UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
Fish and Wildlife Service
300 Westgate Center Drive
Hadley, MA 01035-9589

Lake Umbagog National Wildlife Refuge (NWR)
Comprehensive Conservation Plan (CCP)
Public Hearing - August 7, 2007
Augusta, Maine

Tom Goettel (Hearing Officer): Welcome to the public hearing of Lake Umbagog National Wildlife Refuge Comprehensive Conservation Plan. My name is Tom Goettel. And, I'll be your hearing officer tonight. I work for the Fish and Wildlife Service in the Regional Office in Hadley, MA. My role is to facilitate the recording of your oral comments on the draft CCP. There will be no further presentation by the Service tonight. This is your opportunity to give your thoughts and ideas, and our opportunity to listen. We'll be recording your testimony on video and audio tape. The tapes will be transcribed by a professional court reporter and posted on our web site in September. Transcription will become part of the CCP's official administrative record. Your comments will be considered along with all written comments received. The Service's response to these comments will be in an appendix in the final plan. So, here's the process for the rest of the evening, plus a couple of ground rules. I'll call individuals to the podium over here as you're listed on the sign-in sheet. Does anybody want a last chance to add your name to the sign-in sheet? Anybody, feel free. After being called up, the first thing you need to do is state your name and spell it out. So in other words, you come up to the podium and you say, for example, "My name is Tom Goettel, G-O-E-T-T-E-L." Just spell it out, again, that's for the court reporter who is going to be transcribing. After spelling your name, you'll have four minutes to provide your comments and you can read from prepared text or speak off the cuff. We need to stick to the allotted time so um… Mr. Lima over here on the end will alert you with a flashcard, when you have two minutes left, when you have 30 seconds left, and when your four minutes are up. So, please be respectful of the timelines. If time permits, you can sign up for a second opportunity to speak. We only ask that the second time, you provide new or different comments from what you provided the first time. Only one person will have the floor at a time, so if you're not at the podium, we ask that you respect whoever is speaking and remain silent. I want to reiterate that our purpose tonight is to listen to and record your comments. We will not be answering questions or responding to your comments. If you do have a question, everybody here will be around afterwards, so feel free to ask any question afterwards. We will end the hearing after the last speaker, or 9:30 p.m., whichever comes first. And I think Nancy, before we get started with the first speaker, I think Nancy has a couple of comments to make.

McGarigal: So as I said, this is the fifth of the hearings and with the challenge of the Errol meeting and not being able to really respond to some of the comments we decided

to schedule another information session in Errol on the 16th - most of you will be getting a postcard, or I ask you to pick one up at the document table tonight, just as a reminder. We welcome you to come to that information session where Paul will be giving a very similar presentation, and then there will be a chance for dialogue and hopefully respond more to your questions and needs for clarification directly. I will likely be the person summarizing and synthesizing all the comments that come in, at least getting it to a point where the team can get back together and discuss them. So, I just have a few pointers on your providing comments. Please stick to the draft Comprehensive Conservation Plan, and the proposals that are in there. We've gotten comments that run the gamut of some personal comments, on a personal level about some of us, and then a lot about the state agencies, and how the state agencies are managing their land, but I ask - request that you comment about our proposal; our draft comprehensive conservation plan. Also, it is helpful if you try to get all your questions answered so that you submit comments that are substantive; it's not helpful to me if a letter comes in and it's got 15 questions in it. I'm not really sure necessarily how to deal with that, how to summarize that, and I won't know necessarily what your point or your concern is. So, hopefully you will get all your questions answered here tonight. We'll have a little bit of time at the end of the evening to go back to our open house format. Or, come on the 16th. So, substantive comments would be most helpful if you - a lot of people start with an opinion … "I want this activity to happen on the refuge." It would be really helpful if you would substantiate that. Why - why do you think it should happen on refuge lands; why do you think it's important to have there. If there are…it would be very helpful too, if you're reacting to something that is actually written in the text, or if you can direct our attention to what's in the text that is of concern to you, or where you think there are needs for clarification. So pointing that out to us would be helpful. I think a lot of people are getting their information from friends and neighbors, and I've asked them where they are reading that in the plan, and a lot of people can't find it. So, it's really helpful for you to point out where it is exactly in the plan, in our proposals, that we are saying things that concern you. So again, please elaborate on your opinions. If you would, tell us why. If you find actual errors, we found some errors on the maps already. I'd really like to know about those and clean that up. As Tom indicated, we'll be summarizing these public comments. What you say here tonight doesn't necessarily - does not have any more weight than some of the written comments that are coming in. I'm receiving letters daily, I'm probably sitting on about 120 emails right now, and we've had these five hearings; so, none of those venues provides any more weight than any of the others. You are welcome to speak tonight, and to submit your comments in writing, or elaborate in writing; that's perfectly fine for you to do that. Just to remind you that the decision maker in this process is the Regional Director, who is based out of my office in Hadley, MA. That's Marvin Moriarty. A reminder to you that you'll see on the postcard, in addition to the August 16 additional meeting, is that we have extended the public comment hearing to September 21st. And, that was in direct response to a lot of folks who looked at the volume of, the size of the document, and decided that they just couldn't get through it or digest it. So, thats an additional 30 days. I think that's all I have. Thank you.

Goettel: Thanks Nancy. Excuse me. Any questions on the procedures at this time? Anybody need to clarify anything? Okay, the first speaker is Lori Brown.

Brown: Hi I'm Lori Brown, B-R-O-W-N. I live in Upton. My family has lived in Upton for generations. I had a whole prepared thing that I wanted to read to you, and that was until Nancy's request that it had to be specifically on the plan. And I haven't read the whole plan yet. Um… so, I'm going to tell you that I don't appreciate - I don't - I'm not in favor of the refuge, period. Not this plan, not any plan. We - Maine has more deer than it has ever had. Every day moose - people are killed on the road by moose, and that tells me that the Fish and Game Department are doing a pretty good job of regulating hunting and fishing licenses, so that our forests stay filled with animals. But, we still have the right to hunt and fish where we want to and when we want to and how we want to as long as it is within the Maine laws of our licenses. And to me that is regulation enough. We don't need any more laws from the government, or from any other agency. And, there are always going to be people that will do stupid things and kill animals for the sake of killing them, or just poach. And, if there were an agency, the Fish and Game Agency or any other agency, that could stop them from doing that, they already would have done that. So, that's not going to help that situation. And as far as…I haven't read the plan, I will read the plan… I will - that's pretty big. I'll read as much as I can before the next meeting. But, what bothers me is that if I had heard nothing about this plan, and if I had read nothing in this plan, and all I had done was listen to Paul, I would be like oh, my God that's awesome. That's just an awesome plan. But, then I have to realize that once the government gets involved in these plans, and in our land, there's always discrepancies. There's always things we find out about later, that's like oh, we forgot to tell you that. And, it's - to me - it's been hundreds of years and Mother Nature has done a really unique and successful job in managing the forests, in managing the animals. And sometimes these groups of people don't have a realistic view of what really goes on in the forest. It's like coyotes or coy dogs - whatever you want to call them, they hunt in packs, they are vicious. They can kill moose; they usually kill deer. They kill domestic animals and they kill them by just like ripping them apart, little by little, they don't kill them first. They just rip them apart. And men and women who fish or hunt, we don't - it's not violent. It's not like the animals; but that's Mother Nature. Have you ever heard a blue jay? And have you ever heard a blue jay that's been captured by a hawk? It's, it's like - it seems like forever the blue jay screams because the hawk literally peels the skin off. And, hunting isn't like that. Fishing isn't like that. But that is real life. That is the real forest. And I don't see - I just - it's beyond me why anybody would want the government, that we're already in debt - we already owe everybody and his brother, I'm not willing for my tax money to be spent for the government buying more land to manage when I don't understand why they think they can manage it better than Mother Nature can manage it. Mother Nature has been doing a fine job. And, they don't have to keep - they don't have to buy this land to keep us out. We're not hurting our forests. People who live in Upton, the Umbagog area, people who are in the forest, we get along really well with Mother Nature and I think it should stay that way. Thank you. (Applause)

Goettel: The next speaker is Sean McCormick.

McCormick: My name is Sean McCormick, M-C-C-O-R-M-I-C-K. I'm the State Counselor Chairman of Trout Limited and I am here on behalf of my organization. We

would like to provide written comments, going forward once we get a chance to digest this document a little more. But, I do want to state, and nothing has been mentioned here, about aquatic organisms and I know there was some statement about the state's managing the waters. But, we want to really be certain that the headwater streams that you are looking to acquire have adequate protections on them. And, that the fishery resources, especially the native brook trout in this region, have extreme national significance. The Magalloway, the Rapid, the Dead Diamond, the Cambridge, the Black Diamond…are all of just incredible national importance. And, I know that the US Fish and Wildlife Service, being part of the Eastern Brook Trout Joint Venture, is aware of this. But, we want to reiterate that and make sure protections are put in place for the aquatic organisms and to take every precaution to prevent any more introduction of invasive, non native species, whether it be another fish or another organism such as didymo – which has already been found in Vermont and New York. We have a great deal of concern about that and if there's any way we can prevent those items from getting into these waters; that would be really great. Thank you. (applause)

Goettel: Our next speaker is Joe Bernier.

Bernier: Joe Bernie B-E-R-N-I-E-R. I am a resident of Upton, Maine. There have been members of my family living in Upton for well over 100 years and no matter what their occupations and hobbies were, all these people have loved the land. It would be nice to think that Umbagog National Wildlife Refuge would save the forest, lake, ponds, and streams of the area for future generations to use and enjoy. The problem with this idea is that the refuge does not seem to want to keep the land for the people; they want to keep the land away from the people. If they are going to use my money to buy land that I don't want them to buy, they can at least let me use the land. In the fields of my property, at various times, I have seen moose, bear, deer, turkey, coyote, partridge, quail, and a variety of other wildlife. These animals pay very little attention to me as they eat the apples and the other food they find. My point is that animals adapt. They don't need management; they do, and have done, quite well without the US Fish and Wildlife Service or the Umbagog National Wildlife Refuge trying to control them or their habitats. Leave them and us alone. We're doing alright without being micromanaged. If the refuge does grow to include most of Upton and other surrounding areas, it's easy to visualize the gravel roads will have locked gates because of lack of financing to repair washouts and to remove blown down trees. It's also easy to picture no hunting signs, no fishing signs, and no trespassing signs in the area due to lack of funds to employ the staff necessary to regulate and control these activities. Nancy McGarigal has stated that the intent of the US F&W is to allow us to use the existing snow machine trails. She has stated that it's the intent to keep gravel roads open to the public, and it is their intent to always allow hunting and fishing on a wildlife refuge. When I was a teenager, it was my intent to be rich and comfortable before I turned 40; and I didn't have a very good plan either. A revised plan A probably will work. The authority of the manager should be reduced. Any changes allowed on the refuge land - any changes in allowed uses on the refuge land, should be decided by a committee of not less than five, including area residents and business men as well as wildlife impact experts. The refuge should add to and improve snow machine trails and hiking trails in the area instead of just allowing

existing ones to be used. Umbagog Wildlife Refuge should use the next 15 years to better use their existing 20,000 acres and improve relationships with people who live, work and play in the area, and try to build a mutual trust. To do this, they need to make some changes to Plan A, including change their agenda, change their policies, maybe change their local management. Thank you. (applause)

Goettel: Thank you. Our next speaker is Robert T. Folsom, Sr.

FOLSOM: Good evening. My name is Robert T. Folsom, F-O-L-S-O-M. A couple of concerns - I'm trying to think about things I would like to have open that I didn't presently see in the plan, and one is cranberry picking. Evidently if it's not open now, it's taboo. So add berry picking - cranberries - a lot of people pick cranberries, have for years, on Umbagog Lake. The other one of the items that I think I'd like to have continued and thats float planes landing on the lake. It may - I might not be up to my aeronautical chart - I'm not sure whether they allow it now or not. I know there was a note up for the eagles nest – and that makes sense - stay away from it. But traditionally they have landed sea planes. Mr. Bernham had one. A number of other people used to give float plane rides on the lake. As long as they are not near the nesting coves, I think that makes sense to continue to allow float planes to use the open water. Those are just a couple of items I thought I'd add to my list. There was some concern in regard to the jurisdiction of the water in the 1990 assessment when you wanted to open up the refuge, which I was in favor for and still am in favor of, the refuge. As far as the goal, you know the goal of not having it become developed and spoiled. Nobody wants that. However, in the 1990 Environmental Assessment they stated that they would not have jurisdiction and that would be solely the States of New Hampshire and Maine and would remain that way forever. Quote unquote. And I have copies of the assessment, if the team would like to have copies, in case they have happened to have lost theirs in the past 18 years. So, the open water - my concern about the open water, and I'm probably the one that raised the issue. On Page 4-69 it says "Open Water - Acquiring up to 801 acres to protect the total 5,834 acres of open water habitat under Alternative A, would benefit fish and vertebrates," etc. Well, what they are saying here is that they already acquired the 5,000 acres. The whole refuge, or the whole lake itself, is only 7,500, so they've already got the majority of the lake. Now, there may be a few ponds in there, but we have very few ponds. The other question is about fishing. That was raised a question. And they tell you they are going to allow fishing from certain designated areas. You have to look into that because that excludes all other areas other than the dedicated ones. For instance - for example, it says here future adjacent development of increasing refuge visitation - okay I'm on the wrong page, you've got another one here that they indicated about fishing (page turning). It's talking about fishing and it ways saying that the fishing is not allowed in "A" - okay Bob, get it together here, A is - I've folded the page over and now I can't find it. Okay here it is. (reading from draft plan) "Five of the six priority public uses - hunting, wildlife observation and photography, and environmental education and interpretation are allowed on the refuge and would be provided on lands to be acquired in the future. Fishing is the only priority public use not formally allowed at present. Popular non priority public uses that would be allowed to continue include, snowmobiling and camping. We would maintain the current capacity for these activities.

Education and interpretive programs are limited and we have very little visitor infrastructure in place to facilitate self-guided opportunities." Thank you very much. I think I've said enough. Thank you again. (Applause)

Goettel: Nobody else? There's nobody else on the list. Anybody else like to get up and speak?

Bernier: My name is Jennie Bernier, B-E-R-N-I-E-R. I'm not going to have time to read my whole prepared speech, so I'll just read until you tell me to stop and then I'll come back up. Um… the first thing I think its important for you to understand is the amount of distrust between your agency and the community in which it lies. This distrust comes from many different factors over the years that you have been here… mistreatment of the locals, mismanagement of the land that you already have, and personal/professional conflicts of interest within the refuge. For example, there are many projects that you set out to do and have not yet finished. And, from the beginning, the local people were told our way of life wouldn't change. Yet, more recreational restrictions have come from your agency over the years with no clear explanations. Trust instead of distrust and connections instead of disconnect, between the local community and wildlife refuge should be your goal. I think you need to foster positive relationships within the community. Reach out to the local people and businesses and make connections and alliances, rather than always struggling against the public. Fostering these partnerships within the community is a win-win situation. The public will develop trust and interest in the refuge and its missions, and the refuge will be able to better serve the people in the area but understanding their viewpoint and taking them into consideration within their plans and goals. Reach out to the people who currently oppose your CCP. Attend a snowmobile club meeting. Meet with hunters and fishermen. Hold more educational question and answer style forums. This will allow that trust to develop, and it will let you know exactly what the people want and why. It will also allow for a working partnership and conversations with clear explanations from both sides. This way, instead of being a two-sided battle, you could change it to a one-sided collective set of goals in which both the refuge and the people had significant input. Of the many things that concern my neighbors and me, one is the wording of your priority recreational activities. According to your documents, these six activities are allowed. My concern is that you're simply going to allow these activities; why not develop them instead? Work with groups and community members to enhance the snowmobile trail systems; hold catch and release fishing derbies, and have expert demonstrations and speeches at your new headquarters about the wildlife, the recreation and the people in the area. Work to increase opportunities to recreate on your refuge, and it will help appease the locals as well as bring more people to enjoy our beautiful area. In fact, your refuge could consider mimicking some of the other National Refuges and develop a Friends of Umbagog Wildlife Refuge Group which works in cooperation with the refuge system to develop and enhance the activities available within the refuge, as well as to improve educational and collaborative opportunities. The Friends of Sunkhaze Meadows National Wildlife Refuge in Northern Maine has over 125 volunteer members who work with the refuge on a variety of things from trail maintenance, to community outreach program. I am sure that many people would be glad to see some money spent increasing our chances to use

this land and your refuge, in positive shared ways. Perhaps this could replace or be an extension of the proposed Umbagog Working Group. Another thing that you should consider, is putting everything that you tell people at these meetings and hearings into writing. Because of the distrust and poor relationship with the community, many people find it hard to take what your representatives say at face value. So, instead of telling us what your intents are and are not, put them into the plan. Put them in clearly, articulately and unmistakably so that there are no questions about your intents, or goals, on this plan. Then follow through with what you've written and the public will go to trust and enjoy the refuge on a much larger basis. And, I'll finish later. Thank you. (applause)

Goettel: Thank you. Would anybody else like to comment?

Rioux: My name is Alita Rioux, R-I-O-U-X. And I'm going to take a little bit of a different take on all of this. I was very pleased to see that all three proposals that you have up this evening have continued snowmobile trails. I believe that the current trails that are on the properties that you own now, or manage now, are all club trails. And these are very important trails to the clubs, and the people of the area of Errol and of Upton. The local club trails are so important because this allows the local residents of the community to have access to the more primary, major trail systems in both Maine and New Hampshire. And in both states, snowmobiling is a very, very strong…has a very strong economic impact on these small communities. So, I'm pleased to see that all three proposals have the trails there and I hope that we will continue to see those trails that we have there now and maybe even more development of trails in the future times. (applause)

Goettel: Thank you. I think somebody else had their hand up?

Speaker: I'd rather have the young lady finish her talk.

Goettel: She'll get her time - she'll be in the second round (both speakers at once)

Speaker: I'll defer my time to her.

Goettel: We have plenty of time - you don't have to do that.

Wentzell: My name is Brian Wentzell, W-E-N-T-Z-E-L-L. I am the Maine Policy Manager for the Appalachian Mountain Club, based in Brunswick, ME. We have about 3,800 members in Maine, and about 8 or 9,000 members in New Hampshire. I think if you have a position for Outreach Manager, or somewhere in the refuge, I think you've got someone who you should hire. A lot of good ideas there. I am going to talk more about – broadly, about acquisition. We're still in the midst of taking a close look at the plan and the different alternatives. We'll have formal comments on what exactly our take on it is, but more broadly, we are in support of acquisition under - as is laid out under both Alternatives B and C. One of the major issues here is, I think that we all agree on, is that this area, the refuge and the area around it, is just a spectacular area for a lot of different reasons … for hunting, for fishing, snowmobiling, paddling, camping. And, it

means a lot to a lot of people. And, you have to step back and look at the surrounding lands and what's happening, because change is coming no matter what. And, if you look at some of the land owners who, the private land owners, who own land now, it's been working well for 100 years. I mean my great grandfather worked for Brown Paper Company and ran the logging drives right down the Magalloway to Umbagog, and into Androscoggin, driving the logs to Berlin. And if that's the way things were, if we had Brown Paper Company owning the land today, we probably wouldn't really be having this discussion, but that's not the case. A lot of the private land owners, large private landowners in that area, you don't have to look very far to see major development and that major development brings a lot of change. And, you can see change like cutting access off the land, bringing a lot of different type of people into the area. You know it's private land, and they can do what they want, but when you have the ideas… you have the ability for the refuge to acquire additional lands, we know that we'll always have these types of processes where we can say, we can go to the headquarters and say, "Paul, what are you thinking about this - what's the plan" Where we have a whole public process here, where we can say this is what I like, this is what I don't like. That's not necessarily the case for other private lands; these decisions are made in places - decisions about land management and land use, development, timber harvesting, all that stuff, those decisions are made far away from Umbagog National Wildlife Refuge. And for the lands that are particularly important for the people who enjoy this area, for all the different reasons, in prioritizing those lands around this really special place, and having the refuge the ability to acquire some of these places for public use - for continued public access, for everything that we all agree is important, I think that is kind of a bottom line from our perspective. Protecting the resources for everybody, for all those uses so… that's pretty much what we wanted to get across and we'll have more formal comments. Thanks. (applause)

Goettel: Thank you. Anybody else like to come up? If not, we'll go onto the second round, so come on up, if you want to.

Bernier: My name again is Jennie Bernier, B-E-R-N-I-E-R. I had already talked about developing trust in relationships, developing activities instead of just allowing them. Maybe creating a Friends of the Refuge group, and to make sure that you guys clear things up in writing, in your plan. I have another suggestion which goes along with putting things into writing clearly, and which I know will help many of us feel better about your entire plan, I think this is where some of your – Nancy, you were saying you don't understand where people are getting some of their questions or their statements from, and I think this is where some of it is from is in Chapter 1 Page 8 of your draft CCP. It states that the refuge manager may reevaluate the compatibility of any use at any time if new information reveals unacceptable impact or compatibilities with refuge purposes, and that the refuge manager may allow or deny any use even one which is compatible based on other considerations. I suggest that the very least revision of the clauses, and at the very best, complete removal. It makes it nearly impossible for me to believe your verbiage of the refuge intentions with these clauses. It should not be the power of one person to decide when activities should and should not be reviewed, denied and allowed. Any changes in allowances and enhancements of recreation within the

refuge boundaries should be the decision of a group of people after extensive research and conditional situations leading to such need for change. In addition, I think another change in policy and philosophy and perhaps even management, may be helpful to your plan and to the refuge in general. Consider making all recreational activities open to the public, until a council or committee of some kind democratically decides to close them for good and specific reasons. This will allow all the activities that people in this area love, to remain open, so long as the people who participate in them do so in good standing and do not abuse their privileges. If a conflict did arise, a group of people could then be able to make an informed decision for changes in the allowances of certain activities based on incompatibility with the refuge's written goals, or misuse of the activities. Another step which the people in your refuge and those who are working to develop the CCP could take, is to educate themselves. Although I understand your interest is in the wildlife and the protection of the wildlife, it may be necessary to educate yourselves on other important issues in the area in order to become more well informed and connected to the community. Work to gain knowledge of the area, its history and its people, rather than just the wildlife. This would be a giant step in forging good public relationships and building community trust. It is infuriating to have a conversation with a person from your agency who does not know where B Pond is located, or the lake is pronounced UM-BAY-GOG, because it leads us to believe you have no interest in the people or their desires for the region. Perhaps your education in these matters could stem from the Friends of the Refuge group or even simply by holding informal informational meetings with the local people, with the vested interest in your plans in the region. And the final suggestion which I have for you is something that should have been done early on in your planning process. You need to explain all of your goals and the process for CCP writing clearly, and on paper. Many people are still are unsure of why you even want to do these things and why you have chosen this area to protect, especially because of the mistreatment and rumor that have continually occurred. And don't treat the local people like country idiots or the enemy; instead, work to be in cooperation with us. Know our goals and our reasons for those goals and respond to them. We'll do the same for you if you allow us to by encouraging positive relationships with us. Right now people see this plan as a loss of control over the places and recreations they love. You have the power and opportunity to change this. As at least a six-generation resident of this area, your CCP as it currently stands, greatly distresses me. Maybe not now, maybe not in 15 years, but I fear in time, my neighbors, my family, and the next generation of inhabitants will not be able to live and play as we always have as a result of your plan. And, it is not acceptable. You have no right to take that away from us. So go back; finish the projects that you have already started, make some honest commitments to the public to try to work with them instead of against them, and fix this plan so that it pleases a majority instead of the minority. To reiterate my plan in closing, I suggest you spend the next 15 years taking these steps to build trust and better the refuge instead of buying land that you can't afford and don't have the resources, finances and manpower to manage. Thank you. (applause)

Goettel: Any other? Sir?

END OF SIDE ONE - A- OF TAPE

BEGINNING OF SIDE B

Folsom: My name is Bob Folsom, F-O-L-S-O-M. I agree with everything Jen had to say and I think that some of the issues that have caused this feeling of mistrust is I think that people, like in Upton - I've been there for, you know, off and on 20 years, too, so from what I can see is people are concerned that we're going to end up with being another Grafton. You know, Grafton started - they ended up closing down the town. There were rumors that they had frost every month of the year; they couldn't raise any food. So, if you drive through Grafton Notch you'll see some foundations, and that's the end of it. So people who live in Upton have lived there all their lives don't want another Grafton, they want Upton to stay the same and to grow. Just because the wildlife refuge comes into place, doesn't mean that the town has to die. There are things that they could do to perceive a better feeling amongst the people, and that is like stop telling people that we're going to fight you if you want a subdivision here. You know, on Mr. Ganyon's land, he passed away, he was told by the refuge manager in uniform during the day, I will fight you just like I'm fighting Bob's Marina. Those are fighting words. You guys are not going to go that route, because if you do, you're only going to separate and isolate the people of Upton. Because people have bought a store, people have renovated that store, people employ these people in the store, that's their income. These people have hawked their house to have this store; they can't say for or against the refuge, because they lose some customers. So they don't want to speak out. And, the problem is, when you tell them that you're not going to be able to subdivide 100 acres of land, they've probably got 50 or 60 customers - potential customers - that may come into play. We've got people that run excavation equipment. We've got all kinds of that over there and that means that, you know, the Ed Bernier and the Brian Knightly's, who bought excavators who have trouble meeting payments on those excavators are going to miss out on a 100 acre land subdivision. I don't think that's what the wildlife -- the wildlife doesn't need the 100 acres. It's not even near the water. But I'm just using that as an example. And that's not the only one. And you know, there's reasons for different things, but I think that they need to, as Jen pointed out, they need to have a collaborative effort with the people in the community and get together and not have you know, where the refuge manager becomes a king. And I talked to Paul personally and I asked him to step back and be the refuge manager. Get out of the politics of the town. He doesn't need to be - he does not need to be the selectman to get across refuge policies. He does not need to throw 27 signatures on a petition away and disregard it and say, hey, this is not a popularity contest and throw it aside. That's wrong. That's against the First Amendment of the United States. He took an oath of office to uphold the Constitution of the United States. You violated constitutional rights that I have, you cannot do that. You need to resign yourself as selectman. Get back - step back. Be the refuge manager. I think you're well qualified; you're certainly are a good person, hey you have a family. Nobody wants to see you lose your job; we want to see you be the refuge manager. I am not interested in having you go down the drain in all these things, but we presently have a number of people who want to see that. Because, they have had enough. I'm not the only one, and people - we've got two congressional delegations in both states that are sending letters to the Department of Interior. This has got to stop. You need to step back

and be the refuge manager. Be the person that you could be. I think - I've talked with you a number of times, and I feel confident that you could do that. I'm giving you that opportunity. Step aside or we will recall you. Thank you very much. (applause)

Goettel: Thank you. Any other comments? Anybody else like to come up? We've got plenty of time here tonight, so if you'd like to come up, this is the time to do it. If you'd rather not come up, I encourage anybody who has any comments to put them in writing and send them in - the address is on the plan, and if there is no further comments, this concludes our final public hearing. Thank you all for attending and for your input. Again, Ian, Paul and Nancy will be here afterwards. If you have any questions, this is the time to do it. Thank you very much. (Applause)

END OF TAPE - END OF TRANSCRIPTION

Transcribed by
Action Business Services
15 Benton Drive
East Longmeadow, MA 01028