TOWN OF SOUTH THOMASTON  ) NATURAL RESOURCES PROTECTION ACT
South Thomaston, Knox County  ) ADJACENT TO COASTAL WETLAND
ROAD RECONSTRUCTION  ) FRESHWATER WETLAND ALTERATION
L-29291-2F-A-N (approval)  ) WATER QUALITY CERTIFICATION
L-29291-2G-B-N (approval)  ) FINDINGS OF FACT AND ORDER

Pursuant to the provisions of 38 M.R.S. §§ 480-A–480-JJ, Section 401 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. § 1341), and Chapters 310 & 315 of Department rules, the Department of Environmental Protection has considered the application of TOWN OF SOUTH THOMASTON the supportive data, agency review comments, and other related materials on file and FINDS THE FOLLOWING FACTS:

1. **PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

   A. **Summary:** The applicant proposes to raise and repave approximately 1,075 linear feet over two portions of Island Road to make it more resilient to natural storm events.

   The western section of roadway is located directly adjacent to the intersection of Island Road and Village Road. The applicant proposes to repave approximately 450 linear feet of roadway and raise the road approximately two feet at the lowest point. Additionally, the applicant proposes to construct a three-foot-wide gravel shoulder, remove, and replace the existing guardrail along the west side of the road, replace and install new culverts, and stabilize the southwest side of Island Road with riprap. The proposed riprap will result in 279 square feet of freshwater wetland impact in wetlands of special significance (WOSS) due to being within 250 feet of Highest Annual Tide (HAT).

   The eastern section of roadway is located adjacent to the intersection of Island Road and Seal Cove Road. The applicant proposes to repave approximately 625 linear feet of roadway and raise the road approximately 2 feet at the lowest point. Additionally, the applicant proposes to install a new guardrail along the east side of the road, replace and install new culverts, and stabilize the east side of Island Road with riprap. The proposed riprap will result in 609 square feet of freshwater wetland impact, for a cumulative total of 888 square feet of freshwater wetland impacts within WOSS between both sites.

   The proposed riprap to stabilize the slope will be with 18-inch angular stones. The stabilization design for the shoreline will include placed stone riprap no steeper than 3H:1V. The riprap armor will be underlain by an 18-inch-thick layer of coarse blasted ledge over geotextile filter fabric in order to promote drainage at the base of the slope. The proposed project can be seen on a set of plans the first of which is titled “Island Road
(West) Plan & Profile,” prepared by Gartley & Dorsky Engineering & Surveying, dated June 30, 2021. The project is located on Island Road in the Town of South Thomaston.

B. Current Use of the Site: The road is the only land-accessible access route to Spruce Head Island. The project site is identified as Island Road on the Town of South Thomaston’s tax maps.

2. EXISTING SCENIC, AESTHETIC, RECREATIONAL OR NAVIGATIONAL USES:

The NRPA, in 38 M.R.S. § 480-D(1), requires the applicant to demonstrate that the proposed project will not unreasonably interfere with existing scenic, aesthetic, recreational and navigational uses.

In accordance with Chapter 315, Assessing and Mitigating Impacts to Scenic and Aesthetic Uses (06-096 C.M.R. ch. 315, effective June 29, 2003), the applicant submitted a copy of the Department's Visual Evaluation Field Survey Checklist as Appendix A to the application along with a description of the property and the proposed project. The applicant also submitted several photographs of the proposed project site and surroundings.

The proposed project is located along Seal Harbor, which is a scenic resource visited by the general public, in part, for the use, observation, enjoyment and appreciation of its natural and cultural visual qualities. Local sea traffic consists primarily of commercial and recreational boats. The proposed reconstruction along the existing road will not change the existing viewshed. The proposed armor stone material will match the existing native stones and ledge as closely as possible in color and shape.

The Department staff utilized the Department’s Visual Impact Assessment Matrix in its evaluation of the proposed project and the Matrix showed an acceptable potential visual impact rating for the proposed project. Based on the information submitted in the application and the visual impact rating, the Department determined that the location and scale of the proposed activity is compatible with the existing visual quality and landscape characteristics found within the viewshed of the scenic resource in the project area.

Based on the project’s location and design, the Department finds that the proposed project will not have an unreasonable adverse effect on the scenic character of the surrounding area. The Department further finds that the proposed activity will not unreasonably interfere with existing scenic, aesthetic, recreational or navigational uses.

3. SOIL EROSION:

The NRPA, in 38 M.R.S. § 480-D(2), requires the applicant to demonstrate that the proposed project will not cause unreasonable erosion of soil or sediment nor unreasonably inhibit the natural transfer of soil from the terrestrial to the marine or freshwater environment.
The applicant submitted an erosion and sedimentation control plan for the project. Erosion control measures will be installed prior to the start of earth moving activities and will be installed in accordance with the Best Management Practices outlined in the Maine Erosion and Sediment Control BMPs, which were developed by the Department. Access to the site will be a long Island Road. During stabilization, construction equipment will work from the top of the bank, with a temporary access way built along the slope. Work will be done along the toe of the slope in sections small enough that they can be permanently stabilized in one session between high tide cycles. Permanent stabilization will be from the toe of slope upward. Material stockpiles associated with the project will be placed greater than 25 feet from the resource. Upon completion of the proposed improvements, any remaining disturbed areas will be restored by reseeding and hay mulching grassed areas and new plantings.

The Department finds that the activity will not cause unreasonable erosion of soil or sediment nor unreasonably inhibit the natural transfer of soil from the terrestrial to the marine or freshwater environment.

4. HABITAT CONSIDERATIONS:

The NRPA, in 38 M.R.S. § 480-D(3), requires the applicant to demonstrate that the proposed project will not unreasonably harm significant wildlife habitat, freshwater wetland plant habitat, threatened or endangered plant habitat, aquatic or adjacent upland habitat, travel corridor, freshwater, estuarine or marine fisheries or other aquatic life.

The project site contains a two-lane access road that is surrounded by residential and commercial development, upland forest, and freshwater and coastal wetlands.

According to the Department’s Geographic Information System (GIS) database there are no mapped Essential or Significant Wildlife Habitats located at the site.

The Department finds that the activity will not unreasonably harm any significant wildlife habitat, freshwater wetland plant habitat, threatened or endangered plant habitat, aquatic or adjacent upland habitat, travel corridor, freshwater, estuarine or marine fisheries or other aquatic life.

5. WATER QUALITY CONSIDERATIONS:

As discussed in Finding 3, the applicant proposes to use erosion and sediment control during construction to minimize impacts to water quality from siltation.

The Department does not anticipate that the proposed project will violate any state water quality law, including those governing the classification of the State’s waters.
6. **WETLANDS AND WATERBODIES PROTECTION RULES:**

The applicant proposes to directly alter 888 square feet of freshwater wetland to stabilize the reconstructed access route. Freshwater wetlands within 250 feet of a coastal wetlands are considered to be wetlands of special significance (WOSS).

The *Wetlands and Waterbodies Protection Rules, 06-096 C.M.R. ch. 310* (last amended November 11, 2018), interpret and elaborate on the NRPA criteria for obtaining a permit. The rules guide the Department in its determination of whether a project’s impacts would be unreasonable. A proposed project would generally be found to be unreasonable if it would cause a loss in wetland area, functions and values and there is a practicable alternative to the project that would be less damaging to the environment. Each application for a NRPA permit that involves a freshwater wetland alteration must provide an analysis of alternatives in order to demonstrate that a practicable alternative does not exist.

A. **Avoidance.** An applicant must submit an analysis of whether there is a practicable alternative to the project that would be less damaging to the environment and this analysis is considered by the Department in its assessment of the reasonableness of any impacts. Additionally, for activities proposed in, on, or over wetlands of special significance the activity must be among the types listed in Chapter 310, § 5(A) or a practicable alternative less damaging to the environment is considered to exist and the impact is unreasonable. The proposed access route will impact a wetland of special significance. A project such as this is among the activities specifically provided for in Chapter 310, § 5(A)(1)(a). The applicant submitted an alternatives analysis for the proposed project completed by Gartley & Dorsky Engineering & Surveying, dated June 2021. The purpose of the proposed project is to create and maintain safe access to Spruce Head Island, as Island Road is the only land-accessible access road to and from the island. The applicant has serious concerns regarding the safety of residents and the access to Spruce Head Island for emergency events as well as maintaining access for residents during high tides. The road contains sections that are at an elevation of 9 feet, which is less than 3 feet above the HAT line and well below the flood elevation of 14 feet. The applicant states that any future significant storm event may result in road closure if the road is not raised.

B. **Minimal Alteration.** In support of an application and to address the analysis of the reasonableness of any impacts of a proposed project, an applicant must demonstrate that the amount of coastal and freshwater wetland to be altered will be kept to the minimum amount necessary for meeting the overall purpose of the project. The applicant has avoided any direct impacts to coastal wetlands and has minimized direct impacts to freshwater wetlands to the greatest extent practicable by only utilizing stone riprap to select portions of the bank and utilizing a 3H:1V slope to further minimize impacts to wetlands.

C. **Compensation.** In accordance with Chapter 310, § 5(C)(6)(b), compensation may be required to achieve the goal of no net loss of coastal wetland functions and values.
The applicant submitted a plan depicting the areas of freshwater wetlands and a functions and values assessment of the resources, prepared by Natalie Marceau, dated September 9, 2021. The assessment identified flood flow alteration and production export as the principal function and value of the resources impacted by the proposed project.

This project will result in 888 square feet of fill within WOSS, over the 500 square feet of fill within freshwater wetlands considered to be of special significance due to being within 250 feet of a coastal wetland, and of which is the threshold over which compensation is generally required. However, the applicant stated that there would be no lost functions and values to the freshwater wetlands as they have been previously disturbed and contains limited functions and values that will not be lost as the wetlands will remain hydrologically connected. The Department concurs with this assessment and waives the requirement for compensation for this portion of the project.

The Department finds that the applicant has avoided and minimized freshwater wetland impacts to the greatest extent practicable, and that the proposed project represents the least environmentally damaging alternative that meets the overall purpose of the project.

7. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

The Department finds, based on the design, proposed construction methods, and location, the proposed project will not inhibit the natural transfer of soil from the terrestrial to the marine environment, will not interfere with the natural flow of any surface or subsurface waters, and will not cause or increase flooding. The proposed project is not located in a coastal sand dune system, is not a crossing of an outstanding river segment, and does not involve dredge spoils disposal or the transport of dredge spoils by water.

BASED on the above findings of fact, and subject to the conditions listed below, the Department makes the following conclusions pursuant to 38 M.R.S. §§ 480-A–480-JJ and Section 401 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. § 1341):

A. The proposed activity will not unreasonably interfere with existing scenic, aesthetic, recreational, or navigational uses.

B. The proposed activity will not cause unreasonable erosion of soil or sediment.

C. The proposed activity will not unreasonably inhibit the natural transfer of soil from the terrestrial to the marine or freshwater environment.

D. The proposed activity will not unreasonably harm any significant wildlife habitat, freshwater wetland plant habitat, threatened or endangered plant habitat, aquatic or adjacent upland habitat, travel corridor, freshwater, estuarine, or marine fisheries or other aquatic life.

E. The proposed activity will not unreasonably interfere with the natural flow of any surface or subsurface waters.
F. The proposed activity will not violate any state water quality law including those governing the classifications of the State's waters.

G. The proposed activity will not unreasonably cause or increase the flooding of the alteration area or adjacent properties.

H. The proposed activity is not on or adjacent to a sand dune.

I. The proposed activity is not on an outstanding river segment as noted in 38 M.R.S. § 480-P.

THEREFORE, the Department APPROVES the above noted application of TOWN OF SOUTH THOMASTON to raise, repave, and stabilize an existing road as described in Finding 1, SUBJECT TO THE ATTACHED CONDITIONS, and all applicable standards and regulations:

1. Standard Conditions of Approval, a copy attached.

2. The applicant shall take all necessary measures to ensure that its activities or those of its agents do not result in measurable erosion of soil on the site during the construction of the project covered by this approval.

3. Severability. The invalidity or unenforceability of any provision, or part thereof, of this License shall not affect the remainder of the provision or any other provisions. This License shall be construed and enforced in all respects as if such invalid or unenforceable provision or part thereof had been omitted.

THIS APPROVAL DOES NOT CONSTITUTE OR SUBSTITUTE FOR ANY OTHER REQUIRED STATE, FEDERAL OR LOCAL APPROVALS NOR DOES IT VERIFY COMPLIANCE WITH ANY APPLICABLE SHORELAND ZONING ORDINANCES.

DONE AND DATED IN AUGUSTA, MAINE, THIS 15TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2021.

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

BY: ____________________________
   For: Melanie Loyzim, Commissioner

PLEASE NOTE THE ATTACHED SHEET FOR GUIDANCE ON APPEAL PROCEDURES.

HB/L29291ANBN/ATS#87886/87898
Natural Resources Protection Act (NRPA)
Standard Conditions

THE FOLLOWING STANDARD CONDITIONS SHALL APPLY TO ALL PERMITS GRANTED UNDER THE NATURAL RESOURCES PROTECTION ACT, 38 M.R.S. §§ 480-A ET SEQ., UNLESS OTHERWISE SPECIFICALLY STATED IN THE PERMIT.

A. Approval of Variations From Plans. The granting of this permit is dependent upon and limited to the proposals and plans contained in the application and supporting documents submitted and affirmed to by the applicant. Any variation from these plans, proposals, and supporting documents is subject to review and approval prior to implementation.

B. Compliance With All Applicable Laws. The applicant shall secure and comply with all applicable federal, state, and local licenses, permits, authorizations, conditions, agreements, and orders prior to or during construction and operation, as appropriate.

C. Erosion Control. The applicant shall take all necessary measures to ensure that his activities or those of his agents do not result in measurable erosion of soils on the site during the construction and operation of the project covered by this Approval.

D. Compliance With Conditions. Should the project be found, at any time, not to be in compliance with any of the Conditions of this Approval, or should the applicant construct or operate this development in any way other the specified in the Application or Supporting Documents, as modified by the Conditions of this Approval, then the terms of this Approval shall be considered to have been violated.

E. Time frame for approvals. If construction or operation of the activity is not begun within four years, this permit shall lapse and the applicant shall reapply to the Board for a new permit. The applicant may not begin construction or operation of the activity until a new permit is granted. Reapplications for permits may include information submitted in the initial application by reference. This approval, if construction is begun within the four-year time frame, is valid for seven years. If construction is not completed within the seven-year time frame, the applicant must reapply for, and receive, approval prior to continuing construction.

F. No Construction Equipment Below High Water. No construction equipment used in the undertaking of an approved activity is allowed below the mean high water line unless otherwise specified by this permit.

G. Permit Included In Contract Bids. A copy of this permit must be included in or attached to all contract bid specifications for the approved activity.

H. Permit Shown To Contractor. Work done by a contractor pursuant to this permit shall not begin before the contractor has been shown by the applicant a copy of this permit.

Revised September 2016
Erosion Control for Homeowners

Before Construction

1. If you have hired a contractor, make sure you discuss your permit with them. Talk about what measures they plan to take to control erosion. Everybody involved should understand what the resource is, and where it is located. Most people can identify the edge of a lake or river. However, the edges of wetlands are often not so obvious. Your contractor may be the person actually pushing dirt around, but you are both responsible for complying with the permit.

2. Call around to find where erosion control materials are available. Chances are your contractor has these materials already on hand. You probably will need silt fence, hay bales, wooden stakes, grass seed (or conservation mix), and perhaps filter fabric. Places to check for these items include farm & feed supply stores, garden & lawn suppliers, and landscaping companies. It is not always easy to find hay or straw during late winter and early spring. It also may be more expensive during those times of year. Plan ahead – buy a supply early and keep it under a tarp.

3. Before any soil is disturbed, make sure an erosion control barrier has been installed. The barrier can be either a silt fence, a row of staked hay bales, or both. Use the drawings below as a guide for correct installation and placement. The barrier should be placed as close as possible to the soil-disturbance activity.

4. If a contractor is installing the erosion control barrier, double check it as a precaution. Erosion control barriers should be installed "on the contour", meaning at the same level or elevation across the land slope, whenever possible. This keeps stormwater from flowing to the lowest point along the barrier where it can build up and overflow or destroy the barrier.

During Construction

1. Use lots of hay or straw mulch on disturbed soil. The idea behind mulch is to prevent rain from striking the soil directly. It is the force of raindrops hitting the bare ground that makes the soil begin to move downslope with the runoff water, and cause erosion. More than 90% of erosion is prevented by keeping the soil covered.

2. Inspect your erosion control barriers frequently. This is especially important after a rainfall. If there is muddy water leaving the project site, then your erosion controls are not working as intended. You or your contractor then need to figure out what can be done to prevent more soil from getting past the barrier.

3. Keep your erosion control barrier up and maintained until you get a good and healthy growth of grass and the area is permanently stabilized.
After Construction

1. After your project is finished, seed the area. Note that all ground covers are not equal. For example, a mix of creeping red fescue and Kentucky bluegrass is a good choice for lawns and other high-maintenance areas. But this same seed mix is a poor selection for stabilizing a road shoulder or a cut bank that you don't intend to mow. Your contractor may have experience with different seed mixes, or you might contact a seed supplier for advice.

2. Do not spread grass seed after September 15. There is the likelihood that germinating seedlings could be killed by a frost before they have a chance to become established. Instead, mulch the area with a thick layer of hay or straw. In the spring, rake off the mulch and then seed the area. Don't forget to mulch again to hold in moisture and prevent the seed from washing away or being eaten by birds or other animals.

3. Keep your erosion control barrier up and maintained until you get a good and healthy growth of grass and the area is permanently stabilized.

Why Control Erosion?

To Protect Water Quality

When soil erodes into protected resources such as streams, rivers, wetlands, and lakes, it has many bad effects. Eroding soil particles carry phosphorus to the water. An excess of phosphorus can lead to explosions of algae growth in lakes and ponds called blooms. The water will look green and can have green slime in it. If you are near a lake or pond, this is not pleasant for swimming, and when the soil settles out on the bottom, it smothers fish eggs and small animals eaten by fish. There many other effects as well, which are all bad.

To Protect the Soil

It has taken thousands of years for our soil to develop. It usefulness is evident all around us, from sustaining forests and growing our garden vegetables, to even treating our septic wastewater! We cannot afford to waste this valuable resource.

To Save Money ($$)

Replacing topsoil or gravel washed off your property can be expensive. You end up paying twice because State and local governments wind up spending your tax dollars to dig out ditches and storm drains that have become choked with sediment from soil erosion.
SUMMARY

This document provides information regarding a person’s rights and obligations in filing an administrative or judicial appeal of a licensing decision made by the Department of Environmental Protection’s (DEP) Commissioner.

Except as provided below, there are two methods available to an aggrieved person seeking to appeal a licensing decision made by the DEP Commissioner: (1) an administrative process before the Board of Environmental Protection (Board); or (2) a judicial process before Maine’s Superior Court. An aggrieved person seeking review of a licensing decision over which the Board had original jurisdiction may seek judicial review in Maine’s Superior Court.

A judicial appeal of final action by the Commissioner or the Board regarding an application for an expedited wind energy development (35-A M.R.S. § 3451(4)) or a general permit for an offshore wind energy demonstration project (38 M.R.S. § 480-HH(1)) or a general permit for a tidal energy demonstration project (38 M.R.S. § 636-A) must be taken to the Supreme Judicial Court sitting as the Law Court.

I. ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS TO THE BOARD

LEGAL REFERENCES

A person filing an appeal with the Board should review Organization and Powers, 38 M.R.S. §§ 341-D(4) and 346; the Maine Administrative Procedure Act, 5 M.R.S. § 11001; and the DEP’s Rule Concerning the Processing of Applications and Other Administrative Matters (Chapter 2), 06-096 C.M.R. ch. 2.

DEADLINE TO SUBMIT AN APPEAL TO THE BOARD

Not more than 30 days following the filing of a license decision by the Commissioner with the Board, an aggrieved person may appeal to the Board for review of the Commissioner’s decision. The filing of an appeal with the Board, in care of the Board Clerk, is complete when the Board receives the submission by the close of business on the due date (5:00 p.m. on the 30th calendar day from which the Commissioner's decision was filed with the Board, as determined by the received time stamp on the document or electronic mail). Appeals filed after 5:00 p.m. on the 30th calendar day from which the Commissioner's decision was filed with the Board will be dismissed as untimely, absent a showing of good cause.

HOW TO SUBMIT AN APPEAL TO THE BOARD

An appeal to the Board may be submitted via postal mail or electronic mail and must contain all signatures and required appeal contents. An electronic filing must contain the scanned original signature of the appellant(s). The appeal documents must be sent to the following address.

Chair, Board of Environmental Protection
c/o Board Clerk
17 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333-0017
ruth.a.burke@maine.gov
The DEP may also request the submittal of the original signed paper appeal documents when the appeal is filed electronically. The risk of material not being received in a timely manner is on the sender, regardless of the method used.

At the time an appeal is filed with the Board, the appellant must send a copy of the appeal to: (1) the Commissioner of the DEP (Maine Department of Environmental Protection, 17 State House Station, Augusta, Maine 04333-0017); (2) the licensee; and if a hearing was held on the application, (3) any intervenors in that hearing proceeding. Please contact the DEP at 207-287-7688 with questions or for contact information regarding a specific licensing decision.

REQUIRED APPEAL CONTENTS

A complete appeal must contain the following information at the time the appeal is submitted.

1. **Aggrieved status.** The appeal must explain how the appellant has standing to bring the appeal. This requires an explanation of how the appellant may suffer a particularized injury as a result of the Commissioner’s decision.

2. **The findings, conclusions, or conditions objected to or believed to be in error.** The appeal must identify the specific findings of fact, conclusions of law, license conditions, or other aspects of the written license decision or of the license review process that the appellant objects to or believes to be in error.

3. **The basis of the objections or challenge.** For the objections identified in Item #2, the appeal must state why the appellant believes that the license decision is incorrect and should be modified or reversed. If possible, the appeal should cite specific evidence in the record or specific licensing criteria that the appellant believes were not properly considered or fully addressed.

4. **The remedy sought.** This can range from reversal of the Commissioner’s decision on the license to changes in specific license conditions.

5. **All the matters to be contested.** The Board will limit its consideration to those matters specifically raised in the written notice of appeal.

6. **Request for hearing.** If the appellant wishes the Board to hold a public hearing on the appeal, a request for hearing must be filed as part of the notice of appeal, and it must include an offer of proof regarding the testimony and other evidence that would be presented at the hearing. The offer of proof must consist of a statement of the substance of the evidence, its relevance to the issues on appeal, and whether any witnesses would testify. The Board will hear the arguments in favor of and in opposition to a hearing on the appeal and the presentations on the merits of an appeal at a regularly scheduled meeting. If the Board decides to hold a public hearing on an appeal, that hearing will then be scheduled for a later date.

7. **New or additional evidence to be offered.** If an appellant wants to provide evidence not previously provided to DEP staff during the DEP’s review of the application, the request and the proposed supplemental evidence must be submitted with the appeal. The Board may allow new or additional evidence to be considered in an appeal only under limited circumstances. The proposed supplemental evidence must be relevant and material, and (a) the person seeking to add information to the record must show due diligence in bringing the evidence to the DEP’s attention at the earliest possible time in the licensing process; or (b) the evidence itself must be newly discovered and therefore unable to have been presented earlier in the process. Requirements for supplemental evidence are set forth in Chapter 2 § 24.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS IN APPELING A DECISION TO THE BOARD

1. **Be familiar with all relevant material in the DEP record.** A license application file is public information, subject to any applicable statutory exceptions, and is made accessible by the DEP. Upon request, the DEP will make application materials available to review and photocopy during normal working hours. There may be a charge for copies or copying services.
2. **Be familiar with the regulations and laws under which the application was processed, and the procedural rules governing the appeal.** DEP staff will provide this information upon request and answer general questions regarding the appeal process.

3. **The filing of an appeal does not operate as a stay to any decision.** If a license has been granted and it has been appealed, the license normally remains in effect pending the processing of the appeal. Unless a stay of the decision is requested and granted, a licensee may proceed with a project pending the outcome of an appeal, but the licensee runs the risk of the decision being reversed or modified as a result of the appeal.

**WHAT TO EXPECT ONCE YOU FILE A TIMELY APPEAL WITH THE BOARD**

The Board will acknowledge receipt of an appeal, and it will provide the name of the DEP project manager assigned to the specific appeal. The notice of appeal, any materials admitted by the Board as supplementary evidence, any materials admitted in response to the appeal, relevant excerpts from the DEP’s administrative record for the application, and the DEP staff’s recommendation, in the form of a proposed Board Order, will be provided to Board members. The appellant, the licensee, and parties of record are notified in advance of the date set for the Board’s consideration of an appeal or request for a hearing. The appellant and the licensee will have an opportunity to address the Board at the Board meeting. The Board will decide whether to hold a hearing on appeal when one is requested before deciding the merits of the appeal. The Board’s decision on appeal may be to affirm all or part, affirm with conditions, order a hearing to be held as expeditiously as possible, reverse all or part of the decision of the Commissioner, or remand the matter to the Commissioner for further proceedings. The Board will notify the appellant, the licensee, and parties of record of its decision on appeal.

II. **JUDICIAL APPEALS**

Maine law generally allows aggrieved persons to appeal final Commissioner or Board licensing decisions to Maine’s Superior Court (see [38 M.R.S. § 346(1); 06-096 C.M.R. ch. 2; 5 M.R.S. § 11001]; and M.R. Civ. P. 80C). A party’s appeal must be filed with the Superior Court within 30 days of receipt of notice of the Board’s or the Commissioner’s decision. For any other person, an appeal must be filed within 40 days of the date the decision was rendered. An appeal to court of a license decision regarding an expedited wind energy development, a general permit for an offshore wind energy demonstration project, or a general permit for a tidal energy demonstration project may only be taken directly to the Maine Supreme Judicial Court. See [38 M.R.S. § 346(4)].

Maine’s Administrative Procedure Act, DEP statutes governing a particular matter, and the Maine Rules of Civil Procedure must be consulted for the substantive and procedural details applicable to judicial appeals.

**ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

If you have questions or need additional information on the appeal process, for administrative appeals contact the Board Clerk at 207-287-2811 or the Board Executive Analyst at 207-314-1458 bill.hinkel@maine.gov, or for judicial appeals contact the court clerk’s office in which the appeal will be filed.

---

**Note:** This information sheet, in conjunction with a review of the statutory and regulatory provisions referred to herein, is provided to help a person to understand their rights and obligations in filing an administrative or judicial appeal. The DEP provides this information sheet for general guidance only; it is not intended for use as a legal reference. Maine law governs an appellant’s rights.