eligible for federal funding. The federal sufficiency rating includes both structural deficiencies as well as functional obsolescence. Since functional obsolescence (too narrow or low weight capacity) may account for a large portion of the rating, do not assume that a low sufficiency rating means the bridge could fail.
Source: Maine DOT Bridge Management Section, March 2010

Traffic and Safety Issues
High Crash Locations: MaineDOT has not identified any “high crash locations” in Greenville for the time period 2000 through 2010. High crash locations are defined by MaineDOT as road locations where 8 or more crashes occurred within a 3-year period, where they would not otherwise be expected.
Local Roads

Of Greenville’s 18.43 miles of local roads, about 13.76 miles are paved. The following inventory of local roads provides a good basis for the development of a more detailed inventory that includes road widths, conditions and future needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>Length (miles)</th>
<th>North Maple St</th>
<th>Beech St</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airport Rd</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varney Rd</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higgins Rd</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scammon Rd</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Rd</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson View Rd</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsh Farm Rd</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spruce St</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine St</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crescent St</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craft St</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland Dr</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birch Point Rd</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospect St</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw St</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minden St</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norris St</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottage St</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Lincoln St</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln St</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village St</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington St</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Maple St</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Maine Department of Transportation

Highway Capacity

Greenville’s streets and highways generally have adequate capacity to handle traffic volumes, except during busy seasons when traffic volumes increase significantly creating traffic back-ups, safety issues and confusion in the Village District particularly at the intersections of the Moosehead Lake Road, Pritham Avenue and the Lily Bay Road.

Level of Service (LOS) data provided by the MaineDOT provide a measure of the capacity of roads to handle current levels of traffic. LOS data characterize traffic conditions based on travel speeds, travel times, freedom to maneuver, traffic interruptions, and the perceptions of motorists and passengers. There are six levels of service, with LOS A representing the best operating conditions and LOS F the worst. LOS E is defined as the maximum flow or capacity of a system. For most purposes, however, a level of C or D is usually used as the maximum acceptable volume.
Part II. Inventory and Analysis

As displayed on Transportation Maps 7 and 8 in Appendix B, most of Greenville’s roads function at LOS A. The exceptions are Pritham Avenue and most of the Moosehead Lake Road which function at LOS B, and the road segment from the intersection of Pritham Avenue and the Moosehead Lake Road northward along Lily Bay Road to its intersection with Pleasant Street, which functions at LOS C.

Even with the flashing signal at the intersection of Route 6/15 (Pritham Avenue/Moosehead Lake Road) and the Lily Bay Road, there continue to be safety and congestion problems associated with this three-way intersection. During the busy seasons/times there are traffic backups on Pritham Avenue often caused, in part, by logging and tractor trailer trucks turning in and out of Pritham Avenue. Pedestrians are particularly at risk trying to navigate crossing the street(s). Trucks carrying flammable and/or toxic materials are also a concern in the Village District.

**Future Needs:** Any increases in traffic in the Village District and at these intersections will likely exacerbate conflicts. According to the Community Impact Analysis prepared for the Moosehead Lake Concept Plan, the principal transportation impacts will be changes in traffic flow and increased roadway utilization at this intersection.67

The Town has discussed a bypass of the Village District on a number of occasions in the past, but there was always concern about potential loss of business as a result. The Town may want to reconsider this option and other options if traffic increases significantly in the future. Other options might include improved parking, designated loading/unloading areas for businesses, better pedestrian amenities to encourage walking instead of driving, and traffic routing using side roads or new interconnections. A truck bypass and an alternate route around the Village District may be a much longer term option.

**Private Roads**

There are a number of private roads serving rural developments in Greenville, many of which are managed by private road associations. The Town is aware of the following private roads associations:

- Sandy Bay Road Association – Sandy Bay Road, Nelson Avenue, and Bigey Road
- Rum Ridge Association – Rum Ridge Subdivision

---

67 *Plum Creek Rezoning Proposal Infrastructure and Community Impact Analysis prepared by the Eastern Maine Development Corporation, April 2007*
The Industrial Park Road serving the Town’s Industrial Park is a private road maintained by the Greenville Industrial Park Corporation.

**Public Parking**

Parking in Greenville consists of street-side parking in the village, a number of town-owned parking lots, and several other parking areas used by the public, but not owned by the Town. Parking lots are displayed on Transportation Maps 7 and 8 in Appendix B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Parking Areas</th>
<th>Approx. # of Spaces</th>
<th>Usage</th>
<th>Future Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town-Owned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Office</td>
<td>6 spaces</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minden Street (opposite Town Office)</td>
<td>25 spaces</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katahdin Parking</td>
<td>34 spaces</td>
<td>Heavy use during tourist season</td>
<td>Should be expanded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction Wharf Parking</td>
<td>41 spaces</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Adequate (new facility)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Post Office Parking</td>
<td>26 spaces</td>
<td>Heavy</td>
<td>Could use another 26 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenville Consolidated School</td>
<td>100 spaces</td>
<td>Heavy use for events during school year. Catholic Church lot used for student parking</td>
<td>More parking needed; demolition of Nickerson School could provide more space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NREC/ Visitors Center</td>
<td>Approx. 10</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>More parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport</td>
<td>30 spaces</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preo Park</td>
<td>3 spaces</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawyer Pond Boat Launch</td>
<td>6 spaces</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Pond Boat Launch</td>
<td>6 spaces</td>
<td>Moderate to heavy</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Governmental Parking Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Post Office* (Greenville)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Heavy (summer)</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Post Office (Greenville Jct.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*More parking would be needed if post offices are consolidated.
Source: Greenville Code Enforcement Officer and Town Manager, January 2012
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Future Needs: More parking is needed in the Village District, including in the Katahdin area, particularly during busy times of the year. The major constraint to developing additional parking is the lack of vacant land either public or private in the Village District.

PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE FACILITIES
Walking, running, and bicycling for recreation, exercise, shopping and/or commuting to work or school have become increasingly popular in recent years. Compact mixed-uses in downtowns and adjacent neighborhoods with adequate sidewalks and road shoulders provide people with more affordable, healthy choices for getting around. Well-designed pedestrian systems (sidewalks) with interconnections between businesses, public places and residences also reduce traffic congestion.

Sidewalks: The Town maintains over two miles of sidewalks all of which are within the village area. Many sidewalks are in relatively good repair. Two areas where sidewalks are inadequate include parts of the Lily Bay Road and at the Pritham Avenue underpass of the railroad. A sidewalk or wider road shoulder would also be desirable between the village area and Indian Hill. Sidewalks along main roads are generally difficult to keep plowed in the winter because they are so close to the roadway. The Town hired a contractor at a cost of $8,000 to remove snow and sand the sidewalks on a trial basis for the 2011/2012 winter. The Town will be evaluating this as a long-term option as an alternative to purchasing its own equipment and doing the job itself. Another issue is encouraging students and staff to walk to school. Walking could be encourage through the designation of a “walk zone” where school bus transportation would not be provided.

Bicycle Facilities: Other than the multi-use trail mentioned above, Greenville does not have any other bicycle facilities. The MaineDOT and the Bicycle Coalition of Maine do not list any designated bike routes in the Greenville area. Bicycling is an increasingly popular sport, and there may be a demand for more bicycle trails and more bicycle-friendly roads in the future.

Public Roads: Public roads in rural areas generally do not have wide enough and/or paved shoulders to provide for safe pedestrian and bicycle passage; pedestrians and bicyclists are forced into traveled ways as traffic increases. Given interest in promoting outdoor recreational, the Town may want to strongly advocate that any reconstruction or resurfacing of Routes 6/16 and the Lily Bay Road include wider, paved shoulders.

Recreational trails are discussed in Chapter II-5 Parks, Recreation and Open Space.

POLICIES AND MANAGEMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
Design, Construction and Maintenance of Public and Private Roads
Greenville’s policies for road maintenance and improvements are generally based on the level of use and location. The highest priorities are major roads and streets - particularly those located in village areas.
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**Road Improvement Planning**

In the past, the Town Manager/Road Commissioner developed and maintained a multi-year road improvement plan that identified and prioritized road improvement needs. The plan was updated annually, and funding was appropriated at the annual town meeting.

The road improvement system was set-up so that main roads were repaved every 8 to 10 years, and less heavily-used, residential streets were paved less frequently. However, the cost of paving has increased dramatically since then, making it impossible to keep up with this goal. Current practice is to only utilize the amount provided by the MaineDOT (annually about $27,000) for paving projects, which means not using any local tax dollars for paving.

**Policy for Accepting Privately Built Roads**

A town meeting vote is required to accept a privately built road as a public road. In preparation for a town meeting, the Board of Selectmen would make a recommendation, and the road would have to be constructed to subdivision road standards as set forth in the Land Use Ordinance. Two fairly recent examples of where private roads were accepted as public roads are (1) Wildberry Lane off Route 6/15 near the Shirley/Greenville town line and (2) Goodwin Drive off Lily Bay Road into Chieftan Heights a Section 8 housing complex.

**Policy for Paving of Gravel Roads**

The Town does not have a policy regarding the paving of gravel roads, but no gravel roads have been paved in recent roads, and conversely, no paved roads have been converted back to gravel roads. Any decision to pave a gravel road would be voted upon at a town meeting.

**Land Use and Transportation Policies**

Land use and transportation policies go hand-in-hand to guide future land use patterns and the costs associated with those patterns of development. Sprawling patterns of development result in increased costs for maintaining roads and road capacity to handle traffic. Unregulated access to major roads can result in increased conflicts with driveways and decreased road capacity to handle traffic efficiently. More compact development allows for the more efficient use and cost-effective maintenance of the transportation system.

In general, Greenville’s policies recognize the importance of coordinating land use and transportation systems. The Land Use Ordinance in combination with the provision of a high level of services in the village area enhances many aspects of the transportation system. Village area zoning standards that allow higher densities support infill and a continuation of a more compact area. The subdivision regulations limit direct access to the Moosehead Lake Road (arterial), and allow consideration for interconnections to future subdivisions. Town infrastructure, including parking, sidewalks, and the location of public facilities in the built-up area also support more compact development.
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Land Use Ordinance Provisions Governing Transportation

The Scenic Corridor Overlay District consists of all land areas within 500 feet of both sides of the Route 15 south of the Village District and extending to the Shirley town line. District provisions maintain the scenic character of the gateway corridor; accommodate commercial activities and residences; require attractive development designs (e.g., signage, lighting, landscaping, vegetative buffers, building and parking lot setbacks, etc.); and maintain highway capacity by limiting driveway curb cuts, requiring adequate sight distances, and requiring one common access to Route 15 for subdivisions.

Existing Town-wide Ordinance Requirements

- Traffic Access, Circulation and Parking Applicable to All Uses: Vehicular access to/from and within developments must be designed to safeguard against hazards to traffic and pedestrians. Provisions for driveway design include sight distances, location, design and spacing, and requirements for adequate parking and stormwater management.

- Additional Standards Applicable to Subdivisions: Direct lot access to Moosehead Lake Road is limited. There are requirements for substandard/private access roads. There are also requirements for dead-end streets, including consideration for emergency vehicle turnarounds and connections to potential, adjacent subdivisions.

Future Considerations: The following should be considered to improve the Town ordinance:

- Assure consistency with MaineDOT regulations.
- Update road and street standards to assure adequate sizing and design, but not overbuilt.
- Consider provisions for pedestrians and bicycles.
- Add guidance/standards to support more interconnected development designs to limit direct access to public roads, such as Pritham Avenue and the Lily Bay Road.
- Add more specific guidance/standards for off-street parking and standards for loading and unloading areas, without discouraging development in the Village District.
- Subdivisions – limit direct subdivision lot access to Lily Bay Road; discourage long dead-end roads

RAILROAD

Nationwide rail service has undergone growth in both freight and passenger opportunities. Some of this growth is due to increased congestion on highways; some is due to investment in infrastructure to make trains faster and more efficient carriers. One of the growth areas in rail transportation is in intermodal freight - where trains carry freight, sometimes containerized, for part of the trip and trucks carry the same freight for another part of the trip. Over the past several decades, intermodal rail-truck sites have been constructed at sites in Maine, including a bulk transfer facility in Jackman.

The Montreal, Maine and Atlantic Railroad (MMAR) is Greenville’s link to the rail system in the U.S. and Canada. The MMAR began operations in 2003 and owns over 745 miles of track, serving customers in Maine, Vermont, Quebec and New Brunswick. The MMAR operates approximately 25 trains daily with

---

68 See Chapter II-12 Existing Land Use for more detailed discussion on land use issues.
69 http://www.mmarail.com/
main line operations conducted daily between Madawaska and Searsport, and between Brownville Junction, Maine and Montreal, Quebec. The single-track line through Greenville is used for freight, and has an operating speed of 30 mph. There are no rail sidings or users of the rail in Greenville, but an industry in the Town’s industrial park could have access to rail. The MMAR is a significant, but unused asset to the Town at this time.

**Passenger Rail:** Iron Road Railways and the Bangor and Aroostook Railroad conducted passenger excursions in 1998 on a trial basis; the service was not successful enough to warrant continuation.

### AIR TRANSPORTATION

Primary service airports in Maine are the Portland Jetport (160 miles from Greenville) and the Bangor International Airport (70 miles from Greenville). The Bangor International Airport is the closest full-service airport that provides national and international commercial passenger and cargo service as well as civil defense operations.

Greenville’s municipal airport is part of Maine’s general aviation airport system. The airport was constructed by the U.S. Department of Defense in 1942/43 with an agreement that the Town would own and operate the facility. Greeneville’s is one of the busier small, general aviation airports in the state. While some local businesses use the airport, its use is primarily for recreational and seasonal users. Data for August 2008/09 indicates there was an average of 111 enplanements (defined as a takeoff) per week, of which 64 percent were local general aviation and 36 percent were transient general aviation. The airport does not provide commercial airline services.

Constructed at 1,400 feet above sea level, Greenville’s airport is one of the highest in Maine. The airport has two runways. Runway 14/32, the primary runway, has a northwest-southeast orientation, and is 4,000 feet long by 75 feet wide. The surface is in good condition, and has a 30,000 pound, single-wheel, weight-bearing capacity. Runway 3/21 is 3,000 feet long and 75 feet wide with a north-south orientation. Runway 3/21 consists of asphalt that is in excellent condition, and has a 30,000 pound, single-wheel, weight-bearing capacity. The airport facility includes a paved taxiway system, paved and unpaved aircraft parking areas, a steel T-hangar, aircraft fueling facilities and a control building. There is also a new airport arrivals building with a lounge, telephone, computer, restroom, and automatic weather observation system. The airport accommodates approximately 25 aircraft on the field (21 single-engine and 4 multi-engine planes).

There are 19 privately-owned hangars (land is leased from the Town). One of these is the T-hangar owned by the fixed base operator. There are also another 8 hangar spaces (no building), which are leased. The Town recently purchased about 7.5 acres for another 16 hangar lots.

---

70 William A. Gerrish, PE, PLS, Stantec Consulting Services Inc.; 1/19/12
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The Town has a long-term lease with a fixed-base operator, Moosehead Aviation Corporation, that sells fuel and offers maintenance and repair services for aircraft. Airport facility maintenance is provided by the Town’s Public Works Department.

Future Needs: Many of the recommendations of the 2000 Master Plan have been completed with the exception of a taxiway parallel to one of the runways 14/32 which is scheduled for 2015. There is also a need for more itinerant aircraft parking, but the configuration of the facility makes this a challenge. There has also been discussion about the need for a longer runway for small jets, but the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) would only fund an expansion, if there was a documented need. Increased development, such as that associated with the Moosehead Lake Concept Plan, may result in a demand for this expansion. The Town has reserved land for this. The Town will be updating its airport master plan sometime in the next several years.

Seaplane Bases
The FAA lists two seaplane bases in Greenville: (1) 21M Currier’s Seaplane Base (West Cove), which is open to the public, privately owned and managed by Roger Currier, and (2) 52B Seaplane Base (East Cove), which is open to the public, privately owned and managed by West Outlet LLC (Folsom’s). Seaplane bases are displayed on Transportation Map 8 in Appendix B. While some people come to the Greenville area for training or transportation to/from more distant areas, much of the commercial seaplane use is by visitors who are in the area for other primary reasons. There are several other aviation facilities/users. Both the Maine Forest Service and the Maine Inland Fisheries and Wildlife Department utilize seaplanes out of the East Cove of Moosehead Lake. The Forest Service also has a helicopter pad. Jack’s Air Service also operates out of Greenville.

PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION
Penquis, a social service and transportation agency based in Bangor, provides demand response and deviated fixed-route transportation services by van and light duty bus, and through private drivers, in Penobscot and Piscataquis counties. Penquis’ LYNX is used to provide the door-to-door public and social service transportation in agency vehicles with services in Greenville five days per week (table). MaineCare-covered and other social service transportation is also offered in private vehicles with volunteer drivers. While open to the general public, the primary users of the service are individuals with disabilities or special needs, the elderly, and those with low-incomes. Future Needs: These services will become increasingly important as the overall population ages and is less able to own and/or drive a vehicle. Also, there is no intercity bus service in or near Greenville.

| Penquis’ LYNX Service Schedule for 2011 |
|-----------------|-----|----------|------|--------|
| From           | To  | Day      | Time | Cost  |
| Greenville     | Bangor | Monday  | 7:00-3:00 | $7.00 |
| Monson         | Bangor | Monday  | 7:00-3:00 | $5.50 |
| Dover-Foxcroft | Tuesday | 8:30-2:30 | $3.00 |
| Guilford       | Bangor | Monday  | 7:00-3:00 | $4.50 |
| Dover-Foxcroft | Wednesday | 8:00-10:00 | $1.00 |
| Guilford       | Wednesday | 11:00-1:00 | $0.50 |

Source: http://www.penquis.org, 12/9/11

http://www.airnav.com/airport/21M
http://www.airnav.com/airport/52B
Chapter II-7 Fiscal Capacity

OVERVIEW
This chapter examines Greenville’s financial condition with respect to meeting future needs. A detailed financial analysis is beyond the scope of this plan, but a general assessment can provide some insight into the Town’s overall ability to provide services and facilities to accommodate anticipated growth and development over the next decade.

SUMMARY
Funding Future Capital Investments
- Greenville funds capital improvements through annual appropriations, capital reserve accounts, bonding, grants, and, in some cases, trust accounts and fundraising. The Town also coordinates with other entities to fairly and efficiently pay for capital needs.
- In the future the Town could explore grant funding and/or tax increment financing for Village District and industrial park improvements, and grants for capital improvements associated with emergency services, recreation, and other projects.

Borrowing Capacity
- The Town had approximately $3,075,315 (principal and interest) in long term debt as of December 2, 2011. This debt is well within the legally allowed amount of debt.
- Based on this analysis the Town appears to have sufficient borrowing capacity to fund additional capital investments, but should proceed cautiously. Property valuations over the past several years have lagged behind the rate of inflation, and will need to increase to support future capital investments. Further, the Town is carrying a fair amount of debt at this time. The Town may want to establish formal policies for financing and borrowing.

Regional Collaboration in Funding Capital Projects
- Regional coordination and collaboration to fund capital improvements can reduce costs and increase efficiencies. Beaver Cove, Shirley and Piscataquis County share in closure of the landfill. Greenville is responsible for 59% of closure costs. The Town anticipates there will be an addition amount needed – up to $400,000. Funding may be available from the state to offset these costs.
- Greenville is also a member of School Union 60, where capital improvements to the school are shared by member towns.

FUNDING GOVERNMENT: GREENVILLE’S TAX BASE
The foundation of a town’s fiscal health is the value of its property. The primary source of funding for municipal services and facilities is the property tax on land, buildings and personal property. An ongoing increase in property valuation is crucial to the fiscal health of the community.
The primary purpose of the state valuation is to provide an “equalized” valuation to fairly calculate state revenue sharing, state aid for education, and the county tax for each town. The state assessed valuation can be used as one measure of the trends over time, because it is annually adjusted to reflect the economy and market trends. In Greenville’s situation, it also is a reflection of actual property values prior to the town-wide revaluation done in April 1, 2006.

Greenville’s state assessed property valuation increased by $81 million or by 21.4% (adjusted for inflation) between 2005 and 2009 (Table). The property tax commitment (the amount of property tax income needed to fund budgeted expenses) increased by about 13% between 2005 and 2009.

The locally assessed valuation is suitable for examining change since the revaluation in 2006/07, and reflects actual increases in value due to new construction and additions, which are the fundamental basis of the Town’s valuation. The locally assessed valuation increased by nearly $21 million between 2007 and 2011, but actually decreased by 1.8% when adjusted for inflation. This decrease was a result of less new construction over the past several years, a trend that has been evident in many communities. The property tax commitment increased by about 7.2% during this time period.

As would be expected the tax (mil) rate decreased between 2006 and 2007 as a result of the revaluation. Since then the tax rate has increased slightly from 10.6 in 2007 and 2008 to 12.0 in 2011. In general, as the Town’s property valuation increases, the easier it is to maintain a stable tax rate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Valuation and Taxation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Year (year-end)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Chg 2005-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Chg 2005-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Chg 2007-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Chg 2007-2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The rate of inflation between 2005 and 2009 was 9.8%; the rate of inflation between 2007 and 2011 was 8.5% (U.S. Dept. of Labor, Consumer Price Index)

Source: Greenville Auditor’s Reports, Maine Revenue Services, 2012

Greenville’s tax base is somewhat typical of small service centers that also have shore-front property. The tax base is diverse in that it consists of year-round and second homes, businesses, and some small manufacturers. There are also a number of tax exempt properties, which increase the tax burden on other property owners, but provide necessary services. The challenge for Greenville is that it is such a small community, particularly with regard to its year-round population base. New and expanded development in Greenville to increase the property valuation will be important for the future.
Another major issue for Greenville is that the Town’s tax rate (mil rate) is higher than that of surrounding communities and the unorganized territories (UT) (table). The following observations are made using the 2009 tax year: Greenville’s tax rate (11.39) was lower than Guilford’s, Shirley’s, Monson’s, Jackman’s, the Somerset County average and the state average; but was higher than Beaver Cove’s, the Piscataquis County UT, the Somerset UT, and the Piscataquis County average. Lower property taxes in the UT and other areas is attracting new development into those areas as opposed to in Greenville. The unfairness for Greenville is that residents and businesses in the UT utilize many of the services and facilities in Greenville. While Greenville has charged outside communities for services in some cases, development continues to occur outside instead of inside Greenville where it would provide more benefit to the Town.

REVENUES 75

Property taxes were $3,873,000 or about 59% of total revenues for fiscal year 2011/12 (pie chart). Education revenue, primarily state funding, tuition, surplus and the isolation grant, accounted for about $1 million in revenue (16% of total revenues). Other municipal revenue included vehicle excise taxes ($273,600), state revenue sharing ($72,900), landfill bond proceeds ($955,803) and a number of other smaller revenue sources. Other municipal revenues in the pie chart are significantly higher as a result of the landfill closure. For example, these include $956 thousand in bond proceeds (loan to the Town) and $40 thousand in landfill reimbursements from Beaver Cove, Shirley and the County. Both of these sources of “income” will be in the budget for a number of years.

---

75 All financial data is from the 2010/11 and 2011/12 Greenville Annual Reports, Budget Summary Comparisons
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Revenues for FY 2011/12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenues for FY 2011/12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Tax Revenue</strong>, $3,873,405, 59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Revenues</strong>, $1,010,543, 16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Municipal Revenues</strong>, $1,633,482, 25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Property tax revenue increased by about $524,000 (4.2% when adjusted for inflation\textsuperscript{76}) between 2006/07 and 2011/12 (graph). Education revenues decreased by $231,190 (by 7.1% when adjusted for inflation). Other municipal revenues were decreasing as a result of significant losses in state revenue sharing, local road assistance and vehicle excise taxes. The increase of $842,000 between 2009/10 and 2011/12 was primarily due to bond revenues for landfill closure.

In the future, property taxes will continue to provide most of the revenues needed to support town services, which is why a growing property valuation is so crucial. Since increases in other sources of funding, particularly intergovernmental funding (education, revenue sharing, local road assistance, etc.) may continue to decrease in the future, the Town will want to explore other sources of funding, new financing mechanisms, and work to promote new development.

**EXPENDITURES**

Education expenditures at around $3.3 million accounted for 50% of expenditures for FY 2011/12.\textsuperscript{77} Municipal expenditures at $2.8 million were 43% of expenditures and the County tax was $450,234 or 7% of expenditures.

The largest municipal expenditure categories included: sanitation/solid waste (landfill closure) ($1,275,848); public safety ($471,317); general government ($272,851); and public works ($301,653).

\textsuperscript{76} Inflation adjustment for 2006 through 2011 was 11.5%. ftp://ftp.bls.gov/pub/special.requests/cpi/cpiai.txt

\textsuperscript{77} According to the 2010 Maine Municipal Association Fiscal Survey, the statewide estimated average for the total proportion of municipal expenditures spent for education was 59%.
Education expenditures decreased by $87,105, which was actually an increase of 14% when adjusted for inflation, between 2006/07 and 2011/12 (graph). Municipal expenditures for this time period increased by $1.2 million, or by 88.5% adjusted for inflation. A major portion of this increase was for the landfill closure and new transfer station. County expenses increased by $96,562, or 36% (adj. for inflation) for this time period.

Conservative fiscal policies will help control future expenditures where the Town has control over costs. The Town has little control over school and county budgets, as well as the costs of energy, fuel, and other expenses, where there is limited choice in vendors.

LONG TERM DEBT

The Town had approximately $3,075,315 (principal, interest) in long term debt as of December 2, 2011 (table). Financial responsibility for landfill closure is shared with Beaver Cove and Shirley, and the County. School construction debt is offset by funding through the Maine Forest Service (energy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Annual Payment</th>
<th>Principal Balance</th>
<th>Interest Balance</th>
<th>Total Balance Owed</th>
<th>Adjusted Total*</th>
<th>Payoff Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road Improvement Bond</td>
<td>$55,329</td>
<td>$104,626</td>
<td>$6,091</td>
<td>$110,718</td>
<td>$110,718</td>
<td>8/19/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Incubator</td>
<td>12,070</td>
<td>22,143</td>
<td>2,016</td>
<td>24,159</td>
<td>24,159</td>
<td>8/19/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drew Road/East Road</td>
<td>21,090</td>
<td>75,938</td>
<td>8,421</td>
<td>84,359</td>
<td>84359</td>
<td>11/30/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Truck</td>
<td>22,754</td>
<td>83,143</td>
<td>7,874</td>
<td>91,017</td>
<td>91,017</td>
<td>10/10/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moosehead Sanitary Dist.</td>
<td>32,211</td>
<td>128,107</td>
<td>24,654</td>
<td>152,761</td>
<td>152,761</td>
<td>10/15/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfill Closure Phase 2</td>
<td>93,187</td>
<td>422,000</td>
<td>26,336</td>
<td>448,336</td>
<td>264,518*</td>
<td>8/17/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfill Closure Bond</td>
<td>43,298</td>
<td>266,632</td>
<td>36,454</td>
<td>303,086</td>
<td>178,820*</td>
<td>7/30/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction Wharf Improv.</td>
<td>30,425</td>
<td>184,376</td>
<td>28,596</td>
<td>212,971</td>
<td>212,971</td>
<td>10/1/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Station Loan</td>
<td>70,674</td>
<td>533,000</td>
<td>96,992</td>
<td>629,992</td>
<td>629,992</td>
<td>8/17/2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Construction Bond</td>
<td>120,837**</td>
<td>533,000</td>
<td>96,992</td>
<td>1,326,000**</td>
<td>1,326,000**</td>
<td>9/2/2026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$501,876</td>
<td>$3,075,315</td>
<td>$1,326,000**</td>
<td>$3,075,315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Adjusted to account for debt owed by other entities: Landfill includes 30% for County, 6.3% Beaver Cove and 4.7% Shirley; **The School Department is reimbursed for this bond through funding from the Maine Forest Service and the Internal Revenue Service. The “adjusted total” has been adjusted to reflect the actual long-term debt to Greenville as of May 1, 2012. Source: Beth Lorigan, School Superintendent (March 2012)
Source: Town Treasurer, School Superintendent, March 2012
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The efficiency grant and the IRS reimbursement. The “adjusted total” reflects Greenville’s share of the debt.

The Town anticipates the need to borrow an additional amount, up to $500,000, for the final closure of the landfill.

The Town is also responsible for its proportionate share of county debt, but the county does not have any long-term debt at this time.

**Borrowing Capacity**

Greenville appears to have additional borrowing capacity based on the following analysis. The total combined long-term debt for the purpose of examining borrowing capacity is $3,075,000. There are several “rules of thumb” that can be used to evaluate the Town’s borrowing capacity. Meeting or failing to meet any one measure does not necessarily mean a community is not credit worthy, but rather together these measures provide a general picture of the Town’s capacity to borrow.

**Growing Property Valuation:** The property valuation should be growing. Greenville experienced 21.4% growth in property valuation between 2005 and 2009, which reflected new construction during 2006 and 2007. Since then the increase in valuation has not kept up with the rate of inflation primarily due to the poor economy. This situation will likely reverse as the economy recovers.

**Ratio of Per Capita Debt to Per Capita Income:** The “rule of thumb” is that this ratio should be less than 5%, except that when a community’s tax base includes considerable commercial, industrial, or second-home development, which relieves year-round homeowners of a significant share of the long-term debt, the per capita debt can justifiably be higher. This figure for Greenville is 7.9% (table).

**Long Term Debt to State Valuation:** According to statute, a town’s total debt cannot exceed 15% of the most current state valuation. The 2009 state valuation for Greenville was $340.7 million, which would mean a statutory limit of $51.1 million. Greenville’s debt is about $3 million, which is about .9% of the state valuation, well below the 5% “rule of thumb” (table).

**Fund Balance (Undesignated Surplus):** The fund balance (undesignated surplus) is money available for unforeseen circumstances and should generally be enough to pay the Town’s bills for a period of two months (at least 8.3% of total expenditures). Greenville’s fund balance for 2011 was 4.4% of total Town expenditures, excluding consideration for the school (table).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment of Greenville’s Borrowing Capacity</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
<th>Greenville</th>
<th>“Rule of Thumb”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Debt to Per Capita Income</td>
<td>*$1,868/$23,651</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>Less than 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term Debt to Valuation</td>
<td>**$3,075,000/$340,700,000</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>Less than 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance (undesignated surplus)</td>
<td>***$92,004/$2,096,557</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>More than 8.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Calculated using 2010 population (1,646) and 2009 per capita income ($23,651); **Calculated using 2011 debt and 2009 state valuation; *** Calculated using the 2010/11 fund balance divided by the total expenditures for that year, does not consider education fund balance or expenditures.

FUNDING CAPITAL EXPENDITURES

1 The Town does not have a formal capital improvement program. Annual budgeting consists of
2 department heads and the Town Manager developing a draft budget that is then reviewed by the
3 Budget Committee and Board of Selectmen. The budget is then voted on at Town Meeting.

4 Greenville’s capital improvement planning utilizes a combination of annual appropriations, bonding,
5 grants, trust funds and fundraising. There is one active capital reserve account for replacement of police
6 cruisers. Two other capital reserve accounts (municipal building and the Fire Department equipment)
7 have not been accumulating funds due to budgetary constraints. Capital improvements to roads are
8 funded solely through the state highway reimbursements.
OVERVIEW

Clean, abundant water is an essential resource in any community, and particularly important to the Town of Greenville. Ground water is the primary source of drinking water in Greenville, both for the public water supply and for those with individual wells. Surface water resources include Moosehead Lake (the largest lake in Maine), Upper and Lower Wilson Ponds, Prong Pond, Sawyer Pond, Rum Pond, and several other smaller ponds, Big Wilson Stream, and numerous other streams and wetlands. This chapter inventories and assesses the health and value of these water resources.

SUMMARY

Point-Sources (Direct Discharges) of Pollution

- Point-source discharges in Greenville include wastewater outfalls associated with the public water and sewer districts, and all are compliant with federal and state regulations. The Town’s sand and salt facility, former landfill, and transfer station are also compliant with state regulations. No other potential point-sources of pollution have been identified.
- State and local regulations prevent future pollution from point-sources of pollution, such as from service stations, fuel storage facilities, and junkyards.
- Private contractors’ salt storage is one potential source of point-source pollution that may not receive adequate oversight.

Non-Point Sources of Pollution

- Non-point sources of pollution usually are a result of stormwater runoff that flows over the ground until it reaches a body of water. Stormwater runoff can carry pollutants, such as soil, fertilizers, pesticides, manure, and petroleum products that may originate from places like farm fields, driveways, roads, golf courses, and lawns located within a watershed. This type of pollution can be particularly harmful to lakes and ponds. Greenville’s lakes and ponds have good-to-excellent water quality; however, ongoing development is a potential threat.
- Several specific locations where non-point pollution may be occurring include stormwater carrying winter salt and chemicals flowing down ditches and culverts along Moosehead Lake Road and Lily Bay Road and directly into Moosehead Lake. At a minimum, the Town will want to monitor this.

Protection for Groundwater Supplies

- The Town’s public water supply (two wells) is located in state public reserve land in Moosehead Junction Township. Water quality monitoring wells associated with the sanitary district provide ongoing protection for the water supply.
- Other public water supplies (Moosehead Family Campground, the Lodge at Moosehead Lake, Moosehead Cottage Resort, and the Kineo View Motor Lodge) are protected through state laws and the Town’s Land Use Ordinance.
- The Town’s ordinance includes a ground water overlay district that protects identified, high-yield aquifers, and other standards to protect groundwater town-wide. The Town should review and
amend these regulations to be consistent with current state and federal laws, and to provide any necessary additional protection.

Protection for Surface Waters

- Surface waters, including Moosehead Lake, ponds, wetlands and streams, are protected through state laws and the Town’s Land Use Ordinance. The Town should review and amend its ordinance as necessary to be consistent with current state and federal laws, and to provide any needed additional protection.

Public Works Use of Best Management Practices to Protect Water Resources

- Greenville’s Public Works Department does a good job using best management practices to protect water quality on town-owned property and Town projects (e.g., salt/sand pile maintenance, culvert replacement, street sweeping, and public works garage operations).
- More oversight is needed to assure that private contractors are using best management practices.

Opportunities to Partner with Local or Regional Advocacy Groups

- Advocacy groups include the Friends of Wilson Pond Area (FWPA) and the Moosehead Lake Fisheries Coalition (MLFC). There are also volunteers working within the Maine Volunteer Lakes Monitoring Program. These organizations conduct water quality monitoring and monitoring for invasive species. The FWPA also focuses on land conservation and education, among other activities. The MLFC focuses on efforts to support habitat for coldwater fisheries.
- There are a number of state grant programs available to protect water quality.
- Plum Creeks’ Moosehead Lake Concept Plan provides for the establishment of the Wildlife and Invasive Species Fund that could be used for invasive species prevention efforts.
- In general, the Town should encourage the formation of lake associations for all its developed ponds.

GROUNDWATER RESOURCES

The primary water supply for residents is groundwater through the public water supply system or individual dug or drilled wells. Groundwater resources are either bedrock aquifers or sand and gravel aquifers. A bedrock aquifer is generally adequate for small yields. A sand and gravel aquifer is a deposit of coarse-grained surface materials that, in all probability, can supply large volumes of groundwater.

The Maine Geological Survey has mapped “significant sand and gravel aquifers” in Greenville. “Significant sand and gravel aquifers” have yields that might be suitable for public water supplies or for uses that require significant quantities of water. There are three aquifers located in the northern part of the town: the largest one also extends into Beaver Cove, another associated with Prong Pond also extends into Beaver Cove, and the third is a small extension into Greenville with the major portion of the aquifer in Bowdoin College Grant West Twp. Greenville’s other aquifers are located generally west of the village. All of these aquifers have predicted yields between 10 and 50 gallons per minute. The areas mapped by the state represent the principal groundwater recharge sites. Recharge is the process of
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precipitation filtering through the soil to replenish the groundwater. The recharge area in reality probably extends beyond the shaded area of the aquifer. (See Map 9 Water Resources in Appendix B)

While the state has not mapped bedrock aquifers in Greenville, it is likely that most homes with wells rely on bedrock aquifers. It has been roughly estimated that 70% of homes with private wells in Maine are served by bedrock aquifers.

Greenville’s landfill and sand and salt facilities are secure and currently meet Maine Department of Environmental Protection (MDEP) standards. The former landfill, located in Moosehead Junction Twp. was closed in January of 2012, at which time the transfer station was opened in the Greenville Industrial Park. The Town’s sand and salt facility is located at the town garage in the Greenville Industrial Park. The former sand and salt facility, now owned by a private contractor, is located in Moosehead Junction in the industrial park in that community. Both are licensed by the MDEP.

Greenville’s Land Use Ordinance contains performance standards designed to protect groundwater resources and public water supplies town-wide. It also has a ground water overlay district that coincides with the state-identified, high-yield aquifers. The ordinance needs to be updated to reflect changes in the identification of those aquifers. (See Map 9 Water Resources in Appendix B)

Public Water Systems

A “public water system” is defined by state and federal statute as one that serves 25 or more people for 60 or more days per year. There are three types:

- “Community Water Systems” serve people in their place of residence (town water supply).
- “Non-Transient Non-Community Water Systems”, systems serve schools, office buildings, etc.
- “Transient Non-Community Water Systems”, systems serve a constantly changing, transient population, such as systems associated with motels, restaurants and campgrounds.

Greenville’s “community water system” that serves the village is operated by the Maine Water Company. The water source for the system is the Wiggins Brook Well located on State Public Reserve land in Moosehead Junction Township (see Map 9 Water Resources in Appendix B). The water supply consists of two wells, both located in state public reserve land, which provides considerable protection. The closest potential source of chronic contamination is the municipal wastewater treatment plant, where there are several groundwater monitoring wells. (See Chapter II-4 Public/Community Facilities and Services for more information about the Maine Water Company)

Maine’s Drinking Water Program lists the following “non-community” public water supplies: Moosehead Family Campground, the Lodge at Moosehead Lake, Moosehead Cottage Resort, and the Kineo View Motor Lodge. Federal and state (Public Law 761) regulations require that owners of these public water supplies take steps to protect them. In general, the source protection area around non-community supplies is 300 feet. There are several state laws, including the state plumbing code, that address the
location of potential threats to these water supplies. Further, public water suppliers must be notified of certain activities occurring on nearby properties. These activities include automobile graveyards, recycling businesses, junkyards, septic system expansions or replacements, activities requiring a Maine Natural Resource Protection Act Permit or a State Stormwater Permit, subdivisions, and other land use projects. In general, in any situation where a permit is required, any nearby public water suppliers should be notified of the project. The Land Use Ordinance should be amended to reflect this.

WATER QUALITY OF SURFACE WATERS

Greenville has an abundance of surface water resources. In general, the town’s water quality is good to excellent due to the widely dispersed population (other than in the village) and mostly forested land cover. Undisturbed forest is about the least polluting form of land cover in terms of nutrients and sediments lost to surface waters. Sediment is usually the single greatest pollutant by volume in most watersheds. Roadside runoff, gravel pit runoff and stream bank erosion are major contributors of sediment to surface waters. Road crossings (bridges and culverts) can also contribute significant amounts of polluted runoff to streams.

Other threats to water quality include nutrients and pathogens from improperly maintained septic systems; pathogens, nutrients, sediment and toxic substances, such as heavy metals from storm water runoff from developments; landfills; salt storage sites; underground storage tanks; hazardous materials spills; and litter.

Timber harvesting and agricultural activities can also impact water quality. Timber harvesting activities, such as the layout of roads and skid trails, location of landings and stream crossings, can contribute to water quality problems, particularly when these activities are conducted on steep slopes. Most non-point source pollution from agricultural activities (barnyard runoff, eroding farmland, fertilizers, etc.) occurs during the fall, winter and spring when the ground is frozen.

Water Classification

Maine has four water quality classes of rivers and streams: AA, A, B, and C (38 MRSA § 465). Each classification assigns designated uses and water quality criteria, and may place specific restrictions on certain activities such that the goal conditions of each class may be attained. There is actually not much difference between the uses or the qualities of the various classes because all attain the minimum fishable-swimmable standards of the federal Clean Water Act. Most support the same set of designated uses with modest variations. The classification system is really a hierarchy of risk, more than one of use or quality, the risk being the possibility of a breakdown of the ecosystem and loss of use due to either natural or human-caused events. Classes AA (rivers and streams) and GPA (lakes and ponds) involve less risk since activities, such as waste discharges and impoundments are prohibited. The expectation to achieve natural conditions is high and degradation is therefore less likely. Class A waters allow impound-
ments and very restricted discharges, so the risk of degradation, while small, does increase since there is
some human intervention. All of the streams in Greenville are classified as class A water bodies.

Maine statute (38 MRSA § 465-A) has designated one standard (GPA) for the classification of great
ponds (at least 10 acres in size), and natural lakes less than 10 acres in size. Specifically, Class GPA
waters shall be suitable for the designated uses of drinking water after disinfection, recreation in and on
the water, fishing, industrial process and cooling water supply, hydroelectric power generation and
navigation and as habitat for fish and other aquatic life. The habitat shall be characterized as natural.
Class GPA waters shall meet specific water quality standards and shall be free of culturally induced algal
blooms which impair their use and enjoyment. The number of Escherichia coli bacteria of human origin
in these waters may not exceed minimal levels. There may be no new direct discharge of pollutants into
Class GPA waters, other than those that are legally exempt. The statute further states that no activities
or land uses may take place on the banks of the water body or in the watershed that might degrade the
water quality below the attainment level of the classification.

Currently, all Greenville’s lakes and ponds meet their water quality classification. Sawyer Pond is
currently meeting its water quality standards, but for a number of years it was on the Maine
Department of Environmental Protection’s list of “Direct Watersheds of Lakes Most at Risk from New
Development.” During that period it was considered particularly sensitive to degradation due to its
volume, flushing rate, potential as a cold water fishery, and the projected rate of development.80

Wastewater Outfalls: Wastewater outfalls can be point sources of pollution. The Maine Department
of Environmental Protection (MDEP) lists two waste water discharge licenses for Greenville.81 Both were
issued in 2009 as renewals and are meeting the requirements of state law. It is noteworthy that the
Moosehead Sanitary District does not discharge any sewage directly into a water body, and that there is
considerable unused capacity. They are as follows:

- Moosehead Sanitary District – a license to operate a surface wastewater disposal system, with a
design capacity of 0.17 million gallons per day (MGD), for the treatment and seasonal disposal of
treated sanitary wastewater via spray irrigation of up to 33,938 gallons per acre per week for the
spray field (Outfall #008A) (April 1 – November 30), as well as spray irrigation of up to 116,745
gallons per acre per week (Outfall #009A) (April 1 – October 31) and effluent snow making of up to
61 million gallons per year (Outfall #SM1A) (November 1 – March 31) for the spray irrigation /
snowmaking field, onto land in Greenville. The District also has a number of water quality
monitoring wells.

- Maine Water Company (Aqua Maine, Inc.) – a license to discharge a monthly average of up to
0.0025 MGD of filter cleaning (backwash) wastewater from a drinking water treatment facility to
ground waters in Moosehead Junction Township.

Wastewater outfalls associated with these uses are displayed on Map 9 Water Resources in Appendix B.

80 E-mail/phone correspondence with Susan Daves, MDEP; 9/13-14/11
81 E-mail correspondence with Bill Hinkel, MDEP; 9/13/11
**GREENVILLE’S SURFACE WATERS BY MAJOR RIVER BASINS**

1. An understanding of the town’s watersheds is important when considering surface water quality, particularly the water quality of lakes, which can be negatively impacted by activities within the watershed. Surface waters and their watersheds are displayed on Map 9 Water Resources, Appendix B.

2. Greenville is split between two major river basins: the Kennebec River Basin and the Penobscot River Basin - both drain directly into the ocean.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greenville’s Surface Waters by Major River Basins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major River Basin</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennebec River Basin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penobscot River Basin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lakes and Ponds**

3. The southern end of Moosehead Lake and eleven ponds are located within Greenville. Of the lakes and ponds, Moosehead is the most significant because of its size and outstanding attributes. The next most significant water bodies due to their accessibility and location near developed areas are Lower Wilson Pond, Sawyer Pond and to a lesser extent, Upper Wilson Pond and Prong Pond. Most of the other ponds are located in more remote areas of the community.

4. **Moosehead Lake**

5. Moosehead Lake, the largest lake in New England, is about 40 miles long and 20 miles wide, and occupies 75,471 acres, of which about 398 acres are within Greenville. It has a 280.8 mile perimeter and drains approximately 1,266 square miles (including the Moose River drainage and Roach River drainage). Of the 1,511 lakes of 10 acres or more in the unorganized territories, Moosehead Lake has been classified by the Land Use Planning Commission as the only lake that is outstanding in each of seven

---

82 Information on Lakes can be found at [http://lakesofmaine.org/](http://lakesofmaine.org/) which is a collaboration of the Maine Department of Environmental Protection, the University of Maine, the Maine Volunteer Lakes Monitoring Program and the Knowledgebase for the Gulf of Maine and its watersheds.
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categories: fisheries, wildlife, scenic quality, shore character, botanical features, cultural features, and physical features.

Moosehead Lake’s water quality is considered above average. The Maine Department of Environmental Protection, Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife, and the Moosehead Lake Coalition have collected water quality data from a number of locations on the lake. A summary from data collected for 2003 indicated very good water quality, as follows:

In summary, Moosehead Lake is clearly a very low productivity system. Even when compared to the largest lakes in the state, it is among the lowest in total phosphorus and chlorophyll-a, and very high in clarity. While strongly stratified throughout summer, the lake develops very little oxygen loss in the deep waters. It also appears that the lake was remarkably similar from station to station, and from month to month in 2003. This is perhaps due to the very low nutrient status of the lake and its inputs. This low nutrient input results in less opportunity for any differences in basin shape or circulation between regions to express themselves as different water quality.

The above information is the most current comprehensive evaluation of Moosehead’s water quality according to the MDEP. Updated and ongoing water quality monitoring of Moosehead Lake is needed.

Moosehead’s water quality provides habitat for many aquatic species, including coldwater fisheries, and several other noteworthy species, such as the virile crayfish and three species of mussels. The lake also supports a number of nesting loons and other waterfowl.

Almost the entire shoreline of Moosehead Lake within Greenville is developed. The greatest density of development is the village area on West Cove and East Cove. The density of the development is less proceeding northward along the east shore. There are a few landowners with large parcels on the east side of the lake that at some point may choose to develop/subdivide. Additional second-tier, inland, development back off the shorefront would be more likely.

**Sawyer Pond**

Sawyer Pond located near the airport and not far from the village is one of the town’s most developed small ponds. The pond is about 72 acres in size with a perimeter of 1.8 miles. Water quality monitoring data for Sawyer Pond has been collected since 1958. The pond’s water quality is average and the potential for nuisance alga blooms is low. The report cited in the footnote indicated that there was depletion of dissolved oxygen in deep areas of the lake, a condition that if persistent could eliminate or reduce habitat for sensitive cold water species.

---

81 Maine Department of Environmental Protection, Volunteer Monitors: (Midas: 0390, Basin: Primary) Filename: mo0390, Revised: 3/04, By: RJB

84 Maine Department of Environmental Protection, Volunteer Monitors: (Midas: 386, Sample Station 1) Filename: sawy386, Revised: 2/02, By: MG
The lots with frontage on the pond are 5 acres in size or more. There is one subdivision with 40 acre lots that was done years ago, and since that time, individual lots have been sold without creating a subdivision. There are also three large lots on the pond that have potential for future subdivision. The shoreland of Sawyer Pond is zoned as a Critical Watershed Shoreland Overlay District, such that all the other lots may have to maintain their current water frontage to meet the standards. There is potential for development of back-lots with most of the properties.

Lower Wilson Pond

Lower Wilson Pond is also one of Greenville’s more developed ponds. The pond is 1,414 acres in size and has a perimeter of 15.7 miles. Water quality is above average and the potential for nuisance algae blooms is low. Lower Wilson Pond is managed by MDIFW primarily as a coldwater fishery. Dissolved oxygen in the cold, deep water even during late summer is suitable for coldwater fish, which prefer water with more than 5ppm oxygen. Water quality monitoring by volunteers (Friends of the Wilson Pond Area) is done sporadically. In addition to the coldwater fisheries, the pond supports the eastern floater mussel, a species that requires particularly clean water. Lower Wilson also has nesting loons.

Due to its proximity to the built-up area of Greenville, and its beauty, development around the pond has more than tripled in less than 40+ years. Most of the northern, western and southern shores of the pond are subdivided into house lots. However, there are back-lots that could support second-tier development. There are also several parcels that are in the Tree Growth Property Tax Program, and one large parcel with a state-held conservation easement.

There are two small hydroelectric dams associated with Lower Wilson Pond: one is located at the outlet to Big Wilson Stream; the second is downstream on Big Wilson Stream. KEI (Maine) Power Management LLC, c/o Kruger Energy Montreal Quebec, Canada. KEI purchased these dams in 2009.

Upper Wilson Pond

Upper Wilson Pond is connected to Lower Wilson Pond by a narrow channel. Only a small portion (about 230 acres) of the pond is located within Greenville. The pond is a total of 987 acres with a perimeter of 12.6 miles. Water quality is rated as average. The Maine Department of Environmental Protection and the Volunteer Lake Monitoring Program monitored water quality for six years between 1974 and 2004.

This information indicated that the potential for nuisance algae blooms was low to moderate. Upper Wilson Pond is managed by MDIFW primarily as a coldwater fishery. According to the water quality monitoring dissolved oxygen in the cold, deep water during late summer reaches less than 4ppm. This reduces the suitability of the habitat for coldwater fish, which prefer water with more than 5ppm oxygen. Water quality monitoring by volunteers (Friends of the Wilson Pond Area) is done sporadically.

---

85 Maine Department of Environmental Protection, Volunteer Monitors: (Midas: 342, Sample Station # 1) Filename: wils342, Revised: 3/05, by: RB
86 Maine Department of Environmental Protection: (Midas: 410, Sample Station # 1) Filename: wils410, Revised: 3/05, by: RB
There are a few cabins along the shores of Upper Wilson Pond, but overall the pond is relatively undeveloped due to the lack of road access. There are no known subdivisions on the pond. Plum Creek’s Moosehead Lake Concept Plan includes a 184 acre residential development zone that abuts Greenville and is located along the western shore of Upper Wilson Pond in Bowdoin College Grant West Township. Of the lake’s 8.5 miles of shorefront 7.4 miles of shorefront are within this conservation easement that restricts development.

**Prong Pond**

Prong Pond located in the northeastern corner of Greenville is shared with the Town of Beaver Cove. Prong Pond is 447 acres in size and has a perimeter of 10.8 miles. The lake supports coldwater fisheries. Water quality information is not available; however, given the pond’s remoteness it is likely to be good.

While somewhat remote, the western shore of Prong Pond has a number of large lots. There are two subdivisions in the Prong Pond area with nine shoreline lots in one, and fourteen back-lots in the other. It appears there is considerable undeveloped back lot acreage for second-tier development. Most of the southern and eastern sides of the pond appear to be undevelopable due to wetlands. The Moosehead Lake Concept Plan includes all of the land around Prong Pond in Beaver Cove within the conservation easement which restricts development.

**Greenville’s Other Ponds**

Greenville’s other ponds are remote ponds, due to lack of accessibility. Information on these ponds is displayed in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inventory of Greenville’s Lakes and Ponds</th>
<th>Area (Acres)</th>
<th>Perimeter (Miles)</th>
<th>Max. Depth (Feet)</th>
<th>Mean Depth (Feet)</th>
<th>Fisheries</th>
<th>Water Quality*</th>
<th>Towns/Townships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moosehead Lake</td>
<td>75,471</td>
<td>280.8</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Coldwater</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>Greenville plus 16 Twps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawyer Pond</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Coldwater</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Greenville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Wilson Pond</td>
<td>1,414</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Coldwater</td>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>Greenville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Wilson Pond</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Coldwater</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Greenville, Bowdoin College Grant West Twp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prong Pond</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Coldwater</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Greenville, Beaver Cove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grenell Pond</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Coldwater</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Greenville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Mud Pd.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Coldwater</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Greenville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mud Pond</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Greenville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rum Pond</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Coldwater</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Greenville, Bowdoin College Grant West Twp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmon Pond</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Coldwater</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Greenville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secret Pond</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Coldwater</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Greenville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Pond</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Coldwater</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Greenville, Cove Point Twp., Moosehead Jct. Twp.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Water quality data is discussed in the text*
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Invasive Aquatic Species

The introduction of non-native invasive plant and animal species to the U.S. has been escalating with widespread destructive consequences. Maine has four invasive plants of concern - variable-leaf milfoil, hydrilla, curly-leaved pondweed, and Eurasian milfoil. Significant habitat disruption, loss of native plant and animal communities, loss of property values, reduced fishing and water recreation opportunities, and large public and private expenditures have accompanied invasive plant introductions in many states. In Maine it is illegal to sell, propagate or introduce eleven invasive aquatic plants. These plants are aggressive growers that can become serious nuisances. Maine also requires a “Lake and River Protection Sticker” on all seaplanes, which can also carry invasive plants into water bodies.

Currently, invasive plants have not been identified in any of Greenville’s water bodies. However, variable milfoil and hydrilla infestations have been identified in water bodies in central Maine. Lake associations in some areas have established invasive plant monitoring and education programs with boat inspections and eradication efforts. In Greenville there are certified invasive plant patrollers for Moosehead Lake, and Upper and Lower Wilson Ponds.

Wetlands and Shorelands

Wetlands are defined as “those areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or groundwater at a frequency and duration sufficient to support prevalence of vegetation typically adapted for life in saturated soils.” Wetlands can serve many functions: they protect water quality; control flooding and erosion; provide a natural habitat for waterfowl, wildlife and unique plant life; encourage nutrient recycling; and serve as fish sanctuaries and nursery grounds. Wetlands are vital to preserving water quality and the quantity of surface and groundwater resources. The National Wetlands Inventory provides the most accurate wetlands mapping (See Map 9 Water Resources)

Shorelands are environmentally important because of their relationship to water quality, value as critical wildlife habitat and function as floodplains. Development or the removal of vegetation on shorelands can increase runoff and sedimentation, as well as the amount of nitrogen and phosphorus entering the water, which can lead to algae blooms. Vegetation tends to slow runoff of rainfall, allowing more time for infiltration into the soil. Steep slopes with highly erodible soils are particularly susceptible to erosion and sedimentation and should remain vegetated. Development and the removal of vegetation also disturb many wildlife species that use shoreland areas as habitat and travel corridors.

Protection for Surface Water Resources

Federal and State Laws

Federal and state laws designed to protect water resources include the federal Clean Water Act, and Maine laws, such as the Natural Resources Protection Act, the Erosion and Sedimentation Control and Stormwater Management Laws, the Forest Practices Act and the Minimum Lot Size Law (subsurface wastewater disposal and plumbing regulations). While there are a number of laws protecting water quality, enforcement can be sporadic due to agency staffing levels. In practice, compliance with most state and federal environmental regulations is left to individual landowners and towns.
Greenville’s Ordinances

Greenville’s Land Use Ordinance, which includes town-wide zoning, shoreland zoning and subdivision regulations, is fairly comprehensive in protection for water resources. It includes general standards to address water supply and quality, sewage disposal, stormwater runoff, and erosion and sedimentation control. Shoreland zoning addresses water quality protection along the shores of Moosehead Lake and the other great ponds, unforested wetland greater than 10 aces in size, and along many of the streams. The ordinance also includes “Critical Watershed Districts” which are designed to minimize phosphorus runoff and other negative impacts on Sawyer, Shadow, Little Mud, Grenell, Mud, Salmon, Rum, Secret, and Prong Ponds. The restrictions apply to areas within 750 feet of the normal high water mark. Moosehead Lake and the other ponds not included in the Critical Watershed District are zoned shoreland protection within 250 feet from the shoreline. Shoreland zoning along Big Wilson Stream (considered a river) consists of a 250 foot zone. Shoreland zoning along most streams and brooks applies to an area within 75 feet of the high water mark.

Greenville’s subdivision regulations contain a requirement that the Planning Board make a determination that the “subdivision will not unreasonably increase a great pond’s phosphorus concentration during the construction phase and life of the proposed subdivision” but does not give the Board any guidance on how this is to be determined. MDEP has developed a phosphorus model that can be used to determine acceptable phosphorus exports to a lake, and the appropriate control measures, such as buffers, infiltration systems, wet ponds, and other designs that control stormwater runoff.

The most serious threat to ponds is phosphorus pollution which is associated with non-point sources of pollution (stormwater runoff). Development in the form of roads, buildings, lawns, farms, timber harvesting and other human activities that eliminates vegetation and natural depressions, allows rainwater to flow more quickly and directly into ponds. Increased runoff can carry excessive amounts of phosphorus into ponds (up to 10 times as much as normal), particularly when it carries fertilizers, detergents and other phosphorus laden chemicals. The negative impacts from excessive phosphorus can be loss of fisheries, cloudy green waters with unpleasant odors that lose their appeal for swimming and boating, and a resultant reduction in property values. Restoration of polluted ponds is extremely expensive, and some ponds may never recover. Generally speaking, the more developed a pond’s watershed is, the higher the phosphorus concentration in stormwater runoff.

There are two requirements for keeping phosphorus low and water quality high for ponds in watersheds. First, existing sources of phosphorus need to be minimized, particularly from soil erosion in the watershed and from inadequate shoreline septic systems on sandy or shallow soils. The second requirement is that new additions of phosphorus to the pond that result from residential and commercial growth in the watershed must be minimized.

The MDEP has developed a methodology, described in *Phosphorus Control in Lake Watersheds: A Technical Guide for Evaluating New Development*, to evaluate whether or not a proposed development will add a disproportionate amount of new phosphorus to a pond. It provides a standard that limits the amount of phosphorus a proposed new development can add to a pond, and a means by
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which the development can be designed and evaluated to insure it meets the standard for that pond.

The MDEP provides the estimated phosphorus allocations\textsuperscript{87} for the ponds in Greenville (table). The next to the last column of the table is the most important. It indicates an estimated per acre phosphorus allocation in pounds of phosphorus per acre per year (lb/acre/yr) for each pond watershed, which can serve as a standard for evaluating new development proposals. It is applied to the area of the parcel of land being developed to determine how much the development should be allowed to increase phosphorus loading to the pond.

Calculation of Per Acre Phosphorus Allocations for Lakes and Ponds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Watershed</th>
<th>DDA</th>
<th>ANAD</th>
<th>AAD</th>
<th>GF</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>WQC</th>
<th>LOP</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>FC</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>SWT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grenell Pond</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>mod-sensitive</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Mud</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>mod-sensitive</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Wilson</td>
<td>3634</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>3334</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>70.42</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>70.42</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moosehead</td>
<td>7393</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>6654</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1664</td>
<td>163.5</td>
<td>mod-sensitive</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>122.63</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mud Pond</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>mod-sensitive</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prong Pond</td>
<td>2256</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>1676</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>19.69</td>
<td>mod-sensitive</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>14.77</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rum Pond</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>8.29</td>
<td>mod-sensitive</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmon Pond</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>mod-sensitive</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sawyer Pond</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>mod-sensitive</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebec Lake*</td>
<td>10845</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>9745</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2436</td>
<td>150.33</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>150.33</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secret Pond</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>mod-sensitive</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Wilson</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>mod-sensitive</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

*Sebec Lake 10,856 acres of the Sebec Lake watershed is located in Greenville; Sebec Lake is located in Willimantic, Bowerbank, and Dover-Foxcroft.

DDA Direct land drainage area in Greenville in acres
ANAD Area not available for development in acres (wetlands, steep slopes)
AAD Area available for development in acres (DDA - ANAD)
GF Growth Factor: assumes some development possible; higher the number the more growth anticipated
D Area likely to be developed in acres (GF x AAD)
F Pounds phosphorus allocated to town’s share of watershed per pounds per billion (ppb) in lake
WQC Water quality category; “good” = better than average water quality; “moderate-sensitive” = average water quality, but potential for phosphorus recycling from pond bottom sediments
LOP Level of Protection (h=high (coldwater fishery); m=medium)
C Acceptable increase in lake’s phosphorus concentration in ppb
FC Allowable increase in annual phosphorus load to the lake (lb/year)
P Per acre phosphorus allocation (FC/D) (lb/acre/year)
SWT Small Watershed Threshold in acres

Source: Division of Watershed Management, Maine Department of Environmental Protection, October 2011

\textsuperscript{87} “Phosphorus allocation” is the maximum amount of phosphorus/per acre that can be safely added to the lake.
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For example, a development proposed on a 100 acre parcel in a pond watershed with a per acre allocation of 0.05 lb/acre/yr would be allowed to increase the annual phosphorus loading to the pond by 5 pounds (0.05 X 100). If the projected increase in phosphorus loading to the pond from the development does not exceed this value, then it can safely be concluded that the development will not add an excessive amount of phosphorus to the pond. MDEP uses this methodology to evaluate development applications under Maine’s Site Location Law and Stormwater Management Law. Many towns also use this methodology to evaluate applications for new development under their subdivision and site plan review ordinances. Typically, a developer’s consultant, engineer, surveyor, or soil scientist performs this analysis. MDEP can provide assistance to local planning boards in reviewing these submittals as well as to the developer or his/her consultant in performing the analysis.

Non-regulatory Lake Protection Efforts

There are a number of organizations involved in lake stewardship including the Piscataquis Soil and Water Conservation District, the Maine Volunteers’ Lake Monitoring Program, the Maine Congress of Lakes Association, the Maine Department of Environmental Resources Lakes Division, and the Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife. There are also two local organizations working to monitor and improve water quality:

- The Moosehead Lake Fisheries Coalition works to maintain excellent water quality, aquatic habitat and the traditional fishery resources in the Moosehead Lake ecosystem.
- The Friends of the Wilson Pond Area’s (FWPA) mission is to protect and conserve both Upper and Lower Wilson Ponds and the surrounding areas. FWPA goals include preservation of biological diversity and ecological integrity, and preservation of soil, air, water quality, scenic vistas and quietness. Activities include public education, fundraising, land conservation, water quality monitoring, monitoring for invasive species, and a number of other similar activities. FWPA owns a conservation easement along the eastern and southern shores of Lower Wilson Pond that guarantees no development within 500 feet of the pond along nearly three miles of the shore.

Public Works Practices: Road construction and maintenance activities can be major contributors of pollution to water bodies. This is true of private roads as well as public roads. Greenville’s Public Works Department utilizes best management practices in maintaining and constructing roads, ditches, culverts, and bridges. However, there may be issues with the practices of private contractors.

Grant Programs: Federal/state grant programs available for water quality protection include:

- The Small Community Grants Program (SCG) provides grants to towns to help replace malfunctioning septic systems that are polluting a water body or causing a public nuisance. Grants can be used to fund from 25% to 100% of the design and construction costs, depending upon the income of the owners of the property, and the property’s use.
- The Watershed Protection Grant Program provides funding and classroom support for service learning projects designed to protect the water quality of a lake or stream and to educate the public about the relationship between land use and water quality.
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- Invasive Aquatic Plants Cost Share Grants are for local programs designed to prevent the spread of invasive aquatic plants. This cost share program is administered by the Lakes Environmental Association (LEA) under an agreement with the Maine DEP. Eligible projects include boat inspection programs and education efforts to prevent the spread of invasive aquatic species. Grants up to $2,000 are available to town and county governments, quasi-municipal organizations (including water districts) and 501C(3) eligible organizations (such as lake associations).

- Nonpoint Source Water Pollution Control Grants (“319” or NPS grants) - The primary objective of NPS projects is to prevent or reduce nonpoint source pollutant loadings entering water resources so that beneficial uses of the water resources are maintained or restored. Public organizations, such as state agencies, soil and water conservation districts, regional planning agencies, watershed districts, towns, and nonprofit (501(c)(3)) organizations are eligible to receive NPS grants. Activities include surveys, management plans and implementation of “best management practices” by land owners.

Plum Creek’s Moosehead Lake Region Concept Plan Wildlife and Invasive Species Fund (WISF) is designed to provide funding to address wildlife and botanical communities protection, and invasive species prevention needs, including education, outreach and/or mitigation in the Moosehead Lake Region caused by the development zoned for in the Concept Plan. The region is comprised of the twenty-nine townships involved in the Concept Plan plus the Towns of Greenville and Jackman.

Federal funding for water quality protection is also available through the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the U.S. Department of Agriculture.
Chapter II-9 Critical Natural Resources

OVERVIEW

The Moosehead Lake Region has long been renowned both regionally and nationally for its vast forestlands, lakes, rivers, streams, outstanding wildlife and fisheries, and other natural resources. Greenville sits at the gateway to this vast area, and the town’s natural resources are interwoven into those of the region. Greenville’s natural resources have economic values with people coming to hunt, fish, watch wildlife and recreate in Maine’s North Woods.

Critical natural resources as defined here include important wildlife, plant and fisheries habitats, scenic resources, and other unique natural areas. Maine’s Comprehensive Planning Rules define “critical natural resources” as those natural resources which under federal and state law warrant protection from the negative impacts of development, and include the following:

- Resource protection areas established by Maine’s Shoreland Zoning Act
- Wetlands of special significance identified in the Maine Department of Environmental Protection’s wetlands and waterbodies protection rules
- Significant wildlife habitat as defined in Maine’s Natural Resources Protection Act
- Threatened, endangered and special concern animal species as identified by the Maine Endangered Species Act
- Significant freshwater fisheries spawning habitat identified by Maine’s Departments of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife, and Marine Resources
- Threatened or endangered plant habitats as identified by the Maine Natural Areas Program
- Natural communities that are imperiled or rare as identified by the Maine Natural Areas Program

While these are the natural resources defined and regulated by the state, there may be other important natural resources that are equally significant to the Town.

SUMMARY

Extent and Nature of Important Natural Resources

- The very rural nature of most of Greenville and the Moosehead Lake Region with few public roads and vast undeveloped forests provides a wealth of critical natural resources. Much of the landscape in the region is protected through public and/or private conservation measures. Public and private conservation land is displayed on Map 10 Critical Habitat in Appendix B.
- Greenville’s outstanding natural resources include: pristine lakes, ponds, streams, and wetlands; moderate to high value waterfowl and wading bird habitats; a bald eagle nest site; renown sport...
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fisheries including wild brook trout habitat; a vast working forest that provides habitat for a variety of wildlife species including Greenville’s iconic moose; and exceptional scenic resources.

Protection for Important Natural Resources
- Protection for important natural resources can be both regulatory and non-regulatory. A balance of federal, state and local regulations combined with education and conservation measures can provide considerable protection for critical and important natural resources.
- Greenville’s Land Use Ordinance provides protection for critical and important natural resources through environmental performance standards, up-to-date shoreland zoning, rural area zoning, and scenic overlay corridor zoning. Protection could be improved by incorporating the new information in this chapter into the permitting process and using it to educate landowners. Other issues that might be considered include maintaining the night sky by encouraging full cutoff fixtures for exterior lighting, reducing the visibility of development on hills and ridges, and addressing visual and wildlife concerns associated with cell towers and wind turbines.
- Regional involvement in land use regulation and planning in the Maine Land Use Planning Commission’s jurisdiction, including the build-out of the Moosehead Lake Concept Plan will also be important to Greenville.
- Non-regulatory measures are included below.

Regional Cooperation and Collaboration for Conservation of Important Natural Resources
- Regional cooperation in the protection and conservation of critical natural resources includes the educational and collaborative efforts of organizations like the Natural Resources Education Center, the Forest Society of Maine, the Moosehead Lake Fisheries Coalition, the Friends of Wilson Pond and other similar organizations.

Greenville’s Iconic Moose
- Given the iconic nature of the moose to Greenville and the Moosehead Lake Region, there is a need to increase the visibility of moose to the public. This might be accomplished by increasing the number of road pull-offs or encouraging more guided moose safaris. Another option might be to work with landowners and the Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife to increase the moose population. Any option would have to consider safety to the traveling public.

OVERVIEW OF WILDLIFE AND PLANT HABITAT
The very rural nature of Greenville and the Moosehead Lake Region provides extensive and rich natural habitat for a variety of plants and animals. While development can threaten natural habitats through direct loss of habitat and through fragmentation of existing large areas of habitat, it presents less of a threat in Greenville than in more developed areas of Maine. However, it is still important to realize that fragmentation of habitats by roads, buildings and other development isolates some plants and animals limiting their ability to travel, feed and reproduce. Fragmentation also creates an edge effect where disturbed areas between developed and natural areas are more easily colonized by non-native species. As development and fragmentation continues, more rare species can become increasingly threatened.
Considerable identification and analysis of habitats has been done through the *Beginning with Habitat Program*\(^9\), a habitat-based landscape approach to assessing wildlife and plant conservation needs and opportunities. The goal is to maintain sufficient habitat to support all native plant and animal species currently breeding in Maine by providing information depicting and describing various habitats of statewide and national significance.

*Beginning with Habitat* suggests maintaining a rich compliment of plant and wildlife habitat by interweaving important wetland and riparian (shoreland) areas, high value habitats and large blocks of undeveloped habitat to identify those areas most critical to protect or conserve. Mechanisms to protect important habitats can include both regulatory and non-regulatory approaches. The program recommends utilizing shoreland zoning to protect shoreland habitats around water bodies. Conservation of undeveloped areas can focus on large blocks of agricultural and forested habitat that include high value plant and animal habitats. Large blocks of undeveloped land usually have more wildlife diversity than smaller areas and are important to certain wildlife species that require large unfragmented habitat (undeveloped and generally road less areas).

The approach is designed to utilize information on three different systems to assist communities in building a system of interconnected conserved lands. These are: (1) wetlands and shoreland habitats; (2) high value animal habitats (waterfowl and wading bird habitat, bald eagle nest sites) and high value plant habitats (none known in Greenville); and (3) large habitat blocks.

A discussion of each of these follows. Most of these habitats are displayed on Map 10 Critical Habitat in Appendix B. More detailed mapping can be found on the *Beginning with Habitat Maps* at the Town Office.

---

\(^9\) *Beginning with Habitat Program* includes Maine Inland Fisheries and Wildlife, Maine Natural Areas Program, Maine Audubon, Maine Land Use Team, U. S. Fish and Wildlife, Maine Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Unit, Southern Maine Regional Planning, Nature Conservancy and Wells National Estuarine Research Preserve. Maps are available on the WEB at http://www.beginningwithhabitat.org/the_maps/map_availability.html
**WETLAND AND RIPARIAN (SHORELAND) HABITATS**

The habitats most critical to maintaining wildlife populations are wetlands and riparian areas (shorelands). Wetlands are highly productive areas that provide important habitat for many types of wildlife, including waterfowl and wading birds (wood duck, black duck, herons, etc.), frogs, turtles, snakes, fish, shellfish, aquatic furbearers (muskrat, beaver, mink, etc.) and even large mammals, such as moose. Development in and near wetlands degrades their value to wildlife, and can be particularly threatening to wildlife species that move between small wetlands to meet their habitat needs.

Shoreland habitats are the transitional zones between open water and wetland habitats, and dry or upland habitats. They include the banks and shores of streams, rivers, and ponds, and the upland edges of wetlands. These are perhaps one of the most important habitats because up to 80 percent of terrestrial vertebrate animals use these areas for part of their life cycle. This means that protection of shorelands is recommended as the “backbone” of managing wildlife and fisheries habitat.

Existing shoreland zoning controls land uses and placement of structures to minimize development impacts to areas adjacent to water bodies. Greenville’s shoreland zoning ordinance regulates areas within 250 feet of Moosehead Lake and the town’s other ponds larger than 10 acres, as well as certain unforested wetlands 10 acres and larger. Shoreland zoning also regulates areas within 250 feet of Big Wilson Stream and several other tributaries to Lower Wilson Pond, and 75 feet of other streams. Shoreland zoning does not include areas along very small streams (upstream from the confluence of two perennial streams), many forested wetlands, vernal pools and wetlands less than 10 acres in size.

**WATERFOWL AND WADING BIRD HABITAT**

The Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife (MDIFW) has identified significant inland habitats for ducks, geese, herons, and similar species of waterfowl and wading birds, rating them as having “high to moderate value.” A high to moderate value inland bird habitat is a complex of freshwater wetland and open water areas plus a 250-foot wide area surrounding the complex itself where inland species of waterfowl and wading birds nest. The quality of a wetland complex is determined by the dominant wetland type, the diversity of wetland types in the complex, the size of the wetland(s), the interspersion of the different types, and the relative amount of open water. There are three moderate to high value waterfowl and wading bird habitats: a portion of Prong Pond, Grenell Pond just south of Lower Wilson Pond, and a wetland along one of the branches of Eagle Stream (See Map 10 Critical Habitat). Greenville’s shoreland zoning ordinance provides protection to these habitats.

**VERNAL POOLS**

Vernal pools or "spring pools" are shallow depressions that usually contain water for only part of the year. They are often associated with forested wetlands. Vernal pools serve as essential breeding habitat for certain species of wildlife, including salamanders and frogs (amphibians). Species that must have access to vernal pools in order to survive and reproduce include wood frogs, spotted and blue-spotted...
salamanders, and fairy shrimp. Juvenile and adult amphibians associated with vernal pools provide an
important food source for small carnivores as well as large game species.

Avoiding impacts to significant vernal pools and their surrounding habitat is important because many
amphibians are pool specific: they must return to the pond in which they were born to breed. The loss
of vernal pools and the critical terrestrial habitat around them leads to local loss of amphibian species, a
decline in biodiversity, and a decline in food available for many other animals that live in these areas.

Vernal pools with high value for wildlife are called “significant vernal pools”. Not all vernal pools are
considered "significant". In general, a vernal pool habitat is “significant” if it has a high habitat value,
either because (1) a state-listed threatened or endangered species, such as a spotted turtle, uses it, or
(2) there is a notable abundance of specific wildlife, such as blue spotted salamander, wood frog, or fairy
shrimp. "Significant vernal pool habitat" includes the vernal pool itself and the area within a 250 foot
radius of the spring or fall high water mark of the pool, which is considered critical terrestrial habitat.
Significant vernal pool habitat is protected under Maine’s Natural Resources Protection Act. An activity
in, on or over these areas must avoid unreasonable impacts on the significant vernal pool habitat and
obtain approval from the Maine Department of Environmental Protection. Significant vernal pools have
not been formally identified and mapped in Greenville.

**RARE, THREATENED AND ENDANGERED PLANTS AND ANIMALS**

MDIFW has identified one bald eagle nest site in Greenville and another just across the town line in
Bowdoin College Grant West Township. No rare plants have been identified in Greenville.

Bald eagle restoration has been one of the great success stories of the Endangered Species Act and the
banning of pesticide DDT. As a result of the recovery of bald eagle populations, both federal and state
governments have removed them from their lists of endangered and threatened species. Bald eagles
continue to be a species of “special concern” in order to ensure their continued recovery.

One bald eagle nest site has been identified along the “narrors” between Upper Wilson Pond and
Lower Wilson Pond (Map 10 in Appendix B). Nesting eagles need mature trees and wooded buffers
along shorelands – a niche that will always be at risk to land development and recreational pressures.
The continued use of nests year after year makes site-specific management efforts very effective, which
is why it has been the cornerstone strategy of Maine’s eagle management program since 1972, and it
will continue to be a key strategy for ensuring a lasting recovery of eagles well into the future. MDIFW
recommendations for protection of Bald Eagle nest sites are as follows:

- Consult with MDIFW prior to development or forest harvesting near eagle nest sites.
- Maintain areas within 330 feet of nests as sanctuaries.
- Avoid exterior construction, land clearing, timber harvesting and other major disturbances within
  330 to 1,320 feet of the nest during sensitive nesting season (February 1 to August 31).
- Maintain foraging perches, roosts, potential nest trees, and flight corridors (partial timber harvests
  are compatible if they buffer existing nests and provide a lasting supply of suitable nesting trees).
• Recreationists (boaters, hikers, etc.) remain a safe distance away – 660 to 1,320 feet or more.
• Avoid aerial application of pesticides around nesting sites.
• Shoreland zoning should be resource protection or very low residential density.
• Consider voluntary landowner agreements, conservation easements, or acquisition to protect
  habitat for nest sites.

LARGE UNDEVELOPED HABITAT BLOCKS
Large undeveloped habitat blocks are relatively unbroken areas of habitat that can include forests,
grassland, agricultural land, and wetlands. “Unbroken” means that the habitat is crossed by few roads,
and has relatively little development and human habitation. These blocks are especially important to
species that require large blocks of habitat (moose, black bear, lynx, fisher, oven bird, scarlet tanager,
etc.), but they are also likely to serve a wider diversity of species than smaller blocks. Only in such blocks
will many species find the home ranges that they need to breed, travel and protect themselves.
Greenville and the surrounding areas provide an extensive amount of this kind of wildlife habitat.

MOOSE\textsuperscript{91}
The Latin name for moose is Alces alces, which actually means elk. Four subspecies of moose are
recognized in North America. The eastern or Taiga moose is the subspecies found in Maine. According to
writings of early explorers, moose were plentiful in New England during the 1600s. By the early 1900s,
moose populations in Maine had declined to an estimated 2,000. This decline was mostly attributed to
unrestricted hunting, but clearing of forestland for farming and increased incidence of brainworm
contributed to the decline. During the 1900s, laws protecting moose from excessive hunting, and
improving habitat conditions were implemented. The population is currently estimated to be 29,000.

The average life expectancy is 8 years for a cow and 7 years for a bull. Moose may live into their late
teens, but rarely live past 20. Moose die from a variety of causes: legal and illegal harvest, road kills,
other accidents (drowning, falls, etc.), predation, disease, starvation, and old age. Harvest and road kills
account for 2,000 to 2,500 moose deaths a year. Bulls and cows use somewhat different habitats during
the summer. Bulls are typically found at higher elevations in mixed and hardwood stands, where food
supply is less available, but shading provides cooler temperatures. Cows are found at lower elevations in
regenerating stands and adjacent softwoods, because food is more concentrated. This concentrated
food source reduces the amount of time cows spend feeding, which limits calves vulnerability to
predators. Moose typically winter at higher elevations where more hardwood browse is available, and
they often feed in regenerating stands. Mature softwood is used as cover when snow depth exceeds 3
feet. Moose subsist on browse, the leaves and twigs of woody plants. Willow, aspen, birch, maple, pin
cherry, and mountain ash are important, high quality browse utilized year round by moose. Because
leaves are absent from hardwoods in the winter, balsam fir is an important winter food for moose.
However, moose cannot survive on balsam fir alone, because it has lower nutritional value. Fire, wind

\textsuperscript{91} Text from: http://www.maine.gov/ifw/wildlife/species/moose/
throw, insects, and forest practices, such as clearcutting, promote disturbance and regrowth of these important forage trees. Sodium is also important to moose. Aquatic plants, such as pondweed and water lily, have higher sodium content than woody vegetation and are an important part of a moose’s summer diet. As a result, moose have reduced the number of aquatic plants in much of northern Maine. Natural salt licks are rare, so moose are often seen along roads using the salt runoff as an artificial salt lick. The breeding season for moose begins in late September and last into early October. Cows may produce their first calf at age two, and most produce a calf by age 3. Each May, cows give birth to 1 to 2 calves.

FOCUS AREAS OF STATEWIDE ECOLOGICAL SIGNIFICANCE
The 17,000 acre “Big and Little Moose Mountains Focus Area” extends across portions of Moosehead Junction, and Big Moose and Indian Stream Townships. A very small portion of the focus area is in Greenville. The focus area is a landscape scale area that contains exceptionally rich concentrations of at-risk species and natural communities, and high-quality common natural communities, significant wildlife habitats, within a large area of undeveloped habitat (see Map 10 Critical Habitat). A little less than half of this focus area is within the State’s Little Moose Public Reserve Land, and most of the remainder is in conservation associated with the Moosehead Lake Concept Plan.

FISHERIES
Greenville has a number of high-value fisheries. In addition to their ecological values, these fisheries are important to the local economy in the high-value sport-fisheries that they provide. The MDIFW is charged with managing fisheries, and has provided the following data on Greenville’s fisheries. Freshwater fisheries considered most significant to the state include important brook trout habitat and other rare, native fish habitats.

Spring and summer fishing is popular on Moosehead Lake and many of the ponds. Ice fishing is done on Moosehead Lake and Prong Pond. MDIFW manages Moosehead Lake, Upper and Lower Wilson Ponds for cold water sport-fisheries. Prong Pond is managed for warm-water fisheries with small-mouth bass as the primary sport fishery. Moosehead Lake and Lower Wilson Pond have been stocked with landlocked salmon, and Sawyer Pond, Prong Pond and Shadow Pond have been stocked with brook trout. Many streams in Greenville have brook trout.

Moosehead Lake has been a famous sport-fishing destination for more than a century and a half. The lake’s deep, cold, well-oxygenated water provides ideal habitat for cold water species like landlocked salmon, lake trout (togue) and brook trout. Some of the lake’s other species include burbot (cusk), small mouth bass, rainbow smelt, white and yellow perch, longnose suckers, hornpout (bull head), pumpkinseed sunfish, and a number of other species.

Lower Wilson Pond and Upper Wilson Pond are connected by a short shallow thoroughfare that is easily negotiated by fish and other aquatic species. Both ponds are cold water fisheries with landlocked salmon, brook trout, and lake trout (togue), and a number of other species, such as hornpout, cusk,
suckers, minnows, etc. Prong Pond is a shallow pond that provides considerable spawning habitat for warm-water fish species, such as small-mouth bass, and white and yellow perch. Small mouth bass is its most important sport fish. There are a number of other species such as, hornpout, suckers, and a variety of minnows. Rum Pond is a fairly deep pond that provides cold-water habitat for brook trout, including wild brook trout. Other species include smelt and minnows. Greenville’s other ponds and streams also provide important habitat to fish and other aquatic species. For example, wild brook trout can be found in some streams and Salmon, Secret and Grenell Ponds.

**Threats to Fisheries**

Land use activities, particularly those that remove trees and vegetation from shoreland areas of brooks, streams and ponds, can result in increased water temperatures and degradation of water quality. Maintenance of vegetative buffers to provide shade, particularly for cold-water species (trout and salmon), and to protect water quality is important to maintaining healthy fisheries. Destabilization of banks and activities that increase erosion and sedimentation diminish water quality. Maine’s Natural Resources Protection Act and local shoreland zoning provide considerable protection for fisheries, through required structure setbacks and vegetative buffers, and restrictions on certain activities. Road construction and maintenance activities can also have a significant impact on fisheries. On streams and rivers the biggest threat to aquatic habitats is fish passage, particularly for those species that require upstream habitats for spawning and other habitat needs. Improperly designed culverts can prevent fish passage. Maintenance and continuance of the natural stream bottom surface material without major changes in elevation is important to maintaining fish passage. Additionally, ditching and drainage designs should direct runoff into vegetated areas or sediment ponds to allow for the filtering out of sediments before runoff is released into water bodies.

**Regulatory Protection for Critical Wildlife Habitat**

There are a number of federal and state laws that protect critical wildlife habitat and fisheries including, for example, the federal and state endangered and threatened species laws, and Maine’s Natural Resource Protection Act. Greenville’s Land Use Ordinance also contains provisions to protect wildlife and fisheries habitats, such as the shoreland zoning and subdivision performance standards, and town-wide standards that address water quality. Protection could be improved by incorporating information from this chapter, including the *Beginning with Habitat* information into permit reviews.

**Non-regulatory Protection for Wildlife Habitat**

There are a number of non-regulatory approaches that Greenville can use to protect critical wildlife habitats, including: education, landowner agreements, and conservation easements or fee ownership on very high-value habitat. Several of these approaches are discussed below.

**Conservation Easements Held by MDIFW**

MDIFW holds conservation easements on four parcels in Greenville (See Map 10 in Appendix B). All four parcels are in the same ownership, a Revocable Family Trust under the name Little Island Inc., formally
the Hooker Family. The Conservation easement requires conservation of undeveloped land, but allows the owners to maintain existing buildings and harvest timber.

**Natural Resources Education Center (NREC)**

NREC is strong advocate for conservation of natural resources in the Moosehead Lake Region. NREC’s mission is “to educate and inform people about the Moosehead region’s natural resources of the past, present, and future, and to be the primary source that people rely on to understand the culture, natural history, and uses of the North Maine Woods.” NREC has an office on Pritham Avenue and provides programs and materials at the Moosehead Visitor’s Center along Route 15 south of Greenville. NREC provides orientation and interpretation services, educational exhibits, both on-site and off-site programs, interpretive trails, and events that explain and celebrate the unique natural and cultural heritage of the region. The goal of NREC programs is to provide residents and visitors with an understanding of the management, opportunities and ways to use these resources safely, responsibly, and with the great enjoyment. Two of NREC Programs are described below:

- The Fisheries Enhancement Internship Program is a joint initiative between NREC and the MDIFW fisheries biologists to provide student internships in the field of resource management with valuable hands-on field experience while enhancing fisheries management in the region. The program works with Unity College and other interested colleges to recruit interns for field studies and research projects under the guidance of MDIFW.

- The Maine Woods Explorers Program is designed to get kids outdoors and reconnect them to nature so that they will appreciate the natural resources around them and become advocates for good stewardship.

**Forest Society of Maine (FSM)**

FSM’s mission is “to conserve Maine's forestlands in a manner that sustains their ecological, economic, cultural, and recreational values.” FSM has a satellite office at the Moosehead Visitor’s Center (main office in Bangor). FSM is the holder and enforcer of the 363,000 acre conservation easement that is part of the Moosehead Lake Concept Plan. FSM is responsible for monitoring activities within the easement and assuring that the requirements of the easement are maintained.

**Moosehead Lake Fisheries Coalition (MLFC)**

MLFC’s mission is to restore, improve and enhance the cold-water sport fisheries in Moosehead Lake and the region in collaboration with MDIFW and other government agencies. Landlocked salmon, lake trout, brook trout and cusk are the coldwater species of focus.

**REGIONALLY IMPORTANT SPECIES**

Wildlife and fisheries habitats outside of Greenville are noteworthy because of their cultural and economic values to the greater Greenville community. A few of these are mentioned below.
**Deer Wintering Areas**

MDIFW has not identified any deer wintering areas in Greenville. However, given the importance of the species, and ongoing concern about the viability of the herd, a discussion is included here. White-tailed deer in Maine are at the northern limits of their geographic range. During winter, deer are exposed to cold temperatures and deep snow that makes it hard to find food and keep warm. Deer adapt to winter by congregating in deer wintering areas (DWA) where the snow is not as deep and there is protection from the wind and ample food. A DWA is defined as “a forested area used by deer when snow depth in the open/hardwoods exceeds 12 inches, deer-sinking depth in the open/hardwoods exceeds 8 inches, and mean daily temperatures are below 32 degrees”. DWA are crucial to winter survival of deer. Use of DWA is usually ongoing from one year to the next, and specific sites may receive annual use by many generations of deer. MDIFW has developed a management strategy that includes education, landowner agreements on management of important deer habitats such as DWA, population monitoring, management of hunting, efforts to reduce coyote predation and other management techniques.

**Canada Lynx**

The Canada Lynx is a secretive, forest-dwelling cat common throughout the boreal forest of Alaska and Canada, but rare at the southern edge of their range, as in Maine. There have been confirmed tracks and sightings over the last 15 years concentrated in northern Aroostook, Piscataquis, Somerset, and Franklin Counties. Good habitat consists of large areas of young, dense stands of balsam fir and northern hardwoods approximately 10-20 years after a major forest disturbance (cutting, fire, etc.). These stands provide the highest densities of snowshoe hares, the primary food for lynx, and suitable areas for denning. In 1997, the lynx was considered for state listing as a rare, threatened or endangered species, but there was insufficient information to assess its status. Its current state status is as a "Species of Special Concern". In response to petitions, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service named the lynx as threatened under the Federal Endangered Species Act in 2000. Habitat conditions were close to ideal in Maine in the late 1990s as the widespread clearcuts of the 1980s attained prime conditions for snowshoe hare. As stands mature and snowshoe hare numbers decline, lynx populations will likely decline. Lynx habitat used today will not be prime habitat 10 or 15 years later. Careful planning may be needed to ensure that sufficient young stands are always present on the landscape to preserve populations of lynx and snowshoe hare. MDIFW Recommendations for protecting the Canada Lynx:

- Report all lynx sightings to MDIFW as soon as possible. Sightings can be verified from good photographs, tracks, scat, or hair samples.
- Manage northern forests in landscapes (at the township level) with areas having a high proportion of regenerating balsam fir/northern hardwood stands (less than 30 years old) that support high densities of snowshoe hares.
- Ensure that large blocks of suitable regenerating habitat are distributed widely over the landscape.
- Avoid incidental take of lynx from trapping and snaring.
- Conserve large blocks of unfragmented forestland. Avoid the construction of new high-volume/high-speed highways in currently undeveloped areas.
SCENIC RESOURCES

Greenville and the Moosehead Lake Region are renowned for their scenic beauty. Moosehead Lake, the other lakes and ponds, the rolling hills and majestic mountains, and the wide expanses of forestland make the area particularly attractive to outsiders coming to visit and vacation within the region. The region’s scenery is vital to the area’s economy in nature-based tourism and the continuing perception of the area as wild and unspoiled.

Perhaps, the most important scenic views and vistas are those visible to the general public from public roads, water bodies, public recreation areas or other publicly accessible locations. The view of the mountains and Moosehead Lake from the height of land near the Moosehead Visitor’s Center along Route 15 south of Greenville’s village is outstanding, and serves as the main entrance into the area. Other important scenic areas include: Scammon Ridge (view of Moosehead Lake and mountains), West Cove Point peninsula (view of Lake and mountain peaks), east shore of Moosehead north of Scammon Road (view of Lake and mountain peaks), and Lily Bay Road just north of the Highlands (view of Lake and peaks). There are also views of Moosehead Lake and the surrounding areas from the Junction Warf and other locations in the village. Views from on the water by people in boats, canoes, or kayaks, or on the ice in the winter (ice fishing, snowmobiling) are also striking.

There are so few views of the water from public roads that protection of these views should be a high priority, with acquisition or purchase of conservation easements from a willing seller the preferred options. For example, a scenic turnout on Blair Hill that allows views of Moosehead Lake and the surrounding mountains would be desirable.

Forested road corridors are also important because they serve as visitors’ first impression of Greenville. In recognition of this, Greenville’s Land Use Ordinance includes a scenic corridor overlay district for Route 15 south of the village that requires maintenance of forest and vegetative buffers along the road, lighting standards and increased building setbacks. Greenville’s land use regulations also address scenic resources through height restrictions in shoreland zones, town-wide sign regulations and requirements for buffers, and other performance standards for subdivisions and shoreland development.

Greenville’s regulations could be strengthened in several ways, if desired. Standards could be enacted to limit the visibility of developments on ridgelines, and standards could be enacted to address lighting and its affect on the night sky. The Town could also apply the scenic corridor overlay zone to other roadways.

Cultural views are also important to consider, and include historic structures, the steamboat Katahdin, views of the village from the water, church steeples, etc.

---

92 Scenic areas are considered “critical rural areas” under Maine’s Growth Management Act.
This preliminary list of scenic resources can be expanded to include other scenic resources that are important to the community. The following criteria can be used to prioritize scenic resources: (1) accessibility – must be visible to the general public from a public way, public recreation area or other publicly accessible location; (2) uniqueness – unique or rare features are particularly important; and (3) distance of view or viewshed – relates to size of the view, a view of only a few feet is less important than a view of several miles.

The Town could complete an inventory of its high value scenic resources to include photographs, descriptions, and locations on a map. Inventory information can be used in permitting, where developments can be located to preserve high value resources to the greatest extent practicable, and as suggested previously.

Greenville has worked to improve the scenic and aesthetic character of its village through gateway signage, landscaping at key locations, and development of the Junction Wharf Park. The Town could also initiate a village shade tree program.

**REGIONAL COORDINATION**

Regional coordination is particularly important to protection of critical natural resources because wildlife and fisheries habitats usually extend across town boundaries. Many of the critical natural resources identified in this chapter, such as unfragmented habitat blocks, at least one moderate to high value water fowl and wading bird habitat, a focus area of statewide significance, and valuable fisheries are resources shared with unorganized areas managed by Maine Land Use Planning Commission. Conservation of large tracts of land in areas outside Greenville, such as the conservation easements associated with the Moosehead Lake Concept Plan will provide extensive wildlife habitat for the region. Another example of regional work is the management of important sport fisheries of Moosehead Lake that are dependent upon the success of salmon and brook trout fisheries in the Roach, Moose and East Outlet Rivers managed by MDIFW. NREC, as described previously is also a regional, collaborative effort that serves to conserve the region’s natural resources.

The Moosehead Lake Concept Plan’s Conservation Easement provides for sustainable management, consultations with appropriate state agencies, and protections for rare, threatened, and endangered species, plants and communities, fish, and wildlife, including lynx. Protections are also afforded to inland wading and waterfowl habitat, vernal pools, nesting loons, and deer wintering habitat. Management objectives, performance standards, policies, programs and practices are specified for each.

In addition, a Management Advisory Team made up of personnel from state and federal government, fish, wildlife and natural resource agencies, a representative from the University of Maine forestry school, and a silviculturalist, advises and consults on forest management activities.

Source: http://www.plumcreek
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Chapter II-10 Community Character, History and Archaeology

OVERVIEW
1. The people of Greenville treasure their history and cultural heritage, which serves as a basis for community pride and provides a significant attraction for tourism. The Moosehead Historical Society and Museums, the Natural Resources Education Center, and the Moosehead Marine Museum are at the forefront of preserving and enhancing appreciation for the region’s historic and cultural heritage. The following chapter describes the activities of these organizations, identifies significant historic and archaeological features, and considers how these might be preserved for the future.

SUMMARY

Historic Patterns of Settlement Still Evident in the Community
2. Many historic patterns of settlement are still evident in Greenville today. Early settlement of the village area occurred around the mid-1800s. With the increase in lumbering and other activity in the Moosehead Lake Region, the village grew in size. Over time, the Town of Greenville, anchored at the tip of Moosehead Lake, became the logical service center for all points north, northeast, northwest, and, eventually, south. Then as now, the principle occupations in Greenville were servicing the needs of tourists, and those who live and work in the region.
3. Greenville's early combination of wood harvesting and recreation with Moosehead Lake as the centerpiece shaped the community and continues to do so today. Through the years, the population and the general wealth of the community has depended heavily on its natural resources - forest products, “wildness”, and Moosehead Lake. The town’s remoteness and distance from other developed areas continue to make earning a living challenging and have resulted in overall slow population growth.

Effectiveness of Protective Measures for Historic and Archaeological Resources
4. The efforts of the Moosehead Lake Historical Society and Museums, the Natural Resources Education Center, and the Moosehead Marine Museum to preserve and educate about important cultural resources contributes significantly to the preservation of these resources.
5. Greenville’s Land Use Ordinance contains standards to protect significant historic and archaeological resources when they are listed on, or eligible to be listed on, the National Register of Historic Places. The ordinance could be expanded to allow consideration of other identified historic and archaeological resources so that the Planning Board would have more say over the design of proposals that might negatively impact these resources.

Regulatory Requirements for Identification of Historic or Archaeological Resources
6. Greenville’s Land Use Ordinance does not specifically require a survey for historic or archaeological resources. The Maine Historic Preservation Commission (MHPC) recommends that an inventory be conducted to identify significant historic and archaeological resources so that...
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steps can be taken to preserve these resources. MHPC also recommends that the Town establish a
mechanism for review of all construction or other ground disturbing activity in known
archaeological sites and other identified archaeologically sensitive areas so that development can
be designed to minimize impacts to important resources. MHPC has mapped of areas sensitive for
prehistoric archaeology (See Map 11 In Appendix B).

Significant Historic Resources and Ways to Preserve Them

- Greenville should conduct a town-wide inventory to identify its significant historical and
archaeological resources as a first step in developing more targeted incentives to encourage
appreciation, preservation and enhancement of those resources most important to the Town.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF GREENVILLE93

The spirit of Greenville to this day is marked by the pioneering spirit of its settlers and their
extraordinary willingness to help each other. These intangible qualities are those which others find
special about Greenville: a sense of being on the edge of the wilderness and an extraordinarily high
degree of genuine concern for friend and stranger. Some historians of the town say friendliness and
helpfulness are natural in a community as geographically remote as Greenville has been.

Greenville is perched at the wilderness edge of sparsely populated Piscataquis County, 36 miles from the
county seat, Dover-Foxcroft. Greenville has always been perceived as the gateway to the great
wilderness and, of course, to Moosehead Lake, the largest body of fresh water in the state. Located
north of the 45th parallel, on a line with Montreal, Greenville climatically and vegetatively has more in
common with the northernmost United States and southern Canada than it has with southern Maine.

It was to this remote land that the first white settler, Nathaniel Haskell, was bound in 1824 when he
purchased 11,000 acres of land in what is now known as Greenville. A mill worker from Westbrook,
Haskell also arranged for the sale of land in the northern part of the town to other settlers. To reach this
land was no easy feat in the early part of the 19th century, but those early settlers apparently were
driven by a desire to stake a claim to land, to clear a space, raise a home and family, and make a new
start. In 1824, making a start in the Greenville area required fortitude and stamina as the distances were
formidable, the climate harsh, the soils shallow, and the forests dense. Further, money for goods that
could not be raised or crafted may have been scarce at first because exporting goods was often not
practical. To survive and thrive, an early settler relies heavily on himself, other settlers, and the friendly,
helpful Native Americans who lived in the area.

The settlers organized Haskell Plantation on August 20, 1831, and incorporated as the Town of
Greenville on February 6, 1836. Having first landed in the area of Wilson Stream, early settlers took
advantage of cascades in the stream to power grist mills and saw mills. While most early industry was
for local use, hand-hewn pine shingles were sent regularly to the Bangor market as early as 1832. Local
historians believe Haskell may have settled in the Wilson Pond area for the water power. Others believe

93 Portions excerpted from the Town of Greenville Comprehensive Plan, 1987
he may not at first have known that Moosehead Lake was nearby. Indeed, for some years the road to
Monson lay near the site of the first settlement and is still evident today. In 1825, Haskell cut out a part
of the road that leads from the Wilson Pond area to Moosehead Lake. By this time, there was lumbering
activity around Moosehead Lake. In 1831, settlers were clearing and building closer to the lake. Soon
thereafter, a road was cut from the lake in the direction of Monson. By 1835, even though the village of
Greenville was still the forest primeval, a two-story hotel, the Seboomook House, was erected in the
area near where the bank is now located on 20 Lily Bay Road. Land speculators were among the first
patrons of the hotel. During this same time, land was cleared in the village. By 1846, what is now
Greenville village consisted of one hotel, one store, two dwelling houses, two blacksmith shops, and a
schoolhouse. Also in 1846, a new steamboat was towing rafted logs on Moosehead. Most early settlers
were involved in commerce, either as retail merchants or as farmers who sold some of their produce to
lumbering operations. Lumbermen with service skills such as blacksmithing most likely formed the
second wave of settlers.

Greenville’s village grew in size with the increase in lumbering business and other activity in the
Moosehead Lake area. Anchored at the tip of the lake, Greenville became a logical service center for all
points north, northeast, northwest, and, eventually, south. Then as now, the principle occupations in
Greenville were servicing the needs of woods-workers or tourists. Even as the lumber industry was
growing, word of the wild beauty and the game of the area sifted down to populous centers of the State
and beyond through the writings of people such as Henry David Thoreau. The Moosehead Region began
to gain more income from tourists and sportsmen, many of whom came into Greenville for supplies
before heading up the lake on a steamer. By the 1880s with construction of a railroad, lumbering and
tourism increased even as Greenville entered its own version of the industrial revolution. For years, until
1976, logs were floated down the Kennebec River. But the exportation of lumber and finished lumber
products in large quantities had not been practical until the advent of rail. Greenville's most important
industry for 60 years, the Atlas Plywood Corporation, started operations at about this time as the
Veneer Products Company, and Hollingsworth and Whitney (Scott Paper Company - 1954) began
lumbering operations around Moosehead Lake, buying 160,610 acres of land between 1895 and 1909.
With additional industry came more employment, which resulted in population growth. The population
of Greenville more than doubled in 30 years, from 310 in 1860 to 781 in 1890. By 1900, the population,
1,117, was 360 percent higher than it had been just forty years earlier. As comparison, the population of
Greenville did not as much as double in the first 80 years of the 20th century, but grew slowly from
1,117 to a peak of 2,025 in 1960 and then down to 1,839 in 1980.

By the early 1900s, electricity was available in central parts of the town and expanded to outlying areas
later. This may have been a factor that allowed mills to operate more efficiently but it did not seem to
have changed the town much immediately. Greenville continued in the 20th century its role as a hub
town, as a setting off point for lumbermen, explorers, tourists, and new settlers of outlying areas. As
these numbers of people grew, so did the variety of services Greenville provided so that between the
1890s and 1930s, Greenville was booming with, perhaps, more businesses and industries than the town
has today. Further, the Depression seems to have increased the population as those who had left came
home to find safe harbor and people from cities hoped to find subsistence in the wilderness. Government programs based in the Greenville area, such as the Civilian Conservation Corps, may also have added to the population. By the 1930s, barely more than one hundred years since Haskell arrived, Greenville had four churches, the Shaw Public Library, the Masonic Temple, the C.A. Dean Memorial Hospital, a movie theater, various restaurants and hotels, the high school, a number of stores, including a drug store, jewelry store, a bakery, a print shop, and several other businesses. Longtime residents wistfully call this Greenville's heyday.

Consultants in the 1950s, 1960s, and again in the 1970s described Greenville's growth as static and the economy as depressed. Two mills going out of business and the leveling by fire of the Squaw Mountain Inn hurt area employment. Loss of industrial employment in Greenville was reflective of state and national trends. Development of a municipal airport, extension of Interstate 95 to within about 60 miles of Greenville, development of the former Squaw Mountain Resort and of Lily Bay State Park were indicators that recreation would become more dominant in the area. Further, what could not have been predicted was the rapid growth of a new recreation industry, whitewater rafting, and more people seeking to escape the crowded recreation areas of other parts of the state. Also contributing to tourism and benefiting from tourism were sporting camps, guiding services, and commercial seaplane services.

During the 1980s the town’s year-round population grew modestly from 1,837 in 1980 to 1,884 in 1990, indicating a reversal of the trends of the 1960s and 1970s. Population growth within the surrounding region was more dramatic with the addition of approximately 250 people. Seasonal populations were also increasing, as evidenced by the increase in the number of subdivisions and seasonal residences. Since 1990 the year-round population of Greenville fell dramatically from 1,884 to around 1,623 by 2000, and then increased slightly to 1,646 by 2010. Outdoor recreation and tourism continued to be important parts of the economy, particularly with significant growth in second-homes. Forestry continued to be a mainstay of the region, but provided less employment than in the past due to mechanized harvesting.

Though the town has seen many changes over the past 180 years, the basic pioneering spirit and helpfulness are still evident. Greenville's early combination of wood harvesting and recreation along with Moosehead Lake shaped the community and continues to do so today. Through the years, the population and the general wealth of Greenville has depended heavily on its natural resources: forest products, “wildness”, and Moosehead Lake. Remoteness and the difficulty of earning a living continue to contribute to the town's overall slow growth.

**ORGANIZATIONS**

**Historical Society and Museums**

The Moosehead Historical Society and Museums (MHS) is a non-profit organization whose mission is to “further interest in the history of the Moosehead Lake Region and to aid in its preservation. “ The Society is known as being one of the finest small town historical societies and museum in New England.
The Society’s campus includes the Eveleth-Crafts-Sheridan Historical House, its associated Carriage House and lovely grounds with a sunken garden. The house contains a wide array of permanent and temporary exhibits, ranging from the Civil War to post World War II, relating to the history and culture of the Moosehead Lake Region. The Carriage House has a Lumberman's Museum offering a perspective of logging in the 1800s, and displays Native American artifacts, hand-crafted models depicting the steam vessels of Moosehead Lake, and vintage photographs. A library and gift shop, administrative offices, and artifact storage facilities are also housed in the Carriage House.

In 2005 the MHS purchased what was known as the Ready Workers' Community House, 6 Lakeview Street. This building was dedicated as a Universalist Chapel in 1904. The Society continues to renovate the building and it currently houses a number of displays and exhibits. It is home to the Moosehead Lake Aviation Museum and the second floor auditorium is used for programming and is available to the public for other functions and meetings. Renovations and all preventive maintenance are the responsibility of the Historical Society and will be accomplished as funding allows.

The Society offers guided tours of its campus, conducts presentations, and makes its library and archives available to the public.

**Natural Resources Education Center (NREC)**

NREC, a non-profit organization, has been providing educational and outing opportunities on the Moosehead Region’s historic and cultural heritage since 1991. NREC's mission is "to educate and inform people about the Moosehead region's natural resources of the past, present, and future, and to be the primary source that people rely on to understand the culture, natural history, and uses of the North Maine Woods." NREC's base of operations is the new Moosehead Visitor’s Center, opened in June 2011. The Center is designed to welcome, educate and familiarize the public to the region with orientation and interpretation services, educational exhibits, both on-site and off-site programs, interpretive trails, and events that explain and celebrate the unique natural and cultural heritage of the region. The goal of NREC programs is to provide residents and visitors with an understanding of the management, opportunities and ways to use these resources safely, responsibly, and with the great enjoyment.

A good example of NREC’s work to preserve the history and culture of the region is the annual Thoreau-Wabanaki Festival held in July (currently in its 5th year). The festival celebrates the Thoreau-Wabanaki Trail and the “rich heritage of Native Americans, guides, naturalists and visitors to the Maine Woods.” The festival is a collaborative effort that includes the Moosehead Historical Society and Museums, Moosehead Marine Museum, Shaw Public Library and others.

**Moosehead Marine Museum**

The Moosehead Marine Museum, a non-profit organization founded in 1976, is dedicated to “preserving the glorious days of steamboating and the heritage of the Moosehead Lake Region.” Its star exhibit is the historic steamboat, the Katahdin. In addition to the Katahdin, the Museum has an extensive collection of steamboat memorabilia and early photographs of the area. Cruises on the Katahdin are offered from late June through early October. The Katahdin was built in 1914 by Bath Iron Works.
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Steamboat history began on Moosehead Lake in 1836. As many as fifty boats once steamed up the lake carrying passengers, livestock, mail, supplies and equipment. Steamboats were the only means of transportation to the large resorts, like Mount Kineo, as well as the small hunting camps and villages around the lake. By the late 1930's, with the development of roads around Moosehead, only the Katahdin remained. Used as a towboat to haul booms (rafts) of logs until 1975, she participated in the nation's last log drive and was then designated a National Historic Landmark.

Greenville Junction Depot Friends
The Friends of the Junction Depot is a group of citizens who are trying to save the Canadian Pacific Railroad Depot located in Moosehead Junction Township (adjacent to Greenville) by moving it to another site and restoring the structure. The group is currently raising the funds to do this work.

INVENTORY OF HISTORIC AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES
The Maine Historic Preservation Commission (MHPC) is the state agency responsible for overseeing historic and archaeological resources within Maine. The Commission has identified three types of historic and archaeological resources that should be considered in comprehensive planning: (1) Prehistoric Archaeological (Native American resources, before European arrival); (2) Historic Archaeological (mostly European-American after written historic records, 1600 A.D.); and (3) Historic Buildings/Structures/Objects (buildings and other above ground structures and objects).

Archaeological resources are those found underground and are locations where there has been prior existence of human beings including structures, artifacts, terrain features, graphics or remains of plants and animals associated with human habitation. Prehistoric archaeological resources are those associated with Native Americans and generally date prior to 1600s. They include camp or village locations, rock quarries and workshops, and petroglyphs or rock carvings. Historic archaeological resources are those associated with the earliest European settlers, and sites may include cellar holes from houses, foundations for farm buildings, mills, wharves and boat yards, as well as shipwrecks.

Prehistoric Archaeological Sites
Except for the sites of Maine’s earliest known inhabitants (Paleoindians - at the end of the last ice age), most archaeological sites are found along waterbodies. An archaeological survey for prehistoric sites, completed for the shoreline of Moosehead Lake as a part of hydroelectric licensing, identified two sites of prehistoric activity, but neither is significant. MHPC recommends that similar surveys be conducted for Prong Pond, Rum Pond, and the Wilson Ponds.

MHPC has mapped “archaeologically sensitive areas” for prehistoric sites. Prehistoric archaeological site sensitivity maps are based on the current understanding of Native American settlement patterns. Most commonly, prehistoric archaeological sites are located within 50 meters of canoe-navigable water, on relatively well-drained, level landforms. Some of the most ancient sites (>10,000 years old) are located on sandy soils within 200 meters of small (non canoe-navigable) streams. Where professional
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archaeological survey is not complete, archaeological sensitivity maps are based on water shoreline, surficial geology, and landform. (See Map 11 in Appendix B)

Historic Archaeological Sites
MHPC list three historic archaeological sites in Greenville: (1) ME 182-001: “Moosehead”, American wreck, vessel, late 19th/early 20th c. – exact location unknown (some information available from an amateur diver (Bernard) 1970-1981 - 9/16/81 (Lewiston Daily Sun, pg 11); (2) ME 182-002: "Governor Coburn", American wreck, steam side-wheeler, built in 1872, used until 1895 when she broke up – southern Moosehead Lake; and (3) ME 182-003: "Fairy of the Lake", American wreck, steam side-wheeler probably 19th c. – southern Moosehead Lake. Three steamship wrecks outside, but near Greenville in Moosehead Lake’s West Cove are: (1) ME 537-002 - “Priscilla”, American Steamship; (2) ME 182-004: “Twilight”, American Steamship; and (3) ME 537-001 (no information available).

Locally identified historic archaeological sites in Greenville also include: (1) First Schoolhouse (allegedly) - marker near airport; (2) Founding of Town - marker near 20 Lily Bay Road, the site of the first hotel, the Seboomook House, which is also where Henry David Thoreau stayed in 1850s; and (3) Thoreau’s Visit - marker at town park off Pritham Avenue commemorating the writer's 1857 visit.

MHPC indicates that no professional survey for historic archaeological sites has been conducted in Greenville, and suggests that future fieldwork should focus on agricultural, residential, and industrial sites relating to the earliest Euro-American settlement of the town beginning in the early 19th century.

Historic Buildings/Structures/Objects
There are many historic buildings and structures in Greenville, but only the steamboat Katahdin is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. It is likely that there are other sites and buildings worthy of this distinction. The MHPC recommends conducting a comprehensive professional survey of historic structures, prehistoric archaeological sites, and historic archaeological sites in order to identify other properties that may be eligible for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places. The survey of historic archaeological sites should focus on the earliest European settlement of the town beginning in the early 19th century. The results of the survey can also be used to educate the public on the history of the community and to encourage and educate landowners on how to best preserve their historic and archaeological significant properties.

Even though Greenville lacks a formal inventory of historic and archaeological resources and a planned program of historic preservation, some information is available on historically significant properties. Many buildings and sites have been identified and there are two private, non-profit groups that have undertaken significant historic restorations of the Eveleth-Crafts-Sheridan Historical Home in Greenville Junction and the steamboat Katahdin and the Moosehead Marine Museum.

Eveleth-Crafts-Sheridan Historical Home
The Moosehead Historical Society and Museums, founded in 1962, owns this home that was originally part of the Moosehead Inn property. Built in 1893, the house is filled with artifacts of the period,
Part II. Inventory and Analysis

including a wealth of old photographs. The Moosehead Historical Society and Museums, a private, non-profit group, maintains the home and prepares special exhibits such as an 1880 kitchen, artifacts of Moosehead Native Americans, historic quilts, and several other items. The home was bequeathed to the society in 1976 through Julia Crafts Sheridan.

The Steamboat Katahdin and the Moosehead Marine Museum
The only steamboat left of the fleet of the Coburn Steamboat Company, begun in 1892, the Katahdin dates to the early 1900s. This steamboat was built after the original burned in 1913 and was converted from steam to diesel in 1922-23. Steamboats such as the Katahdin carried livestock, railroad equipment, supplies, passengers, and often were used to boom logs down the lake. In 1975, the Katahdin hauled her last boom across Moosehead Lake to the East Outlet, at which time she was owned by Scott Paper Company which gave the boat to the Moosehead Marine Museum in 1977. The Katahdin is currently listed in the National Register of Historic Places.

The Moosehead Marine Museum was founded in 1977 as a private, non-profit corporation primarily to restore the boat. Nearly fully restored, the Katahdin was put to work again as a passenger boat on Moosehead Lake in 1985. The Marine Museum, housed in a small building near the municipal parking lot off Main Street, also exhibits many artifacts of the area.

Other Historic Buildings and Sites
The following is a listing of historically significant structures that have been identified in Greenville.

- House behind Flatlanders, 1800s, Rufus King
- Union Church, 1850s, back part is original
- Major Benjamin Bigney Home (former), 1850s, 16 Pleasant Street
- Blair House, Over 100 years old
- Shaw Block, 1893, site of first theater
- Center for Moosehead History (Universalist Chapel), 1904, Community House, 6 Lakeview Street
- American Legion Hall, Coburn Steamboat Office (moved from Jct. Wharf to current location)
- Greenville Inn, Will Shaw Home
- First C.A. Dean Hospital, 1917 old nursing home, now doctors’ offices and outpatient facility
- Shaw Public Library, 1925 (current Annex was one of first homes in village, built by Mr. Gower)
- Masonic Temple, 1929
- Greenville High School, 1935, gift of Louis Oakes
- Oakhill, 1930s

Other significant historic and archaeological sites in the region outside of Greenville include:

- Pittston Farm
- Canadian Pacific Train Station, Jct. Wharf
- Fire tower (first in the nation) - originally on Squaw Mountain, recently moved to the NREC (Route 15, south of Greenville)
- The Fitzgerald Farm, base of Squaw Mt.
- Mount Kineo
- Brassua Lake (arrowheads)
- B-52 Crash Site
PROTECTION FOR HISTORIC AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The nationally recognized standard for what makes an historic or archaeological resource worthy of preservation is normally eligibility for, or listing on, the National Register of Historic Places. The National Register, administered by the National Park Service, is a listing of buildings, districts, structures, objects and sites deemed worthy of preservation for their historical, cultural or archaeological significance. Because the National Register is intended to accommodate buildings and sites of national, state and local significance, it can include resources of value to towns. Structures on the National Register also receive a limited amount of protection from alterations or demolition where federal funding is utilized. The primary threat to most of these buildings and sites is the desire of their owners, present and future, to alter them in ways that destroy their architectural or archaeological integrity. Since activities that disturb the ground can potentially destroy significant archaeological information, MHPC recommends a mechanism for review of all construction or other ground-disturbing activity within archaeologically sensitive areas (historic and prehistoric) and known archaeological sites. Contacting MHPC for an opinion, and/or review of the construction area by a MHPC-approved archaeologist is advised.

Maine's Subdivision statute (30-A MRSA 4401-4407) recommends review of impact on "historic sites" (Section 4404(8)), which includes both National Register listed and eligible buildings and archaeological sites. Maine's Shoreland Zoning statute (38 MRSA 435-449) includes, as one of its purposes, "protect archaeological and historic resources" (Section 435). Subdivision or other construction review ordinances might contain language indicating applicability and subdivision plan requirements similar to the following:

"An appropriate archaeological survey shall be conducted when archaeological sites within or adjacent to the proposed subdivision which are either listed in or eligible to be listed in the National Register of Historic Places, or within or adjacent to an area designated as archaeologically sensitive or potentially containing such sites, as determined by the municipality or the Maine Historic Preservation Commission."

"If one or more National Register eligible or listed archaeological sites will suffer adverse impact, appropriate mitigation measures shall be proposed in the subdivision plan, and submitted for comment to the Maine Historic Preservation Commission at least 20 days prior to action being scheduled by the Planning Board."

Greenville’s Land Use Ordinance contains wording similar to the above that is applicable to development town-wide. These standards could be strengthened to allow the Planning Board to consider protection for other significant resources (identified by the town as being important, but not necessarily National Register sites). The Town should review its standards to determine their adequacy.

Historical and archaeological resources can also be protected to some extent through public education. The activities of the Moosehead Historical Society and Museums, the Natural Resources Education Center and the Moosehead Marine Museum serve to increase public awareness and appreciation for the town’s cultural resources.


**OVERVIEW**

Forestry and agriculture are traditional economic endeavors in rural Maine. The extensive forests have provided a natural resource base that has supported local and regional economies for several hundred years. Greenville like many other rural communities located near Maine’s north woods is highly reliant on the working forestland in the region. Agriculture, particularly in recent decades, has been much less significant in Greenville and the surrounding region.

Maine’s forests are vitally important – economically, culturally and biologically. Maine has the largest and most diverse forest products industrial “cluster” in New England, consisting of paper companies, sawmills and secondary wood products manufacturers, forestland owners and managers, loggers, equipment manufacturers and distributors, biomass energy firms and other power facilities, financial institutions, forest-based recreation businesses, transportation firms and many others. The forest products industry is a fundamental part of the Maine economy. The health of the forest products industry, and consequent maintenance of large tracts of undeveloped land, and the public access policies of many large landowners have provided an environment for non-timber, forest-based activities, such as outdoor recreation and nature-based tourism. Biologically, the forests provide genetic and ecosystem diversity, natural systems for counteracting air and water pollution, animal and plant habitats, and many other values.

The past three decades have seen increasing diversity in the use and value of Maine’s forest resources, including construction of biomass plants, uses of land for purposes other than timber production, such as wind power, water extraction, residential and resort development, new forms of recreation, and a growing interest in forest biodiversity and carbon sequestration potential.

The Moosehead Lake Region’s forests should continue to serve Greenville and the region well into the future because of the vastness and productivity of the resource, as well as ongoing conservation efforts by both private and public landowners.

**SUMMARY**

**Importance of Forestry and Agriculture**

- Commercial forestry and the natural resource base that supports it is the mainstay of the region. Commercial forestry is a very significant land use in Greenville, with 15,321 acres or 56% of the town’s land area enrolled in the Tree Growth Property Tax Program. Given the vast industrial forests of the region it is likely that forestry will remain a stable and major activity in the future.
- Commercial agriculture is much less significant, with only one commercial farm operation. Greenville’s climate, distance from markets and farm services, and the predominance of forestry
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94 Comprehensive Land Use Plan, Land Use Planning Commission, 2010
are reasons for the limited amount of agriculture within the community. Further, there are only a few areas that have prime farmland or farmland soils of statewide importance. Many people do have gardens, tap trees for maple syrup, or raise a few horses or other livestock for personal use. Both forestry and agriculture have important cultural, economic, scenic, and biological values.

Regulatory and Non-Regulatory Support for Productive Farm and Forest Lands
- Greenville’s land use regulations allow forestry and agriculture, and associated resource-based uses, such as sawmills and lumber yards, in many areas of the town.
- While there are several conservation easements on land in Greenville, none are necessarily focused on preserving farm or forestland. There are significant efforts to preserve forestland outside of Greenville, such as the Forest Society of Maine’s conservation easement associated with the Moosehead Lake Concept Plan.
- Organizations, such as the Forest Society of Maine and the Natural Resources Education Center both work to educate the public about the value of productive forestland in the region.

Participation in Tree Growth, Farmland and Open Space Property Tax Laws
- Forestland owners, in particular, are utilizing the state’s current use tax laws. There are 15,321 acres of forestland enrolled in the Tree Growth Property Tax Program, but only 68 acres enrolled in the Farmland Property Tax Program. There are also 11.36 acres enrolled in Open Space.

Impacts of New Homes or Other Incompatible Uses on Forestry and Farming Activities
- The proximity of new homes or other incompatible uses has not affected the normal operations of farmers or forestland owners.

Conversion of Large Tracts of Agricultural or Industrial Forest Land
- The Town is not aware of any large tracts of forestland or farmland that are currently for sale for development. While residential subdivisions have taken some forestland out of production over the past decade, there still remain a number of vacant lots to accommodate future housing.
- The conversion of forestland to other uses has not been of concern primarily because of the vastness of the forest resource, much of it in conservation, within the region.

Community Supported Forestry or Agriculture
- Greenville’s Town Forest consists of 228 acres and is located off the Marsh Farm Road. The forest is managed to produce income for the school.
- With the exception of the Town Forest, there are no other community farm or forestry programs, such as community gardens, farmers’ markets, or community supported agriculture. In concept the Town supports these types of activities but has not actively promoted them.

FORESTRY

Most of Greenville’s land area is covered with forests, and a major portion of these forests are devoted to commercial forestry. Plum Creek with around 8,800 acres in Greenville is the largest landowner in
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95 Plum Creek, a publically-held Real Estate Investment Trust, is a land and timber company whose core business is timber management. The company also manages some of its land for conservation, recreation, natural resources, economic development and community development. Source: http://www.plumcreek
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Greenville, and is also the largest landowner in the Moosehead Lake Region. Most of Plum Creek’s land is located in the southeastern portion of town. While there are several other landowners with considerable acreage in Greenville (Muzzy and Hilton), there are also a number of smaller woodlot owners. Smaller woodlot owners may use their land for a variety of purposes including home sites, timber harvesting for personal use or sale to others, for privacy or buffering from adjacent uses, for wildlife habitat, for scenic value, or for recreation.

There are also businesses in Greenville involved in forestry-related endeavors including foresters, loggers and truckers, lumber dealers, a log house manufacturer, and a few other small scale manufacturers of secondary wood products. Greenville Steam, while currently closed, produced energy using forest products.96

Land Enrolled in the Tree Growth Property Tax Program

The amount of forestland in the Maine Tree Growth Property Tax Program provides some indication of the extent of commercial forest land, even though in some cases land is put into tree growth primarily to reduce property taxes. The Program allows for the assessment of property taxes on forestland to be based on current use rather than market value as long as the land is managed according to the criteria set forth in the law. The law specifies that there must be at least 10 acres of forestland used for commercial harvesting, and that a Forest Management and Harvest Plan be prepared. If the forestland no longer meets the criteria for eligibility, or the landowner opts to withdraw from the Tree Growth classification, then a penalty is applied to recover some of the back property taxes.

There are currently 79 parcels with a total of 15,321 acres of land enrolled in the Tree Growth Program. This amounts to about 56% of Greenville’s land area (excluding water bodies). Land in Tree Growth is identified on Map 12 Forest and Farmland in Appendix B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total (acres)</th>
<th>Softwood (acres)</th>
<th>Mixed-wood (acres)</th>
<th>Hardwood (acres)</th>
<th>Parcels (#)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>15,037</td>
<td>5,816</td>
<td>5,220</td>
<td>4,001</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>15,321</td>
<td>5,208</td>
<td>7,331</td>
<td>2,782</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Property Tax Records, February 2012

The amount of land in Tree Growth has remained about the same over the past decade. In 1997 there were 76 parcels with a total of 15,037 acres registered in Tree Growth.

Commercial Timber Harvests

The Maine Forest Practices Act requires that landowners notify the Maine Bureau of Forestry of any commercial timber harvests, and requires that harvests meet specific standards for activities adjacent to water bodies, clearcutting and forest regeneration. For example, if harvests result in a clearcut larger than 5 acres, there must be a separation zone between clearcuts and regeneration standards must be met. This rule also requires a harvest management plan developed by a licensed forester for clearcuts greater than 20 acres, and prohibits clearcuts greater than 250 acres.

96 See also Chapter II-2 Economy
Data collected in accordance with the Maine Forest Practices Act can be helpful in identifying overall trends, but should be used with caution due to differences in reporting by individuals (see table). Noteworthy is that the total acreage harvested between 2001 and 2010 was 6,705 acres, about 1,000 acres more than the 5,709 acres harvested between 1991 and 2000. Additionally, there were 379 acres harvested for changes in land use (probably for house sites) since 2001 as compared to only 36 acres harvested for changes in land use between 1991 and 2000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Selection Harvest (acres)</th>
<th>Shelterwood Harvest (acres)</th>
<th>Clearcut Harvest (acres)</th>
<th>Total Harvest (acres)</th>
<th>Change of Use (acres)</th>
<th>Number of Active Notifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>1182</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1,036</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,043</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: 2001-2010</td>
<td>2,637</td>
<td>3,358</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>6,705</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: To protect confidentiality, data is reported only where there are three or more landowner reports.

**Key to Headings:** “Selection harvests” remove some trees of all sizes with the goal of encouraging regeneration with a multi-aged stand structure. “Shelterwood harvests” remove trees in 2 or more stages; the initial harvest removes most mature trees leaving enough trees as seed sources and to provide shade for a new generation of trees. “Clearcut harvests” remove most/all the trees in one harvest; regeneration occurs through natural seeding. “Change of Use” is usually removal and sale of trees prior to land clearing for development.
AGRICULTURE

There is very little commercial farming in Greenville. The short growing season, distance from markets and farm services, and the predominance of forestry are reasons for the limited amount of agriculture. Further, there are only a few areas that have prime farmland soils or farmland soils of statewide importance. There are, however, many people with gardens, or who raise a few horses or other livestock for personal use.

This inventory identified only one commercial farm operation: Autumn Brooke Farm on East Road. Autumn Brooke Farm specializes in ornamental floriculture and nursery products. Greenville does not have any farmer’s markets, community supported agriculture (CSAs) or community gardens.

Land Enrolled in the Farmland Property Tax Program

The Maine Farmland Property Tax Program is similar to the Tree Growth Program in that property taxes are assessed based on current use rather than market value if the land remains in agricultural use. In the Farmland Program the property owner is required to have at least five contiguous acres. The land must be used for farming, agriculture, or horticulture, and can include woodland and wasteland. The farmland must contribute at least $2,000 gross income from farming activities each year. If at some point the property no longer qualifies as farmland, then a penalty is assessed.

Autumn Brook Farm off East Road is the only farm enrolled in the Farmland Program. The enrollment consists of two parcels with a combined total of 68 acres (See Map 12 in Appendix B). The amount of land in the Farmland Program has remained about the same over the past decade.

Prime Farmland and Farmland of Statewide Importance

“Prime farmland” has been identified by the U.S. Department of Agriculture as land that is best suited to producing food, feed, forage, fiber and oilseed crops. It has soil quality, growing season, and moisture supply needed to produce a sustained high yield of crops while using acceptable farming methods. Prime Farmland produces the highest yields and requires minimal amounts of energy and economic resources, and farming it results in the least damage to the environment.

“Farmland of Statewide Importance” is land, in addition to prime, that is of statewide significance for the production of food, feed, fiber, forage, and oilseed crops. These lands are generally considered nearly prime farmland and that economically produce a high yield as prime farmlands if conditions are favorable.

Areas with these important farmland soils are displayed on Map 12 Forestry and Farmland in Appendix B.

---
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OVERVIEW
An analysis of land use is one of the most important elements of the Comprehensive Plan because it provides the basis for the Future Land Use Plan. This chapter examines land use patterns, identifies development trends, and predicts where and how much future growth is most likely to occur. The Town's land use regulations and their administration and enforcement are also examined. Key policy issues to be addressed include: to what extent does the Town wish to direct future development; how can the Town best prepare for future development; how does the Town ensure that new development will be compatible with existing uses; and how can the Town assure that new development will not over-tax public facilities and services.

SUMMARY
Recent Development Trends and Consistency with the Town's Vision for the Future
Residential Development: New residential development has been modest over the past decade consisting of about one to two small subdivisions (less than 15 lots each) per year and an average of about 17 new residential units per year (about ½ are second homes). Trends include:

- Most new homes are constructed on subdivision lots as opposed to lots outside of subdivisions.
- Conversion of camps to homes suitable for year-round habitation continues.
- Many new subdivisions are in locations with views; most of the developable and accessible shorefront has been developed.
- Of the sixteen subdivisions permitted over the past decade, three were located in/or near the village, nine were in the Rural Development District and three were in the Rural District.
- There are over 200 vacant subdivision lots where future development can occur. However, many of these lots are purposefully kept vacant by owners for buffering purposes.

Non-residential Development: The Planning Board approved 23 building permits for non-residential uses between 1999 and 2011, or an average of about 2.3 per year. At least five of the 23 were permits for Town uses. Most new non-residential uses were located in either the Village District or the Commercial/Industrial District.

Consistency with the Vision: Development trends have been fairly consistent with the goals of the existing Land Use Ordinance – that is, a large proportion of the development over the past decade has occurred in development districts, including the Rural Development District. Where recent development trends have fallen short of the Town’s vision, is in the overall limited amount of development that has occurred over the past decade.
Part II. Inventory and Analysis

Amount of Land Zoned for Future Growth

Overall, there appears to be adequate land area zoned for future development in Greenville, particularly given that the Town’s vision is to serve as a “growth area” for the region, and to encourage population growth and expand the local economy. The only real constraint is the amount of vacant land available in the village/built-up area on sewer and water.

Regulatory and Non-Regulatory Actions to Promote Development Consistent with the Vision

In general, the Town would like to promote more, good quality development, particularly in areas served by sewer and water. More development is needed to support community services, such as the hospital and schools. The following are suggested regulatory improvements:

- Update Shoreland Zoning to be consistent with existing lot sizes and setbacks, particularly in the Village District.
- Consider amending the Scenic Corridor District to allow more commercial development – setbacks, frontage requirements, landscaping, signage and screening requirements are too restrictive. Scenic views, similar signage and design guidelines would be desirable.
- Consider requiring occupancy permits after looking at the process, standards and costs.
- Consider tightening-up the sign ordinance to support more uniformity; also allow more flexibility for businesses not located along main roads.
- Review road standards; consider requiring an engineer’s road design for proposed roads.
- Consider requiring impact fees for large developments.
- Review the Village District and Residential District standards and ensure that they are flexible enough to permit infill and more dense development.
- Consider design standards for the Village District to assure authentic village character

The most significant non-regulatory land use measure to promote development would be to expand centralized sewer and water. Currently, there is very little vacant land available for additional development that is accessible to sewer and water services. However, some of the existing buildings in the Village District are underutilized and/or in need of renovation.

Administrative Capacity to Manage Land Use Regulation Program

The Town has a full-time certified Code Enforcement Officer (CEO) who is responsible for permitting, compliance, enforcement, and staffing Planning Board and Comprehensive Plan Committee meetings. The Code Enforcement Officer, like other administrative staff, is often called upon to assist the Town Manager which takes him away from his current duties. The Town hires a separate Plumbing Inspector. Administrative capacity is generally adequate at this time, but a significant increase in development might require additional staffing.

Flooding and Floodplain Management

Flooding is not a significant problem in Greenville. The Town’s Floodplain Ordinance is up-to-date with state and federal standards making the Town eligible to participate in the National Flood Insurance Program.
THE SETTING

Geographically, Greenville is a relatively large town consisting of approximately 46.4 square miles, of which 42.5 square miles is land and 3.9 square miles (8.39%) is water. Development in Greenville is most concentrated in and around the village area. Other developed locations include areas along or near the shores of Moosehead Lake including the Highlands, areas along the shores of Lower Wilson Pond including Rum Ridge. Development is also scattered along the Moosehead Lake Road, Lily Bay Road, Pleasant Street, and Scammon Road to the airport and Sawyer Pond. Large expanses of northeastern and southeastern Greenville are working forestlands with few roads. Land use patterns are depicted on Map 2 Aerial and Map 13 Existing Land Use in Appendix B.

RESIDENTIAL LAND USE

Residential uses in Greenville consist of year-round homes, including multi-family structures and mobile home parks, and seasonally-used, second homes. In general, many seasonal camps have been upgraded to homes that could be used year-round. Given that seasonal or part-time use may involve use most times of the year, the following description does not distinguish between year-round and seasonal homes. It is noted, however, that in the last ten years about half of new housing was for seasonal or second-home use.

Most of Greenville’s residential uses are located in the village area, either in residential neighborhoods or in areas with mixed uses. Residential uses in the village include single-family, multifamily (including five subsidized housing complexes), and mobile homes (including two mobile home parks).

There is considerable residential development along the shores and just inland of Moosehead Lake. Residential uses are particularly dense with very small lots along the shore of West Cove. Residential uses on generally slightly larger lots are found along the shores of East Cove, in some places mixed with other uses. Residential uses are also concentrated just north of the village along Moosehead Lake and the west side of Lily Bay Road up to and including the Highlands, an area with very small lots (Ridge Parkway). Residential uses north of the Highlands are typically on larger lots, although there are clusters of small shorefront lots at several locations. There are also several larger lot subdivisions in this area.

Other areas outside the village where there are concentrations of residential uses include residences along and near the shores of Lower Wilson Pond and Sawyer Pond. There are also a few residences along the shores of Upper Wilson Pond and Prong Pond. Rural residential uses are also scattered along the Moosehead Lake Road, upper Lily Bay Road, Scammon Road and Pleasant Street extending to the airport and Lower Wilson Pond.

---

98 U.S Census

99 Chapter II-3 Housing contains information about types of housing, housing conditions and affordability.
Part II. Inventory and Analysis

Additionally, there are two condominium developments, Birch Point Condominiums and Sandy Bay Cottages, and a timeshare development, Moosehead Cottage Resort. In Birch Point Condominiums the land is held in common with seven cottages owned by separate individuals. In Moosehead Cottage Resorts the land is also held in common - including a club house, but ownership of the 14 units is by individuals on a weekly basis. These developments are geared for part-time users. This type of development may become more popular in the future. Another residential land use trend has been the conversion of commercial sporting camps to residential units.

Residential Uses in the Future

According to the Census, the number of housing units in Greenville increased at a rate of 17.2 units per year between 1990 and 2010. Projecting this forward, this translates to 172 additional housing units by the year 2020. Based on past trends, at least half of these new units will be second homes for non-residents. The majority of new homes constructed over the past decade have been placed on subdivision lots rather than non-subdivision lots. Many of these have been sited on lots with views. This trend will likely continue, particularly since there are at least 200 vacant subdivision lots.

Subdivision Activity

A review of subdivision activity (three or more lots within a five year period) provides additional information on where recent residential growth has occurred. The table on the next several pages lists subdivisions approved by the Planning Board between the years of 1986 and 2011.

Subdivisions 1980s and 1990s

Subdivision activity during the 1980s and 1990s was mostly in rural areas and along the shores of ponds, including Moosehead Lake, Lower Wilson Pond and Sawyer Pond. The Lily Bay Road and to a lesser extent Moosehead Lake Road also experienced considerable subdivision activity. Most housing development during these decades occurred in these subdivisions.

Subdivisions 1999 to 2011

Sixteen subdivisions (some in multiple phases) for a combined total of 146 lots were approved between 1999 and 2011. There were no subdivisions approved in 2010 or 2011. The subdivisions during this decade were relatively small - less than 15 lots. This averages out to about one to two small subdivisions per year. Only one of the subdivisions had frontage on a lake. Most of the lake frontage on Moosehead Lake, and buildable areas around Lower Wilson Pond has been developed. At least six of the subdivisions had views of mountains and/or Moosehead Lake. Of the sixteen subdivisions, three were located in/or near the village, nine were in the Rural Development District and three were in the Rural District.

Subdivisions in the Future

If trends over the past decade continue, it is likely that there will continue to be one or two small subdivisions per year with most located in rural areas with views. As Prong Pond and Upper Wilson Pond become more accessible, more development may occur in these areas.
### Approved Subdivisions as of March 1, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Developer/Subdivision Name</th>
<th>Map, Lot, Location</th>
<th>Lots/Units</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Dwellings/Buildings</th>
<th>Vacant Lots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Chubbuck</td>
<td>M.37, L.20's (Nelson Ave/Alice Dr)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Moosehead Properties (J. Devlin)</td>
<td>M.10, L.13 (Moosehead Lake/Sloper Ln)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Rum Ridge Farms</td>
<td>M.6, L.3 (L. Wilson Pond)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Rum Ridge (128 acres open space, 8,200 feet shoreline)</td>
<td>M. 44-45 (L. Wilson Pond)</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Rum Ridge Farms</td>
<td>M.6, L.3 (L. Wilson Pond)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Russell Crosby</td>
<td>M.1, L.3 (Wildberry Lane)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Tom Knapp</td>
<td>M.10, L.25 (Lily Bay Rd/Hilltop Dr)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Greenville Industrial Park</td>
<td>M.7, L.3 (In-town Greenville)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Birch Point Condominiums</td>
<td>M.29, L.49 (Moosehead/Birch Pt. Rd)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Wayne Shaw</td>
<td>M.35, L.19 &amp; 20's (Shoals Rd)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Sandy Bay Cottages (Condos)</td>
<td>M.37, L.15 (Moosehead Lake/Sandy Bay Rd)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-*</td>
<td>-*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>John and Bea Gray</td>
<td>M.1, L.12 (Rt 15, south)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Knapp Acres (split another lot later)</td>
<td>M.12, L.7 &amp; 13 (Lily Bay Rd)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>McBrierarty/Moosehead Isle Estates (phases 2 &amp; 3)</td>
<td>M.10, L.15 (Lily Bay Rd)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Bristol Bay (lot split later)</td>
<td>M.12, L.10 (Nelson Ave)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Ken Hughes/Nancy Bligh</td>
<td>M.8, L.26 (Sawyer Pd/Highlands)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Jacques Benetar</td>
<td>M.1, L.9 (Rt 15, south)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Jacques Benetar</td>
<td>M.1, L.14 (Rt 15, south)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Jacques Benetar</td>
<td>M.1, L.15 (Rt 15, south)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Jacques Benetar</td>
<td>M.1, L.14 (Rt 15, south)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Moosehead Cottage Resort (Timeshares)</td>
<td>(Rte 15, south)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Milbrook</td>
<td>McAfee St</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>West Cove Pt.</td>
<td>M.7, L 14-1-14-7 (Birch St/Craft Rd) (Residential District)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Sub-total | 126 |

(Continued on next page)
Approved Subdivisions as of March 1, 2012 (continued from prior page)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Developer/Subdivision Name</th>
<th>Map, Lot, Location (District)</th>
<th>Lots/Units</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Dwellings/Buildings</th>
<th>Vacant Lots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Birchshire Acres (Bay View Drive)</td>
<td>Upper Lily Bay Rd (Rural Dev. Dist.)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Otter Ridge (William Eurich)</td>
<td>M.10, L.23-1-23-8 (Upper Lily Bay Rd) (Rural Dev. Dist.)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Woods at Scammon Ridge</td>
<td>Hawksholm Trail (Off Upper Lily Bay Rd) (Rural Dev. Dist.)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Hedberg Subdivision</td>
<td>Rainbow Rd, Lower Wilson Pd. (Rural Dist.)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Santos’s Subdivision (Wilson View)</td>
<td>M.5, LSB1-5B14 (Wilson View) (Rural Dist.)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Santos</td>
<td>Ledge Drive</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Eagle Stream</td>
<td>M.5, L.5 C1-13 Eagle Stream (Rural Dist.)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Grand View Estates</td>
<td>Upper Lily Bay Rd. (Rural Dev. Dist.)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Alpine Ridge Estates (phase 1)</td>
<td>Alpine Ridge, Moosehead Lake Rd near Shirley (Rural Dev. District)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/2008</td>
<td>Boucher Subdivision (phases 1,2 &amp; 3)</td>
<td>Bushey Rd, Moosehead Lake Rd near Shirley (Rural Dev. Dist.)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Summerfield Subdivision (Collins) - never developed</td>
<td>Pleasant Street (Rural Dev. Dist.)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Spencer Lots Subdivision</td>
<td>Washington Street (village)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Lily Bay Rd Subdivision (Butman)</td>
<td>Lily Bay Road (Rural Dev. Dist.)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Overlook Drive (Santos)</td>
<td>Overlook Drive (Kineo) (Rural Dev. Dist.)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Thorell Park - RV sites</td>
<td>Thoreau Drive (near village)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-*</td>
<td>-*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>460</td>
<td>1,873</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not included in Totals  

### COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL USES

Commercial uses are most prevalent and concentrated within the village along Pritham Avenue, Lily Bay Road and the Moosehead Lake Road. Village commercial uses also extend along side streets, such as Minden, Pleasant and Washington Streets. There are also several water-dependent, commercial uses (marina, boat repair and rentals, seaplane bases, etc.) along the shoreline of Moosehead Lake within the village. Commercial uses in the village are often intermixed with residential, recreational, public and

---

1. **COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL USES**
2. See Chapter II-2 Economy for a listing of businesses and industries.
semi-public uses. Commercial development is also located along the Moosehead Lake Road, particularly at Indian Hill.

Several of the Town’s industrial uses are located in the Industrial Park. There are also several public uses in the Industrial Park, such as the Town’s Public Works Department and Transfer Station. Greenville Steam, the largest industry in Greenville, closed around 2007/08. It was purchased by a new owner and was in operation for two years, but then closed again, and is currently for sale.

As displayed in the following table, the Planning Board approved 23 building permits for non-residential uses between 1999 and 2011, or an average of about 2 per year. Most of these permits were for uses located in development districts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Business/Organization</th>
<th>Location (Zoning District)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Bangor Savings Bank</td>
<td>Lily Bay Road (Village District)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Moosehead Hill Cabins (William Foley)</td>
<td>Lily Bay Road (views of Moosehead) (Rural Dev. Dist.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Graves Seafood (Robert Graves)</td>
<td>Pritham Avenue (Village District)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Town Garage</td>
<td>Industrial Park (Commercial/Industrial District)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Moosehead Chalet (Paul Mlodzianoski)</td>
<td>Pritham Avenue (Village District)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Northern Associates (Marion McManus)</td>
<td>Moosehead Lake Road (Village District)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Pepin Associates (John Pepin)</td>
<td>Industrial Park (Commercial/Industrial District)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Mechanics Shop (Joe Pelletier)</td>
<td>Industrial Park (Commercial/Industrial District)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Plum Creek Office</td>
<td>Pritham Avenue (Village District)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Century 21 (Joe Diangelo)</td>
<td>Moosehead Lake Road (Village District)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>David Vaughn/Patricia Huckins (Cabins)</td>
<td>Prong Pond (Rural District)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Storage/Garage (Walter Secatore)</td>
<td>Industrial Park (Commercial/Industrial District)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Winter maintenance building (airport)</td>
<td>Airport District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Incubator Building</td>
<td>Industrial Park (Commercial/Industrial District)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Greenville Town Office</td>
<td>Minden Street (Village District)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Recycling Center (Sean Bolen)</td>
<td>Industrial Park (Commercial/Industrial District)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Moosehead Mtn. Candle (Sandy Appaneal)</td>
<td>Moosehead Lake Road (Village District)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Storage Building (Town)</td>
<td>Minden Street (Village District)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Premium Choice Broadband (Tower)</td>
<td>Overlook Drive (Rural Dev. District)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Small Saw Mill (Ira Gray)</td>
<td>Industrial Park (Commercial/Industrial District)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Dr's Office</td>
<td>Hospital, Pritham Ave. (Village District)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Moosehead Rubbish - Recycling Center expansion (Sean Bolen)</td>
<td>Industrial Park (Commercial/Industrial District)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Airport Arrivals Building</td>
<td>Airport District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Natural Resources Education Center/Visitors’ Ctr.</td>
<td>Moosehead Lake Road (Rural Dev./Scenic Corridor)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Town Staff; Building Permits
PUBLIC AND SEMI-PUBLIC USES

1 As is typical of service center communities, Greenville has a wealth of public and semi-public uses including government facilities, utilities, the hospital, service and veteran’s organizations, churches and parsonages, and other non-profit organizations. The majority of these uses are located within the village. The following table is an inventory of public and semi-public uses.

5 Town-Owned Property
- Town Office and Parking Lot
- Industrial Park (three vacant lots)
- Public Works Department
- Main Street Parking Lot
- Minden Street Parking Lot
- Fire Department
- Transfer Station
- Shaw Public Library
- Greenville Consolidated School Campus
- Moosehead Lake Visitor’s Center
- Junction Wharf
- Red Cross Beach
- Thoreau Park
- Preo Park
- Pine Grove Playground
- Tennis Courts
- Airport
- Town Woodlot
- Greenville Cemetery
- Old Town Dumps, Scammon Road and Maple Street

Quasi-Municipal Property
- Moosehead Sanitary District, Facility, Pump Stations and Sewage Disposal Area
- Maine Water Company Building, Facility, Wells and Water District Reservoir

Federal Government
- Greenville Post Office
- Greenville Junction Post Office

State Government
- Maine Inland Fisheries and Wildlife Regional Office
- Maine Department of Agriculture, Conservation and Forestry
- Maine Bureau of Public Lands Sawyer Pond and Wilson Pond Boat Accesses

Other Semi-public
- Charles A. Dean Hospital
- Natural Resources Education Center Office
- Moosehead Historical Society and Museums
- Moosehead Marine Museum
- Moosehead Riders Clubhouse
- American Legion
- Masonic Temple
- Appalachian Mountain Club Office

Churches
- Greenville Baptist Church
- Holy Family Catholic Church and Rectory
- Methodist Church and Parsonage
- Church of the Open Bible
- Union Church and Parsonage
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HOME OCCUPATIONS
1. Home occupations are common in Greenville. Many of the businesses in town are located within people’s homes or on the same property as the residence. Home occupations will most likely continue as people in this rural community continue to seek sources of income close to home, and with limited overhead. The seasonal nature of many businesses may make the home occupation option more viable than a separate business location.

GREENVILLE’S LAND USE REGULATIONS

Overview
The Town has two locally-adopted ordinances that deal with land use: (1) the Land Use Ordinance that includes town-wide and shoreland zoning, and subdivision regulations and (2) the Floodplain Management Ordinance. Both shoreland zoning and subdivision regulations are state-mandated and must be administered according to statute.\textsuperscript{101} The Floodplain Ordinance enables the Town and its residents to participate in the federal flood insurance program. The Town also administers the state-mandated Minimum Lot Size Law, Maine Subsurface Wastewater Disposal Law and the Maine Plumbing Code. The town-wide zoning is a local option, but state law requires that the ordinance be consistent with a comprehensive plan prepared in accordance with the Growth Management Act.\textsuperscript{102}

Land Use Ordinance
The Town’s first town-wide land use ordinance was enacted in 1988. In 2001 the current “Land Use Ordinance for the Town of Greenville” was enacted. As a unified ordinance it contains town-wide zoning, shoreland zoning and subdivision regulations, all combined into one ordinance. Both the Town’s 1999 Comprehensive Plan and 2001 Land Use Ordinance were deemed consistent with Maine’s Growth Management Act at that time.

The Land Use Ordinance consists of the following growth area districts: Village, Residential, Commercial/Industrial, Airport, and Rural Development. Rural area districts are the Rural District and the Resource Protection District. In addition there are three overlay districts: the Shoreland Zoning Overlays, the Scenic Corridor Overlay and the Groundwater Protection Overlay. Shoreland Zoning includes overlays to nearly all of the underlying districts (i.e., Village Shoreland, Residential Shoreland, etc.), and an expanded shoreland district, the Critical Watershed District. The following is a summary of the purpose and primary dimensional requirements for each district. (See Map 16 Zoning in Appendix B):

- The Airport District accommodates the airport and associated uses.
- The Residential District accommodates higher density residential uses while ensuring a wholesome living environment. Development may not exceed two dwelling units per 10,000 sq. ft. in areas with sewer, and one dwelling unit per 20,000 sq. ft. without sewer.

\textsuperscript{101} Mandatory Shoreland Zoning Act (38 MRSA Sec 435 et seq.), Subdivisions (30-A MRSA Sec 4401 et seq.)
\textsuperscript{102} Growth Management Act (30-A MRSA Sec 4312 et seq.)
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- The Village District allows higher-density mixed uses, including a variety of housing types, while assuring a quality environment for residential, selected retail and other light-commercial uses. The secondary purpose is to preserve the traditional character, architecture, and blend of uses that make up developed village areas. Development may not exceed two dwelling units per 10,000 sq. ft. with sewer, and one dwelling unit per 20,000 sq. ft. without sewer.

- The Commercial/Industrial District provides land conveniently located with access to transportation facilities for business and industrial activities that must be separated from residential uses to prevent undesirable conflicts and minimize traffic congestion. Minimum lot sizes are 20,000 sq. ft. with sewer, and 40,000 sq. ft. without sewer.

- The Rural Development District accommodates low to medium-density rural residential and commercial development that requires larger lots than available within the village, and a more rural setting. This district provides a regional growth area designed to accommodate the demand for second and seasonal residences, recreational accommodations and services for the transient population of the region. The minimum lot size is 40,000 sq.ft.

- The Rural District preserves rural areas that have traditionally been forests and open areas that are generally characterized by large parcels. This district is best suited to low-density single-family dwellings, farms, open space, and forestlands. Development may not exceed one dwelling unit per 40,000 sq.ft. Natural resource based industries, home occupations and other low-intensity recreational, commercial and residential uses are permitted with restrictions on size and impacts. The minimum lot size is 40,000 sq.ft.

- The Resource Protection District includes areas where most types of development are restricted to protect water quality, productive wildlife habitat, biological ecosystems, or scenic and natural values. It generally includes wetlands, steep slopes, highly erodible soils, important wildlife habitat and floodplains as regulated through shoreland zoning.

- The Shoreland Zoning Overlay District includes all other shoreland areas as regulated through state shoreland zoning. Greenville has an additional Critical Watershed Overlay (750 ft. zone around specific ponds) for added protection to ponds particularly susceptible to degradation. Shoreland overlay zones are often more stringent than the underlying zone.

- The Scenic Corridor Overlay District accommodates primarily commercial activities (residential uses are allowed) located within 500 feet of both sides of the Moosehead Lake Road south of the Village District to the Shirley-Greenville town line. The District requires attractive development designs (e.g., signage, landscaping, maintenance of existing vegetative buffers and parking in the rear) and access management strategies (e.g., shared driveways, limits on curb cuts) designed to address traffic safety issues and highway capacity. The road frontage must be at least 200 ft., minimum residential building setbacks are 75 ft. and minimum commercial/non-residential setbacks are 100 ft. from the Moosehead Lake Road.

- The Groundwater Protection Overlay District protects identified high-yield groundwater aquifers by restricting certain land use activities, such as the disposal or storage of solid wastes, sludge, subsurface waste disposal, road salting materials, gas or other petroleum products.

---

103 The Critical Watershed Overlay District is associated with the following ponds: Sawyer, Prong, Grenell, Rum, Little Mud, Secret, Salmon and Mud.
The Land Use Ordinance also contains design and performance standards applicable to most uses:

- Land Not Included in Calculating Lot Area
- Water Supply and Quality
- Sewage Disposal
- Storm Water Runoff
- Erosion and Sedimentation Control
- Solid Waste Disposal
- Traffic Access, Circulation and Parking
- Buffer Areas
- Recreational Facilities, Campgrounds, and Parks and Recreation
- Home Occupations
- Signs
- Historic and Archaeological Sites
- Conformance with Other Laws, Regulations
- Cluster Development: Residential and/or Non-Residential
- Reservation, Dedication and Maintenance of Common Open Space and Facilities

There are additional performance standards for shoreland zoning and subdivisions. The Town’s Floodplain Management Ordinance requires a permit for any construction or other development, including the placement of manufactured homes, within any area of an established flood area. Certain development standards must be followed, such as a design that prevents flotation, collapse or lateral movement of the structure; the use of materials that are resistant to flood damage; the design and placement of sewage systems so as to minimize infiltration of floodwaters and discharge of sewage into the floodwaters; and special rules for mobile homes.

**Administrative Capacity**

The Town currently has a full-time certified Code Enforcement Officer (CEO) who is responsible for the following: permitting, compliance and enforcement; staffing Planning Board and Comprehensive Plan Comprehensive Plan Committee meetings. The Town hires a separate Plumbing Inspector. While there appears to be adequate administrative capacity for land use planning and regulation at this time, significant increases in development activity could create the need for additional capacity.

**Amount of Land Needed for Future Growth**

The most suitable areas for future growth are those areas with the following characteristics: few development constraints; least likely to impact sensitive or important natural resources; for commercial and industrial uses, located to serve their economic needs; convenient and cost-effective for the public; and cost-effective for the provision of public services (e.g., roads, sewer, water, etc.). Fortunately, there are areas in Greenville that meet these criteria. (See Map 14 Development Constraints and Map 15 Soil Potential for Low Density Development in the Appendix B.)

Overall, there appears to be adequate land area zoned for future development in Greenville, particularly given that the Town’s vision is to serve as a “growth area” for the region, and to encourage population growth and expand the local economy.
Appendix A. Opinion Survey Results

The public opinion survey, conducted in April and May 2012 as a part of the Comprehensive Plan, was distributed to 1,750 year-round residents and non-resident property owners (seasonal/second home owners, business owners and other landowners). A total of 664 completed surveys were returned for an overall response rate of 38%, which is excellent. There were 360 year-round resident responses (54% of the total responses) and 304 non year-round resident responses (46% of total responses). A number of year-round residents indicated they also have a cottage or second home in Greenville. Other respondents indicated they have a primary residence in Greenville but spend part of the year elsewhere. Anyone who completed question #2 below was tabulated as a year-round resident.

The percentages recorded below were calculated by dividing the number of responses to the particular question response by the total number of survey respondents for each group. Percentages may not add up to 100% for each question because not all survey respondents answered every question. Non-year-round residents were more likely to either not respond to a question or indicate “neutral or no opinion”, which should be considered when examining the results. Many people wrote comments on the surveys. These are included in a separate document.

The following survey responses are separated into two parts: Part 1. Year-round Resident Responses and Part 2. Non-resident Responses.

Part 1. Year-round Resident Responses

[Percents (%) are the percentage of respondents selecting the response]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. How would you rate the overall quality of life in Greenville? Check one response with an (X) in the box under your response.</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Neutral or No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. If your primary residence is in Greenville, why do you live in Greenville? Check all that apply.
   a. It is a rural community - 50%
   b. It is a nice place to retire - 45%
   c. My family and friends live in Greenville - 38%
   d. It is a good place to raise children - 29%
   e. I have always lived in Greenville - 27%
   f. Most everything I need I get in Greenville - 26%
   g. It is close to work - 19%
   h. I also own a business in Greenville - 17%
   i. I also own a camp in Greenville - 11%
   j. Other - 6%

3. If you are a seasonal or second home resident, why is your second home or camp in Greenville? [Some year-round residents also answered this question.] Check all that apply.
   a. The recreational opportunities are great! - 6%
   b. I plan to live full-time in Greenville in the future - 6%
   c. I have friends who live/vacation in Greenville - 5%
   d. I have always had a second home/camp in Greenville - 4%
   e. My family lives in Greenville - 3%
   f. I would like to live full-time in Greenville, but can’t find a job - 1%
   g. Other - 1%

4. Do you have a business or own land in Greenville? Check all that apply.
   Have a business                                                                                                             | 28%      | Own land, only | Other |
   Own land, only                                                                                                              | <3%      | 6%              |
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#### 5. Thinking about the next ten years, what do you think about each of the following? *Check one for each.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Need a lot more</th>
<th>Need some more</th>
<th>Stay the same</th>
<th>Need some less</th>
<th>Need a lot less</th>
<th>Neutral/No opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Year-round population</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Part-time population with second homes</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Tourism and day visitors, overall</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Homes in the village/built-up area</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Homes in rural areas</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Subsidized affordable housing</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Subsidized senior housing</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Housing affordable to local people</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Businesses (goods/services)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Industries</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Job opportunities</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Locally grown food; farmers’ market</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Public access to open space</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Public access to lakes and ponds</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Community Events</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Tourist attractions – recreational, cultural, accommodations, etc.</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Health care services</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Recreation facilities/programs for children</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. Recreation facilities/programs for teens</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. Recreation facilities/programs for adults</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u. Recreation facilities/ programs for seniors</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6. What services do you obtain on a regular basis in places outside of Greenville? *Check as many as apply.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Medical</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>Other - 17% (See Comments) Responses included household items, groceries, clothing, medical, dental, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Accounting</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Legal</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Building supplies</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Auto repair</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7. Which of the following types of business would you like to see in Greenville in the future? *Check as many as apply.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Automatic car wash</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Other - 20% (See Comments) Responses included downhill ski area, employment-related businesses/industries, recreation-related businesses, more restaurants, more retail (grocery, clothing, household items), etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Miniature golf</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Bowling alley</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Theater</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Conference/event center</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Shorefront fuel services for boats</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. For-hire transportation (taxi, limo, vehicle rentals)</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Part II. Inventory and Analysis

8. Please rate the following services/facilities. *Check one response for each question.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service/Facility</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Neutral or No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Town government, overall</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Town financial management</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Town Office customer service</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Town Office (building)</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Economic development efforts</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Public education for grades K to 12</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Downtown, in general</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Sidewalks</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Public parking</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Traffic circulation in the downtown</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Ambulance service</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Fire protection</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Police protection</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Public road maintenance (not snow removal)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Snowplowing and sanding</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Recycling (curbside pick-up)</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Private recycling center</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Solid waste disposal (curbside pick-up)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. Transfer station (solid waste)</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. C.A. Dean Hospital</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u. Northwoods Health Care</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Doctors</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w. Public water service (Maine Water Company)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x. Public sewer service (Moosehead Sanitary District)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y. Greenville Airport</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z. Greenville Library</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aa. Community Events</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bb. Amount of money neighboring communities and county are contributing to Greenville for services</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cc. Land Use Regulation</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dd. Local Code Enforcement</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ee. Town Sponsored Recreation Programs</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ff. Playgrounds</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gg. Parks/picnic areas</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hh. Tennis courts</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Basketball courts</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jj. Athletic fields/ball fields</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kk. Beaches/swimming areas</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ll. Boat ramps/launching areas</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm. Skateboard park</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nn. Ice skating rink</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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9. The following public facility and/or service needs have been identified. Some improvements may support future growth and development. What priority would you give to each of the following actions? Check one response for each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>High Priority</th>
<th>Medium Priority</th>
<th>Low Priority</th>
<th>Not a Priority</th>
<th>Neutral/Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Increase amount of space at Town Office by moving the Police Dept. in with the Fire Department where space is available.</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Increase Police Department staffing</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Establish full-time paid Fire Chief</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Increase Recreation Director hours</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Improve the downtown (more parking, better signage, aesthetics, traffic circulation, etc.)</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Expand sewer and water service to/in the industrial park</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Expand sewer service area to accommodate future growth</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Expand water service area to accommodate future growth</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Bring high speed internet service to Greenville</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Study bypass between Route 15 (Moosehead Lake Road) and Dyer Road to reduce truck traffic in the downtown</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Improve/expand pedestrian and bicycle facilities, sidewalks, road shoulders, trails, etc.</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Increase regional/inter-local cooperation and collaboration</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Improve/expand multi-use motorized trails (snowmobile/ATV)</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Improve public access to lakes, ponds</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Bring more business to Greenville</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Provide development assistance to businesses and industries</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Have the Economic Development Committee meet more often</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Establish Town Economic Develop. Director (at least part-time)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. Create a Multi-use Trail around Moosehead Lake</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. Develop a Community/Recreation Center</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u. Obtain a grant to upgrade substandard housing</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Should the Town of Greenville provide curb-side trash pick-up?
Check one.
- a. Yes  79%
- b. No  15%

11. Do you think Greenville’s schools should be changed? If so, which of the following options might you support? Check as many responses as you might support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. No Change is needed</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Keep Greenville’s Schools as they are, but make improvements</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Develop a Charter School</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Tuition all students to another school district</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Tuition just high school students to another district and maintain elementary levels in Greenville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other suggestions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Property Taxes: (Check one response for each question)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Much too high</th>
<th>Too high</th>
<th>About right</th>
<th>Too low</th>
<th>Neutral/No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. What is your opinion about the amount of property taxes raised for municipal services (not including education) in Greenville?</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. What is your opinion about the amount of property taxes raised for education in Greenville? Check one.</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### 13. What priority would you give to each of the following land use policies? Check one for each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>High Priority</th>
<th>Medium Priority</th>
<th>Low Priority</th>
<th>Not a Priority</th>
<th>Neutral/Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Protect residences from new commercial and industrial development</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Encourage new/expanded businesses in the downtown/village</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Encourage businesses along the Moosehead Lake Road south of the village</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Consider aesthetics (Design Standards) associated with development (landscaping, signage, building design, etc.)</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Discourage franchises and big box store development, such as McDonalds &amp; Wal-Mart</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Limit the size of large retail businesses - for example don’t allow retail business larger than 75,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Provide incentives to encourage manufacturing consistent with Greenville’s character.</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Protect/conserve historic and archaeological resources</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Protect water quality (lake, ponds, streams)</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Protect scenic views, areas and aesthetics</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Protect wildlife and fisheries habitat</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Control the impacts of wind farms</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Regulate adult businesses</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Regulate the use of fireworks</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Amend town sign ordinance to support businesses while enhancing community character.</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 14. The following questions will help us better understand the results of this survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Where is your year-round or summer residence located within Greenville? Check all that apply.</td>
<td>47% Area served by public water and/or sewer 49% Area not served by public water and/or sewer 18% Along the shores of a lake or pond 7% Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. If you are a seasonal/part-time resident, what times of the year do you reside in Greenville? Check all that apply.</td>
<td>10% Spring 12% Summer 11% Fall 8% Winter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. What is your employment status? Check all that apply.</td>
<td>26% Self-employed 29% Salaried or hourly employee 2% Unemployed, looking for work 1% Unemployed, not looking for work 47% Retired 3% Other (specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. What is your present age? Check the appropriate age range.</td>
<td>0% 18 to 25 11% 26 to 44 43% 45 to 64 43% 65 or over</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Part 2. Non-Resident Property Owners (seasonal/second home owners, business owners and other landowners)

[Per cents (%) are the percentage of respondents selecting the response]

1. How would you rate the overall quality of life in Greenville? Check one response with an (x) in the box under your response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Neutral / No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Not applicable.

3. If you are a seasonal or second home resident, why is your second home or camp in Greenville? Check all that apply.
   a. The recreational opportunities are great! - 55%
   b. I have always had a second home/camp in Greenville - 32%
   c. I have friends who live/vacation in Greenville - 26%
   d. I plan to live full-time in Greenville in the future - 17%
   e. My family lives in Greenville - 11%
   f. I would like to live full-time in Greenville, but can’t find a job - 7%
   g. Other - 12%

4. Do you have a business or own land in Greenville? Check all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have business</th>
<th>Own land, only</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Thinking about the next ten years, what do you think about each of the following? Check one for each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need a lot more</th>
<th>Need some more</th>
<th>Stay the same</th>
<th>Need some less</th>
<th>Need a lot less</th>
<th>Neutral / No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Year-round population</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Part-time population with second homes</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Tourism and day visitors, overall</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Homes in the village/built-up area</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Homes in rural areas</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Subsidized affordable housing</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Subsidized senior housing</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Housing affordable to local people</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Businesses (goods/services)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Industries</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Job opportunities</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Locally grown food; farmers’ market</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Public access to open space</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Public access to lakes and ponds</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Community Events</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Tourist attractions – recreational, cultural, accommodations, etc.</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Health care services</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Recreation facilities/programs for children</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. Recreation facilities/programs for teens</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. Recreation facilities/programs for adults</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u. Recreation facilities/programs for seniors</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part II. Inventory and Analysis

6. What services do you obtain on a regular basis in places outside of Greenville?
   Check as many as apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Medical</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Accounting</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Legal</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Building supplies</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Auto repair</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9% (See Comments)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Most non-residents did not respond to this question, or responded that it was not applicable. The percentages recorded are those that did check the responses. Comments were similar to resident comments.

7. Which of the following types of business would you like to see in Greenville in the future?
   Check as many as apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Automatic car wash</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Miniature golf</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Bowling alley</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Theater</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Conference/event center</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Shorefront fuel services for boats</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. For-hire transportation (taxi, limo, vehicle rentals)</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16% (See Comments)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments were similar to resident comments.

8. Please rate the following services/facilities. Check one response for each question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Neutral/No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Town government, overall</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Town financial management</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Town Office customer service</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Town Office (building)</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Economic development efforts</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Public education for grades K to 12</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Downtown, in general</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Sidewalks</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Public parking</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Traffic circulation in the downtown</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Ambulance service</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Fire protection</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Police protection</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Public road maintenance (not snow removal)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Snowplowing and sanding</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Recycling (curbside pick-up)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Private recycling center</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Solid waste disposal (curbside pick-up)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. Transfer station (solid waste)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. C.A. Dean Hospital</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u. Northwoods Health Care</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Doctors</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w. Public water service (Maine Water Company)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x. Public sewer service (Moosehead Sanitary Dis.)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y. Greenville Airport</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z. Greenville Library</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aa. Community Events</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bb. Amount of money neighboring towns &amp; county are contributing to Greenville for services</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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8. Please rate the following services/facilities. *Check one response for each question.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service/Facility</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Needs Improvement</th>
<th>Neutral/No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Land Use Regulation</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Local Code Enforcement</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Town Sponsored Recreation Programs</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Playgrounds</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Parks/picnic areas</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Tennis courts</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Basketball courts</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Athletic fields.ball fields</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Beaches/swimming areas</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Boat ramps/launching areas</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Skateboard park</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Ice skating rink</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. The following public facility and/or service needs have been identified. Some improvements may support future growth and development. What priority would you give to each of the following actions? *Check one response for each.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>High Priority</th>
<th>Medium Priority</th>
<th>Low Priority</th>
<th>Not a Priority</th>
<th>Neutral/Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Increase amount of space at Town Office by moving the Police Dept. in with the Fire Department where space is available.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Increase Police Department staffing</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Establish full-time paid Fire Chief</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Increase Recreation Director hours</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Improve the downtown (more parking, better signage, aesthetics, traffic circulation, etc.)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Expand sewer and water service to/in the industrial park</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Expand sewer service area to accommodate future growth</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Expand water service area to accommodate future growth</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Bring high speed internet service to Greenville</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Study bypass between Route 15 (Moosehead Lake Road) and Dyer Road to reduce truck traffic in the downtown</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Improve/expand pedestrian and bicycle facilities, sidewalks, road shoulders, trails, etc.</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Increase regional/inter-local cooperation and collaboration</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Improve/expand multi-use motorized trails (snowmobile/ATV)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Improve public access to lakes, ponds</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Bring more business to Greenville</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Provide development assistance to businesses and industries</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Have the Economic Development Committee meet more often</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Establish Town Economic Develop. Director (at least part-time)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s. Create a Multi-use Trail around Moosehead Lake</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t. Develop a Community/Recreation Center</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u. Obtain a grant to upgrade substandard housing</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Should the Town of Greenville provide curb-side trash pick-up? *Check one.*

- [ ] a. Yes
- [ ] b. No

---
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# Part II. Inventory and Analysis

11. Do you think Greenville’s schools should be changed? If so, which of the following options might you support? *Check as many responses as you might support.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>14%</th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>41%</th>
<th>9%</th>
<th>11%</th>
<th>6%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>No Change is needed</td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Keep Greenville’s Schools as they are, but make improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td>c. Develop a Charter School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Tuition all students to another school district</td>
<td></td>
<td>e. Tuition just high school students to another district and maintain elementary levels in Greenville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Property Taxes: (Check one response for each question)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Much too high</th>
<th>Too high</th>
<th>About right</th>
<th>Too low</th>
<th>Neutral/ No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. What is your opinion about the amount of property taxes raised for municipal services (not including education) in Greenville?</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. What is your opinion about the amount of property taxes raised for education in Greenville?</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. What priority would you give to each of the following land use policies? *Check one for each.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Policy</th>
<th>High Priority</th>
<th>Medium Priority</th>
<th>Low Priority</th>
<th>Not a Priority</th>
<th>Neutral/ Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Protect residences from new commercial and industrial development</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Encourage new/expanded businesses in the downtown/village</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Encourage businesses along the Moosehead Lake Road south of the village</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Consider aesthetics (Design Standards) associated with development (landscaping, signage, building design, etc.)</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Discourage franchises and big box store development, such as McDonalds &amp; Wal-Mart</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Limit the size of large retail businesses- for example don’t allow retail business larger than 75,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Provide incentives to encourage manufacturing consistent with Greenville’s character.</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Protect/conserve historic and archaeological resources</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Protect water quality (lake, ponds, streams)</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Protect scenic views, areas and aesthetics</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Protect wildlife and fisheries habitat</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Control the impacts of wind farms</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Regulate adult businesses</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Regulate the use of fireworks</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Amend town sign ordinance to support businesses while enhancing community character.</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. The following questions will help us better understand the results of this survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Where is your year-round or summer residence located within Greenville?</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Area served by public water and/or sewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>Area not served by public water and/or sewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>Along the shores of a lake or pond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. If you are a seasonal/part-time resident, what times of the year do you reside in Greenville?</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>Summer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>Fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>Winter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. What is your employment status? Check all that apply.</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>Self-employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>Salaried or hourly employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Unemployed, looking for work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>Unemployed, not looking for work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>Retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. What is your present age? Check the appropriate age range.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>18 to 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>26 to 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>45 to 64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>65 or over</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix B. Maps
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