

1. Agenda

1.I. Planning Board Agenda 02/10/2025

Documents:

[PLANNING_BOARD_AGENDA_02102026.PDF](#)

2. Packet

2.I. 26-005 Off-Premises Signage Amendments Packet

Documents:

[26-005 OFF-PREMISES SIGNAGE AMENDMENTS PACKET.PDF](#)

2.II. 25-057: Ten Two LLC Subdivision - Sketch Plan And Waiver Request

Documents:

[25-057 TEN TWO SKETCH PACKET.PDF](#)
[25-057 TEN TWO WAIVER PACKET.PDF](#)
[CASE 25-057 FIRE DEPT MEMO.PDF](#)
[25_057_PUBLIC_COMMENT_FEB7_TO_FEB10.PDF](#)

2.III. 25-059 MaineHealth Cancer Center

Documents:

[25-059_DRAFT_FINAL_FOF_2.PDF](#)
[25_059_FINAL_PACKET.PDF](#)

3. Addendum



Town of Brunswick, Maine
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT

**Planning Board Meeting Agenda
Brunswick Town Hall
85 Union Street – Council Chambers
Tuesday, February 10, 2026 @ 6:00 PM**

There is an opportunity to attend this meeting in person or view the meeting via Zoom, TV 3, or live stream.

How to watch and comment via Zoom:

<https://www.brunswickme.org/313/Brunswick-Cable-TV3>

How to watch via TV3 or Live Stream:

The link to view or listen to the meeting on TV3 (Channel 3 on Comcast) or via live stream from the Town's website: <https://tv3hd.brunswickme.org/internetchannel/watch-now?channel=1>

The public may provide comment via email (mjames@brunswickme.gov) prior to the meeting OR they may provide live comment at the meeting via Zoom or in person. Comments are allowed during the public comment period, during public hearings, and on other items and matters at the discretion of the Planning Board Chair or Vice Chair.

1. **Case No. 26-005 – Off-Premises Signage – Zoning Text Amendment:** The Planning Board will hold a **PUBLIC HEARING** to review and make a recommendation to the Town Council regarding Zoning Text Amendments drafted by the Planning & Development Department. The amendments are proposed in Sections 4.13 and would facilitate allowing off-premises business directory signage.
2. **Case No. 25-057 – Ten Two LLC Subdivision – Waiver Request:** The Planning Board will review and act upon a **Street Design Standard Waiver Request** application submitted by Little River Land Survey on behalf of the property owner, Ten Two, LLC, for a three-lot subdivision. The proposed development exceeds the maximum allowable number of units to be served on a dead-end road. The subject property is located on Moody Road (Map 10, Lot 10) and within the **Rural Farm and Forest (RF) Zoning District, and the Shoreland Protection Overlay (SPO), the Shoreland Protection Overlay – Stream Protection (SPO-SP), and Aquifer Protection Overlay 3 (APO 3) Subdistricts.**
3. **Case No. 25-057 – Ten Two LLC Subdivision – Sketch Plan:** The Planning Board will review and act upon a **Major Development Review Sketch Plan** application submitted by Little River Land Survey on behalf of the property owner, Ten Two, LLC, for a three-lot subdivision. The proposed development exceeds the maximum allowable number of units to be served on a dead-end road. The subject property is located on Moody Road (Map 10, Lot 10) and within the **Rural Farm and Forest (RF) Zoning District, and the Shoreland Protection Overlay (SPO), the Shoreland Protection Overlay – Stream Protection (SPO-SP), and Aquifer Protection Overlay 3 (APO 3) Subdistricts.**
4. **Case No. 25-059 – MaineHealth Mid Coast Cancer Center Renovation:** The Planning Board will review and act upon a **Site Plan Amendment** application submitted by Pine Tree Engineering on behalf of the property owner, Mid

Please call the Brunswick Department of Planning and Development (725-6660) with questions or comments. Individuals needing auxiliary aids for effective communications please call 725-6659 or TDD 725-5521. This meeting will be televised.

Coast Health Services, for two one-story additions and the renovation of the existing building and parking area. The subject property is located at 81 Medical Center Drive (Map 45, Lot 32, 32-1) and within the **Growth Mixed-Use 8 (GM8) Zoning District, and the Shoreland Protection Overlay (SPO), Shoreland Protection Overlay – Stream Protection (SPO-SP), Shoreland Protection Overlay – Resource Protection (SPO-RP), Rural Protection Stormwater Management Overlay (RPSMO), Flood Protection Overlay (FPO), Wetland Protection Overlay (WPO), and Cook’s Corner Overlay (CCO)** subdistricts. Development is proposed in the **Growth Mixed-Use 8 (GM8) Zoning District and Cook’s Corner Overlay (CCO)**.

5. **Adjourn**

PLANNING BOARD REPORT
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT



Off-Premises Signage Amendments (#26-005)

Submitted to:	Brunswick Planning Board	Prepared By:	Julie Erdman Jimmy Dealaman
Public Hearing Date:	February 10, 2026	Date:	February 5, 2026

I. INTRODUCTION SUMMARY

A primary reason why the Town's zoning ordinance expressly prohibits off-premises signs in all zoning districts is because the cumulative impact of allowing off-premises signs for individual properties would contribute to greater visual clutter along public roads, create driver distraction, and make the Town's sign standards more difficult to administer and enforce. However, in locations where multiple businesses exist closely together, consolidated off-premises signage could improve wayfinding and may help shift larger signage away from building frontages resulting in less visually cluttered building elevations.

Last year staff received concerns from the business community that the ordinance's limitations included not allowing for off-premises business directory signs. A good example is where entrance roads leading into industrial parks exist outside of the park property, businesses cannot use external signage to communicate those businesses contained therewithin. Allowing off-premises signs in these cases would improve advertising of businesses that do not have the benefit of being located along a commercial corridor, as well as helping vehicles better navigate to these locations. Staff are recommending the attached zoning amendments to allow for business directory signage clustered in an off-premise location to address signage challenges like those experienced at industrial parks, as well as supporting more consolidated signage and orderly wayfinding at entrances to development.

The Planning Board is requested to review the attached zoning amendments (Attachments 1) and provide a recommendation to the Town Council.

II. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Since the January 27 Planning Board workshop, staff have added clarifying language to the draft amendments specifying that off-premises business directory signage would be subject to the same standards as Multi-Tenant Signs, which allow the following:

E. Multi-tenant Signs. Multi-tenant signs are permitted at major entrances to multi-tenant developed properties and shall comply with the sign type standards in this Ordinance and may exceed such standards as follows:

- (1) In the GA, GM1, GM2, GM3, GM4, GM5, GM7, GM8 (Bath Road frontage only), and GI zoning districts a multi-tenant sign may consist of 25 square feet per tenant; not to exceed a cumulative sign area of 200 square feet nor 15 feet in height.
- (2) In the GM6, GM8 (excluding Bath Road frontage lots) and RM zoning districts a multi-tenant sign may consist of 18 square feet per tenant, not to exceed a cumulative sign area of 54 square feet nor 12 feet in height

III. COMPATIBILITY WITH COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

In making its recommendation to the Town Council, the Planning Board will provide a recommendation whether the amendments are consistent with the town's [Comprehensive Plan](#).

Staff have reviewed the proposed amendments and believe they are consistent with the following:

- Action Strategy D.1 recommends supporting established economic drivers and large and small local businesses. Allowing for off-premises signage for businesses will provide greater flexibility for businesses to advertise and attract customers as well as providing more predictable wayfinding for customers and deliveries.

IV. NEXT STEPS

Staff request the Planning Board review the proposed amendments and vote on making a recommendation to the Town Council regarding their consistency with the Comprehensive Plan.

V. ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment 1. Draft Zoning Text Amendments - Off-Premises Signage

Sec. 4.13. Signs.

4.13.1. General Standard.

All new outdoor signs must be compatible in design and scale with their surroundings and shall not unreasonably interfere with the safe operation of adjoining roads, sidewalks, parking areas, or uses.

4.13.2. Specific Standards.

Signs may not unduly impact property values and should enhance and protect the physical appearance of the community, avoid distractions and obstructions, and reduce hazards that may be caused by signs.

A. Standards and Permits Required.

- (1) No sign shall be erected or altered unless it conforms to these regulations. Signs must be kept clean, legible, and free from all hazards, such as, but not limited to, faulty wiring, loose fastenings, or deterioration, and must be maintained at all times in such condition so as not to be detrimental to the public health or safety, or constitute a distraction or obstruction that may impair traffic safety. Any such sign that becomes a nuisance or a hazard to public safety shall be removed from the premises if so ordered by the Code Enforcement Officer.
- (2) A permit is not required if the area of the sign is one (1) square foot or less.
- (3) If applicable, no sign shall be erected or altered unless it conforms to the Cooks Corner Design Standards, or meets the intent of design guidelines established for the Village Review Overlay Zone, or the Brunswick Landing Design Guidelines (administered by the Midcoast Regional Redevelopment Authority).
- (4) The construction, alteration, maintenance and repair of all signs shall conform to all applicable building and electrical codes adopted by the Town of Brunswick.

B. Nonconforming Signs.

- (1) *Continuance.* A nonconforming sign may be continued even though it does not conform to the requirement of this Ordinance.
- (2) *Change.* Any change in the content of a nonconforming sign shall not constitute a change requiring the sign's compliance with the current sign standards in this Section 4.13 provided that, the sign is not a prohibited sign under subsection 4.13.2.C (Signs Expressly Prohibited), the changes do not make the sign more nonconforming, and a permit is obtained for the changes from the Code Enforcement Officer.
- (3) *Termination of Identified Use or Activity.* If a sign becomes nonconforming because the associated use or activity it identifies is terminated the sign face shall be removed within 30 days after the date the use or activity is terminated. If the sign face is not reused by another use or activity occupying the same site within one (1) year after the termination of the previous use, the entire sign, including all mountings, brackets, poles, sign faces, and other signage material, shall be removed.
- (4) *New Signs and Waivers.* New signs may be proposed for a site that contains nonconforming signs, provided that all new signs comply with this Section 4.13. The Review Authority may waive sign standards to allow new signs on a site containing nonconforming signs provided it finds that extenuating circumstances render compliance with this Section 4.13, infeasible or impractical, and that the signage plan for the entire site furthers the spirit and intent of this Ordinance by reducing visual clutter, or otherwise improves the aesthetic appearance of the signage on site by bringing the overall site into closer compliance with the requirements of this Section 4.13.

-
- (5) *Restoration and Reconstruction.* Any nonconforming sign that is destroyed or damaged by any cause may be restored or reconstructed to its pre-destruction or pre-damage condition provided that a permit for the restoration or reconstruction is obtained within one (1) year after the date of destruction or damage, and no existing nonconformity is increased and no new nonconformity is created. Any restoration or reconstruction of the sign approved more than one (1) year after the destruction or damage shall comply with all requirements of this Ordinance.
- C. *Signs Expressly Prohibited.* The following signs are prohibited in all zoning districts:
- (1) Off-premise signs. Except that business directory signs for three (3) or more businesses may be clustered in an off-premises location, to allow for wayfinding at entrances to a development, only when sufficient right, title, and interest is recorded at the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds, and the Planning Board finds that the following are met:
- i. Only one business directory sign is proposed per entrance to a development,
- ii. Signage is equally sized for each respective business and signage shall be subject to standards for Multi-tenant Signs 4.13.3(E)
- iii. All applicable Section 4.13 requirements are met
- The Code Enforcement Officer or his/her duly authorized representative has the authority to immediately remove any unauthorized off-premise sign.
- (2) Flashing illuminated signs, with the exception of Changeable Message signs allowed in Subsection 4.13.3.D.
- (3) Moving signs, including but not limited to inflatable/expandable object signs, wind/feather signs, streamers, pennants, large bundles of balloons [more than six (6)] and other signs with moving parts meant to attract the attention of the general public.
- (4) Roof signs.
- (5) Portable signs.
- (6) Distracting glare signs.
- (7) Signs located in, on, or projecting over any public right-of-way with the exception of signs as permitted in Subsection 4.13.2.D.
- D. *Exemption of Town Council-Authorized Signs.* Signs authorized by the Brunswick Town Council for installation on town-owned or leased property, or over public rights-of-way shall be permitted.
- E. *Calculation of Size of Sign.*
- (1) *Two-Sided Sign.* Only one (1) side of a sign shall be counted when determining the size of a two-sided sign.
- (2) *Signs Within or on Structures.* When the graphic representation of the sign occurs on a sign board, the size of the sign shall include the square footage of the sign board. For illuminated signs, all proportions of the sign that are illuminated shall be included in the square footage. Where individual sign graphics are attached to a structure and no sign board is used, the sign area is the sum of the areas of each of the graphic elements.
- F. *Illumination.*
- (1) *Directly Illuminated Signs.*
- a. The light emitted from a directly illuminated sign shall not result in light trespass beyond the intended area of illumination.

-
- b. Directly illuminated signs located in Growth Residential or any Rural zoning district are permitted only between the hours of 7:00 am and 11:00 pm or during hours open to the public, whichever is less.
 - (2) *Internally Illuminated Signs.* Internally illuminated signs are permitted only in the GM4, GM5, GM7, GM8 (Bath Road only), GA, and GI zoning districts.
 - (3) *Tube Illuminated Signs.* Tube illuminated signs, including neon signs, shall not result in excessive light trespass or glare in accordance with Subsection 4.14.1.J.
 - G. *Maximum Sign Size.* No sign shall exceed 200 square feet, except for:
 - (1) Any sign for which a smaller sign area is indicated in this Section 4.13; and
 - (2) Wall signage on structures greater than 30,000 square feet, which shall not exceed 250 square feet.
 - H. *Sign Maintenance.* All signs shall be maintained pursuant to Section 4.15 (Maintenance).

4.13.3. Standards for Sign Types Requiring Permits.

Signs are permitted as indicated in each Subsection below subject to a permit issued by the Code Enforcement Officer. The permit application shall indicate the type, size, and location of the sign and shall be accompanied by a fee as determined by the Town Council.

- A. *Awning Signs.*
 - (1) The area of an awning sign shall not be included in the total building sign area permitted by this Ordinance.
 - (2) The total area of awning signage shall not exceed one (1) square foot for each one (1) linear foot of awning width up to a maximum of 16 square feet.
 - (3) A vertical clearance of no less than eight (8) feet shall be maintained for all parts of an awning.
- B. *Campus-Type Signs.* The following signage is permitted on parcels of land developed in a campus-type environment and shall supersede standards for the specific sign type.
 - (1) *Vehicle Entrance Signs.* A freestanding pole or monument sign may be located at main vehicular entrances to the campus. Each sign shall comply with the following standards:
 - a. Freestanding pole signs shall not exceed 25 square feet in total sign area nor exceed 15 feet in height.
 - b. Freestanding monument signs shall not exceed 32 square feet in total sign area nor exceed ten (10) feet in height.
 - c. Vehicle entrance signs shall be sited within the boundaries of the campus and shall not be located within the right-of-way of any public street nor create or aggravate a traffic hazard.
 - d. For a campus-type parcel with multiple vehicular entry points, additional vehicle entrance signs, installed in accordance with Subsections a through c above, may be sited at each vehicular entry point.
 - (2) *Interior Campus Signs.* Interior campus signs may be installed and shall comply with the following standards:
 - a. Interior campus signs shall not exceed 15 square feet in size nor exceed ten (10) feet in height.

-
- b. Interior campus signs shall be sited within the boundaries of the campus and shall not be located within the right-of-way of any public street, nor create or aggravate a traffic hazard.
 - c. Internal campus signs not exceeding a total sign area of six (6) square feet nor ten (10) feet in height are exempt from the requirement of obtaining a sign permit.
 - C. *Canopy Signs.* Canopy signs are allowed in addition to other types of signs permitted by this Section 4.13. The sign area shall not extend beyond the edges of the canopy and shall comply with one (1) of the two (2) following alternative provisions:
 - (1) The total sign area shall not exceed nine (9) percent of the total square footage of all sides of the canopy with no more than two (2) signs located anywhere on the canopy.
 - (2) The total sign area shall not exceed 15 percent of the area of the side of the canopy on which it is located with no side containing more than one (1) sign.
 - D. *Changeable Message Signs.* All changeable message signs shall comply with the following standards.
 - (1) Changeable message signs shall only be permitted in the GM4, GM5, and GM8 (Bath Road frontage only) zoning districts.
 - (2) Each sign shall meet the dimensional requirements per Section 4.13 of this Ordinance.
 - (3) Messages shall remain fixed on the display surface for not less than five (5) seconds and may transition as rapidly as technologically practicable, but not to exceed a transition time of one (1) second, with no phasing, rolling, scrolling, flashing, or blending of content.
 - (4) Such signs shall be equipped with a sensor or other device that automatically determines the ambient illumination conditions and be programmed to automatically dim the sign illumination to not exceed the ambient light conditions by more than 0.3 foot candles. The Code Enforcement Officer shall use the Illumination Measurement Criteria in accordance with the "Night-time Brightness Levels for On-Premise Electronic Message Centers" as recommended by the International Sign Association dated April 2011, as amended, which is on file in the Department of Planning and Development office.
 - (5) Such signs shall not be visible from a controlled-access highway or ramp.
 - E. *Multi-tenant Signs.* Multi-tenant signs are permitted at major entrances to multi-tenant developed properties and shall comply with the sign type standards in this Ordinance and may exceed such standards as follows:
 - (1) In the GA, GM1, GM2, GM3, GM4, GM5, GM7, GM8 (Bath Road frontage only), and GI zoning districts a multi-tenant sign may consist of 25 square feet per tenant; not to exceed a cumulative sign area of 200 square feet nor 15 feet in height.
 - (2) In the GM6, GM8 (excluding Bath Road frontage lots) and RM zoning districts a multi-tenant sign may consist of 18 square feet per tenant, not to exceed a cumulative sign area of 54 square feet nor 12 feet in height.
 - F. *Monument Signs.*
 - (1) In the GM1, GM2, GM3, GM4, GM5, GM7, GM8 (Bath Road frontage only), and GI zoning districts the size of the face of a monument sign shall not exceed 32 square feet nor a height of ten (10) feet.
 - (2) In the GC2 and 3, GM6, GM8 (excluding Bath Road frontage lots) and RM zoning districts the size of a monument sign shall not exceed 18 square feet nor a height of eight feet. The maximum height of a monument sign is ten (10) feet.

-
- (3) In all other zoning districts the height of a monument sign shall not exceed six (6) feet nor 12 square feet in size.
 - (4) Only one (1) monument sign per 250 feet of lot frontage is permitted. For a lot of record with less than 250 feet of lot frontage, one (1) monument sign is permitted.
 - G. *Tube illuminated Window Signs.* Tube illuminated signs, including neon signs, that are placed inside a window are permitted, and shall not exceed 25 percent of the glass area of the window on which the sign is to be placed.
 - H. *Multiple-Driveway Signs.* A multiple-driveway sign may not exceed two (2) square feet in area and shall be placed so as not to impede sight distance.
 - I. *Pole Signs.*
 - (1) Only one (1) pole sign per 250 feet of lot frontage is permitted. For a lot of record with less than 250 feet of lot frontage, one (1) pole sign is permitted.
 - (2) In the GA, GM1, GM2, GM3, GM4, GM5, GM7, GM8 (lots with Bath Road frontage only), and GI Districts, the height of the pole sign shall not exceed 15 feet and the size of a pole sign shall not exceed 25 square feet.
 - (3) In the GM6, GM8 (excluding lots with Bath Road frontage), GC2 and 3, and RM zoning districts, the height of a pole sign shall not exceed ten (10) feet and the size of the pole sign shall not exceed 18 square feet. Pole signs in these districts shall be constructed of materials that are made of or resemble wood.
 - (4) In all other zoning districts the height of a pole sign shall not exceed ten (10) feet and the size of a pole sign shall not exceed 15 square feet. Pole signs in these districts shall be constructed of materials that are made of or resemble wood.
 - (5) Pole signs shall be set back at least five (5) feet from a side or rear property line.
 - J. *Projecting Signs.*
 - (1) In all Growth Residential (GR) zoning districts, GM6, and GM8 (excluding lots with Bath Road frontage) zoning districts, Growth College (GC) zoning districts, and Rural Area zoning districts the size of a projecting sign shall not exceed six (6) square feet and the sign shall not project more than three (3) feet beyond the wall to which it is attached.
 - (2) In the GM1, GM2, GM3, GM4, GM5, GM7, GM8 (lots with Bath Road frontage only), and GI zoning districts, the size of a projecting sign shall not exceed 25 square feet.
 - (3) Where a projecting sign projects over a sidewalk, it must clear the sidewalk by at least eight (8) feet.
 - (4) Any use that contains a projecting sign may not contain a pole sign, unless the projecting sign is located 50 feet or more from a public right-of-way.
 - (5) Projecting signs shall not be placed above the first story of a structure unless it is related to a use that occurs above the first floor. Where a projecting sign occurs above the first story of a structure, it may not be placed higher than the midpoint of the second story.
 - K. *Wall Signs.*
 - (1) No wall sign shall protrude beyond the roof line or cornice structure of a building, and shall not cover windows, doors or architectural detailing of the building to which it is affixed.
 - (2) In the GA, GM1, GM2, GM3, GM4, GM5, GM7, GM8 (lots with Bath Road frontage only), and GI zoning districts, each establishment shall be allowed wall signage not to exceed a total of 25

square feet. However establishments occupying a portion of the building's principal façade shall be allowed wall signage not to exceed 25 square feet or ten (10%) percent of that portion of the principal façade occupied by that establishment, whichever is greater.

- (3) In the GM6, GM8 (excluding lots with Bath Road frontage), GC2, GC3 and RM zoning districts, wall signs shall not exceed 16 square feet. Wall signs shall be placed on the building floor level of which the establishment is located.
- (4) In all other zoning districts, each establishment shall be allowed wall signage not to exceed a total of 16 square feet. However, establishments occupying a portion of the building's principal façade shall be allowed wall signage not to exceed 16 square feet or ten (10) percent of that portion of the principal façade occupied by that establishment, whichever is greater.

4.13.4. Temporary Signs Allowed and Not Subject to Permitting.

Temporary signs are permitted as indicated below and are not subject to a permit. Temporary signs listed below shall not be placed in a position that will impair vision, obstruct traffic, or create a hazard or nuisance to the general public.

A. Sidewalk or Sandwich Signs.

- (1) Sidewalk or sandwich signs, including but not limited to, easel signs and other similar signs are permitted in any district and shall be made of durable materials (i.e., not of cardboard or paper).
- (2) Such signs shall be placed to allow at least five (5) feet of sidewalk width for unrestricted pedestrian movement and shall not create a vehicular traffic hazard.
- (3) Such sign shall not exceed eight (8) square feet in size per side.
- (4) Only one (1) sign per establishment is permitted and shall be removed each day at the close of business.

B. Freestanding/Yard Signs.

- (1) The size of a freestanding/yard sign shall not exceed eight (8) square feet in GN, GR1-10, RR, RN, RF and RP1-2 Districts nor 24 square feet in all other zoning districts.
- (2) With the exception of political signs, a freestanding/yard sign may be placed on-premise no more than three (3) days prior to the activity and shall be removed within three (3) days of the end of the activity.
- (3) Political signs on private property may remain indefinitely, and shall not be located on Town-owned property, including but not limited to rights-of-way, schools, parks, cemeteries.
- (4) Freestanding/yard signs are prohibited to be located within a public right-of-way.

C. Window Signs. Window signs are allowed provided they are placed on the inside of the window and occupy no more than 25 percent of the glassed area of the window on which the sign is to be placed.

D. Flag Signs. A flag sign is allowed in all zoning districts so long as such sign is attached to a structure.

4.13.5. Special Event Signs Requiring Notice to Code Enforcement Officer.

- A. Prior to installing any special event sign, the building occupant or property owner shall submit written notification to the Code Enforcement Officer of the proposed sign's installation and removal.
- B. No individual building occupant or property owner may install a special event sign for more than 90 days within a calendar year, provided that special event or notice signs for an event exceeding 90 days in length may remain in place for (a) a period not to exceed five (5) calendar days immediately following the

conclusion of the event, or (b) 180 days per calendar year, whichever is less, upon written approval by the Code Enforcement Officer.

- C. Special event signs shall not interfere with pedestrian or vehicular access.
- D. Special event signs shall be located on the property of which the special event is to take place.

4.13.6. *Special Requirements Signs.*

The following signs are allowed subject to special requirements without obtaining a permit from the Code Enforcement Officer.

- A. *Public Safety Signs.* Governmental bodies may erect and maintain signs necessary for the public safety and welfare, or as required by law, Ordinance or government regulation.
- B. *Banners.* Town Council permission is required to raise a banner over a Town-owned public right-of-way and the Town Council or its designee may restrict where and when such banners may be displayed.
- C. *Official Business Directional Signs.* An Official Business Directional Sign visible from a public way may be erected or maintained in the Town of Brunswick in accordance with the following standards and with applicable provisions of the Maine Traveler Information Services Act (23 M.R.S.A. § 1901-1925, as amended) and any related regulations of the Maine Department of Transportation (MDOT), not inconsistent with the provisions of this Section 4.13.
 - (1) *Qualifying Uses.* The following uses are qualifying uses:
 - a. Public and private schools and colleges.
 - b. Airports.
 - c. Cultural facilities and historic monuments.
 - d. Recreational facilities.
 - e. Municipal and other government facilities.
 - f. Nonprofit organizations.
 - g. Public accommodations and commercial businesses.
 - h. Retail agricultural operation.
 - (2) *Number of Signs.* Not more than four (4) official business directional signs may be permitted per each qualified use.
 - (3) *Placement of Signs.* Official Business Directional Signs may not be installed on a State-Aid highway/road frontage, a Bath Road frontage, in the GM6 zoning district, the Village Review Overlay District, or the Maine Street or Park Row right-of-way.
 - (4) *Additional Requirements.* The following additional requirements shall apply to Official Business Directional Signs:
 - a. Official Business Directional Signs shall be a standard size of 12"x48".
 - b. To obtain a permit for an Official Business Directional Sign, the business, service facility, or point of interest must be located within a five-mile radius of the proposed location of the sign.
 - c. The background color of all signs shall be blue and shall be in accordance with the highway blue color tolerance charts PR-Color#3. All legends and borders shall be silver.

-
- d. All Official Business Directional Signs, apart from those proposed for Route 1 or Interstate 295, must direct travelers to a Brunswick based business, service facility or point of interest.
 - e. The minimum distance between Official Business Directional Signposts shall be at least 300 feet as measured along the shortest straight line.
 - f. No Official Business Directional Sign shall be placed closer than 200 feet from the property line of a commercial business offering directly competing goods or services.
 - g. An Official Business Directional Sign shall be located no closer than 200 feet, nor further than 2,500 feet, from an intersection where a change in direction as indicated on said sign is required.
 - h. No more than three (3) Official Business Directional Signs may be attached to an individual signpost assembly. No new signpost assembly shall be installed until existing signpost assemblies suitable for any newly proposed Official Business Directional Sign contain the maximum number of permitted signs.
- (5) *Permitting and approval process.* Any entity wishing to erect an Official Business Directional Sign shall make application with the Maine Department of Transportation on an application form provided by MDOT. Prior to submittal to the MDOT for final review, the application will require the signature of the Brunswick Code Enforcement Officer certifying compliance with the Town's Zoning Ordinance and the approval of the Town's Police and Public Works Departments.

Town of Brunswick, Maine

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

DRAFT FINDINGS OF FACT SKETCH PLAN MAJOR DEVELOPMENT REVIEW PLANNING BOARD

CASE NUMBER: 25-057

PROJECT NAME: Ten Two LLC Subdivision

LOCATION: 0 Moody Road (Map 10 Lot 10)

APPLICANT: Ten Two LLC
97 Ledge Brook Crossing
Brunswick, ME 04011

REPRESENTATIVE: Little River Land Surveying
16 Cattail Lane
Lisbon, ME 04250

REVIEW DATE: February 10, 2025

ZONING DISTRICT: Rural Farm and Forest (RF) Zone

OVERLAY ZONING: Shoreland Protection Overlay (SPO)
Shoreland Protection Overlay – Stream Protection (SPO-SP)
Wildlife Protection Overlay (WPO)
Aquifer Protection Overlay 3 (APO 3)

NOTICE: 300-foot abutter notices sent 11/18/2025

I. PROJECT SUMMARY:

The applicant proposes a three-lot subdivision along Moody Road on a 17.43 acre undeveloped parcel. The subdivision is anticipated to support three houses - one dwelling unit per lot - each with a private driveway, septic system, and well. No new construction or infrastructure is proposed for review by the Board.

Lot 1 is proposed at approximately 7.55 acres, Lot 2 at approximately 4.24 acres, and Lot 3 at approximately 5.64 acres.

The applicant has submitted a Sketch Plan Major Development Review application and is currently seeking direction from the Planning Board in accordance with all pertinent provisions of the zoning ordinance.

The applicant is also requesting a waiver for the maximum allowable number of units on a dead-end street (the Street Standards Ordinance provides for 25 units before further review is required).

The Staff Review Committee (SRC) reviewed the Sketch Plan Major Development Review application on January 14, 2026, and minutes are attached for the Board's reference.

II. APPLICATION COMPLETENESS

Staff has reviewed the application and determined that it is complete.

Draft Motion #1:

That the Planning Board concurs with staff's conclusion that the basic Sketch Plan Major Development Review application materials have been submitted and that the application is complete such that the Board may proceed with substantive review of the application and identification of any further information required from the applicant.

Motion:

Second:

Vote:

III. SKETCH PLAN REVIEW

Staff has reviewed the submitted Sketch Plan with pertinent provisions of the zoning ordinance and is providing a summary of review comments and recommendations for the Board's consideration.

Zone:

The subject property is located within the Rural Farm and Forest (RF) Zoning District, the Shoreland Protection Overlay (SPO), Shoreland Protection Overlay – Stream Protection (SPO-SP), Wildlife Protection Overlay (WPO), and Aquifer Protection Overlay 3 (APO 3) Subdistricts.

No development is proposed that would intersect with these zones. Future development of each proposed lot will be reviewed by the Code Enforcement Officer and/or other applicable review authorities.

Use:

Table 3.3: Permitted Use Table for Rural Area Zoning Districts of the Zoning Ordinance designates residential developments as a permitted use in the Rural Farm and Forest (RF) Zoning District.

Dimensional and Density Standards:

The Town Codes Enforcement Officer has reviewed the application and determined that it complies with all the applicable dimensional and density standards for the Rural Farm and Forest (RF) Zoning District as established in *Table 4.2.4: Dimensional and Density Standards for Rural Zoning Districts* of the Zoning Ordinance.

All proposed lots are greater than 2 acres and provide at least 150 feet of street frontage on Moody Road.

Access and Circulation:

Access to each proposed lot will be taken from Moody Road. Private driveways will be utilized for each lot but are not proposed as part of this review; driveway entrance permits issued by the Engineering Department will be required. The proposed development is also required to obtain

a waiver for the maximum number of units allowed on a public dead-end road, per sections 14-187: *Design Standards*, and 14-190: *Waivers*, of the municipal Code of Ordinances. A waiver application has been submitted for concurrent review with the sketch plan submittal.

IV. MOTION FOR APPROVAL:

Draft Motion #3:

That the Sketch Plan Application is approved.

Motion:

Second:

Vote:

V. ATTACHMENTS

- A. Sketch Plan Major Development Review Application for the Ten Two LLC Subdivision, dated November 17, 2025, and submitted by Little River Land Surveying
- B. Street Design Standards Waiver Application for the Ten Two LLC Subdivision, dated January 20, 2026, and submitted by Little River Land Surveying
- C. Memorandum from Trey Crews, Town Engineer, dated January 28, 2026
- D. Memorandum from Ryan Leighton, Director of Public Works, dated January 22, 2026
- E. Memorandum from, Kristin Collins, Town Attorney, dated February 5, 2026
- F. SRC minutes for January 14 and 28, 2026.

Town of Brunswick

PLANNING & CODES

Committee:	Staff Review Committee		
Date of Meeting:	1/14/2026	Time:	10:00 AM
Minutes Prepared By:	Emily Stone	Location:	Town Hall, Council Chambers / Zoom
1. Purpose of Meeting (<i>Weekly meeting, Training, Workshop, etc....</i>)			
Weekly meeting			

2. Attendance	
Staff:	Ryan Leighton, Director of Public Works Chrissy Adamowicz, Project Manager, Economic Development Trey Crews, Town Engineer Matt James, Land Use Planner Jim Flood, Engineer, Water District Julie Erdman, Director of Planning and Development Taylor Lund, Code Enforcement Officer & Zoning Administrator Taylor Burns, Town Assessor Ashley Charleson, Environmental Planner Jimmy Dealaman, Principal Planner Josh Shean, Deputy Fire Chief
Non-SRC Staff:	
Applicants:	Ten Two LLC Jay Raitt / Little River Land Surveying
Public:	

3. Meeting Agenda
1. Case No. 25-057 – Ten Two LLC Subdivision – Major Development Review Sketch Plan: The Staff Review Committee will review and make a recommendation to the Planning Board on a Major Development Review Sketch Plan application submitted by Little River Land Survey on behalf of the property owner, Ten Two, LLC, for a three-lot subdivision. The subject property is located on Moody Road (Map 10, Lot 10) and within the Rural Farm and Forest (RF) Zoning District, and the Shoreland Protection Overlay (SPO), the Shoreland Protection Overlay – Stream Protection (SPO-SP), and Aquifer Protection Overlay 3 (APO 3) Subdistricts.
4. Discussion, Decisions, Issues
Jay Raitt - At this point, I think this is a sketch level submission. It's really just a creation of three parcels out of a larger parcel. We have shown on another division that happened as a result of the sale from the estate prior in 2024, I believe. There's no proposed infrastructure. Since the developer's not here, I'm not sure where they plan to build the houses, but I suspect based on other activity they would be pretty close to Moody Road. Given that, there wouldn't be a significant impact to any of the

natural resources like some of the wetlands that run a little bit farther from the road. I can try to answer what questions you have, but I'm not sure what the developer's intent is in terms of where they plan to site homes or if they plan to just sell these lots as is.

Ryan – No comments.

Taylor Burns - My only comment for the developers is to note that this parcel is fully enrolled in the Open Space Tax Relief program. In order to develop in the future, it would need to be withdrawn from the program and the penalty paid.

Matt – Dennis Wilson, our Arborist, Jim Flood from the Water District, Jen Nicholson from the Sewer District and the Police Department do not have any comments for this project.

Chrissy – No comments.

Trey - A little backstory this lot. Map 10, lot 10; in 2024 it came for a waiver to approve one to two more dwelling units being built on that lot, which was approved. This is now seeking to subdivide it and add more units, so you will need to request a waiver from the street standards to put additional units onto Moody Road. So, you will have to ask that of the Planning Board. You should submit some sort of narrative on anticipated traffic and safety impacts. The proposed development a little farther north has already done a lot of that work. I don't foresee any major traffic or safety issues with this subdivision, but technically you do need to ask for a new waiver for this project.

Jimmy – No comments.

Matt – No comments.

Julie - I just wanted to piggyback on what Trey was saying about the waiver request. We do have an application form now that's online specifically for the street standards waiver. So, you would want to fill that out and submit it when you come through for final or potentially before that.

Taylor Lund – No comments.

Ashley – No comments.

Josh – Usually for new subdivisions the fire department requires a cistern to be put in for water supply. This one especially because it's going in on a dead-end road that exceeds the maximum number of units. Because they're individual units and not part of an organized HOA, I would ask that a requirement to be added to the deed that residential sprinkler systems to be installed. That also has a benefit. Without a sprinkler system, residential buildings have to be 150 feet from a fire department access road, depending on the size of the lots and how they're laid out. With a sprinkler system, the residential units can be up to 450 feet from the fire department access road.

Matt – Looks like no one for public comment. Jay, do you have any questions for us?

Jay - No, I think that's pretty clear. I didn't put in the waiver for the street standards for when they divided this into two parcels. I think that was the homeowner or the representative for the estate. We can certainly do that for the division; I'm not sure if I would be requesting a waiver for an additional two dwelling units because one has been granted for two? And in terms of the sprinkler systems, I'll talk to the developer about that. It's either a cistern or sprinkler systems, I think is what you're telling me.

Josh - Normally we would require a cistern with an organized HOA but where these are three separate building lots added to Moody Road, we would be looking for them to be sprinkled.

Julie - And then for the waiver request, I would just make note that it's a modification to a previously approved waiver, and you can note how many units were approved and the date of that. I can get you a copy of that waiver.

Jay - I don't have any other questions.

Matt - I think that given the circumstances with similar projects happening right now you might have a bit of an uphill battle despite getting in before the moratorium. I think it might be worth talking to the developer and seeing whether you want to proceed with asking for a waiver first or get through the sketch plan and then move on to that. If you want to proceed with a sketch plan right now, we can probably do that at the meeting on January 27th or the meeting on February 10th.

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW APPLICATION

1. Development Review application type (refer to **Appendix D**):

☐

Minor Development Review

☒

Major Development Review: **Sketch Plan**

☐

Major Development Review: **Final Plan**

2. Project Name: TEN TWO LLC SUBDIVISION

3. Project Applicant

Name: TEN TWO LLC
Address: 97 LEDGE BROOK CROSSING
BRUNSWICK, ME 04101
Phone Number: 207-751-4313
Email: jsnell@jaidenlandscaping.com

4. Property Owner (name on deed)

Name: TEN TWO LLC
Address: 97 LEDGE BROOK CROSSING
BRUNSWICK, ME 04101
Phone Number: 207-751-04101
Email: jsnell@jaidenlandscaping.com

5. Authorized Representative

Name: JAY RAITT / LITTLE RIVER LAND SURVEYING
Address: 16 CATTAIL LANE
LISBON, ME 04250
Phone Number: 207-841-0056
Email: JRAITT@LRLS.NET

6. List of Design Consultants. Indicate the registration number, address and phone number, email for any additional project engineers, surveyors, architects, landscape architects or planners:

1. JERAMIAH J. RAITT, SURVEYOR, ME 2376
2. _____
3. _____

7. Physical location of property: MOODY ROAD, BRUNSWICK

8. Lot Size: 17.43 ACRES

9. Zoning District: RURAL FARM & FOREST DISTRICT

10. Overlay Zoning District(s): _____

11. Indicate the interest of the applicant in the property and abutting property. For example, is the applicant the owner of the property and abutting property? If not, who owns the property subject to this application? If property owner is an organization, what is the applicant's affiliation?

PROPERTY OWNER

12. Assessor's Tax Map 10 Lot Number 10 of subject property.

13. Brief description of proposed use/subdivision: _____

3 LOT SUBDIVISION, NO NEW INFRASTRUCTURE PROPOSED

14. Describe specific physical improvements to be done: _____

THREE HOUSES, DRIVEWAYS, SEPTIC SYSTEMS AND WELLS

Property Owner Signature:




FOR TEN TWO LLC

Date: **11-17-2025**

Property Owner Name Printed:

TEN TWO LLC

Applicant Signature:



FOR TEN TWO LLC

Date: **11-17-2025**

Applicant Name & Title Printed:

TEN TWO LLC

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS

The submission requirements contained in Appendix D of the Brunswick Zoning Ordinance (attached in checklist format for each application category) shall apply to all Minor Development, Major Development, and Streamlined Major Development Review unless a waiver is granted. Proposed development applications shall be submitted to the Director of Planning and Development.

For each item listed in Appendix D the applicant shall either submit the requested information or request a waiver from the information requirement pursuant to Subsection 5.2.9.M of the Zoning Ordinance.

REQUIREMENTS FOR SKETCH PLAN APPLICATION SUBMITTAL Please mark box with one of the following: "W" (Waiver); "P" (Pending); "X" (Submitted) or "N/A" (Not applicable)		Sketch Plan
General	Application form and fee	X
	Name of development	X
	Existing zoning district and overlay designations	X
	Location map (Project property and surrounding area for context)	X
	Location of features, natural and artificial, such as water bodies, wetlands, streams, important habitats, vegetation, railroads, ditches and buildings	X
	Documentation of Right, Title and Interest	X
	Draft performance guarantee or conditional agreement	N/A?
	List of anticipated permits required (federal, state, local)	N/A
Survey, Topography, & Existing Conditions	Scale, date, north point, and area	X
	Existing easements associated with the development	X
	Existing locations of sidewalks	N/A
	Approximate locations of dedicated public open space, areas protected by conservation easements and recreation areas	N/A
	When applicable, a table indicating the maximum number of lots permitted based upon the applicable dimensional requirements, the number of lots proposed, and the number of lots permitted to be further subdivided.	N/A?
	Building envelopes showing acceptable locations for principal and accessory structures, setbacks and impervious coverage	X
Proposed Development Plan	Number of lots if a subdivision	X
	If proposing 15 or more units of rental housing, describe how affordability requirements will be met.	N/A

REQUIREMENTS FOR FINAL PLAN & MINOR DEVELOPMENT REVIEW APPLICATION SUBMITTAL		Final Plan	Minor	Staff
Please mark box with one of the following: “W” (Waiver); “P” (Pending); “X” (Submitted) or “N/A” (Not applicable)				
General	Application form and fee			
	Name of development			
	Existing zoning district and overlay designations			
	Location map (Project property and surrounding area for context)			
	Location of features, natural and artificial, such as water bodies, wetlands, streams, important habitats, vegetation, railroads, ditches and buildings			
	Documentation of Right, Title and Interest			
	Draft performance guarantee or conditional agreement			
	Disclosure of permits required (federal, state, local); if permit has been granted or application submitted, provide a copy			
	Drafts of legal documents appropriate to the application, including: deeds, easements, conservation easements, deed restrictions or covenants, home/property owners association declarations and by-laws, and such other agreements or documents as are necessary to show the manner in which common areas will be owned, maintained, and protected			
	Narrative including Chapter 4 development standards and any applicable overlay standards and how they are being addressed			
Survey, Topography, & Existing Conditions	Written response to all Staff Review Committee comments received			
	Scale, date, north point, and area			
	A survey submitted by a professional land surveyor with a current license by the State of Maine Board of Licensure for Professional Surveyors. Surveys must be stamped for final plan approval.			
	Boundaries of all lots and tracts with accurate distances and bearings, locations of all permanent monuments on the property identified as existing or proposed.			
	Location of existing utilities; water, sewer, electrical lines, and profiles of underground facilities			
	Existing easements associated with the development			
	Existing locations of sidewalks			
	Approximate locations of dedicated public open space, areas protected by conservation easements and recreation areas			
	When applicable, a table indicating the maximum number of lots permitted based upon the applicable dimensional requirements, the number of lots proposed, and the number of lots permitted to be further subdivided.			
	Building envelopes showing acceptable locations for principal and accessory structures, setbacks and impervious coverage			
	Existing location, size, profile and cross section of sanitary sewers; description, plan and location of other means of sewage disposal with evidence of soil suitability			
	Topography with contour intervals of not more than two (2) feet			
	A delineation of wetlands, floodplains, important habitats, and other environmentally sensitive areas			
	A Medium Intensity Soil Survey, available from the Cumberland County Soil and Water Conservation District. The Planning Board may require a Class A (high intensity) Soil Survey, prepared in accordance with the standards of the Maine Association of Professional Soil Scientists, if issues of water quality, wetlands or other natural constraints are noted.			

REQUIREMENTS FOR FINAL PLAN & MINOR DEVELOPMENT REVIEW APPLICATION SUBMITTAL		Final Plan	Minor	Staff
Please mark box with one of the following: "W" (Waiver); "P" (Pending); "X" (Submitted) or "N/A" (Not applicable)				
Infrastructure - Proposed	Name, location, width of paving and rights-of-way, profile, cross-section dimensions, curve radii of existing and proposed streets; profiles of center-lines of proposed streets, at a horizontal scale of one (1) inch = 50 feet and vertical scale of one (1) = five (5) feet, with all evaluations referred to in U.S.G.S. datum			
	Proposed easements associated with the development			
	Kind, location, profile and cross-section of all proposed drainage facilities, both within and connections to the proposed development, and a storm-water management plan in accordance with Section 4.5.4			
	Location of proposed utilities; water, sewer, electrical lines, and profiles of underground facilities. Tentative locations of private wells.			
	Proposed location, size, profile and cross section of sanitary sewers; description, plan and location of other means of sewage disposal with evidence of soil suitability			
	Proposed locations, widths and profiles of sidewalks			
	Locations, dimensions, and number of proposed vehicular and bicycle parking spaces, including proposed shared parking arrangement if applicable.			
	Grading, erosion control, and landscaping plan; proposed finished grades, slopes, swells, and ground cover or other means of stabilization			
	Storm water management plan for the proposed project prepared by a professional engineer			
	The size and proposed location of water supply and sewage disposal systems			
	A statement from the General Manager of the Brunswick Sewer District as to conditions under which the Sewer District will provide public sewer and approval of the proposed sanitary sewer infrastructure			
	A statement from the General Manager of the Brunswick and Topsham Water District as to conditions under which public water will be provided and approval of the proposed water distribution infrastructure			
	Proposed Development Plan	Lighting plan showing details of all proposed lighting and the location of that lighting in relation to the site		
Reference to special conditions stipulated by the Review Authority				
Proposed ownership and approximate location and dimensions of open spaces for conservation and recreation. Dedicated public open specs, areas protected by conservation easements, and existing and proposed open spaces or recreation areas and potential connectivity to adjoining open space.				
When applicable, a table indicating the maximum number of lots permitted based upon the applicable dimensional requirements, the number of lots proposed, and the number of lots permitted to be further subdivided.				
Building envelopes showing acceptable locations for principal and accessory structures, setbacks and impervious coverage				
Disclosures of any required permits. If a permit has been granted or an application for one submitted, provide a copy of the permit application.				
A statement from the General Manager of the Brunswick and Topsham Water District regarding the proposed development if located within an Aquifer Protection Zone				
A plan of all new construction, expansion and/or redevelopment of existing facilities, including type, size, footprint, floor layout, setback, elevation of first floor slab, storage and loading areas				

REQUIREMENTS FOR FINAL PLAN & MINOR DEVELOPMENT REVIEW APPLICATION SUBMITTAL		Final Plan	Minor	Staff
Please mark box with one of the following: “W” (Waiver); “P” (Pending); “X” (Submitted) or “N/A” (Not applicable)				
Proposed Development Plan	An elevation view of all sides of each building proposed indicating height, color, bulk, surface treatment, signage and other features as may be required by specific design standards [Cooks Corner or Village Review]			
	A circulation plan describing all pedestrian and vehicle traffic flow on surrounding road systems			
	Traffic: A trip generation report			
	A site landscaping plan indicating grade change, vegetation to be preserved, new plantings used to stabilize areas of cut and fill, screening, the size, locations and purpose and type of vegetation			
	Number of lots if a subdivision			
	A plan showing all ten (10) inch caliper trees to be removed as a result of the development proposal			
	All applicable materials necessary for the Review Authority to review the proposal in accordance with the criteria of Chapter 5.			
	Any additional studies required by the Review Authority			

TRUSTEE'S DEED

DLN: 2510657

MARK J. FISHER, CURRENT TRUSTEE OF THE JANICE K. FISHER TRUST DATED APRIL 20, 1999, of Portland, County of Cumberland, and State of Maine, for consideration paid, grants to **TEN TWO LLC**, a Maine limited liability company with its principal place of business in Brunswick, County of Cumberland, and State of Maine, having a mailing address of 97 Ledge Brook Crossing, Brunswick, ME 04011, the real property in the Town of Brunswick, County of Cumberland, and State of Maine, more particularly described as follows:

BEGINNING on the westerly line of Moody Road at the southerly corner of land now or formerly of Jade Stuart and Samuel Stuart as described in a deed dated May 27, 2001 and recorded in book 38263, page 303;

THENCE S 23° 07' 27" W along Moody Road a distance of 234.56 feet to a point;

THENCE S 21° 16' 40" W along Moody Road a distance of 85.27 feet to a point;

THENCE S 12° 33' 47" W along Moody Road a distance of 160.93 feet to the easterly corner of land recently conveyed by this grantor;

THENCE N 58° 10' 29" W along land recently conveyed by this grantor a distance of 599.71 feet to a point;

THENCE S 81° 37' 00" W along land recently conveyed by this grantor a distance of 785.12 feet to a point in the easterly line of land now or formerly Brenda C. Masse and Patrick J. Masse as described in a deed dated September 8, 1997 and recorded in book 13337, page 263;

THENCE N 32° 37' 50" E along the land of Brenda C. Masse and Patrick J. Masse a distance of 567.44 feet to a point;

THENCE N 09° 57' 29" E along the land of Brenda C. Masse and Patrick J. Masse a distance of 112.62 feet to a point;

THENCE N 11° 51' 57" E along the land of Brenda C. Masse and Patrick J. Masse a distance of 437.16 feet to the westerly corner of land now or formerly of Stefanie M. Hallett and Alex C. Hallett as described in a deed dated September 22, 2023 and recorded in book 40385, page 29;

THENCE S 56° 56' 56" E along the land of Stefanie M. Hallett and Alex C. Hallett a distance of 516.19 feet to a point in the northwesterly line of land of Jade Stuart and Samuel Stuart;

THENCE S 33° 20' 46" W along the land of Jade Stuart and Samuel Stuart a distance of 99.96 feet to a point;

THENCE S 58° 06' 13" E along the land of Jade Stuart and Samuel Stuart a distance of 92.07 feet to a point;

THENCE S 58° 22' 51" E along the land of Jade Stuart and Samuel Stuart a distance of 203.47 feet to a point;

THENCE S 58° 36' 52" E along the land of Jade Stuart and Samuel Stuart a distance of 46.71 feet to a point;

THENCE S 58° 24' 54" E along the land of Jade Stuart and Samuel Stuart a distance of 148.75 feet to a point;

THENCE S 58° 37' 54" E along the land of Jade Stuart and Samuel Stuart a distance of 101.15 feet to a point;

THENCE S 58° 14' 41" E along the land of Jade Stuart and Samuel Stuart a distance of 172.76 feet to the Point of Beginning of the parcel herein described.

This parcel includes 17.43 acres, more or less.

This being the remaining portion of the premises described in a deed to Janice Fisher, Trustee of the Janice Fisher Trust, dated April 20, 1999 and recorded in book 14704, page 106.

This property is conveyed subject to any easements or rights of way of record.

Bearings used herein are referenced to the State Plane Coordinate System of 1983, Maine West Zone.

Reference may be made to a "Survey Of Proposed Division Of Property of Mark J. Fisher, Co-Trustee Of The Janice K. Fisher Trust" dated August 13, 2024 and revised through August 22, 2024 by Little River Land Surveying, Inc.


Mark J. Fisher, Trustee of the Janice K. Fisher Trust, dated April 20, 1999 hereby certifies the following:

1. This Certificate is made pursuant to Title 18-B M.R.S. § 1013 of the Maine Trust Code by Mark J. Fisher, as current Trustee of the Janice K. Fisher Trust dated April 20, 1999.

2. I, Mark J. Fisher, am the current Trustee of The Janice K. Fisher Trust, dated April 20, 1999, of which the prior Co-Trustee and Settlor, Janice K. Fisher, died on November 28, 2021, leaving me as sole Trustee.
3. That said Trust has not been altered, revoked, amended or changed and I have remained a Co-Trustee and now the sole current Trustee.
4. The Janice K. Fisher Trust dated April 20, 1999, has not been revoked, or further modified or amended in any manner that would cause the representations contained in this certification to be incorrect.
5. The powers of the Trustee, under said Trust Agreement, include the authority to convey trust assets, including real property.


IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the said MARK J. FISHER, in his capacity as TRUSTEE OF THE JANICE K. FISHER TRUST dated April 20, 1999, has caused this instrument to be executed.

Witness my hand and seal this 21st day of March, 2025.



Witness

The Janice K. Fisher Trust dated April 20, 1999




By: Mark J. Fisher, Trustee

STATE OF MAINE
COUNTY OF CUMBERLAND, ss.

March 21, 2025

Then personally appeared before me the above-named MARK J. FISHER in said capacity as current Trustee of the Janice K. Fisher Trust dated April 20, 1999 and acknowledged the foregoing instrument to be his free act and deed in said capacity.

Before me,



Notary Public / Attorney at Law

My Commission Expires: _____

GAIL G. FRASER
NOTARY PUBLIC
State of Maine
My Commission Expires
August 28, 2028

**MAINE**

Department of the Secretary of State

Bureau of Corporations, Elections and Commissions

Corporate Name Search

Information Summary

[Subscriber activity report](#)

This record contains information from the CEC database and is accurate as of: Thu Feb 05 2026 11:08:34. Please print or save for your records.

Legal Name	Charter Number	Filing Type	Status
TEN TWO LLC	202405188DC	LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY	GOOD STANDING

Filing Date	Expiration Date	Jurisdiction
04/30/2024	N/A	MAINE

Other Names (A=Assumed ; F=Former)

NONE

Principal Home Office Address

Physical

97 LEDGE BROOK CROSSING
BRUNSWICK, ME 04011

Mailing

97 LEDGE BROOK CROSSING
BRUNSWICK, ME 04011

Clerk/Registered Agent

Physical

LANGDON THAXTER
NORMAN, HANSON & DETROY, LLC
220 MIDDLE STREET
PORTLAND, ME 04101

Mailing

LANGDON THAXTER
NORMAN, HANSON & DETROY, LLC
P.O. BOX 4600
PORTLAND, ME 04112-4600

[New Search](#)

Click on a link to obtain additional information.

List of Filings

[View list of filings](#)

Obtain additional information:

Certificate of Existence (Good Standing) ([more info](#))

[Short Form without amendments \(\\$30.00\)](#) [Long Form with amendments \(\\$30.00\)](#)

Certificate of Legal Existence ([more info](#))

[Short Form without amendments \(\\$30.00\)](#) [Long Form with amendments \(\\$30.00\)](#)

You will need Adobe Acrobat version 3.0 or higher in order to view PDF files.
If you encounter problems, visit the [troubleshooting page](#).



If you encounter technical difficulties while using these services, please contact the [Webmaster](#). If you are unable to find the information you need through the resources provided on this web site, please contact the Division of Corporations, UCC & Commissions Reporting and Information Section at 207-624-7752 or [e-mail](#).

© Department of the Secretary of State

Town of Brunswick

PLANNING & CODES

Committee:	Staff Review Committee		
Date of Meeting:	1/28/2026	Time:	10:00 AM
Minutes Prepared By:	Emily Stone	Location:	Town Hall, Council Chambers / Zoom
1. Purpose of Meeting (<i>Weekly meeting, Training, Workshop, etc....</i>)			
Weekly meeting			

2. Attendance	
Staff:	Ryan Leighton, Director of Public Works Sally Costello, Economic Development Trey Crews, Town Engineer Matt James, Land Use Planner Taylor Burns, Town Assessor Ashley Charleson, Environmental Planner Jimmy Dealaman, Principal Planner Josh Shean, Deputy Fire Chief Dennis Wilson, Town Arborist
Non-SRC Staff:	
Applicants:	Ten Two LLC Jay Raitt / Little River Land Surveying
Public:	Sande Updegraph Greg O'Donnell

3. Meeting Agenda
1. <u>Case No. 25-057 – Ten Two LLC Subdivision – Waiver Request:</u> The Staff Review Committee will review and make a recommendation to the Planning Board on a Street Design Standards Waiver request application submitted by Little River Land Survey on behalf of the property owner, Ten Two, LLC, for a three-lot subdivision. The subject property is located on Moody Road (Map 10, Lot 10) and within the Rural Farm and Forest (RF) Zoning District, and the Shoreland Protection Overlay (SPO), the Shoreland Protection Overlay – Stream Protection (SPO-SP), and Aquifer Protection Overlay 3 (APO 3) Subdistricts.
4. Discussion, Decisions, Issues
Dennis – No comments. Ryan - No comments. Matt - Ryan, I believe you submitted a memo for this project already, correct?

Ryan – Correct.

Josh - Just to reiterate from the last meeting... for these to be subdivided into three units to be included in the deed for those would be a requirement for residential sprinklers to be installed in any residence constructed on the properties.

Sally - No comments.

Taylor Burns – No comments.

Trey - I'm writing a memo for the planning board, but I didn't have any major concerns. This lot was already approved for two additional lots, and it's asking for another two now, based off the traffic study that the applicant of 25-037 (Garnet Ridge Subdivision) did, I don't think there will be an unreasonable traffic impact or congestion or safety impact. So, I don't have any objections to granting the waiver and I'll finish writing that memo to that effect. I know 25-037 has not been approved yet, and I guess my only recommendation would depend on if that's approved or which gets built first, I would still suggest that a streetlight gets installed at the intersection of Moody and Durham. And it would be nice if this project would provide a turnaround for public works if the other application is not approved with a turnaround that it's proposing. My memo will discuss those, and it would just be whoever starts developing the laws first would be responsible for completing those at public improvements.

Jimmy – No comments.

Matt – No comments.

Ashley - I don't have many comments. I think mine would be more applicable for when development is actually proposed. That being said, including a map that shows town overlays pertaining to natural resources, as well as looking at beginning with habitats maps online does show some important wetland features out there and a vernal pool somewhat close to the vicinity. Not sure if it's on the project parcel itself, but more so just a comment for them to keep in mind in the future when they're looking to develop it.

Matt - The current application is just for the lot splits. So, it's not really applicable right now, but we'll have to see what their future plans are.

Jimmy - I don't know if this application or this waiver request includes a plan, but that would be something I would recommend the applicant provide to the planning board because it's relevant to the waiver request.

Matt – Trey, will you be requesting that they submit their own traffic assessment or will it just rely on other recent projects that have happened on the road?

Trey - Considering another project on the same road has submitted a report that covers everything I would've asked for of this one - I'm willing to just use that. It's a minimal increase over what that project was proposing. It doesn't really change the results.

Matt - At this time I think we can open it up to the public.

Sande Updegraph - Good morning, I'm Sande Updegraph of Durham Road, Brunswick. I am curious about the timing of this application as it may or may not interface with Garnet Ridge. My comments this morning really are of a more global nature. I'm not terribly familiar with this committee, but I'm wondering if in the future there could be some consideration for how these applications fit into the guidelines of the newly adopted comp plan. In particular as they regard more development in the rural areas. I don't know if that would involve a change in the description of this committee or if it is

something you really are not appropriately going to be involved in, but I think someone needs, or some group needs to take a look at this with recommendations as they go to the planning board. So, it's just a suggestion. And thank you. And thank you all for looking very thoroughly at these applications. Thank you.

Greg O'Donnell - My name's Greg O'Donnell. I live at 157 Bracket Road. I just want to clarify what the waivers are for. I might have missed that. Is it for the road length and number of houses? Is that what the waiver is for?

Matt - Yes this is a waiver for the number of units on a dead-end road. I don't believe it is for the road length because they're not proposing to add any road. Whereas the other project on Moody Road is building their own private street off of the end, this project would only be adding driveways, which don't count towards the dead-end road maximum. This project is just for the number of units. Of course they're not proposing actual buildings at this time, but in the sense of adding three new buildable lots. That's what we're taking a look at.


Greg O'Donnell – Great. Thank you. That's all I have.

Jimmy - I did want to jump into Sande's suggestion about reviewing for the comp plan with waiver requests. That generally is something we do factor into a typical waiver request that lives in our zoning ordinance. However, the waiver that we're looking at today to waive the max units - that's out of the street standards chapter. So, the waiver criteria in that is different and it doesn't talk about the comp plan, but, it's noted that potentially next time we amend that chapter, we could consider putting some language in about the comprehensive plan consistency.

Matt - At this time we're reviewing everything based on the order of the ordinances at the time that the application was submitted. We do have two wholly separate ordinances - the zoning ordinance and the code of ordinances. These street standards are referenced in the zoning ordinance, but the waiver criteria and the actual standards live in the code of ordinances.

Sally - I just wanted to, to say that we would be having a different conversation today if we were talking about actually building the units themselves because of the moratorium. If they were coming forward with that, that would be a different conversation we would be having today.

Matt - They did submit the application I think a day before the moratorium took effect. So, if they had submitted their original application after that, then it would be reviewed under the moratorium - which would mean that it wouldn't be reviewed at this time.



Town of Brunswick, Maine

INCORPORATED 1739

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

85 UNION STREET

BRUNSWICK, MAINE 04011-2418

TELEPHONE 207-725-6100

FAX 207-725-6663

MEMORANDUM

TO: Planning Board
FROM: Trey Crews, PE, Town Engineer
SUBJECT: 25-057 Ten Two Subdivision Waiver Request
DATE: January 28, 2026

Case 25-057, Ten Two LLC Subdivision, proposes a four-lot subdivision located off Moody Rd. The project was presented for sketch plan review to the Staff Review Committee on January 28, 2026.

The project would subdivide Lot 10-10 on Moody Road. Presently, Moody Road does not comply with the town street standards. Previously, Lot 10-10 was approved by the town council on September 16, 2024 to add an additional one to two units. However, this requests an additional two units be considered for approval. As Moody Road is over the maximum total number of units allowed, a waiver must be granted from the Planning Board to allow the subdivision.

In Case 25-037, the applicant requested a waiver for additional units to be added onto Moody Rd. As part of that application, a traffic impact study was completed and demonstrated that the proposed development in Case 25-037 would not result in unreasonable congestion or unsafe conditions along Moody Road, or at its intersection with Durham Road.

Based on the study from 25-037 and the proposed additional two units, the town engineer does not think the proposed Case 25-057 would not cause unreasonable congestion or unsafe conditions. The Town Engineer does not object to the requested waiver.

If the waiver is granted by the planning board, the Town Engineer recommends that the applicant be required to install a new streetlight at the Moody Road/Durham Road intersection, in accordance with the Town's Street Lighting Policy. The town engineer also recommended that for Case 25-037. The improvement should be the responsibility of the first applicant to develop additional lots on Moody Rd. Further, Case 25-037 also proposed a turnaround to be constructed for use by public works, school district, waste management, etc to address the lack of one at the end of Moody Rd. If Case 25-037 does not proceed, or if case 25-057 proceeds first, the Town Engineer recommends that Case 25-057 provide a turnaround with a public easement.

Town of Brunswick, Maine

INCORPORATED 1739

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

MEMORANDUM

TO: Matthew James, *Land Use Planner*

FROM: E. Ryan Leighton, *Public Works Director*

DATE: January 22, 2026

SUBJECT: Case No. 25-057 - Ten Two LLC Subdivision – Waiver Request

Public Works has no concerns associated with the proposed subdivision referenced above.

Please contact me if you have any questions or would like additional information.

Kristin M. Collins
kcollins@preti.com
Direct Dial: 207.791.3292

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Planning Board

FROM: Kristin M. Collins, Town Attorney

DATE: February 5, 2026

RE: **Dead-End Roads**

This memo is intended to guide the Planning Board's review of street and traffic standards pertaining to dead-end streets. These standards derive from two provisions of Town Code: (1) street design standards under Sec. 14-187 of the general code; and (2) circulation and access standards under Section 4.8 of the Zoning Ordinance.

A dead-end street is defined as "a street that has only one combined inlet and outlet." The "combined inlet and outlet" would allow a street to avoid categorization as "dead end" if it has two separate points of ingress/egress, even if to the same principal street. Note that the definition of "dead-end street" also provides that "dead-end streets that originate from another dead-end shall be measured as one continuous street."

Section 14-187

The Zoning Ordinance (Sec. 4.8.1) requires streets within a development to meet the requirements of the Street Acceptance and Standards Ordinance (Chapter 14, Article VI of the general code). Section 14-187(6) provides that new private streets must be built according to the Street Standards table. The table provides that the maximum length of a dead-end street is 1,500 feet, and the maximum number of units served by a dead-end street without additional review is 25 if paved, and 5 if unpaved.¹ As noted above, the length is measured based upon the total path of dead-end streets leading to the development, even if one portion is existing and the other is new, or if one portion is public and the other is private.

Section 14-187(6) allows for waivers, with the applicable waiver standard dependent upon whether the dead-end street is new or existing. In some developments, there will be a proposed new dead-end street to be accessed via an existing dead-end street. The standards – and any available waiver – should be applied to each based on their status as new or existing.

¹ Footnote 4 to the table allows for an unpaved private street to serve up to 25 units if each lot is served by a street maintenance association agreement.

For new streets, “the roadway will be constructed to meet the private road standard in the below table as a minimum.” (§14-187(6)(a)). In other words, new dead-end private road may be permitted if the total path of dead-end road will be more than 1,500 feet, or if the portion of new private road will serve more than 25 units. Waiver is permitted only in the case of “hardship” (§14-190). “Hardship” is not defined within the street standards, but other uses of the term in the code are illustrative of the intent behind the word. In the Housing Code, “hardship” is defined as “extraordinary conditions peculiar to [the] premises, or to a proposed building, which are not reasonably remediable.” (Housing code §8-63) Though it is not strictly applicable here, the Board may also apply concepts from the “undue hardship” standard for variance, which takes into account whether the applicant can make a reasonable return on the land if the standard is applied, whether the circumstances are unique to the property, and whether the owner created (or could reasonably avoid) the hardship.

For existing streets, Section 14-187(6) provides that the Planning Board may approve a proposal that creates a new lot of record on an existing street that doesn’t meet these standards. If a waiver is requested, it must be reviewed by the staff review committee for its comments and recommendations prior to planning board review. The following standards must be considered:

1. Waiver may be allowed only if the applicant “receives recommendation from the engineering department and the fire department that the standards should be waived.” This criterion must be met for a waiver to be granted; however, the waiver may still be denied in the presence of a recommendation, if the other standards aren’t met.
2. The layout and the design of the street “must conform to the standards to the maximum extents practicable.” In applying this standard, the Board may consider concepts such as whether a development – even with fewer lots or units or a different development concept– could have been designed with better connectivity, and whether provisions have been made for safe and adequate turnarounds.
3. There must be “restrictions that prevent the standards from being met.” As to the dead-end street standard, this provision is moot, as the existing dead-end street likely cannot be shortened or made to serve fewer units.
4. Prior conveyances or construction abutting the street must “make it impossible or an undue hardship to meet the standards.” Again, this provision is moot when applied to the dead-end road standards.
5. The reviewing authority must determine “that the modifications to the standards would be reasonably safe.” Here, the question is whether adding the additional proposed units to the dead-end road will reasonably cause unsafe conditions. The Planning Board should consider the guidance given by the Town Engineer and Fire Chief and determine whether the additional units or length of dead-end road will impede public safety response, potentially cut the neighborhood off in the event of downed trees, an accident/fire or wash-out, or risk accidents or pedestrian collisions.

Generally speaking, the Planning Board should give a high degree of weight to engineering and fire department recommendations and should refuse a waiver in the presence of those

recommendations only if it can articulate specific reasons, tied to one of more of the above standards, why the waiver should not be granted.

Circulation and Traffic Standards per Zoning Ordinance

Development on dead-end streets should also be evaluated under Section 4.8.1(D) of the Zoning Ordinance, which provides:

The street design shall allow for proper continuation of streets from other adjacent subdivisions and built-up areas. Dead-ends are to be avoided unless based on site constraints and there are no other feasible alternatives. For purposes of this subsection, pedestrian or bicycle connections to adjacent lands may be sufficient to satisfy this standard. This standard may be waived in cases where interconnectedness would result in the disruption of community character.

This may be a complicated and restrictive standard to apply in rural areas, but it is important to remember that the section prohibits dead-end streets as a rule. Exceptions are only available if (1) there are site constraints such as challenging topography or wetlands and there are no other feasible alternatives, or (2) where the Planning Board determines interconnectedness would result in the disruption of community character. These standards are applied separate from the street standards in Section 14-187, meaning that a dead-end street might meet the length or unit maximums in the street standards, or be granted a waiver, but still fail to meet these Section 4.8.1(D) standards.

The ordinance does not make it clear whether the term “feasible” should be interpreted to require the developer to reduce the size or number of units/lots in the development in order to allow for such connection. However, I believe a court would uphold a decision finding that a minor reduction in number of units, or a change to a less developer-preferred layout could be considered “feasible” to allow the standard to be met. In considering feasibility, the Planning Board may consider whether there is undeveloped land or easements that are available or could be acquired, where connections could be made, either to the same access road from a secondary point in the new subdivision, or to another adjacent road or public area. As the standard says, in the absence of road connections, walking or biking easements or paths can suffice.

As to the ability to excuse the dead-end prohibition if connection would result in the disruption of community character, the Planning Board should consider whether the development is in a rural district, the overall surrounding housing density, natural resources and open space, and similar considerations. The Planning Board should be cautious to avoid routinely granting waivers simply because of location in a rural area or in an area where dead-end developments are common. If the ordinance intended to allow the waiver to apply so broadly, it would have exempted rural areas from the standard. Instead, the Planning Board should consider factors specific to the immediately surrounding area and whether they are cause for special consideration.

Other standards in Section 4.8 may be relevant to a dead-end road, though they are not specific to such roads. The Planning Board should consider comments from the Town Engineer,

Fire Chief, Police Chief and planning staff, as well as its own reasonable and evidence-based concerns, and consider whether the dead-end design satisfies the following applicable standards:

- Design provides safe travel for all users of the street (4.8.1(B)).
- Design will not cause congestion or unsafe conditions on public roads (Sec. 4.8.1(F)(1-2); emphasis here on public). Developers may be required to make street improvements.
- Design will allow for safe pedestrian and bicycle access and propose improvements necessary to link pedestrians and bicyclists from identified points outside of the development (4.8.3(B)).

Because of the complex interweaving of standards and exceptions in these provisions, the Planning Board should be meticulous in making findings pertaining to dead-end streets, making it clear upon which standard or waiver allowance any determination is based. The Board should endeavor to apply each of the standards and to harmonize them, where possible.

**STREET DESIGN STANDARDS
WAIVER APPLICATION**

1. Street Design Standard Waiver application type:

☐ New Street

☒ Existing Street

2. Project Name: TEN TWO LLC SUBDIVISION

3. Project Applicant

Name: TEN TWO LLC
Address: 97 LEDGE BROOK CROSSING
BRUNSWICK, ME 04101
Phone Number: 207-751-4313
Email: JON@JAIDENLANDSCAPING.COM

4. Property Owner (name on deed)

Name: TEN TWO LLC
Address: 97 LEDGE BROOK CROSSING
BRUNSWICK, ME 04101
Phone Number: 207-751-4313
Email: JON@JAIDENLANDSCAPING.COM

5. Assessor's Tax Map 10 Lot Number 10 of subject property.

6. Physical location of property: MOODY ROAD

7. Lot Size: 17.43 ACRES

8. Zoning District: RURAL FARM & FOREST

9. Overlay Zoning District: APO-3 & WILDLIFE PROTECTION

10. Description of what the waiver is being requested for:

ORIGINAL LOT 10 (35 ACRES±) WAS DIVIDED INTO LOTS 10 AND 10A IN OCTOBER, 2024.
AROUND THAT TIME A WAIVER WAS GRANTED FOR DWELLING UNITS TO BE BUILT ON THE
RESULTING TWO PARCELS. AT THIS TIME THE REQUEST IS FOR THE NEW LOT 10 TO HAVE
TWO MORE DWELLING UNITS, FOR A TOTAL OF THREE, TO ALLOW FOR A SUBDIVISION.

11. Description of why the street standards cannot be met:

MOODY ROAD IS AN EXISTING DEAD END ROAD THAT EXCEEDS THE LENGTH OF THAT
ALLOWED BY MUNICIPAL ORDINANCES.


12. Describe specific physical improvements to be made: THREE SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL

DWELLING UNITS WITH PRIVATE DRIVES, WELLS AND SEPTIC SYSTEMS.

13. Indicate the interest of the applicant in the property and abutting property. For example, is the applicant the owner of the property and abutting property? If not, who owns the property subject to this application? If property owner is an organization, what is the applicant's affiliation?

THE APPLICANT OWNS THE PROPERTY, BUT HAS NO INTEREST IN ANY ABUTTING PROPERTY.

Property Owner Signature:




Date: JANUARY 20, 2026

Property Owner Name Printed:

JERAMIAH RAITT FOR TEN TWO, LLC

Applicant Signature:



Date: JANUARY 20, 2026

Applicant Name & Title Printed:

JERAMIAH RAITT, LAND SURVEYOR

Traffic Impact Statement

Prepared in Support of a Three-Lot Single-Family Residential Subdivision
Moody Road at Durham Road, Brunswick, Maine

Project Identification

Applicant proposes a three-lot single-family residential subdivision located on Moody Road in Brunswick, Maine. Access to the subdivision will be provided from Moody Road, with traffic dispersing through Durham Road.

Existing Roadway Network

Moody Road is a local residential roadway serving low-density development. Durham Road functions as a local/collector roadway. Both facilities operate under low traffic volumes consistent with residential land use.

Existing Traffic Conditions

Observed conditions along Moody Road and at the Moody Road/Durham Road intersection reflect free-flow operations with minimal delay. Existing Levels of Service are estimated to be LOS A or B.

Trip Generation

Trip generation estimates are based on the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, Land Use Code 210 (Single-Family Detached Housing). The subdivision is expected to generate approximately 30 average daily trips, including approximately 2–3 trips during the weekday AM and PM peak hours.

Trip Distribution and Assignment

Site-generated traffic will enter and exit via Moody Road and distribute naturally through the local roadway network via Durham Road. Traffic volumes are minimal and will not concentrate turning movements at any single location.

Future Traffic Conditions

The addition of three single-family dwellings will result in a negligible increase in traffic volumes. Moody Road and the Moody Road/Durham Road intersection have sufficient reserve capacity to accommodate the projected traffic.

Level of Service Analysis

Under build conditions, roadway segments and the study intersection are expected to continue operating at LOS A or B, which exceeds the Town of Brunswick's typical minimum planning standard of LOS C.

Sight Distance and Access

Residential driveways will be designed to meet applicable Town of Brunswick and MaineDOT sight distance requirements. Adequate stopping sight distance will be provided in both directions along Moody Road.

Safety Analysis

The proposed development will generate typical residential traffic at low speeds. No increase in crash potential is anticipated, and emergency vehicle access will remain adequate.


Mitigation Measures

Due to the minimal traffic generated by the proposed subdivision, no roadway improvements, intersection upgrades, or traffic control devices are required.

Conclusion

The proposed three-lot single-family residential subdivision meets the intent of the Brunswick Planning Board traffic review criteria. The project will not create adverse traffic or safety impacts and will maintain acceptable levels of service on Moody Road and at the Moody Road/Durham Road intersection.

Prepared for: Brunswick Planning Board

Prepared by:  _____

Date: January 20, 2026



Town of Brunswick, Maine

Incorporated 1739

Brunswick Fire Department
119 PLEASANT STREET, BRUNSWICK, MAINE 04011
TELEPHONE (207)725-5541 FAX (207)725-6638
WWW.BRUNSWICKME.GOV

"Working Today for a Safer Tomorrow"

KENNETH A. BRILLANT
Fire Chief



JAMES MILLSON
Deputy Chief Operations

JOSH SHEAN
Deputy Chief Fire Prevention

MEMORANDUM

To: Town of Brunswick, Planning Board
From: Deputy Chief Josh Shean
Date: February 10, 2026
RE: Case 25-057, Ten Two LLC Subdivision

Case 25-057, Ten Two LLC Subdivision proposes a three-lot subdivision on Moody Road. Moody Road currently exceeds the maximum number of units served by a dead-end road as defined by Town Ordinance Chapter 14, Article VI, Section 14-187, Design Standards.

The Fire Department has supported waiver requests with requirements for vehicle turnarounds and/or cisterns to be included as part of the projects. These options are not practical due to the location of the proposed subdivision, and no site improvements are included as part of the subdivision plan.

The Fire Department is willing to approve the waiver request with the requirement that any residential structures built on the subdivision of Map 10, Lot 10 be required to install a residential automatic sprinkler system designed to the standards of the currently adopted edition of the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) 13R Standard for the Installation of Sprinkler Systems in Low-Rise Residential Occupancies.

The requirement for automatic residential sprinkler systems should be included in the subdivision deeds to maintain the requirement in perpetuity.

Case 25-057

Ten Two , LLC, Subdivision

Public Comment

Stuart - February 7, 2026

To the planning board:

I am writing in opposition to the waiver proposal from the Ten Two LLC developer on Moody Road.

1. Moody Road is already a dead end road that branches onto other dead end roads: Sisters Way, Seargent Way, Crossman Drive, and Jasper Way. At present, there are multiple houses yet to be built on Crossman Drive (3 sold, 1 under construction and awaiting sale, 5 to be built), two buildable lots on Jasper Drive, and a twelve unit proposal on the other side of our property on a proposed new road. Although the plan from Ten Two is vague and doesn't seem to specify how many additional units will be built, the number of houses on Moody Road is already in excess and should not be further expanded. The waiver to permit more houses on the end of an already over-saturated, dead-end road promotes urban sprawl and undermines the town's goal to preserve the quality and character of rural areas of the town. Further, it will give a foothold to other, even less desirable proposals in the same area (e.g., Garnet Ridge, Brackett Road).
2. We have concerns about where proposed new units would be located, particularly given the number of waterways and wetlands on the proposed properties. We do not feel waivers should be granted when there are many outstanding questions about feasibility of putting in driveways and housing on these lots. As the neighbor to lot 3, we are very aware of the area in question and honestly question the feasibility of building units in what tend to be very wet areas with a lot of runoff into existing waterways and yards. Navigating placement of driveways, septic systems, and flood-resistant housing given the number of existing streams, ponds, swampy areas, and culverts would be difficult and we feel plans need to be much more finite before granting consideration to more housing in the area.
3. We want to minimize further disruption of the natural habitats located in our area. We have concerns surrounding habitat/wildlife preservation and feel the above questions need to be thoroughly answered before approving any waivers, especially on a road that is already overcapacity.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jade Stuart

103 Moody Road, Brunswick

Stadincki - February 10, 2026

Hello Matt,

My name is Sarah Stadnicki and I live on 24 Moody Road in Brunswick. I intended on attending tonight's planning board meeting in person, but due to unforeseen circumstances, I will not be there.

I do, however, strongly oppose the waiver Two Ten LLC is submitting to the board in with intention to add three additional home constructions to Moody Road.

I have lived on Moody Road for over 20 years. We were one of the first builds and over time the road has met its dwelling capacity and then some. There have been four off shoots approved for Moody Road which include Sisters Way, Sargent Lane, Crossman Drive and Jasper Road. As an avid walker who is on the road two to three times every day, I can attest to the increased traffic flow, dangerous walking conditions with no sidewalks/limited shoulder room and increased pace of those traveling the length of the road.

We are at capacity for a rural road. Approving these waivers would only set precedence for further construction off of a rural road that has already been maximally developed. This is not withstanding the environmental impact as well as the impact on resources (namely wells) used by existing residents. There is a limit for existing dwellings on a rural dead end road for good reason.

Please respect and support the rights of the existing residents of this rural dead end road and deny the waiver in question.

Fondly,

Dr. Michael and Sarah Stadnicki

Masse - February 10, 2026

Good afternoon, Members of the Brunswick Planning Board,

My name is Brenda Masse, and I reside with my family at 312 Durham Road. I am writing to you today to express our profound and growing concerns regarding the two development proposals slated for properties off Moody Road, one of which directly abuts our property.

As a family with deep, multi-generational roots in Brunswick, we have always cherished and actively participated in maintaining our town's unique character. We have witnessed firsthand the transformation of our beloved rural community over recent decades. While we recognize the need for thoughtful, sustainable growth, the current trajectory of development, particularly in our historically undeveloped zones, is alarming and unsustainable.

It is from this perspective that we respectfully, yet firmly, urge the Planning Board to deny the waivers currently being requested by the developers for these projects. These existing regulations and zoning restrictions were not arbitrarily established; they are critical safeguards designed to protect our natural environment, manage infrastructure capacity, and preserve the quality of life that defines Brunswick.

Granting these waivers will have significant and irreversible environmental consequences.

Furthermore, the anticipated increase in traffic volume from these developments on Moody Road pose a threat to safety.

We implore the Planning Board to prioritize the long-term well-being and established character of Brunswick over the short-term interests of developers. Please uphold the integrity of our town's planning process and heed the earnest pleas of your constituents, who look to you to protect what makes Brunswick special.

Thank you for your careful consideration of our family's concerns and for your dedication to our community.

Sincerely,

Brenda Masse

(On behalf of the Masse Family)

Salko - February 10, 2026

Hello Mr. James,

I hope this finds you well. My name is Jennifer Salko and my family and I have been residents of Moody Road for over 18 years. I am writing to voice my concerns regarding the waiver request on tonight's agenda which proposes to increase the number of homes on Moody Road.

Moody Road, being a rural dead end road, is at maximum capacity for the number of dwellings. Adding more to what already exists would put a strain on the resources we have.

Every time a new home is built, many of us find ourselves with well or septic issues and, because most if not all of this road is perched on ledge, building new homes requires blasting. We have many cracks in our home as a result of the repeated blasting required to build. We have also had to drill a new well as a result of the aquifer's inability to handle the additional population Moody Road has acquired over the years.

Adding more homes adds more vehicular traffic. We have quite a bit of vehicle traffic already and we also have many vehicles that travel at higher than the posted speed, thus endangering the many pedestrians who walk our road every day. Cars are bad enough but the number of construction trucks that travel the road at higher than acceptable speeds makes this quiet rural neighborhood feel unsafe for children and pets, especially.

In conclusion, it doesn't seem prudent to allow for a waiver request to add more homes on our maxed capacity rural street. I respectfully request that this waiver request be denied and that there be a permanent moratorium on future new home building on Moody Road.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I deeply appreciate it.

Respectfully yours,

Jennifer Salko

Calligrapher/Engraver

IG: @theuntamedcalligrapher

207.319.9513

Town of Brunswick, Maine

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

DRAFT FINDINGS OF FACT SITE PLAN AMENDMENT PLANNING BOARD

CASE NUMBER: 25-059

PROJECT NAME: MaineHealth Mid Coast Cancer Renter Renovation

LOCATION: 81 Medical Center Drive (Map 45, Lot 32, 32-1)

APPLICANT: Maine Health
C/O Christopher Bowe
121 Medical Center Drive
Brunswick ME 04011

OWNER: Maine Health – Successor by Merger – MidCoast Health Services Corp.
58 Baribeu Drive
Brunswick ME 04011

REPRESENTATIVE: Pine Tree Engineering, Inc
53 Front Street
Bath, ME 04530

REVIEW DATE: January 13, 2026

ZONING DISTRICT: Growth Mixed-Use 4 (GM4)
Growth Mixed-Use 8 (GM8)

OVERLAY ZONING: Cook's Corner Overlay (CCO)

NOTICE: 300-foot abutter notices sent December 3, 2025

I. APPLICATION COMPLETENESS

Staff has reviewed the application and determined that it is complete.

Draft Motion #1:

The Planning Board concurs with planning staff's conclusion that the basic Major Development Review application materials have been submitted and that the application is complete such that the Board may proceed with substantive review of the application and identification of any further information required from the applicant.

Motion:

2nd:

Vote:

II. PROJECT SUMMARY

The proposed development consists of two one-story additions to the current medical facility at 81 Medical Center Drive, including a 1,186 square foot pharmacy adjacent to the existing parking lot and a 2,325 square foot medical linear accelerator (LINAC) facility on the south side of the building. Six (6) vehicle parking stalls will be removed to accommodate the proposed pharmacy, and eighteen (18) bicycle parking stalls will be installed.

The project is subject to Cook's Corner Design Standards and will also require an amendment to the existing Maine DEP Site Law Stormwater Management Permit.

The Staff Review Committee (SRC) reviewed the Final Plan Major Development Review application on December 10, 2025, and minutes are attached for the Board's reference.

III. COOK'S CORNER DESIGN STANDARDS

1. Site Design

The subject parcel is already developed. Two additions are proposed for the existing facility. A portion of the site will be revegetated, the façade of the existing building will be renovated, and new bicycle parking will be installed. Six (6) vehicle parking stalls will be removed, but vehicular flow will not be affected.

The Planning Board finds that the provisions of Section 1.0 are satisfied.

2. Streets & Public Spaces

Existing streets and connections will be maintained.

The Planning Board finds that the provisions of Section 2.0 are satisfied.

3. Building Design

The additions will be constructed to be visually compatible with the existing design of 81 Medical Center Drive; however, the same materials and treatments will not be utilized on the additions. Due to the proposed uses of the additions and the need for added safety and security, the additions are built with solid walls; it is not feasible to include windows or other openings. The pharmacy addition will not be visible from the roadway, and the LINAC addition will not be readily visible from the road or parking area.

The Planning Board finds that the provisions of Section 3.0 are satisfied.

4. Landscape Design

10 new trees will be planted along the existing tree line to the south of the LINAC addition. No new landscaping is proposed around the pharmacy addition. A construction entrance will be created at the south-west corner of the building. Revegetation will be required at the completion of the development.

The Planning Board finds that the provisions of Section 4.0 are satisfied, provided that the Condition of Approval is met.

IV. REVIEW STANDARDS

4.1. Applicability of Property Development Standards

Town of Brunswick Zoning Ordinance:

The project has been designed in accordance with the Property Development Standards of Chapter 4 of the Brunswick, Maine, Zoning Ordinance.

The Planning Board finds that the provisions of Section 4.1 are satisfied.

4.2. Dimensional and Density Standards

Town Staff have reviewed the application and determined that it complies with all the applicable dimensional and density standards for the Growth Mixed-Use 8 (GM8) zoning districts as established in *Table 4.2.3: Dimensional and Density Standards for Growth Area* of the Zoning Ordinance.

The Planning Board finds that the provisions of Section 4.2 are satisfied.

4.3. Natural and Historic Areas

4.3.1 Mapping of Natural and Historic Areas

There are no known mapped historical or scenic areas on the parcel. Natural areas in proximity to the location of development have been identified on the plan and were mapped as part of the original development of the site.

4.3.2 Pollution

The project will not result in undue water or air pollution. The proposed Linear Accelerator does not store or produce any radioactive waste. **Compliance with State and Federal regulations for particle accelerators and therapeutic radiation machines falls under the jurisdiction of the Department of Health and Human Services.** Maintenance and removal of the unit will be undertaken by the vendor, Varian Medical Systems, or by another licensed medical equipment service provider.

4.3.3 Protection of Natural Vegetation

10 trees of 10-inch caliper diameter or larger have been marked for removal. All trees to be removed are outside of the forested wetland area, and 10 new trees are proposed to stabilize and buffer the developed area. Due to the limited scope of the project, it is unlikely that the proposed development activity will cause an undue impact to the nearby forested wetlands.

4.3.4 Protection of Significant Plant and Animal Habitat

No significant plant or animal habitats have been identified in proximity to the location of development. As recommended by the Maine Natural Areas Program (MNAP) and Maine Department of Island Fisheries & Wildlife (MDIFW), the proposed development will maintain a 250-foot vegetated buffer from salt-hay saltmarsh, a 75-foot buffer from the forested wetland on the western side of Medical Center Drive, and a 100-foot buffer from the stream.

4.3.5 Steep Slopes

The location of development does not contain greater than 5000 contiguous square feet of slopes exceeding 25% grade.

4.3.6 Erosion and Sedimentation

An erosion and sedimentation control plan has been submitted as part of the application.

4.3.7 Groundwater

The proposed development will not have an undue impact on the quality or quantity of groundwater.

4.3.8 Surface Waters, Wetlands and Marine Resources

The proposed development will not have an undue impact on the nearby forested wetlands or streams. Additional landscaping is proposed around the LINAC addition to mitigate the reduction in the nearby tree line.

4.3.9 Historic and Archaeological Resources

The site is currently developed, with only minor additions beyond the current impervious area. No known historical or archaeological sites will be disturbed.

The Planning Board finds that the provisions of Section 4.3 are satisfied.

4.4. Flood Hazard Areas

The proposed location of development is not within a Flood Hazard Area.

The Planning Board finds that the provisions of Section 4.4. are satisfied.

4.5. Basic and Municipal Services

4.5.1 Sewage Disposal

The proposed development will result in an increase in the use of existing sewage disposal services but will not exceed the capacity of the existing services.

4.5.2 Water Supply and Quality:

50 cold water fixtures will be added as a result of the proposed development, and the additions will not exceed the capacity of the existing 4-inch water service.

4.5.3 Solid Waste Disposal:

The proposed development will not cause an unreasonable increase to municipal waste disposal services.

4.5.4 Stormwater Management

New construction is proposed that will alter the existing stormwater management on-site, and the existing Maine DEP Site Law permit will be amended to account for the new additions. A 2-foot crushed stone apron will be installed where new construction abuts pervious areas.

The Planning Board finds that the provisions of Section 4.5 are satisfied.

4.6. Landscaping Requirements

10 2-inch caliper evergreen trees will be planted along the tree line to be affected by the LINAC addition.

The Planning Board finds that the provisions of Section 4.6 are satisfied

4.7. Residential Recreation Requirements

The proposed project does not include the addition of any residential dwelling units.

The Planning Board finds that the provisions of Section 4.7 are not applicable.

4.8. Circulation and Access

4.8.1 Street Standards

A. General Standard

The proposed development will not create or impact any streets.

4.8.2 Streets, Sidewalks and other Public Places

The proposed development will maintain the existing access from Medical Center Drive.

4.8.3 Pedestrian and Bicycle Access

The proposed development will maintain existing pedestrian and bicycle access. A bicycle parking rack that accommodates 18 bicycles is proposed to the east of the dumpster on site.

4.8.4 Access for Persons with Disabilities

The proposed development will maintain existing access for persons with disabilities. The satellite parking area on the western side of Medical Center Drive does not contain any accessible parking stalls, and the road crossing to 81 Medical Center Drive is therefore not required to meet the ADA standards for an accessible route.

The Planning Board finds that the provisions of Section 4.8 are satisfied.

4.9. Parking and Loading

Accounting for the 11 parking stalls required due to the addition of 3,511 square feet of building area, and the removal of 6 parking stalls to accommodate the proposed pharmacy, the site will continue to exceed the required number of parking stalls. 134 parking stalls were approved for 81 Medical Drive in 2007, with an additional 65 parking stalls being added in 2016. A total of 151 parking stalls are required, and 193 are proposed.

The proposed development also requires the addition of 20 bicycle parking stalls. 25 new stalls are proposed.

The Planning Board finds that the provisions of Section 4.9 are satisfied.

4.10. Lighting

New outdoor lighting will not adversely impact the road or adjacent properties and uses. Any lighting to be added must be full cut-off and a color temperature of 3000k or less.

The Planning Board finds that the provisions of Section 4.10 are satisfied, provided that the Condition of Approval is met.

4.11. Architectural Compatibility

The proposed development will include facades, textures, colors, and materials that are visually compatible with the existing design of 81 medical Center Drive. The Cooks Corner Design Standards reference “windowless circumstances” as is required for the LINAC room and the pharmacy for safety and security purposes. The applicant has addressed this by utilizing different siding materials to provide interest and balance. The applicable Cook’s Corner Design Standards have been met.

The Planning Board finds that the provisions of Section 4.11 are satisfied.

4.12. Neighborhood Protection Standards

The proposed development does not abut a Growth Residential District and is therefore not required to comply with this standard.

The Planning Board finds that the provisions of Section 4.12 are not applicable.

4.13. Signs

No new signage is proposed.

The Planning Board finds that the provisions of Section 4.13 are satisfied.

4.14. Performance Standards

The proposed development will operate in accordance with the performance standards listed at Section 4.14. No additional operating hours are proposed. No exceedance in Section 4.14 standards is proposed.

The Planning Board finds that the provisions of Section 4.14 are satisfied.

4.15. Site Maintenance

The Applicant shall be responsible for the maintenance of site features constructed or installed as required by a development approval which must be maintained in good repair, and replaced if damaged or destroyed.

The Planning Board finds that the provisions of Section 4.15 are satisfied.

4.16. Financial and Technical Capacity

The applicant has provided a deed as evidence of right, title and interest in property. A narrative that outlines the current ownership of the property and structure, and the ownership of the proposed additions, has been provided. Bath Road Associates LLC owns 81 Medical Center Drive. MaineHealth owns the surrounding land and will own the proposed additions. Signatures have been provided by representatives of both Bath Road Associates and MaineHealth. A letter has been provided by MaineHealth's Chief Financial Officer attesting to the applicant's financial capacity for the proposed development. The project is anticipated to cost approximately \$10,800,000 and a estimated cost breakdown is provided.

The Planning Board finds that the provisions of Section 4.16 are satisfied.

4.17. Administrative Adjustments / Alternative Equivalent Compliance

No administrative adjustment / alternative equivalent compliance is requested.

The Planning Board finds that the provisions of Section 4.17 are not applicable.

V. MOTION FOR APPROVAL

Draft Motion #3:

That the Planning Board approves the Major Development Review application for the site plan amendment on the property located at 81 medical Center Drive. (Map 45, Lot 32, 32-1), as outlined in the application, with the following conditions:

- 1. That the Board's review and approval does hereby refer to these findings of fact, the plans and materials submitted by the applicant and the written and oral comments of the applicant, his representatives, reviewing officials, and members of the public as reflected in the public record. Any changes to the approved plan not called for in these conditions of approval or otherwise approved by the Director of Planning and Development as a minor modification shall require review and approval in accordance with the Brunswick Zoning Ordinance.*
- 2. That any new lighting to be installed will be full cut-off and a color temperature of 3000k or less.*
- 3. That prior to the issuance of a Building Permit, the applicants shall submit to the Director of Planning and Development an approved amendment to the existing Maine DEP Site Law Stormwater Management Permit.*
- 4. That prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, the construction entrance will be removed and revegetated.*
- 5. That prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy, a 20 spot bicycle rack will be located on site to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Development and the Director of Economic and Community Development.*

Motion:

2nd:

Vote:

VI. EXHIBITS

- A. Development Review Application for MaineHealth Mid Coast Cancer Renter Renovation,

- dated January 20, 2026, and submitted by Pine Tree Engineering, Inc.
- B. Staff Review Committee minutes dated December 10, 2025.

Town of Brunswick

PLANNING & CODES

Committee:	Staff Review Committee		
Date of Meeting:	12/10/2025	Time:	10:00 AM
Minutes Prepared By:	Susan Karnes, Administrative Floater	Location:	Town Hall, Council Chambers / Zoom
1. Purpose of Meeting <i>(Weekly meeting, Training, Workshop, etc....)</i>			
Weekly meeting			

2. Attendance	
Staff:	Ryan Leighton, Director of Public Works Chrissy Adamowicz, Project Manager, Economic Development Trey Crews, Town Engineer Dennis Wilson, Town Arborist Matt James, Land Use Planner Jim Flood, Engineer, Water District Julie Erdman, Director of Planning and Development Taylor Lund, Code Enforcement Officer & Zoning Administrator Taylor Burns, Town Assessor Ashley Charleson, Environmental Planner Todd Riddlon, Police Department Ryan Leighton, Public Works Director
Non-SRC Staff:	
Applicants:	Jon Boyd, E4H Environments for Health Architecture Jeremy Prue, Pine Tree Engineering, Inc Ashley Roan, MaineHealth
Public:	

3. Meeting Agenda
1. Case No. 25-059 – MaineHealth Mid Coast Cancer Center Renovation: The Staff Review Committee will review and make a recommendation to the Planning Board on a Site Plan Amendment application submitted by Pine Tree Engineering on behalf of the property owner, Mid Coast Health Services, for two one-story additions and the renovation of the existing building and parking area. The subject property is located at 81 Medical Center Drive (Map 45, Lot 32, 32-1) and within the Growth Mixed-Use 8 (GM8) Zoning District, and the Shoreland Protection Overlay (SPO), Shoreland Protection Overlay – Stream Protection (SPO-SP), Shoreland Protection Overlay – Resource Protection (SPO-RP), Rural Protection Stormwater Management Overlay (RPSMO), Flood Protection Overlay (FPO), Wetland Protection Overlay (WPO), and Cook’s Corner Overlay (CCO) subdistricts. The proposed location of development is only within the Growth Mixed-Use 8 (GM8) Zoning District and Cook’s Corner Overlay (CCO) subdistrict.

4. Discussion, Decisions, Issues

Jon Boyd: I'm the principal in charge for E4H Architects on the project. We've been working with Mid Coast Health and Maine Health for the last year to develop this project, which involves primarily renovations within 81 Medical Center Drive but also requires two small additions. One is a compounding pharmacy to support their cancer center oncology program and infusion spaces. And the other one is a linear accelerator, which will provide cancer treatment programs to support the other programs within the building.

Dennis Wilson: The one thing I got is your proposed addition for the LINAC system. I would recommend you add 10 evergreen trees along that tree line in a 10-inch spacing to augment that new tree line. Because that'll open up a new environment for those, there is potential for those current trees to die or fall over.

And the only other question I had is the construction entrance. Are you removing vegetation to create that construction entrance? And if so, are you revegetating it after you close it?

Jon Boyd: Yeah. Also, I want to clarify, the trees would be 10 feet on center, right? Not 10 inches?

Dennis: Correct. 10 feet on center.

Jeremy Prue: Just to introduce myself. I'm Jeremy Prue with Pine Tree Engineering, so I'm doing the site civil work for this project. Thank you for the comments, Dennis.

The construction entrance, there's a detail on the back of the plan set that describes the materials used for the construction entrance to control erosion in and out of the site. And after the job is completed it'll be restored back to a loam. It'll be loamed, seeded, mulch, so it'll be grassed again after the construction was complete.

Ryan Leighton: No comments.

Todd Riddlon: No comments.

Chrissy Adamowicz: Did you have a chance to look at the Cook's Corner design standards when you were developing this? Because they do apply. And we reviewed Section 3.4, where it talks about the facade requirements and it doesn't quite meet the requirements. The requirements ask for windows and a broken-up facade. And we were looking at it and we understand that it's not like a really very public facing building. It's not like the full building, but it does apply to additions. But had you considered windows in any parts of the buildings and also maybe vegetation to break it up? The standards talk about a variety of ways to break it up.

3.4 J Windowless circumstances says, "buildings without windows, i.e. a computer, a server building or self-storage buildings, shall incorporate a change in scale and siding materials instead of windows to create a sense of rhythm and cadence to create human scale. These material scale changes shall be demonstrably compatible with the scale and cadence of adjacent building facade treatments". The LINAC part of the building is towards the back, but the pharmacy faces a parking lot, so that is a little bit human facing.

So, we want to make sure that these standards are enforced and utilized.

Jon Boyd: The linear accelerator is closest to Medical Center Drive, the pharmacy's in the back. I don't know if you have floor plans for this, but the linear accelerator is a three-foot-thick concrete vault that has radiation in it. If you put windows on the building, they would be looking at a concrete wall. So, it's not practical. The one place where we can have a window is as it's shown, you can see the thick three-foot-thick concrete walls that go around. The other room is the control room, and they don't want a window in there because they're looking at computer screens and they're looking at technical stuff. A lot of times they're sitting in the dark and if we put a window there, it would have to have a pretty robust blackout shade on it. And then the one in the room in the corner is the control room, which is chock a block with electrical equipment to support the linear accelerator.

So, we have put a window in one place, we're going to make that window a little bit taller so that it goes all the way to the floor because they're going to move the four ton gantry unit for the linear accelerator in that they're going to move it in through that hole. And then when it needs to be replaced in seven to 10 years, they'll use that as a method to pull it out. Because finding a pathway through the existing building for that big piece of equipment is not practical.

We did try to break it up and match the banding at the bottom to the existing building. We didn't feel like we could confidently match that brick. So, because of the scale of the building and the purpose of the building, we came up with a design that we felt would complement the existing building but not necessarily try to match it exactly. Now we could do, with the panels we're doing, we could maybe do some different colors. So, they wouldn't be windows per se, but they would maybe help create a rhythm and be similar to the window that we're showing.

And then as far as the pharmacy is concerned, on the back of the building, pretty much everything that wraps around the building except where we're showing the two small windows our clean rooms we just can't have windows in those spaces. One of them is hazardous storage. The other one is for compounding drugs and medications. We put as many windows in as we could, given the purpose of the spaces. They're pretty highly technical.

Julie Erdman: What is the material on the siding material? **Jon:** It's called azac. It's a cementitious panel. It replicates natural stone. It actually might be a quartz product, I'm not sure of its physical makeup, but it looks like a stone panel when it's installed and it's very smooth, unlike the base, which is the split face block, concrete block or CMU that I think you guys probably are used to seeing.

Julie: Would you, at least with the pharmacy portion, be able to add some plantings along that windowless facade to kind of to break up that wall? **Jon:** On the pharmacy, on the lower left-hand corner where we see the two small windows. That's the only face that we could do plantings on the opposite side, which is over here on the other small elevation, that's the sidewalk entrance into the back of the building. There's literally no place to put plantings without reconfiguring that staff entrance, which is also an exit access way. And then the long face of the building that's facing us in the middle is literally about 18 inches from the edge of the drive lane of the parking lot. Again, there's no opportunity there. We could put some plantings on the street facing side of the of the linear accelerator, which would be the top image with the window.

Julie: Okay. And you mentioned maybe breaking up the wall with a different material or a different color. **Jon:** We'd have to look at that.

Dennis Wilson: The 18 inches along that linear wall that's got nothing, you can put environmental grass in there to help shape that. The 18 inches will be totally fine for that kind of plant environment. **Jon:** Yeah, I'm not opposed to that. We could do that.

Taylor Burns: No comments.

Trey Crews: Jeremy, can you just briefly speak to the existing storm water infrastructure? I know you're removing some of the parking lot for a building and then there's a new one impervious surface, there's a new sidewalk connection. Can you just kind of speak of what the existing stormwater does, the increase of it, impervious capacity, et cetera. Can you just give a brief overview of what's there?

Jeremy Prue: The existing stormwater, it's more or less a fill slope running to the east of the property. Where the LINAC unit's going to be, that's pretty flat grassed area, and basically the water will flow down that bank towards the, basically a forested area, forested wetland.

And in the parking lot, of course it's impervious where the pharmacy unit's going. There are parking spaces. It's the sidewalk that's all impervious there. And the existing drainage are catch basins in the center of the parking lot. So, it flows away from that pharmacy unit. I don't anticipate any negative change to the stormwater flow in the parking lot from the pharmacy because it's not like the water's running to where we were. It's all running away. And you can see on the grading plan for where the LINAC, generator pad, and construction entrance are that we're basically just extending that fill slope. It'll change the grading, but it won't change the method of sheet flowing to that forested buffer.

Trey Crews: Can you confirm that with this new pharmacy, this new medical testing lab, there's no anticipated increase in trips to the facility itself. They're just maybe rearranging what's already there. If there are, this property is subject to the Cook's Corner transportation impact fee.

Jeremy Prue: Yeah. This is more for John or Ashley, but the capabilities are adding here, allow them to do certain things, but we don't foresee a generation of additional trips from this. It just gives them different capabilities. Is that correct?

Ashley: Ashley with MaineHealth. In order to bring on the service line for all of the cancer services we're providing, we are removing neurology, ENT and some other services from the building. We see it as an even swap in providers and patients will be coming to and from the building.

Trey Crews: I see that you're adding a new sidewalk and A-R-R-F-B to the parking lot on the other side. I don't see any sort of grading plans for it, so I just would like you to add some notes that it needs to be ADA accessible when it's built by the contractor. I know that parking lot is at a much higher elevation, making sure that it follows maximum slope in the direction of travel, any ramps that might be necessary. Just make sure that it's noted to be ADA compliant. **Jeremy:** Yes, absolutely, we will. And that's the intention, it'll be an ADA facility.

Trey: On your erosion and sedimentation control, you include very detailed notes and some standard details. But can you provide an additional plan just showing where you intend the contractor to install these erosion control measures? Where the actual limit of disturbance is, just provide them better direction than leaving it up on their own to do it? **Jeremy:** Yes, absolutely. We show the proposed tree line. What we'll do is I'll add a proposed erosion control barrier. A silt fence or ECM berm, essentially. Okay. **Trey:** Yeah. If you just include that for that. And then, I believe your narrative mentions you already have bike parking provided. I didn't see it called out on the plan. If you just note it somewhere on the plan, just make sure that it's there.

Julie Erdman: I was hoping that you could provide a table on the site plan, just showing how the dimensional and density standards are met or the dimensional standards, really not density. Just

what they are in that zoning district and what they are for the lot, your setbacks and impervious surface coverage and such.

Jeremy Prue: Okay. More or less just a table of the requirements and that we've met them. **Julie:** Yep. And maybe if you could provide an inset showing the larger parcel. The full parcel on the plan.

Julie Erdman: And there's a request for a waiver for the tree survey. Waivers have been a hot button issue at planning board right now, and I don't know what the likelihood is of that being approved. I would recommend, it seems like it would be a fairly easy thing to do. There are not too many trees that are coming out.

Jeremy: Yeah. Just to give a little background on, the reason I asked that waiver request is that there's not that much tree clearing and there's not that many trees to add, but it's more or less a cost and a time situation that, we have a topographical survey, so to really put that on the right spot out there, we'd have to have the survey crew go back out there for at least half a day to go out and survey just to the 10 trees. And given that it's a minor clearing, overall, we thought that it might be okay just to show that where we're clearing in general, but we don't have every specific tree called out, though. Just for ease and for just cost as well. Okay. It's not as simple as just like pulling tapes because we want to make sure it's actually located properly. Like it, we would really would want it to be surveyed on a job like this. So that's the only reason I asked for that waiver. **Julie:** Okay. It's, and again it's your discretion, but... Just so you're aware of what's been going on at planning board lately.

Julie Erdman: Stormwater management permit, and it says that you are applying for an amendment. Is that something that's already been applied for?

Jeremy Prue: We've already been in talks with DEP about this because we were, I'll probably get all the terminology wrong, but we were a site law situation initially with the permit. All we're required to, and we're not adding more than 10,000 square feet of impervious in any given year, I think it was. All we need to do is report at the end of the project what had changed and the measures that were taken. We've already talked DEP; we're going to be compliant with that. At the completion of this project, we'll submit everything that we need to be compliant with that stormwater permit. But we've already gone through all those channels.

Julie Erdman: I didn't see anything in the plans that show what's going on with stormwater now. Is that something you can provide for us for planning board? **Jeremy:** I can at least add a narrative of that, what I described earlier, about how existing sheet flow to a forested wetland, it's basically going to be the same, slightly different, as you can tell, there's not that much site change work. It's a lot of it is internal for the project. **Julie:** Okay. Chrissy already mentioned Cook's Corner Design standards. I think that's all I've got.

Matt James: I had sent in my initial email to you a recommendation to do the 10-inch caliper tree survey. I'd also still recommend that is done, especially because of Dennis's comments, with trees moving around. I wouldn't be as concerned with it if it was on like a completely flat area, but because there is like some amount of slope over there, if other trees were to die, we'd like to know what kind of caused that to happen, what trees were removed. If trees come down, you can also have erosion problems. But again, it is your choice whether or not you want to proceed with asking for a waiver.

The only other thing I had asked about was the interior of the building and whether or not you're going to be changing the internal plumbing in a way that would increase or decrease your water service. Looks like you are potentially moving some bathrooms around, but it was pretty dense in

there, so I'm not a hundred percent sure what is going to end up changing. **Jeremy:** That's a good Jon question.

Jon Boyd: We can give you a (*unintelligible word*) of what's added.

Taylor Lund: It looks like you guys have plenty of parking. I would add your square footage of the building, how many spaces you have, how many spaces you're removing, how many spaces will be there at the end of that, because it looks like you're getting rid of four or five or something like that. Thanks.

Jeremy Prue: They've added a lot of parking over the years, far and above what they need for the requirements. I can't remember exactly how we wrote it, but it was more or less that we've added so much over the years. We've been compliant. We keep adding some, we've only taken away four, so we should be in good shape, but I will add those numbers in there.

Ashley Charleson: I believe it's page 70 of the actual packet, but under 4.3.1 for the mapping of natural and historic areas requirements. In your packet, it indicates that these features are displayed on the existing conditions site plan and the legend reads or references the stream and edge of waterline on site. But from what I saw, this is the extent to what I assume is the wetland delineation and mapping of national areas that you're referring to.

Can you confirm when your wetland delineation was conducted and is there a reason it wasn't included in the report? I know it's a minimal amount of new area disturbed, but it says there was one conducted and I'm just curious.

Jeremy Prue: This has been a project that's been conducted over many phases, and so that's been done. I have to look into the existing conditions and the survey itself.

Ashley Charleson: I could maybe save you a little time. I do want to see the wetland delineation report if you have it at least some reference to it was conducted, who conducted it, a summary of any findings, relevant photographs of the area, just so we get a sense for what it looks like.

Jeremy: Yeah, it's just to adjust that, the wetlands we don't have any specific notes in our survey of when that was reported. We took that map from the previous phase and we've redone the topographic survey so I can figure out when that was done for you. We do show the wetland boundary on the plans. We don't have the delineation note. I could track down the delineation report one that when I can go back for that.

Ashley: And then just a few other minor ones. If you could provide updated maps in your application packet as well as your plan set. Boundaries like the wetland should be clearly delineated. And if you could please also use the town overlays that fall within your parcel area. Even a screenshot from our GIS web application would suffice. Just so we have a clear sense of what overlays exist on the property and where.

I would also recommend providing a map of the project area from beginning with habitat site. And then another just super minimal. If you could please reach out to the Maine Natural Areas Program, IF&W as well, we can get a clear sense of if there are any existing sensitive, threatened, what have you, habitats, species, vegetation on site. Email communication or scanned letters would suffice, but we do want to see those included please.

Jeremy Prue: Okay. That sounds great. When we do the overall site plan that shows the entire parcel, could we show a lot of the overlays on that and then just have a little area of where we're working? So, you get all the mapping done at once. Is that okay? **Ashley:** Potentially, if that

suffices for our standard, that's fine. But yeah, if you could also just make sure to include those communications. We just want confirmation of what's out there.

Jim Flood: No comments.

Trey Crews: You mentioned that the existing parking lot flows to a closed drainage system. Can you provide a detail on your erosion control plan for protecting that inlet from any additional erosion or sedimentation going into that **Jeremy:** Do you need a detail on the plans or can I give you a verbal response or covered by those notes? **Trey:** I think it's best to provide clear direction to the contractor of -he needs to protect this inlet, here's what's being recommended, here's the standard, a typical detail for it. Doesn't have to be overly complicated. **Jeremy:** As you noted, we have a lot of those erosion control notes. I believe there's a silt trap or sediment trap note in there about how during construction, any in the area will have that kind of, that orange silt trap in the inlet so that anything gets caught in there. If not, I'll make sure I add it. **Trey:** Or when you make a map just showing/specifying where the limits of disturbance, where the measures go, just include that.

Matt James: Do you guys have any questions for us?

Jon Boyd: One question for you, Matt, to clarify. The count of the existing toilets versus new added is that apply to sinks as well? There are instances where we're turning offices into exam rooms and vice versa versus, so we have hand sinks obviously in exam rooms, and we're removing some hand sinks from exam rooms that become offices. So, I can give you a count of those as well. Or are you just primarily worried about toilets?

Matt: If there's any sinks or toilets or eye washing station showers, things like that. Anything that might be used that would increase your usage? If it's just a one-to-one, replacement throughout the building, then, I'm probably fine with not seeing that, but if it is an increase or an additional toilet or sink, then we'd like to see that. And of course, you'll have to go through all your building and plumbing permits, but I just wanted to double-check on your service.

Jim Flood: Matt, I think they have a four-inch domestic service, which should be plenty for any change use. But I agree. It would be good to know if there's going to be any change in demand.

From: [Jeremy Prue](#)
To: [Matthew James](#)
Cc: [Pine Tree Engineering](#); [Ashley Roan](#); [Jon Boyd](#); [Julie Erdman](#)
Subject: RE: MaineHealth Site Plan
Date: Tuesday, February 3, 2026 1:26:11 PM
Attachments: [image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[RE 95041.21 MCH Cancer Center Renovation - Proposed Walkway.msg](#)

Hi Matt,

After our meeting, I reviewed the video of the meeting in its entirety and came up with the following comments that required changes to our application. Please see this table for SRC Comments Received and the Applicant Response, which points to the changes made within the application that was submitted on 1/20/26.

Landscaping Comments	Applicant Response
1. Add 10 evergreen trees at 10' o.c. spacing along proposed treelines	The proposed trees have been added to AS1.00 Proposed Site Plan.
2. Add note about revegetating construction entrance after construction	See Note 7 on the Construction Entrance detail on AS2.00 ESC Notes and Details.
3. Add ornamental grass along parking lot side of pharmacy, near bollards	See Section B-B on AS3.00 Civil Details
Architecture Comments	
4. Review Cooks Corner Design Standards, specifically Section 3.4 Façade Requirements, and within 3.4.j.	See Exhibit 8: Cook's Corner Design Standards Narrative.
Engineering Comments	
5. Add notes to clarify that the walkway will be Accessible	This was discussed with Town Engineer Trey Crews after the meeting via phone call and in the attached email. It was agreed upon that the proposed walkway did not need to be Accessible. See General Notes - Note 1 on AS1.00 Proposed Site Plan for design parameters for the walkway, as requested.
6. Add Erosion Control Barrier linework to plans	Linework for the temporary sediment barrier has been added to AS1.00 Proposed Site Plan.
7. Add bicycle rack locations and callouts to plan (min. 13 spaces)	The proposed bicycle rack has been added to AS1.00 Proposed

	Site Plan.
8. Add callouts for sediment sack to inlets	A callout for Temporary inlet protection has been added to AS1.00 Proposed Site Plan
General Comments	
9. Add table of requirements plans (dimensional standards, density standards)	See Exhibit 2: Overall Site Plan.
10. Create overall site plan that shows entire parcel to be included in the application	See Exhibit 2: Overall Site Plan.
11. Provide more information on if the water supply requirements will be increasing, based on modifications to internal plumbing (existing 4" domestic service)	See Exhibit 9: Chapter 4 Development Standards, Section 4.5.2. for the updated response.
12. In item #10 above, include parking SF of building, and total parking	See Exhibit 2: Overall Site Plan.
13. Provide wetland delineation report	See Exhibit 9: Chapter 4 Development Standards, Section 4.3.1. for the updated response. The wetland delineation report is on file with the Town from previous applications, as this is an amendment.
14. Provide updated mapping, including Town overlays. This will be shown in #10 above.	See Exhibit 2: Overall Site Plan.
15. Reach out to Maine Natural Areas Program and IF&W for existing sensitive/threatened habitat/species on-site. Email is sufficient	See Exhibit 7: Environmental Review.

Please let me know if you need anything further on this.

Thank you,

Jeremy Prue, P.E.
Project Manager

**PINE TREE
ENGINEERING**



53 Front St, Bath, ME 04530
Office: (207) 443-1508
Mobile: (207) 713-5427

Response to Development Review Application Question 11


Between January and February 1989, Mid Coast Health Services took ownership of several parcels of land along Medical Center Drive in Brunswick, Maine, now known as 81 Medical Center Drive ("Property"). See the following Book and Page references in the Registry of Deeds for Cumberland County ("Registry"): 8628/148; 8660/183; 8654/342. On July 6, 2007, Mid Coast Health Services entered into a Ground Lease with respect to the Property with Bath Road Associates, LLC, a New York limited liability company. See Memorandum of Ground Lease recorded in the Registry at Book 25280, Page 322. Pursuant to the terms of that lease agreement, Bath Road Associates constructed and retained title to a medical office building on the Property ("Building"). MaineHealth is the current tenant of the Building.

Mid Coast Health Services formally changed its name to Mid Coast-Parkview Health (Maine Secretary of State Charter No. 19870489ND) after 2007, and Mid Coast-Parkview Health merged into MaineHealth on January 1, 2021 (Maine Secretary of State Charter No. 19510013ND). MaineHealth is the current owner of the Property, the lessor under the ground lease, and the tenant of the Building. Bath Road Associates, LLC remains the owner of the Building and the lessor under the ground lease.

MaineHealth now brings this Application to build two structures on the Property: one structure will house a pharmacy, and the other structure will house a LINAC ("Structures"). The Structures will be attached to and accessed via the Building. However, the Structures will be owned by MaineHealth, not Bath Road Associates. Bath Road Associates, therefore, will have no ownership interest in the project.

Bath Road Associates has reviewed MaineHealth's construction plans and this Application, and consents to the project as described.

Sincerely,

 1-19-26

Christopher T. Bowe, MD

Seen and Agreed to:

BATH ROAD ASSOCIATES, LLC

Name:

Title:

Bath Road Associates, LLC

By: **Bath Road Management, LLC**

As: **Managing Member**

By: 

Gary Parrotta, Member



Town Of Brunswick
Planning & Development
85 Union Street
Brunswick, ME 04011

Attn: Matt James

Subject: LINAC Operation, Waste, and Regulatory Requirements – 81 Medical Center Drive

Thank you for your question regarding waste management for the proposed medical linear accelerator (LINAC) at 81 Medical Center Drive.

LINAC Operation and Waste Generation

The LINAC we are installing is a *radiation-producing machine* used for therapeutic medical x-ray treatment. It does *not use, generate, or store radioactive materials* as defined by Maine's Radiation Control Regulations (10-144 C.M.R. Chapter 220) or federal standards. In a medical LINAC (with maximum photon energy of 10 MV), the accelerated electrons interact with a target to produce therapeutic x-rays, but *no radioactive isotopes are created or left behind* in normal operation. Consequently:

- There are no radioactive waste products from LINAC operation.
- There is no byproduct radioactive material requiring disposal under radioactive materials licensing rules.

State Regulatory Framework

The Maine Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), Radiation Control Program regulates radiation safety in the state under *10-144 C.M.R. Chapter 220 – Rules Relating to Radiation Protection*. This set of regulations includes:

- Licensing of radioactive material and devices using radioactive material (*Part C*).
- Requirements for radiation-producing machines, including therapeutic radiation machines such as LINACs (*Part X*).

Because the LINAC does not involve radioactive materials, *it does not trigger a radioactive materials license* under Part C and is not subject to radioactive waste disposal regulations. The regulatory controls that do apply are those for radiation-producing machines, which focus on safety procedures and shielding rather than waste.

Additionally, under *Maine statute (Title 22, §677)*, the Department may license or register other radiation sources, but it also allows for exemptions where use does not pose a significant risk — such as the operation of diagnostic and therapeutic radiation machines not involving radioactive materials.

Federal Context

At the federal level, 10 C.F.R. Part 20 defines standards for protection against radiation from licensed activities involving radioactive materials; these do not apply to radiation-producing machines that do not use or create radioactive material.

Equipment Maintenance, Decommissioning, and Removal

- Routine maintenance, repairs, and eventual removal or replacement of the LINAC are handled by the *manufacturer/vendor (Varian Medical Systems)* or licensed medical equipment service providers.
- Because the LINAC itself is not radioactive, *any removed components do not constitute radioactive waste*.
- Structural shielding (e.g., concrete) is simply demolished or repurposed following standard construction practices and *is not subject to radioactive waste disposal requirements*.

This approach is consistent with standard practice in radiation oncology facilities and does not require a radioactive materials waste management plan.

**TOWN OF BRUNSWICK
MAJOR DEVELOPMENT REVIEW APPLICATION
STREAMLINED FINAL PLAN
MAINEHEALTH MID COAST CANCER CENTER RENOVATION**

**ARCHITECT
E4H – ENVIRONMENTS FOR HEALTH
75 YORK STREET, SUITE 3
PORTLAND, MAINE 04101**

**MEP & STRUCTURAL ENGINEERING
RFS – RIST, FROST, SHUMWAY ENGINEERING
71 WATER STREET
LACONIA, NEW HAMPSHIRE 03246**

**CIVIL ENGINEERING
PINE TREE ENGINEERING, INC.
53 FRONT STREET
BATH, MAINE 04530**

DECEMBER 2025

Pine Tree Engineering, Inc.

53 Front Street
Bath, Maine 04530
(207) 443-1508
Fax: (207) 442-7029
E-mail: pte@pte-maine.com

January 20, 2026

Ms. Julie Erdman, Director of Planning & Development
Town of Brunswick
85 Union Street
Brunswick, Maine 04011

Subject: Major Development Review Application
MaineHealth Mid Coast Cancer Center Renovation **#95041.21**
Brunswick, Maine

Dear Julie:

On behalf of MaineHealth, we have enclosed a Major Development Review Application for renovations to their Mid Coast Hospital campus.

The proposed project is for two (2) one-story building additions to 81 Medical Center Drive office building, one to house the linear accelerator (LINAC) system, and the other to house a pharmacy, thus, the project requires a Major Development Review.

Details of the proposed project can be reviewed on the enclosed plans.

Please contact us if you have any questions concerning this application.

Sincerely,

PINE TREE ENGINEERING, INC.



Jeremy R. Prue, P.E.
Civil Project Manager

JRP/tls
Enclosures

- | | |
|--|-------------|
| c. Ashley Roan, MaineHealth | (Via Email) |
| Architect, E4H – Environments for Health | (Via Email) |
| MEP & Structural Engineer, RIFS – Rist, Frost, Shumway Engineering | (Via Email) |



November 18, 2025

To whom it may concern:

By this letter, I authorize Pine Tree Engineering, Inc. to act on behalf of MaineHealth / Mid Coast Hospital as our Agent for the preparation and submission of all federal, state, and local town or city permit applications, along with all relevant documents, submittals, and correspondence related to the Coastal Cancer Project at Mid Coast Hospital in Brunswick, Maine. This authorization includes attending meetings and site visits, appearing before all boards, commissions, and/or committees, and providing other services as required to complete the aforementioned tasks.

Thank you for your assistance and coordination on this project. Should you have any additional questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at 207-471-0591 or by email at Christoper.bowe@mainehealth.org.

Authorized by:

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Christopher Bowe". The signature is written over a horizontal line.

Christopher Bowe
President
MaineHealth / Mid Coast Hospital

Department Name
Hospital Name

555 Street Name, Suite 555, City, ME 55555 • 555-555-5555 • Opt 2: 555-555-5555 • Opt 3: 555-555-5555
mainehealth.org

DEVELOPMENT REVIEW APPLICATION

1. Development Review application type (refer to **Appendix D**):

☐

Minor Development Review

☐

Major Development Review: **Sketch Plan**

☒

Major Development Review: **Final Plan**

2. Project Name: MaineHealth Mid Coast Cancer Center Additions

3. Project Applicant

Name: Christopher Bowe - MaineHealth
Address: 81 Medical Center Drive
Brunswick ME 04011
Phone Number: _____
Email: christoper.bowe@mainehealth.org

4. Property Owner (name on deed)

Name: MaineHealth - Successor by Merger - MidCoast Health Services Corporation
Address: 58 Baribeau Drive
Brunswick, ME 04011
Phone Number: _____
Email: _____

5. Authorized Representative

Name: Jeremy R. Prue, P.E. - Pine Tree Engineering, Inc. (PE16639)
Address: 53 Front Street
Bath, ME 04530
Phone Number: (207) 443-1508
Email: jrprue@pte-maine.com

6. List of Design Consultants. Indicate the registration number, address and phone number, email for any additional project engineers, surveyors, architects, landscape architects or planners:

E4H Environments for Health Architecture, 163 Fore Street, 4th Floor Portland, ME 04101 (207) 773-8841
1. Jon Boyd AIA, LEED AP, LSSGB Senior Principal, Maine #3028 Jon.Boyd@e4harchitecture.com

RFS - Rist, Frost, Shumway Engineering, 71 Water Street, Laconia, NH 03246 O:(603) 524-4647
2. Christopher M. Shumway, Maine PE No. 10820, LEED AP, President

3. _____

7. Physical location of property: 81 Medical Center Drive, Brunswick ME 04011

8. Lot Size: 113 Acres

9. Zoning District: Growth Mixed Use-4 (GM4); Growth Mixed Use-8 (GM8)

10. Overlay Zoning District(s):

11. Indicate the interest of the applicant in the property and abutting property. For example, is the applicant the owner of the property and abutting property? If not, who owns the property subject to this application? If property owner is an organization, what is the applicant's affiliation?

Applicant is the owner of the property.

12. Assessor's Tax Map 45 Lot Number 32 of subject property.

13. Brief description of proposed use/subdivision: The proposed development will not change the existing use. The site will remain in operation as a medical office building with associated parking lot.

14. Describe specific physical improvements to be done: MaineHealth is building two different one-story additions to the existing building. The first is a 1,186 SF addition for a new pharmacy and the second is a 2,325 SF addition for the new LINAC unit. Beyond the building additions will include regrading of the existing slopes, selectively clearing trees, and sitework to tie into the existing parking lot.

Property Owner Signature:

Christopher Bowe

Date: 1-20-26

Property Owner Name Printed:

Christopher Bowe - MaineHealth

Applicant Signature:

Christopher Bowe

Date: 1-20-26

Applicant Name & Title Printed:

Christopher Bowe - MaineHealth

REQUIREMENTS FOR FINAL PLAN, STREAMLINED REVIEW & MINOR REVIEW APPLICATION SUBMITTAL		Final Plan	Streamlined	Minor
Please mark box with one of the following: “W” (Waiver); “P” (Pending); “X” (Submitted) or “N/A” (Not applicable)				
General	Application form and fee	X	--	--
	Name of development	X	--	--
	Existing zoning district and overlay designations	X	--	--
	Location map	X	--	--
	Names of current owner(s) of subject parcel and abutting parcels	X	--	--
	Names of engineer and surveyor; and professional registration numbers of those who prepared the plan	X	--	--
	Location of features, natural and artificial, such as water bodies, wetlands, streams, important habitats, vegetation, railroads, ditches and buildings	X	--	--
	Documentation of Right, Title and Interest	X	--	--
	Drafts of legal documents appropriate to the application, including: deeds, easements, conservation easements, deed restrictions or covenants, home/property owners association declarations and by-laws, and such other agreements or documents as are necessary to show the manner in which common areas will be owned, maintained, and protected	X	--	--
	Draft performance guarantee or conditional agreement	N/A	--	--
Survey, Topography, & Existing Conditions	Scale, date, north point, and area	X	--	--
	A survey submitted (stamped for final plan submittal) by a professional surveyor with a current license by the State of Maine Board of Licensure for Professional Surveyors	X	--	--
	Boundaries of all lots and tracts with accurate distances and bearings, locations of all permanent monuments property identified as existing or proposed	X	--	--
	Existing easements associated with the development	X	--	--
	Location of existing utilities; water, sewer, electrical lines, and profiles of underground facilities	X	--	--
Survey, Topography, & Existing Conditions	Existing location, size, profile and cross section of sanitary sewers; description, plan and location of other means of sewage disposal with evidence of soil suitability	NA		
	Topography with contour intervals of not more than two (2) feet	X	--	--
	A Medium Intensity Soil Survey, available from the Cumberland County Soil and water Conservation District,. The Planning Board may require a Class A (high intensity) Soil Survey, prepared in accordance with the standards of the Maine Association of Professional Soil Scientists, if issues of water quality, wetlands or other natural constraints are noted.	X	--	--
	Existing locations of sidewalks	X	--	--
	A delineation of wetlands, floodplains, important habitats, and other environmentally sensitive areas	X	--	--
	Approximate locations of dedicated public open space, areas protected by conservation easements and recreation areas	X	--	--

REQUIREMENTS FOR FINAL PLAN, STREAMLINED REVIEW & MINOR REVIEW APPLICATION SUBMITTAL		Final Plan	Streamlined	Minor
Please mark box with one of the following: “W” (Waiver); “P” (Pending); “X” (Submitted) or “N/A” (Not applicable)				
Infrastructure - Proposed	Name, location, width of paving and rights-of-way, profile, cross-section dimensions, curve radii of existing and proposed streets; profiles of center-lines of proposed streets, at a horizontal scale of one (1) inch = 50 feet and vertical scale of one (1) = five (5) feet, with all evaluations referred to in U.S.G.S. datum	X	--	--
	Proposed easements associated with the development	N/A	--	--
	Kind, location, profile and cross-section of all proposed drainage facilities, both within and connections to the proposed development, and a storm-water management plan in accordance with Section	X	--	--
	Location of proposed utilities; water, sewer, electrical lines, and profiles of underground facilities. Tentative locations of private wells.	N/A	--	--
	Proposed location, size, profile and cross section of sanitary sewers; description, plan and location of other means of sewage disposal with evidence of soil suitability	N/A	--	--
	Proposed locations, widths and profiles of sidewalks	X	--	--
	Locations and dimensions of proposed vehicular and bicycle parking areas, including proposed shared parking arrangement if applicable.	X	--	--
Infrastructure - Proposed	Grading, erosion control, and landscaping plan; proposed finished grades, slopes, swells, and ground cover or other means of stabilization	X	--	--
	Storm water management plan for the proposed project prepared by a professional engineer	X	--	--
	The size and proposed location of water supply and sewage disposal systems	N/A	--	--
	Where a septic system is to be used, evidence of soil suitability	N/A	--	--
	A statement from the General Manager of the Brunswick Sewer District as to conditions under which the Sewer District will provide public sewer and approval of the proposed sanitary sewer infrastructure	N/A	--	--
	A statement from the Fire Chief recommending the number, size and location of hydrants, available pressure levels, road layout and street and project name, and any other fire protection measures to be taken	N/A	--	--
	A statement from the General Manager of the Brunswick and Topsham Water District as to conditions under which public water will be provided and approval of the proposed water distribution infrastructure	N/A	--	--
Proposed Development Plan	Lighting plan showing details of all proposed lighting and the location of that lighting in relation to the site	X	--	--
	Reference to special conditions stipulated by the Review Authority	N/A	--	--
	Proposed ownership and approximate location and dimensions of open spaces for conservation and recreation. Dedicated public open specs, areas protected by conservation easements, and existing and proposed open spaces or recreation areas and potential connectivity to adjoining open space.	X	--	--
	When applicable, a table indicating the maximum number of lots permitted based upon the applicable dimensional requirements, the number of lots proposed, and the number of lots permitted to be further subdivided.	N/A	--	--
	Building envelopes showing acceptable locations for principal and accessory structures, setbacks and impervious coverage	X	--	--

REQUIREMENTS FOR FINAL PLAN, STREAMLINED REVIEW & MINOR REVIEW APPLICATION SUBMITTAL Please mark box with one of the following: “W” (Waiver); “P” (Pending); “X” (Submitted) or “N/A” (Not applicable)		Final Plan	Streamlined	Minor
Proposed Development Plan	Disclosure of any required permits or, if a permit has already been granted, a copy of that permit	N/A	--	--
	A statement from the General Manager of the Brunswick and Topsham Water District regarding the proposed development if located within an Aquifer Protection Zone	N/A	--	--
	A plan of all new construction, expansion and/or redevelopment of existing facilities, including type, size, footprint, floor layout, setback, elevation of first floor slab, storage and loading areas	X	--	--
	An elevation view of all sides of each building proposed indicating height, color, bulk, surface treatment, signage and other features as may be required by specific design standards	X	--	--
	A circulation plan describing all pedestrian and vehicle traffic flow on surrounding road systems	X	--	--
	A site landscaping plan indicating grade change, vegetation to be preserved, new plantings used to stabilize areas of cut and fill, screening, the size, locations and purpose and type of vegetation	X	--	--
	Number of lots if a subdivision	N/A	--	--
	A plan showing all ten (10) inch caliper trees to be removed as a result of the development proposal	W	--	--
	All applicable materials necessary for the Review Authority to review the proposal in accordance with the criteria of Chapter 5.	X	--	--
	Any additional studies required by the Review Authority	N/A	--	--

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Transmittal Letter, Authorized Agent Letter

*Town of Brunswick
Major Development Review Application – Streamlined Final Plan*

EXHIBITS


1. Location Map
2. Overall Site Plan
3. Owner's Title, Right and Interest
4. List of Abutters
5. Soil Map
6. Financial Capacity Letter
7. Environmental Review (MNAP & MDIFW)
8. Cook's Corner Design Standards Narrative
9. Chapter 4 Development Standards
10. Construction Drawings

EXHIBIT 1

Location Map

G:\Projects\1995\95041.21\DWG\8x11-MAP.dwg

10/08/25 10:30am



1 inch = 2000 ft.

LATITUDE: 43°54'34.2"N
LONGITUDE: 69°53'33.8"W

**PINE TREE
ENGINEERING**



53 Front Street
Bath, Maine 04530
Tel: (207) 443-1508
Fax: (207) 442-7029

Civil/Environmental Engineering • Surveying

LOCATION MAP MID COAST CANCER CENTER RENOVATION

APPLICATION BY: MAINEHEALTH
81 MEDICAL CENTER DRIVE
BRUNSWICK, ME 04011

DATE
OCTOBER 10, 2025
SHEET 1 OF 1

EXHIBIT 2

Overall Site Plan

EXHIBIT 3

Owner's Title, Right and Interest

January 20, 2026

Narrative regarding ownership was approved by Town Attorney prior to filing and is pending signature.

Once narrative has been signed it will be submitted to the Town by Applicant.

002450

Know All Men By These Presents.

That I, JOSEPH A. FOOTER, of Brunswick, in the County of Cumberland, and State of Maine,

in consideration of One Dollar and other good and valuable considerations,

paid by MID COAST HEALTH SERVICES CORPORATION, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Maine, with a place of business in Brunswick, in the County of Cumberland, and State of Maine,

the receipt whereof I do hereby acknowledge, do hereby

give, grant, bargain, sell and convey unto the said MID COAST HEALTH SERVICES CORPORATION, 58 Baribeau Drive, Brunswick, Maine, 04011,

its successors ~~and~~ and assigns forever,

~~acertain to do back premises as follows:~~

A certain lot or parcel of land, situated in Brunswick, in the County of Cumberland and State of Maine, on the northwesterly side of the Adams Road, so-called, and being more specifically bounded and described as follows:

Beginning at a point in the northeast line of land now or formerly of Alvin B. Allen, Arthur Altschuler and David Altschuler and being the southerly corner of land now or formerly of H. William Sowles, John W. Sowles and Peter P. Sowles, recorded in the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds Book 6493, Page 111, and being the northwesterly corner of land herein conveyed by Joseph A. Footer, recorded in the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds Book 4609, Page 268; thence south eighty-nine degrees, five minutes, forty-four seconds east (S 89° 05' 44" E) along the southerly line of the said H. William Sowles et al. and along the southerly line of land now or formerly of Marian B. Washburn, recorded in the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds Book 2935, Page 528, and along the northerly line of land herein conveyed by the said Joseph A. Footer a distance of seven hundred forty-eight and twenty-nine hundredths feet (748.29') to a point being the southeasterly corner of land now or formerly of Earnest Washburn, recorded in the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds Book 1976, Page 277, and being the westerly corner of land now or formerly of Felton Pervier and Rita Pervier, recorded in the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds Book 2991, Page 178, and being the northeasterly corner of land herein conveyed by the said Joseph A. Footer; thence forty-one degrees, zero minutes, thirty-four seconds east (S 41° 00' 34" E) along the southwesterly line of the said Felton Pervier and Rita Pervier and the northeasterly line of land herein conveyed by the said Joseph A. Footer a distance of seven hundred sixteen and seventeen hundredths feet (716.17') to a point marked by an iron rod; thence continuing south forty-one degrees, zero minutes, thirty-four seconds east (S 41° 00' 34" E) along the southwesterly line of the said Felton Pervier and Rita Pervier and the northeasterly line of land herein conveyed by the said Joseph A. Footer a distance of approximately one hundred forty feet (140') more or less to the centerline of the brook; thence southwesterly by the centerline of said brook a distance of twenty-one hundred forty feet (2140') more or less to a point in the easterly property line of land now or formerly of Charles Warren Ring, recorded in the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds Book 2660, Page 135; thence

BX 862 JPG 0148

CUMBERLAND REAL ESTATE TRANSFER TAX PRINC.

EX8628PG0149

north forty-one degrees, thirty minutes, twenty-six seconds west (N 41° 30' 26" W) along the easterly line of the said Charles Warren Ring and the westerly line of land herein conveyed by the said Joseph A. Footer a distance of approximately twenty-three hundred forty feet (2340') more or less to a point marked by a 1 1/4" diameter iron pipe being the northeasterly corner of the said Charles Warren Ring and being the southeasterly line of said Alvin B. Allen et. al. and being the northwesterly corner of land herein conveyed by the said Joseph A. Footer; thence north forty-seven degrees, thirty-two minutes, thirty-eight seconds east (N 47° 32' 38" E) along the southeasterly line of said Alvin B. Allen et. al. and the northwesterly line of land herein conveyed by the said Joseph A. Footer a distance of five hundred twenty-nine and ninety-one hundredths feet (529.91') to a point marked by a 1 1/2" diameter iron pipe being the southwesterly corner of the said Alvin B. Allen et. al.; thence north forty-one degrees, thirty-seven minutes, fifty-three seconds west (N 41° 37' 53" W) along the northeasterly line of the said Alvin B. Allen et. al. and the southwesterly line of the said Joseph A. Footer a distance of four hundred sixty-five and eighty-four hundredths feet (465.84') to the point of beginning. Containing forty-three acres (43 ac.).

Subject, however, to the rights held by New England Telephone and Telegraph Company, by virtue of Easement dated January 21, 1911, and recorded in the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds in Book 868, Page 491.

For source of title reference may be had to the following instruments: Mary D. Footer to Joseph A. Footer, dated December 21, 1973, and recorded in the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds in Book 3498, Page 69; Mary D. Footer to Joseph A. Footer, dated February 1, 1974, and recorded in the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds in Book 3508, Page 150; and Mary A. Parnham to Joseph A. Footer, dated August 30, 1974, and recorded in the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds in Book 3594, Page 165. Reference may also be had to Judgment entered in the matter of Joseph A. Footer v. Nancy W. Footer, dated May 6, 1980, and recorded in the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds in Book 4598, Page 261; and Release Deed of Nancy Waterman f/k/a Nancy W. Footer to Joseph A. Footer, dated May 7, 1980, and recorded in the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds in Book 4609, Page 268.

5X8620PG0150

And I do COVENANT with the said Grantee, its successors ~~and assigns~~
and assigns, that I am lawfully seized in fee of the premises that they
are free of all encumbrances:

In Witness Whereof, I, the said JOSEPH A. FOOTER,

RECEIVED
PROPERTY OFFICE OF FBI
1969 JAN 17 AM 11:10
COMMUNICATIONS SECTION
0 *James Smith*

Sigurd, Harald and Helmered.

in presence of

in presence of
Roger K. Thomas

Joseph A. Footer

58

January 13, 1989

Personally appeared the above named

JOSEPH A. FOOTER

and acknowledged the above

instrument to be his free act and deed.

Before me,

Roger R. Thieriault
 Roger R. Thieriault Attorney At Law

EX8660PG0183

007393

MATTHEW B. ALLEN of Brookline, Massachusetts, DOUGLAS ALLEN of Brookline, Massachusetts, ELIZABETH ALLEN of New York, New York, EMILY ALLEN of New York, New York, MILTON ALTSCHULER of Houston, Texas, and GEORGE S. ABRAMS AS TRUSTEE OF THE ARTHUR ALTSCHULER IRREVOCABLE TRUST of Boston, Massachusetts

For consideration paid, grant(s) to MID COAST HEALTH SERVICES, a Maine corporation, with a principal place of business at 58 Baribeau Drive, Brunswick, Maine, the land in Brunswick, in the County of Cumberland and State of Maine, as follows:

A certain lot or parcel of land situated in the Town of Brunswick, County of Cumberland and State of Maine, lying on the southerly side of U.S. Route One, also known as the Bath Road, said lot or parcel of land being more particularly bounded and described as follows:

Beginning at a point in the southerly right of way of the Bath Road fifty and zero hundredths feet (50.00') southwesterly from the northwesterly corner of land now or formerly of Douglas Schmidt, et als. (by deed recorded in the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds, Book 4352, Page 66); thence south two degrees, three minutes, forty, five seconds east (S 02° 03' 45" E) by and along remaining land of the Grantors a distance of two hundred forty one and zero hundredths feet (241.00') to a point of curve; thence by a curve concave to the northeast having a radius of six hundred fifty and zero hundredths feet (650.00') a delta angle of thirty nine degrees, twenty eight minutes, twenty four seconds (39° 28' 24") with a distance of four hundred forty seven and eighty one hundredths feet (447.81') by and along said remaining land of the Grantors to a

BK8660PG0184

point; thence south forty one degrees, thirty two minutes, nine seconds east (S 41° 32' 09" E) by and along said remaining land of the Grantors a distance of five hundred twenty and ninety five hundredths feet (520.95') to a point in the northwesterly line of land now or formerly of Joseph A. Footer (by deed recorded in the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds, Book 4609, Page 268); thence south forty seven degrees, thirty two minutes, thirty eight seconds west (S 47° 32' 38" W) along land of said Footer a distance of fifty and one hundredths feet (50.01') to a point marked by a 1-1/4" diameter iron pipe marking the northwesterly corner of land of said Footer and being the northeast corner of land now or formerly of Charles Warren Ring (by deed recorded in the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds, Book 2660, Page 135); thence south forty seven degrees, thirty one minutes, thirteen seconds west (S 47° 31' 13" W) along the northerly line of land of said Ring a distance of one thousand, one hundred twenty nine and thirty five hundredths feet (1129.35') to a point marked by a granite monument in the northeasterly line of land of James T. Redding (by deed recorded in the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds, Book 3264, Page 322); thence north thirty seven degrees, twenty eight minutes, four seconds west (N 37° 28' 04" W) by and along land of said Redding and land now or formerly of William S. Dodge a distance of five hundred twenty and sixty nine hundredths feet (520.69') to a point; thence north forty seven degrees, thirty one minutes, thirteen seconds east (N 47° 31' 13" E) by and along said remaining land of the Grantors a distance of one thousand forty and seventeen hundredths feet (1040.17') to a point; thence north forty two degrees, twenty eight minutes, forty seven seconds west (N 42° 28' 47" W) by and along said remaining land of the Grantors a distance of five and ninety one hundredths feet (5.91') to a point of curve; thence by a curve concave to the northeast having a radius of seven hundred fifty and zero hundredths feet (750.00') a delta angle of thirty nine degrees nineteen minutes, fifty seconds (39° 19' 50") and a distance of five hundred fourteen and eighty four hundredths feet (514.84') by and along said remaining land of the Grantors to a point; Thence north two degrees, three minutes, forty five seconds west (N 02° 03' 45" W) along land of the said Grantors a distance of two hundred forty and twenty eight hundredths feet (240.28') to a point in the southerly right of way line of the Bath Road; Thence along a curve concave to the south having a radius of thirteen thousand, one hundred eighty nine and ten hundredths feet (13,189.10') a delta angle of zero degrees, twenty six minutes, four seconds (0° 26' 04") and a distance of one hundred and zero hundredths feet (100.00) by and along the southerly right of way of the Bath Road to the point of beginning.

EX8660PG0185

The above described and conveyed premises contain fifteen and forty nine hundredths (15.49) acres and are more particularly shown on plan entitled "Proposed Property Acquisition, Mid Coast Health Services" by Kimball Chase Company, Inc. dated December 15, 1988 and to be recorded in the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds.

Grantors herein, for themselves and their heirs and assigns, in common with the Grantees, their successors, assigns and others, except and reserve a perpetual easement over, under and across a portion of the above described and conveyed parcel, said easement area being more particularly bounded and described as follows:

Beginning at a point in the southerly right of way of the Bath Road fifty and zero hundredths feet (50.00') southwesterly from the north westerly corner of land now or formerly of Douglas Schmidt, Robert Molesan, Elmer Saltzman and Leo Loiselle (by deed recorded in the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds, Book 4352, Page 66); Thence south two degrees, three minutes, forty five seconds east (S 02° 03' 45" E) by and along remaining land of the Grantors a distance of two hundred forty one and zero hundredths feet (241.00') to a point of curve; Thence by a curve concave to the northeast having a radius of six hundred fifty and zero hundredths feet (650.00'), a delta angle of thirty nine degrees, twenty eight minutes, twenty four seconds (39° 28' 24") with a distance of four hundred forty seven and eighty one hundredths feet (447.81') along said remaining land of the Grantors to a point; Thence south forty one degrees, thirty two minutes, nine seconds east (S 41° 32' 09" E) along land of said remaining land of the Grantors a distance of five hundred twenty and ninety five hundredths feet (520.95') to a point in the north westerly line of land now or formerly of Joseph A. Footer (by deed recorded in the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds, Book 4609, Page 268); Thence south forty seven degrees, thirty two minutes, thirty eight seconds west (S 47° 32' 38" W) along land of said Footer a distance of fifty and one hundredths feet (50.01') to a point marked by a 1-1/4" diameter iron pipe marking the northwesterly corner of land of said Footer and being the north east corner of land now or formerly of Charles Warren Ring (by deed recorded in the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds, Book 2660, Page 1350); thence South 47° 31' 13" West by and along said land of Ring fifty (50) feet, more or less, to a point; thence North 41° 32' 09" West across the property hereinabove described and conveyed five hundred twenty (520) feet, more or less, to a point at remaining land of the Grantors herein; Thence north forty two degrees, twenty eight minutes, forty seven seconds west (N 42° 28' 47" W) along land of the said Alvin B. Allen et. al. a distance of five and ninety one hundredths feet (5.91') to a point of curve; Thence by a curve concave to the north east

having a radius of seven hundred fifty and zero hundredths (750.00') a delta angle of thirty nine degrees nineteen minutes, fifty seconds (39° 19' 50") and a distance of five hundred fourteen and eighty four hundredths feet (514.84') along land of the said Grantors to a point; Thence north two degrees, three minutes, forty five seconds west (N 02° 03' 45" W) along land of the said Grantors a distance of two hundred forty and twenty eight hundredths feet (240.28') to a point in the southerly right of way line of the Bath Road; Thence along a curve concave to the south having a radius of thirteen thousand, one hundred eighty nine and ten hundredths feet (13,189.10') a delta angle of zero degrees, twenty six minutes, four seconds (0° 26' 04") and a distance of one hundred and zero hundredths feet (100.00) along the southerly right of way of the Bath Road to the point of beginning.

The above perpetual easement shall be for all purposes of an easement to benefit remaining land of the Grantors herein, including the following purposes: (A) as a roadway and means of ingress to and egress from other land of the Grantors herein by vehicular, pedestrian and all other modes of passage including the right to use any such roadway constructed and installed by the Grantee herein or its successors and assigns; and (B) to use and to connect to sewer and water lines, overhead and underground utility lines, wires and pipes, and any appurtenances to any of the foregoing, which are now, or may hereafter be installed in said easement area by the Grantee herein, or its successors and assigns, and the right of the Grantors herein, their heirs, personal representatives, successors and assigns, to construct, install, lay, maintain, repair and replace sewer and water lines, overhead and underground utility lines, wires, and pipes, and appurtenances to any of the foregoing.

The above described and conveyed premises are a portion only of the premises conveyed to the Grantors herein by Alvin B. Allen and David Altschuler, as Trustees of the Brunswick Shopping Plaza Trust by deed dated February 2, 1989 and recorded in the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds, in Book _____, Page _____ R.D.M.

TO HAVE AND TO HOLD the aforegranted and bargained premises, with all privileges and appurtenances thereof to the said MID COAST HEALTH SERVICES, its successors and assigns, forever, to them and their use and behoof forever.

AND we do hereby covenant with the said Grantee, its successors and assigns, that we are lawfully seized in fee of the premises; that they are free of all encumbrances, except as aforesaid; that we have good right to sell and convey the same to the said Grantee to hold as aforesaid, and that we and our heirs and assigns, shall and will WARRANT AND DEFEND the same

BK8660PG0187

to the said Grantee, its successors and assigns forever,
against the lawful claims and demands of all persons.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the said MATTHEW B. ALLEN, DOUGLAS
ALLEN, ELIZABETH ALLEN, EMILY ALLEN, MILTON ALTSCHULER, and
GEORGE S. ABRAMS AS TRUSTEE OF THE ARTHUR ALTSCHULER
IRREVOCABLE TRUST have hereunto set our hands and seals
this 3rd day of February, 1989

[Signature]
[Signature]

Matthew B. Allen
MATTHEW B. ALLEN

D. Allen
DOUGLAS ALLEN
ELIZABETH ALLEN

Elizabeth B. Allen atty. in fact
ELIZABETH ALLEN
EMILY ALLEN

Matthew B. Allen atty. in fact
EMILY ALLEN

Milton Altshuler
MILTON ALTSCHULER BY HIS ATTORNEY-
IN-FACT DAVID ALTSCHULER

THE ARTHUR ALTSCHULER
IRREVOCABLE TRUST

By *George S. Abrams, Trustee*
GEORGE S. ABRAMS, TRUSTEE

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
COUNTY OF MIDDLESEX

February 3, 1989

Then personally appeared the above named *David*
Altshuler, attorney for Milton Altshuler
and acknowledged the foregoing instrument to be his/her/their
free act and deed, before me

Barbara Maynard SEAL
NOTARY PUBLIC

RECEIVED
RECORDS SECTION OF DEEDS

1989 FEB 16 PH 2:40

CUMMELAND COUNTY
James S. Walsh

BK8654PG0342

006513

SHORT FORM WARRANTY DEED

CHARLES WARREN RING, whose mailing address is RR#5, Adams Road, Brunswick, Maine 04011, FOR CONSIDERATION PAID, grants to MID COAST HEALTH SERVICES, a Maine corporation whose mailing address is 58 Baribeau Drive, Brunswick, Maine 04011, with WARRANTY COVENANTS, certain real property, located in Brunswick, Cumberland County, Maine, more particularly described on Exhibit A attached hereto and made a part hereof.

WITNESS my hand and seal this 10th day of February, 1989.

WITNESS:

Philip H. Elison
Name: PHILIP H. ELISON

Charles Warren Ring
Charles Warren Ring

State of Maine
County of Cumberland, ss.

February 10, 1989

PERSONALLY APPEARED the above-named Charles Warren Ring and acknowledged the foregoing instrument to be his free act and deed.

Before me,

Philip H. Elison
Name: PHILIP H. ELISON
Title: ATTORNEY AT LAW

19047002.021
205.286

EXHIBIT A

A CERTAIN LOT OR PARCEL OF LAND LOCATED SOUTHERLY OF THE BATH ROAD (OLD U.S. ROUTE ONE), BOUNDED AND DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

Beginning at a point marked by granite being the southerly corner of land now or formerly Alvin B. Allen, Arthur Altschuler and David Altschuler and being the north westerly corner of land now or formerly Charles Warren Ring recorded in the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds Book 2660, Page 135;

thence north forty seven degrees, thirty one minutes, thirteen seconds east (N 47° 31' 13" E) along the south easterly line of the said Alvin B. Allen and the north westerly line of the said Charles Warren Ring a distance of one thousand, one hundred twenty nine and thirty five hundredths feet (1129.35') to a point marked by a 1 1/4" dia. iron pipe being the northerly corner of the said Charles Warren Ring and a north Westerly corner of land now or formerly Joseph A. Footer recorded in the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds Book 4609, Page 268;

thence south forty one degrees, thirty minutes, twenty six seconds east (S 41° 30' 26" E) along the south westerly line of the said Joseph A. Footer and the north easterly line of the said Charles Warren Ring a distance of approximately two thousand three hundred forty feet (2340'±) to the center line of Thompson's Brook; thence south westerly by the centerline of the

EXHIBIT A

said Thompson's Brook a distance of fifteen hundred fifty feet (1550'±) to a point in the south westerly line of the said Charles Warren Ring;

thence north forty one degrees, thirty minutes, twenty six seconds west (N 41° 30' 26" W) along land of the said Charles W. Ring a distance approximately eight hundred feet (800'±) to a point being a north easterly corner of the said Charles W. Ring;

thence south twenty-one degrees, twenty three minutes, two seconds west (S 21° 23' 02" W) along a northerly line of the said Charles W. Ring a distance of one hundred sixty eight and fifty one hundredths feet (168.51') to a point being a south westerly corner of land of the said Charles W. Ring;

thence north forty one degrees, thirty minutes, twenty six seconds west (N 41° 30' 26" W) along the south westerly line of the said Charles Warren Ring a distance of one thousand, five hundred and thirteen hundredths (1500.13'±) to the point of beginning containing approximately fifty four and seven tenths acres (54.7± ac).

The grantor, Charles W. Ring, reserves the right to an access easement to a point of land on the northerly side of Thompson's Brook. The location of said easement to be determined by Mid Coast Health Services in conjunction with the facilities to be constructed on the property being conveyed herein.

EXHIBIT A

TOGETHER WITH THE PERPETUAL RIGHT AND EASEMENT, IN COMMON WITH THE GRANTOR, HIS HEIRS AND ASSIGNS, TO PASS AND REPASS ON FOOT AND WITH VEHICLES AT ANY AND ALL TIMES AND TO CARRY, REPAIR, MAINTAIN, REPLACE AND REMOVE UTILITY PIPES AND MAINS, AND POLES AND WIRES WITH ALL NECESSARY APPURTENANCES UPON, UNDER OR OVER ADJACENT LAND OF GRANTOR, BOUNDED AND DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS:

EASEMENT ONE:

Beginning at a point marked by an iron pipe, being the south easterly corner of land now or formerly of James T. Reding, recorded in the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds, Book 3264, Page 322;

thence south thirty six degrees, twenty four minutes, fourteen seconds west (S 36° 24' 14" W) along the southerly line of the said James T. Reding parcel a distance of two hundred sixty four and eighty five hundredths feet (264.85'), to a point being the south westerly corner of the said James T. Reding parcel, also being the south easterly corner of land now or formerly of Charles W. Ring and recorded in the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds, Book 2473, Page 457;

thence south nineteen degrees, fifty four minutes, thirty four seconds west (S 19° 54' 34" W) along the southerly line of the said Charles W. Ring a distance of three hundred eight and eight hundredths feet (308.08') a point being the south westerly corner of the said Charles W. Ring and being in the easterly line of land now or formerly of Konover Family Limited recorded in the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds, Book 6812, Page 312 and being the north westerly corner of other land of Charles W. Ring recorded in the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds, Book 2660, Page 135;

EX0654PC0345

thence south forty one degrees six minutes, forty nine seconds east (S 41° 06' 49" E) along the easterly line of the said Konover Family Limited a distance of fifty seven and fifteen hundredths feet (57.15') to a point in the easterly line of the said Konover Family Limited;

thence north nineteen degrees, fifty four minutes, thirty four east (N 19° 54' 34" E) a distance of three hundred twenty eight and fifty two hundredths feet (328.52') to a point;

thence north thirty six degrees, twenty four minutes, fourteen seconds east (N 36° 24' 14" E) a distance of two hundred forty six and eighty nine hundredths feet (246.89') to a point in the easterly line of other land of the said Charles W. Ring;

thence north forty one degrees, thirty minutes, twenty six seconds west (N 41° 30' 26" W) along the easterly line of other land of the said Charles W. Ring, a distance of fifty one and thirteen hundredths feet (51.13') to the point of beginning.

EXHIBIT A

EASEMENT TWO:

Beginning at a point in the northerly right-of-way of the Adams Road at the south easterly corner of land now or formerly of William M. Greene and Judith A. Greene and recorded in the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds, Book 3828, Page 246;

thence north twenty seven degrees, seventeen minutes, ten seconds east (N 27° 17' 10" E) along the easterly line of the said William M. Greene and Judith A. Greene a distance of twenty nine and seventy five hundredths feet (29.75') to an angle point in the easterly line of the said William M. Greene and Judith A. Greene;

thence north forty one degrees, zero minutes, five seconds west (N 41° 00' 05" W) along the easterly line of the said William M. Greene and Judith A. Greene a distance of four hundred ten and twenty seven hundredths feet (410.27') to the north easterly corner of the said William M. Greene and Judith A. Greene;

thence along land now or formerly Charles W. Ring and recorded in the Cumberland County Registry of Deeds, Book 2660, Page 135 by a curve concave to the east having a radius of three hundred and zero hundredths feet (300.00'), a delta angle of twenty seven degrees,

EX8654PG0347

EXHIBIT A

twenty five minutes, seven seconds (27° 25' 07") a distance of one hundred forty three and fifty six hundredths feet (143.56') to a point;

thence north thirteen degrees, thirty four minutes, fifty nine seconds west (N 13° 34' 59" W) along land of the said Charles W. Ring a distance of forty two and five hundredths feet (42.05') to a point;

thence along land of the said Charles W. Ring by a curve concave south easterly having a radius of three hundred and zero hundredths feet (300.00'), a delta angle of thirty four degrees, fifty eight minutes, one second (34° 58' 01"), a distance of one hundred eighty three and nine hundredths feet (183.09') to a point;

thence north twenty one degrees, twenty three minutes, two seconds east (N 21° 23' 02" E) along land of the said Charles W. Ring a distance of four hundred thirty five and seventy five hundredths feet (435.75') to a point in the easterly line of land of the said Charles W. Ring;

thence south forty one degrees, thirty minutes, twenty six seconds east (S 41° 30' 26" E) along the easterly line of land of the said Charles W. Ring a distance of fifty six and seventeen hundredths feet (56.17') to a point in the easterly line of land of the said Charles W. Ring;

EXHIBIT A

thence south twenty one degrees, twenty three minutes, two seconds west ($S\ 21^{\circ}\ 23'\ 02''\ W$) along land of the said Charles W. Ring a distance of four hundred ten and sixteen hundredths feet (410.16') to a point;

thence along land of the said Charles W. Ring by a curve concave south easterly having a radius of two hundred fifty and zero hundredths feet (250.00'), a delta angle of thirty four degrees, fifty eight minutes, one second ($34^{\circ}\ 58'\ 01''$), a distance of one hundred fifty two and fifty seven hundredths feet (152.57') to a point;

thence south thirteen degrees, thirty four minutes, fifty nine seconds east ($S\ 13^{\circ}\ 34'\ 59''\ E$) along land of the said Charles W. Ring a distance of forty and five hundredths feet (42.05') to point;

thence along land of the said Charles W. Ring by a curve concave to the east having a radius of two hundred fifty and zero hundredths feet (250.00'), a delta angle of twenty seven degrees, twenty five minutes, seven seconds ($27^{\circ}\ 25'\ 07''$), a distance of one hundred nineteen and sixty four hundredths feet (119.64') to a point;

thence south forty one degrees, zero minutes, five seconds east ($54^{\circ}\ 00'\ 05''\ E$) along land of the said Charles W. Ring also being parallel and fifty and zero hundredths feet (50.00') from the

BK8654PG0349

EXHIBIT A

easterly line of the said William M. Greene and Judith A. Greene a distance of four hundred forty four and seventeen hundredths feet (444.17') to a point;

thence south twenty seven degrees, seventeen minutes, ten seconds west along land of said Charles W. Ring a distance of sixty four and eighty six hundredths feet (64.86') to a point in the northerly right-of-way line of the said Adams Road;

thence north sixty one degrees, twenty minutes, eleven seconds west (N 61° 20' 11" W) along the northerly right-of-way of the said Adams Road and southerly line of land of the said Charles W. Ring a distance of fifty and one hundredths feet (50.01') to the point of beginning.

RECEIVED
RECORDED DEPT. OF DEEDS

1989 FEB 10 PM 3:38

CUMBERLAND COUNTY

James J. Walsh

EXHIBIT 4

List of Abutters

BATH IRON WORKS CORPORATION
MS1145
700 WASHINGTON ST
BATH ME , 04530

BATH IRON WORKS CORPORATION
MS1145
700 WASHINGTON ST
BATH ME , 04530

BATH ROAD ASSOCIATES LLC
309 N WATER ST STE 500
MILWAUKEE WI , 53202

BRUNSWICK APARTMENTS LLC
310 SEVEN FIELDS BLVD STE 350
SEVEN FIELDS PA , 16046

BRUNSWICK ASSOCIATES LLC
C/O SLATE PROPERTY TAX SOLUTIONS
546 SILICON DR #100
SOUTHLAKE TX , 76092

BRUNSWICK MAINE MEDICAL REAL ESTATE LLC
310 BATH RD
BRUNSWICK ME , 04011

BRUNSWICK, TOWN OF
85 UNION ST
BRUNSWICK ME , 04011

CARPENTER, DAVID R
50 VARNEY LN
BRUNSWICK ME , 04011

DARLING'S
96 PARKWAY SOUTH
BREWER ME , 04412

FOOTER, JOSEPH A
255 ADAMS RD
BRUNSWICK ME , 04011

J&B FITZPATRICK FAMILY PROPERTIES, LLC
450 BATH RD
BRUNSWICK ME , 04011

KERKSTRA, SUSAN B
4 CRANBERRY DR
BRUNSWICK ME , 04011

MAINEHEALTH
ATTN: ACCOUNTING
329 MAINE ST
BRUNSWICK ME , 04011

MID COAST HEALTH SERVICES
329 MAINE ST STE C120
BRUNSWICK ME , 04011

MID COAST HEALTH SERVICES
C/O SLATE PROPERTY TAX SOLUTIONS
546 SILICON DR #100
SOUTHLAKE TX , 76092

MID COAST HEALTH SERVICES INC
123 MEDICAL CENTER DR
SUITE 2200
BRUNSWICK ME , 04011

MID COAST HEALTH SERVICES INC
309 N WATER ST STE 500
MILWAUKEE WI , 53202

MID COAST HOSPITAL
ATTN: SHARON
329 MAINE ST
BRUNSWICK ME , 04011

MID COAST HOSPITAL
123 MEDICAL CENTER DR
BRUNSWICK ME , 04011

MID COAST HOSPITAL
123 MEDICAL CENTER DR
SUITE 2200
BRUNSWICK ME , 04011

NORTHBRIDGE SUNNYBROOK II LLC
C/O LAURY DELANO
340 BATH RD
BRUNSWICK ME , 04011

PICONE, LEO
PO BOX 602
BRUNSWICK ME , 04011

SOWLES REAL ESTATE LLC
187 ROUTE 1
FALMOUTH ME , 04105

SOWLES REAL ESTATE LLC
187 ROUTE 1
FALMOUTH ME , 04105

THOMPSON, WILLIAM H & MICHELLE B JT
42 VARNEY LN
BRUNSWICK ME , 04011

WARREN, JOHN F III
332 BATH RD
BRUNSWICK ME , 04011

EXHIBIT 5

Soil Map



United States
Department of
Agriculture

NRCS

Natural
Resources
Conservation
Service

A product of the National
Cooperative Soil Survey,
a joint effort of the United
States Department of
Agriculture and other
Federal agencies, State
agencies including the
Agricultural Experiment
Stations, and local
participants

Custom Soil Resource Report for Cumberland County and Part of Oxford County, Maine



Preface

Soil surveys contain information that affects land use planning in survey areas. They highlight soil limitations that affect various land uses and provide information about the properties of the soils in the survey areas. Soil surveys are designed for many different users, including farmers, ranchers, foresters, agronomists, urban planners, community officials, engineers, developers, builders, and home buyers. Also, conservationists, teachers, students, and specialists in recreation, waste disposal, and pollution control can use the surveys to help them understand, protect, or enhance the environment.

Various land use regulations of Federal, State, and local governments may impose special restrictions on land use or land treatment. Soil surveys identify soil properties that are used in making various land use or land treatment decisions. The information is intended to help the land users identify and reduce the effects of soil limitations on various land uses. The landowner or user is responsible for identifying and complying with existing laws and regulations.

Although soil survey information can be used for general farm, local, and wider area planning, onsite investigation is needed to supplement this information in some cases. Examples include soil quality assessments (<http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/main/soils/health/>) and certain conservation and engineering applications. For more detailed information, contact your local USDA Service Center (<https://offices.sc.egov.usda.gov/locator/app?agency=nrcs>) or your NRCS State Soil Scientist (http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/soils/contactus/?cid=nrcs142p2_053951).

Great differences in soil properties can occur within short distances. Some soils are seasonally wet or subject to flooding. Some are too unstable to be used as a foundation for buildings or roads. Clayey or wet soils are poorly suited to use as septic tank absorption fields. A high water table makes a soil poorly suited to basements or underground installations.

The National Cooperative Soil Survey is a joint effort of the United States Department of Agriculture and other Federal agencies, State agencies including the Agricultural Experiment Stations, and local agencies. The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) has leadership for the Federal part of the National Cooperative Soil Survey.

Information about soils is updated periodically. Updated information is available through the NRCS Web Soil Survey, the site for official soil survey information.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or a part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require

alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination, write to USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250-9410 or call (800) 795-3272 (voice) or (202) 720-6382 (TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

Contents

Preface	2
How Soil Surveys Are Made	5
Soil Map	8
Soil Map.....	9
Legend.....	10
Map Unit Legend.....	12
Map Unit Descriptions.....	12
Cumberland County and Part of Oxford County, Maine.....	14
Au—Au Gres loamy sand.....	14
HrB—Lyman-Tunbridge complex, 0 to 8 percent slopes, rocky.....	15
HrC—Lyman-Tunbridge complex, 8 to 15 percent slopes, rocky.....	17
Tm—Pemaquid, Todds point, and Damariscotta soils, 0 to 2 percent slopes.....	19
WmB—Windsor loamy sand, 0 to 8 percent slopes.....	21
WmC—Windsor loamy sand, 8 to 15 percent slopes.....	22
Soil Information for All Uses	24
Soil Reports.....	24
Soil Physical Properties.....	24
Physical Soil Properties.....	24
References	31

How Soil Surveys Are Made

Soil surveys are made to provide information about the soils and miscellaneous areas in a specific area. They include a description of the soils and miscellaneous areas and their location on the landscape and tables that show soil properties and limitations affecting various uses. Soil scientists observed the steepness, length, and shape of the slopes; the general pattern of drainage; the kinds of crops and native plants; and the kinds of bedrock. They observed and described many soil profiles. A soil profile is the sequence of natural layers, or horizons, in a soil. The profile extends from the surface down into the unconsolidated material in which the soil formed or from the surface down to bedrock. The unconsolidated material is devoid of roots and other living organisms and has not been changed by other biological activity.

Currently, soils are mapped according to the boundaries of major land resource areas (MLRAs). MLRAs are geographically associated land resource units that share common characteristics related to physiography, geology, climate, water resources, soils, biological resources, and land uses (USDA, 2006). Soil survey areas typically consist of parts of one or more MLRA.

The soils and miscellaneous areas in a survey area occur in an orderly pattern that is related to the geology, landforms, relief, climate, and natural vegetation of the area. Each kind of soil and miscellaneous area is associated with a particular kind of landform or with a segment of the landform. By observing the soils and miscellaneous areas in the survey area and relating their position to specific segments of the landform, a soil scientist develops a concept, or model, of how they were formed. Thus, during mapping, this model enables the soil scientist to predict with a considerable degree of accuracy the kind of soil or miscellaneous area at a specific location on the landscape.

Commonly, individual soils on the landscape merge into one another as their characteristics gradually change. To construct an accurate soil map, however, soil scientists must determine the boundaries between the soils. They can observe only a limited number of soil profiles. Nevertheless, these observations, supplemented by an understanding of the soil-vegetation-landscape relationship, are sufficient to verify predictions of the kinds of soil in an area and to determine the boundaries.

Soil scientists recorded the characteristics of the soil profiles that they studied. They noted soil color, texture, size and shape of soil aggregates, kind and amount of rock fragments, distribution of plant roots, reaction, and other features that enable them to identify soils. After describing the soils in the survey area and determining their properties, the soil scientists assigned the soils to taxonomic classes (units). Taxonomic classes are concepts. Each taxonomic class has a set of soil characteristics with precisely defined limits. The classes are used as a basis for comparison to classify soils systematically. Soil taxonomy, the system of taxonomic classification used in the United States, is based mainly on the kind and character of soil properties and the arrangement of horizons within the profile. After the soil

scientists classified and named the soils in the survey area, they compared the individual soils with similar soils in the same taxonomic class in other areas so that they could confirm data and assemble additional data based on experience and research.

The objective of soil mapping is not to delineate pure map unit components; the objective is to separate the landscape into landforms or landform segments that have similar use and management requirements. Each map unit is defined by a unique combination of soil components and/or miscellaneous areas in predictable proportions. Some components may be highly contrasting to the other components of the map unit. The presence of minor components in a map unit in no way diminishes the usefulness or accuracy of the data. The delineation of such landforms and landform segments on the map provides sufficient information for the development of resource plans. If intensive use of small areas is planned, onsite investigation is needed to define and locate the soils and miscellaneous areas.

Soil scientists make many field observations in the process of producing a soil map. The frequency of observation is dependent upon several factors, including scale of mapping, intensity of mapping, design of map units, complexity of the landscape, and experience of the soil scientist. Observations are made to test and refine the soil-landscape model and predictions and to verify the classification of the soils at specific locations. Once the soil-landscape model is refined, a significantly smaller number of measurements of individual soil properties are made and recorded. These measurements may include field measurements, such as those for color, depth to bedrock, and texture, and laboratory measurements, such as those for content of sand, silt, clay, salt, and other components. Properties of each soil typically vary from one point to another across the landscape.

Observations for map unit components are aggregated to develop ranges of characteristics for the components. The aggregated values are presented. Direct measurements do not exist for every property presented for every map unit component. Values for some properties are estimated from combinations of other properties.

While a soil survey is in progress, samples of some of the soils in the area generally are collected for laboratory analyses and for engineering tests. Soil scientists interpret the data from these analyses and tests as well as the field-observed characteristics and the soil properties to determine the expected behavior of the soils under different uses. Interpretations for all of the soils are field tested through observation of the soils in different uses and under different levels of management. Some interpretations are modified to fit local conditions, and some new interpretations are developed to meet local needs. Data are assembled from other sources, such as research information, production records, and field experience of specialists. For example, data on crop yields under defined levels of management are assembled from farm records and from field or plot experiments on the same kinds of soil.

Predictions about soil behavior are based not only on soil properties but also on such variables as climate and biological activity. Soil conditions are predictable over long periods of time, but they are not predictable from year to year. For example, soil scientists can predict with a fairly high degree of accuracy that a given soil will have a high water table within certain depths in most years, but they cannot predict that a high water table will always be at a specific level in the soil on a specific date.

After soil scientists located and identified the significant natural bodies of soil in the survey area, they drew the boundaries of these bodies on aerial photographs and

Custom Soil Resource Report

identified each as a specific map unit. Aerial photographs show trees, buildings, fields, roads, and rivers, all of which help in locating boundaries accurately.

Soil Map

The soil map section includes the soil map for the defined area of interest, a list of soil map units on the map and extent of each map unit, and cartographic symbols displayed on the map. Also presented are various metadata about data used to produce the map, and a description of each soil map unit.

Custom Soil Resource Report Soil Map



Custom Soil Resource Report

MAP LEGEND

Area of Interest (AOI)

 Area of Interest (AOI)

Soils

 Soil Map Unit Polygons

 Soil Map Unit Lines

 Soil Map Unit Points

Special Point Features

 Blowout

 Borrow Pit

 Clay Spot

 Closed Depression

 Gravel Pit

 Gravelly Spot

 Landfill

 Lava Flow

 Marsh or swamp

 Mine or Quarry

 Miscellaneous Water

 Perennial Water

 Rock Outcrop

 Saline Spot

 Sandy Spot

 Severely Eroded Spot

 Sinkhole

 Slide or Slip

 Sodic Spot

 Spoil Area

 Stony Spot

 Very Stony Spot

 Wet Spot

 Other

 Special Line Features

Water Features

 Streams and Canals

Transportation

 Rails

 Interstate Highways

 US Routes

 Major Roads

 Local Roads

Background

 Aerial Photography

MAP INFORMATION

The soil surveys that comprise your AOI were mapped at 1:24,000.

Warning: Soil Map may not be valid at this scale.

Enlargement of maps beyond the scale of mapping can cause misunderstanding of the detail of mapping and accuracy of soil line placement. The maps do not show the small areas of contrasting soils that could have been shown at a more detailed scale.

Please rely on the bar scale on each map sheet for map measurements.

Source of Map: Natural Resources Conservation Service
Web Soil Survey URL:
Coordinate System: Web Mercator (EPSG:3857)

Maps from the Web Soil Survey are based on the Web Mercator projection, which preserves direction and shape but distorts distance and area. A projection that preserves area, such as the Albers equal-area conic projection, should be used if more accurate calculations of distance or area are required.

This product is generated from the USDA-NRCS certified data as of the version date(s) listed below.

Soil Survey Area: Cumberland County and Part of Oxford County, Maine
Survey Area Data: Version 22, Aug 29, 2025

Soil map units are labeled (as space allows) for map scales 1:50,000 or larger.

Date(s) aerial images were photographed: Jul 22, 2021—Oct 7, 2021

The orthophoto or other base map on which the soil lines were compiled and digitized probably differs from the background

MAP LEGEND

MAP INFORMATION

imagery displayed on these maps. As a result, some minor shifting of map unit boundaries may be evident.

Map Unit Legend

Map Unit Symbol	Map Unit Name	Acres in AOI	Percent of AOI
Au	Au Gres loamy sand	2.1	9.3%
HrB	Lyman-Tunbridge complex, 0 to 8 percent slopes, rocky	4.7	21.2%
HrC	Lyman-Tunbridge complex, 8 to 15 percent slopes, rocky	8.1	36.3%
Tm	Pemaquid, Todds point, and Damariscotta soils, 0 to 2 percent slopes	0.1	0.3%
WmB	Windsor loamy sand, 0 to 8 percent slopes	5.3	23.7%
WmC	Windsor loamy sand, 8 to 15 percent slopes	2.0	9.0%
Totals for Area of Interest		22.3	100.0%

Map Unit Descriptions

The map units delineated on the detailed soil maps in a soil survey represent the soils or miscellaneous areas in the survey area. The map unit descriptions, along with the maps, can be used to determine the composition and properties of a unit.

A map unit delineation on a soil map represents an area dominated by one or more major kinds of soil or miscellaneous areas. A map unit is identified and named according to the taxonomic classification of the dominant soils. Within a taxonomic class there are precisely defined limits for the properties of the soils. On the landscape, however, the soils are natural phenomena, and they have the characteristic variability of all natural phenomena. Thus, the range of some observed properties may extend beyond the limits defined for a taxonomic class. Areas of soils of a single taxonomic class rarely, if ever, can be mapped without including areas of other taxonomic classes. Consequently, every map unit is made up of the soils or miscellaneous areas for which it is named and some minor components that belong to taxonomic classes other than those of the major soils.

Most minor soils have properties similar to those of the dominant soil or soils in the map unit, and thus they do not affect use and management. These are called noncontrasting, or similar, components. They may or may not be mentioned in a particular map unit description. Other minor components, however, have properties and behavioral characteristics divergent enough to affect use or to require different management. These are called contrasting, or dissimilar, components. They generally are in small areas and could not be mapped separately because of the scale used. Some small areas of strongly contrasting soils or miscellaneous areas are identified by a special symbol on the maps. If included in the database for a given area, the contrasting minor components are identified in the map unit descriptions along with some characteristics of each. A few areas of minor components may not have been observed, and consequently they are not mentioned in the descriptions, especially where the pattern was so complex that it

was impractical to make enough observations to identify all the soils and miscellaneous areas on the landscape.

The presence of minor components in a map unit in no way diminishes the usefulness or accuracy of the data. The objective of mapping is not to delineate pure taxonomic classes but rather to separate the landscape into landforms or landform segments that have similar use and management requirements. The delineation of such segments on the map provides sufficient information for the development of resource plans. If intensive use of small areas is planned, however, onsite investigation is needed to define and locate the soils and miscellaneous areas.

An identifying symbol precedes the map unit name in the map unit descriptions. Each description includes general facts about the unit and gives important soil properties and qualities.

Soils that have profiles that are almost alike make up a *soil series*. Except for differences in texture of the surface layer, all the soils of a series have major horizons that are similar in composition, thickness, and arrangement.

Soils of one series can differ in texture of the surface layer, slope, stoniness, salinity, degree of erosion, and other characteristics that affect their use. On the basis of such differences, a soil series is divided into *soil phases*. Most of the areas shown on the detailed soil maps are phases of soil series. The name of a soil phase commonly indicates a feature that affects use or management. For example, Alpha silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes, is a phase of the Alpha series.

Some map units are made up of two or more major soils or miscellaneous areas. These map units are complexes, associations, or undifferentiated groups.

A *complex* consists of two or more soils or miscellaneous areas in such an intricate pattern or in such small areas that they cannot be shown separately on the maps. The pattern and proportion of the soils or miscellaneous areas are somewhat similar in all areas. Alpha-Beta complex, 0 to 6 percent slopes, is an example.

An *association* is made up of two or more geographically associated soils or miscellaneous areas that are shown as one unit on the maps. Because of present or anticipated uses of the map units in the survey area, it was not considered practical or necessary to map the soils or miscellaneous areas separately. The pattern and relative proportion of the soils or miscellaneous areas are somewhat similar. Alpha-Beta association, 0 to 2 percent slopes, is an example.

An *undifferentiated group* is made up of two or more soils or miscellaneous areas that could be mapped individually but are mapped as one unit because similar interpretations can be made for use and management. The pattern and proportion of the soils or miscellaneous areas in a mapped area are not uniform. An area can be made up of only one of the major soils or miscellaneous areas, or it can be made up of all of them. Alpha and Beta soils, 0 to 2 percent slopes, is an example.

Some surveys include *miscellaneous areas*. Such areas have little or no soil material and support little or no vegetation. Rock outcrop is an example.

Cumberland County and Part of Oxford County, Maine

Au—Au Gres loamy sand

Map Unit Setting

National map unit symbol: blgr
Elevation: 10 to 1,800 feet
Mean annual precipitation: 29 to 50 inches
Mean annual air temperature: 41 to 46 degrees F
Frost-free period: 90 to 160 days
Farmland classification: Farmland of local importance

Map Unit Composition

Au gres and similar soils: 85 percent
Minor components: 10 percent
Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the mapunit.

Description of Au Gres

Setting

Landform: Outwash plains
Landform position (two-dimensional): Toeslope
Landform position (three-dimensional): Talf
Down-slope shape: Linear
Across-slope shape: Linear
Parent material: Sandy glaciofluvial deposits derived from granite and gneiss

Typical profile

H1 - 0 to 10 inches: loamy sand
H2 - 10 to 32 inches: loamy sand
H3 - 32 to 65 inches: sand

Properties and qualities

Slope: 0 to 3 percent
Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches
Drainage class: Poorly drained
Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): High (2.00 to 6.00 in/hr)
Depth to water table: About 0 to 18 inches
Frequency of flooding: None
Frequency of ponding: None
Available water supply, 0 to 60 inches: Low (about 3.6 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability classification (irrigated): None specified
Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 4w
Hydrologic Soil Group: A/D
Hydric soil rating: Yes

Minor Components

Saugatuck

Percent of map unit: 6 percent
Landform: Outwash plains
Landform position (two-dimensional): Toeslope
Landform position (three-dimensional): Talf

Custom Soil Resource Report

Down-slope shape: Linear
Across-slope shape: Linear
Hydric soil rating: Yes

Scantic

Percent of map unit: 2 percent
Landform: Coastal plains
Landform position (two-dimensional): Toeslope
Landform position (three-dimensional): Dip
Down-slope shape: Concave
Across-slope shape: Concave
Hydric soil rating: Yes

Walpole

Percent of map unit: 2 percent
Landform: Outwash plains
Landform position (two-dimensional): Toeslope
Landform position (three-dimensional): Talf
Down-slope shape: Linear
Across-slope shape: Linear
Hydric soil rating: Yes

HrB—Lyman-Tunbridge complex, 0 to 8 percent slopes, rocky

Map Unit Setting

National map unit symbol: 2x1cx
Elevation: 0 to 520 feet
Mean annual precipitation: 36 to 65 inches
Mean annual air temperature: 36 to 52 degrees F
Frost-free period: 90 to 160 days
Farmland classification: Farmland of statewide importance

Map Unit Composition

Lyman and similar soils: 50 percent
Tunbridge and similar soils: 30 percent
Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the mapunit.

Description of Lyman

Setting

Landform: Ridges, hills
Landform position (two-dimensional): Summit, shoulder, backslope
Landform position (three-dimensional): Nose slope, crest
Down-slope shape: Convex
Across-slope shape: Convex
Parent material: Loamy supraglacial till derived from granite and gneiss and/or loamy supraglacial till derived from phyllite and/or loamy supraglacial till derived from mica schist

Typical profile

Oe - 0 to 1 inches: moderately decomposed plant material

Custom Soil Resource Report

A - 1 to 3 inches: loam
E - 3 to 5 inches: fine sandy loam
Bhs - 5 to 7 inches: loam
Bs1 - 7 to 11 inches: loam
Bs2 - 11 to 18 inches: channery loam
R - 18 to 79 inches: bedrock

Properties and qualities

Slope: 0 to 8 percent
Surface area covered with cobbles, stones or boulders: 1.5 percent
Depth to restrictive feature: 11 to 24 inches to lithic bedrock
Drainage class: Somewhat excessively drained
Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Very low to high (0.00 to 14.03 in/hr)
Depth to water table: More than 80 inches
Frequency of flooding: None
Frequency of ponding: None
Available water supply, 0 to 60 inches: Low (about 3.2 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability classification (irrigated): None specified
Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 6s
Hydrologic Soil Group: D
Ecological site: F144BY702ME - Shallow and Moderately-deep Till
Hydric soil rating: No

Description of Tunbridge

Setting

Landform: Ridges, hills
Landform position (two-dimensional): Summit, shoulder, backslope
Landform position (three-dimensional): Side slope, crest
Down-slope shape: Linear
Across-slope shape: Convex
Parent material: Loamy supraglacial till derived from granite and gneiss and/or loamy supraglacial till derived from phyllite and/or loamy supraglacial till derived from mica schist

Typical profile

Oe - 0 to 3 inches: moderately decomposed plant material
Oa - 3 to 5 inches: highly decomposed plant material
E - 5 to 8 inches: fine sandy loam
Bhs - 8 to 11 inches: fine sandy loam
Bs - 11 to 26 inches: fine sandy loam
BC - 26 to 28 inches: fine sandy loam
R - 28 to 79 inches: bedrock

Properties and qualities

Slope: 3 to 8 percent
Surface area covered with cobbles, stones or boulders: 1.5 percent
Depth to restrictive feature: 21 to 41 inches to lithic bedrock
Drainage class: Well drained
Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Very low to high (0.00 to 14.03 in/hr)
Depth to water table: More than 80 inches
Frequency of flooding: None
Frequency of ponding: None

Available water supply, 0 to 60 inches: Low (about 5.6 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability classification (irrigated): None specified

Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 6s

Hydrologic Soil Group: C

Ecological site: F144BY702ME - Shallow and Moderately-deep Till

Hydric soil rating: No

HrC—Lyman-Tunbridge complex, 8 to 15 percent slopes, rocky

Map Unit Setting

National map unit symbol: 2x1cy

Elevation: 0 to 520 feet

Mean annual precipitation: 36 to 65 inches

Mean annual air temperature: 36 to 52 degrees F

Frost-free period: 90 to 160 days

Farmland classification: Farmland of local importance

Map Unit Composition

Lyman and similar soils: 45 percent

Tunbridge and similar soils: 40 percent

Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the mapunit.

Description of Lyman

Setting

Landform: Ridges, hills

Landform position (two-dimensional): Summit, shoulder, backslope

Landform position (three-dimensional): Nose slope, crest

Down-slope shape: Convex

Across-slope shape: Convex

Parent material: Loamy supraglacial till derived from granite and gneiss and/or
loamy supraglacial till derived from phyllite and/or loamy supraglacial till
derived from mica schist

Typical profile

Oe - 0 to 1 inches: moderately decomposed plant material

A - 1 to 3 inches: loam

E - 3 to 5 inches: fine sandy loam

Bhs - 5 to 7 inches: loam

Bs1 - 7 to 11 inches: loam

Bs2 - 11 to 18 inches: channery loam

R - 18 to 79 inches: bedrock

Properties and qualities

Slope: 8 to 15 percent

Surface area covered with cobbles, stones or boulders: 1.5 percent

Depth to restrictive feature: 11 to 24 inches to lithic bedrock

Drainage class: Somewhat excessively drained

Custom Soil Resource Report

Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Very low to high (0.00 to 14.03 in/hr)

Depth to water table: More than 80 inches

Frequency of flooding: None

Frequency of ponding: None

Available water supply, 0 to 60 inches: Low (about 3.2 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability classification (irrigated): None specified

Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 6s

Hydrologic Soil Group: D

Ecological site: F144BY702ME - Shallow and Moderately-deep Till

Hydric soil rating: No

Description of Tunbridge

Setting

Landform: Ridges, hills

Landform position (two-dimensional): Summit, shoulder, backslope

Landform position (three-dimensional): Side slope, crest

Down-slope shape: Linear

Across-slope shape: Convex

Parent material: Loamy supraglacial till derived from granite and gneiss and/or loamy supraglacial till derived from phyllite and/or loamy supraglacial till derived from mica schist

Typical profile

Oe - 0 to 3 inches: moderately decomposed plant material

Oa - 3 to 5 inches: highly decomposed plant material

E - 5 to 8 inches: fine sandy loam

Bhs - 8 to 11 inches: fine sandy loam

Bs - 11 to 26 inches: fine sandy loam

BC - 26 to 28 inches: fine sandy loam

R - 28 to 79 inches: bedrock

Properties and qualities

Slope: 8 to 15 percent

Surface area covered with cobbles, stones or boulders: 1.5 percent

Depth to restrictive feature: 21 to 41 inches to lithic bedrock

Drainage class: Well drained

Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Very low to high (0.00 to 14.03 in/hr)

Depth to water table: More than 80 inches

Frequency of flooding: None

Frequency of ponding: None

Available water supply, 0 to 60 inches: Low (about 5.6 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability classification (irrigated): None specified

Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 6s

Hydrologic Soil Group: C

Ecological site: F144BY702ME - Shallow and Moderately-deep Till

Hydric soil rating: No

Tm—Pemaquid, Todds point, and Damariscotta soils, 0 to 2 percent slopes

Map Unit Setting

National map unit symbol: 2x1d9

Elevation: 0 to 10 feet

Mean annual precipitation: 63 to 87 inches

Mean annual air temperature: 36 to 52 degrees F

Frost-free period: 90 to 160 days

Farmland classification: Not prime farmland

Map Unit Composition

Pemaquid and similar soils: 40 percent

Todds point and similar soils: 30 percent

Damariscotta and similar soils: 15 percent

Minor components: 15 percent

Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the mapunit.

Description of Pemaquid

Setting

Landform: Tidal marshes

Landform position (three-dimensional): Talf

Down-slope shape: Linear

Across-slope shape: Linear

Parent material: Herbaceous organic material over sandy marine deposits

Typical profile

Oi - 0 to 16 inches: peat

Oe - 16 to 35 inches: mucky peat

Cseg - 35 to 65 inches: sand

Properties and qualities

Slope: 0 to 2 percent

Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches

Drainage class: Very poorly drained

Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Moderately high to high
(1.42 to 14.17 in/hr)

Depth to water table: About 0 inches

Frequency of flooding: Very frequent

Frequency of ponding: None

Maximum salinity: Very slightly saline to strongly saline (2.0 to 16.0 mmhos/cm)

Sodium adsorption ratio, maximum: 20.0

Available water supply, 0 to 60 inches: Very high (about 14.0 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability classification (irrigated): None specified

Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 8

Hydrologic Soil Group: A/D

Hydric soil rating: Yes

Description of Todds Point

Setting

Landform: Tidal marshes
Landform position (three-dimensional): Dip
Down-slope shape: Linear
Across-slope shape: Linear
Parent material: Herbaceous organic material

Typical profile

Oe1 - 0 to 31 inches: mucky peat
Oe2 - 31 to 42 inches: mucky peat
Oa - 42 to 65 inches: muck

Properties and qualities

Slope: 0 to 2 percent
Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches
Drainage class: Very poorly drained
Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Moderately high to high (1.42 to 14.17 in/hr)
Depth to water table: About 0 inches
Frequency of flooding: Very frequent
Frequency of ponding: None
Maximum salinity: Very slightly saline to strongly saline (2.0 to 16.0 mmhos/cm)
Sodium adsorption ratio, maximum: 20.0
Available water supply, 0 to 60 inches: Very high (about 16.2 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability classification (irrigated): None specified
Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 8
Hydrologic Soil Group: A/D
Hydric soil rating: Yes

Description of Damariscotta

Setting

Landform: Tidal marshes
Landform position (three-dimensional): Talf
Down-slope shape: Linear
Across-slope shape: Linear
Parent material: Sandy glaciomarine deposits

Typical profile

Ase1 - 0 to 10 inches: mucky loamy fine sand
Ase2 - 10 to 21 inches: mucky loamy fine sand
Cseg - 21 to 65 inches: sand

Properties and qualities

Slope: 0 to 2 percent
Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches
Drainage class: Very poorly drained
Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Moderately high to very high (1.42 to 99.90 in/hr)
Depth to water table: About 0 inches
Frequency of flooding: Very frequent
Frequency of ponding: None
Maximum salinity: Nonsaline to very slightly saline (0.0 to 2.0 mmhos/cm)

Custom Soil Resource Report

Sodium adsorption ratio, maximum: 20.0

Available water supply, 0 to 60 inches: High (about 11.6 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability classification (irrigated): None specified

Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 8

Hydrologic Soil Group: A/D

Hydric soil rating: Yes

Minor Components

Phippsburg

Percent of map unit: 8 percent

Landform: Tidal marshes

Landform position (three-dimensional): Talf

Down-slope shape: Linear

Across-slope shape: Linear

Hydric soil rating: Yes

Todds point, moderately deep

Percent of map unit: 5 percent

Landform: Tidal marshes

Landform position (three-dimensional): Dip

Down-slope shape: Linear

Across-slope shape: Linear

Hydric soil rating: Yes

Fort knox

Percent of map unit: 1 percent

Landform: Tidal marshes

Landform position (three-dimensional): Talf

Down-slope shape: Linear

Across-slope shape: Linear

Hydric soil rating: Yes

Gouldsboro

Percent of map unit: 1 percent

Landform: Tidal marshes

Landform position (three-dimensional): Talf

Down-slope shape: Linear

Across-slope shape: Linear

Hydric soil rating: Yes

WmB—Windsor loamy sand, 0 to 8 percent slopes

Map Unit Setting

National map unit symbol: 2w2x2

Elevation: 0 to 1,410 feet

Mean annual precipitation: 36 to 71 inches

Custom Soil Resource Report

Mean annual air temperature: 39 to 55 degrees F

Frost-free period: 140 to 240 days

Farmland classification: Farmland of statewide importance

Map Unit Composition

Windsor and similar soils: 85 percent

Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the mapunit.

Description of Windsor

Setting

Landform: Dunes, outwash plains, deltas, outwash terraces

Landform position (three-dimensional): Tread, riser

Down-slope shape: Convex, linear

Across-slope shape: Convex, linear

Parent material: Loose sandy glaciofluvial deposits derived from granite and/or loose sandy glaciofluvial deposits derived from schist and/or loose sandy glaciofluvial deposits derived from gneiss

Typical profile

Oe - 0 to 1 inches: moderately decomposed plant material

A - 1 to 3 inches: loamy sand

Bw - 3 to 25 inches: loamy sand

C - 25 to 65 inches: sand

Properties and qualities

Slope: 0 to 8 percent

Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches

Drainage class: Excessively drained

Runoff class: Low

Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Moderately high to very high (1.42 to 99.90 in/hr)

Depth to water table: More than 80 inches

Frequency of flooding: None

Frequency of ponding: None

Maximum salinity: Nonsaline (0.0 to 1.9 mmhos/cm)

Available water supply, 0 to 60 inches: Low (about 4.5 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability classification (irrigated): None specified

Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 2s

Hydrologic Soil Group: A

Ecological site: F144BY601ME - Dry Sand

Hydric soil rating: No

WmC—Windsor loamy sand, 8 to 15 percent slopes

Map Unit Setting

National map unit symbol: 2svkq

Elevation: 0 to 1,260 feet

Mean annual precipitation: 36 to 71 inches

Mean annual air temperature: 39 to 55 degrees F

Custom Soil Resource Report

Frost-free period: 140 to 240 days

Farmland classification: Farmland of local importance

Map Unit Composition

Windsor and similar soils: 85 percent

Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the mapunit.

Description of Windsor

Setting

Landform: — error in exists on —

Landform position (two-dimensional): Summit, shoulder, backslope

Landform position (three-dimensional): Side slope, riser

Down-slope shape: Convex

Across-slope shape: Convex, linear

Parent material: Loose sandy glaciofluvial deposits derived from granite and/or loose sandy glaciofluvial deposits derived from schist and/or loose sandy glaciofluvial deposits derived from gneiss

Typical profile

Oe - 0 to 1 inches: moderately decomposed plant material

Ap - 1 to 11 inches: loamy sand

Bw - 11 to 31 inches: loamy sand

C - 31 to 65 inches: sand

Properties and qualities

Slope: 8 to 15 percent

Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches

Drainage class: Excessively drained

Runoff class: Low

Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Moderately high to very high (1.42 to 99.90 in/hr)

Depth to water table: More than 80 inches

Frequency of flooding: None

Frequency of ponding: None

Maximum salinity: Nonsaline (0.0 to 1.9 mmhos/cm)

Available water supply, 0 to 60 inches: Low (about 4.2 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability classification (irrigated): None specified

Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 3e

Hydrologic Soil Group: A

Ecological site: F144AY022MA - Dry Outwash

Hydric soil rating: No

Soil Information for All Uses

Soil Reports

The Soil Reports section includes various formatted tabular and narrative reports (tables) containing data for each selected soil map unit and each component of each unit. No aggregation of data has occurred as is done in reports in the Soil Properties and Qualities and Suitabilities and Limitations sections.

The reports contain soil interpretive information as well as basic soil properties and qualities. A description of each report (table) is included.

Soil Physical Properties

This folder contains a collection of tabular reports that present soil physical properties. The reports (tables) include all selected map units and components for each map unit. Soil physical properties are measured or inferred from direct observations in the field or laboratory. Examples of soil physical properties include percent clay, organic matter, saturated hydraulic conductivity, available water capacity, and bulk density.

Physical Soil Properties

This table shows estimates of some physical characteristics and features that affect soil behavior. These estimates are given for the layers of each soil in the survey area. The estimates are based on field observations and on test data for these and similar soils.

Depth to the upper and lower boundaries of each layer is indicated.

Particle size is the effective diameter of a soil particle as measured by sedimentation, sieving, or micrometric methods. Particle sizes are expressed as classes with specific effective diameter class limits. The broad classes are sand, silt, and clay, ranging from the larger to the smaller.

Sand as a soil separate consists of mineral soil particles that are 0.05 millimeter to 2 millimeters in diameter. In this table, the estimated sand content of each soil layer is given as a percentage, by weight, of the soil material that is less than 2 millimeters in diameter.

Silt as a soil separate consists of mineral soil particles that are 0.002 to 0.05 millimeter in diameter. In this table, the estimated silt content of each soil layer is

given as a percentage, by weight, of the soil material that is less than 2 millimeters in diameter.

Clay as a soil separate consists of mineral soil particles that are less than 0.002 millimeter in diameter. In this table, the estimated clay content of each soil layer is given as a percentage, by weight, of the soil material that is less than 2 millimeters in diameter.

The content of sand, silt, and clay affects the physical behavior of a soil. Particle size is important for engineering and agronomic interpretations, for determination of soil hydrologic qualities, and for soil classification.

The amount and kind of clay affect the fertility and physical condition of the soil and the ability of the soil to adsorb cations and to retain moisture. They influence shrink-swell potential, saturated hydraulic conductivity (*K_{sat}*), plasticity, the ease of soil dispersion, and other soil properties. The amount and kind of clay in a soil also affect tillage and earthmoving operations.

Moist bulk density is the weight of soil (ovendry) per unit volume. Volume is measured when the soil is at field moisture capacity, that is, the moisture content at 1/3- or 1/10-bar (33kPa or 10kPa) moisture tension. Weight is determined after the soil is dried at 105 degrees C. In the table, the estimated moist bulk density of each soil horizon is expressed in grams per cubic centimeter of soil material that is less than 2 millimeters in diameter. Bulk density data are used to compute linear extensibility, shrink-swell potential, available water capacity, total pore space, and other soil properties. The moist bulk density of a soil indicates the pore space available for water and roots. Depending on soil texture, a bulk density of more than 1.4 can restrict water storage and root penetration. Moist bulk density is influenced by texture, kind of clay, content of organic matter, and soil structure.

*Saturated hydraulic conductivity (*K_{sat}*)* refers to the ease with which pores in a saturated soil transmit water. The estimates in the table are expressed in terms of micrometers per second. They are based on soil characteristics observed in the field, particularly structure, porosity, and texture. Saturated hydraulic conductivity (*K_{sat}*) is considered in the design of soil drainage systems and septic tank absorption fields.

Available water capacity refers to the quantity of water that the soil is capable of storing for use by plants. The capacity for water storage is given in inches of water per inch of soil for each soil layer. The capacity varies, depending on soil properties that affect retention of water. The most important properties are the content of organic matter, soil texture, bulk density, and soil structure. Available water capacity is an important factor in the choice of plants or crops to be grown and in the design and management of irrigation systems. Available water capacity is not an estimate of the quantity of water actually available to plants at any given time.

Linear extensibility refers to the change in length of an unconfined clod as moisture content is decreased from a moist to a dry state. It is an expression of the volume change between the water content of the clod at 1/3- or 1/10-bar tension (33kPa or 10kPa tension) and oven dryness. The volume change is reported in the table as percent change for the whole soil. The amount and type of clay minerals in the soil influence volume change.

Linear extensibility is used to determine the shrink-swell potential of soils. The shrink-swell potential is low if the soil has a linear extensibility of less than 3 percent; moderate if 3 to 6 percent; high if 6 to 9 percent; and very high if more than 9 percent. If the linear extensibility is more than 3, shrinking and swelling can cause

Custom Soil Resource Report

damage to buildings, roads, and other structures and to plant roots. Special design commonly is needed.

Organic matter is the plant and animal residue in the soil at various stages of decomposition. In this table, the estimated content of organic matter is expressed as a percentage, by weight, of the soil material that is less than 2 millimeters in diameter. The content of organic matter in a soil can be maintained by returning crop residue to the soil.

Organic matter has a positive effect on available water capacity, water infiltration, soil organism activity, and tilth. It is a source of nitrogen and other nutrients for crops and soil organisms.

Erosion factors are shown in the table as the K factor (K_w and K_f) and the T factor. Erosion factor K indicates the susceptibility of a soil to sheet and rill erosion by water. Factor K is one of six factors used in the Universal Soil Loss Equation (USLE) and the Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation (RUSLE) to predict the average annual rate of soil loss by sheet and rill erosion in tons per acre per year. The estimates are based primarily on percentage of silt, sand, and organic matter and on soil structure and K_{sat} . Values of K range from 0.02 to 0.69. Other factors being equal, the higher the value, the more susceptible the soil is to sheet and rill erosion by water.

Erosion factor K_w indicates the erodibility of the whole soil. The estimates are modified by the presence of rock fragments.

Erosion factor K_f indicates the erodibility of the fine-earth fraction, or the material less than 2 millimeters in size.

Erosion factor T is an estimate of the maximum average annual rate of soil erosion by wind and/or water that can occur without affecting crop productivity over a sustained period. The rate is in tons per acre per year.

Wind erodibility groups are made up of soils that have similar properties affecting their susceptibility to wind erosion in cultivated areas. The soils assigned to group 1 are the most susceptible to wind erosion, and those assigned to group 8 are the least susceptible. The groups are described in the "National Soil Survey Handbook."

Wind erodibility index is a numerical value indicating the susceptibility of soil to wind erosion, or the tons per acre per year that can be expected to be lost to wind erosion. There is a close correlation between wind erosion and the texture of the surface layer, the size and durability of surface clods, rock fragments, organic matter, and a calcareous reaction. Soil moisture and frozen soil layers also influence wind erosion.

Reference:

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service.
National soil survey handbook, title 430-VI. (<http://soils.usda.gov>)

Custom Soil Resource Report

Physical Soil Properties—Cumberland County and Part of Oxford County, Maine														
Map symbol and soil name	Depth	Sand	Silt	Clay	Moist bulk density	Saturated hydraulic conductivity	Available water capacity	Linear extensibility	Organic matter	Erosion factors			Wind erodibility group	Wind erodibility index
										Kw	Kf	T		
	<i>In</i>	<i>Pct</i>	<i>Pct</i>	<i>Pct</i>	<i>g/cc</i>	<i>micro m/sec</i>	<i>In/in</i>	<i>Pct</i>	<i>Pct</i>					
Au—Au Gres loamy sand														
Au gres	0-10	70-81- 90	0-16- 30	1- 3- 5	1.20-1.50	14.11-42.34	0.05-0.09	0.0-2.9	3.0-7.0	.15	.15	5	2	134
	10-32	70-80- 90	0-17- 30	1- 3- 5	1.20-1.50	42.34-141.14	0.06-0.08	0.0-2.9	0.5-3.0	.15	.15			
	32-65	85-91-100	0- 6- 10	1- 3- 5	1.45-1.65	42.34-141.14	0.04-0.06	0.0-2.9	0.1-0.5	.02	.02			
HrB—Lyman-Tunbridge complex, 0 to 8 percent slopes, rocky														
Lyman	0-1	—	—	—	0.17-0.33	10.00-99.00	0.15-0.39	—	35.0-95.0			1	5	56
	1-3	40-52- 80	10-41- 50	1- 7- 10	0.70-1.31	1.00-99.00	0.19-0.23	0.1-1.0	4.0-20.0	.32	.32			
	3-5	40-59- 80	10-37- 50	1- 4- 10	1.48-1.54	1.00-99.00	0.12-0.16	0.5-1.4	1.4-5.7	.37	.37			
	5-7	40-52- 80	10-41- 50	1- 7- 10	0.57-1.44	1.00-99.00	0.16-0.21	0.1-1.0	3.1-25.0	.32	.32			
	7-11	40-52- 80	10-41- 50	1- 7- 10	0.58-1.45	1.00-99.00	0.17-0.21	0.1-1.0	2.2-18.0	.32	.32			
	11-18	40-52- 80	10-41- 50	1- 7- 10	0.89-1.45	1.00-99.00	0.14-0.18	0.5-1.2	2.2-7.0	.24	.32			
	18-79	—	—	—	—	0.01-100.00	—	—	—					
Tunbridge	0-3	—	—	—	0.17-0.33	10.00-99.00	0.15-0.39	—	35.0-95.0			2	3	86
	3-5	—	—	—	0.17-0.33	10.00-99.00	0.35-0.50	—	35.0-95.0					
	5-8	40-59- 80	10-37- 50	1- 4- 10	1.48-1.54	1.00-100.00	0.12-0.16	0.4-1.3	1.4-5.7	.37	.37			
	8-11	40-59- 80	10-34- 50	1- 7- 10	0.57-1.44	1.00-100.00	0.14-0.21	0.0-0.9	3.1-25.0	.32	.32			
	11-26	40-59- 80	10-37- 50	1- 4- 10	0.58-1.45	1.00-100.00	0.13-0.21	0.1-0.9	2.2-18.0	.37	.37			
	26-28	40-59- 80	10-37- 50	1- 4- 10	1.31-1.58	1.00-100.00	0.10-0.14	0.4-1.0	1.0-4.2	.43	.43			
	28-79	—	—	—	—	0.01-100.00	—	—	—					

Custom Soil Resource Report

Physical Soil Properties—Cumberland County and Part of Oxford County, Maine														
Map symbol and soil name	Depth	Sand	Silt	Clay	Moist bulk density	Saturated hydraulic conductivity	Available water capacity	Linear extensibility	Organic matter	Erosion factors			Wind erodibility group	Wind erodibility index
										Kw	Kf	T		
	<i>In</i>	<i>Pct</i>	<i>Pct</i>	<i>Pct</i>	<i>g/cc</i>	<i>micro m/sec</i>	<i>In/In</i>	<i>Pct</i>	<i>Pct</i>					
HrC—Lyman-Tunbridge complex, 8 to 15 percent slopes, rocky														
Lyman	0-1	—	—	—	0.17-0.33	10.00-99.00	0.15-0.39	—	35.0-95.0			1	5	56
	1-3	40-52- 80	10-41- 50	1- 7- 10	0.70-1.31	1.00-99.00	0.19-0.23	0.1-1.0	4.0-20.0	.32	.32			
	3-5	40-59- 80	10-37- 50	1- 4- 10	1.48-1.54	1.00-99.00	0.12-0.16	0.5-1.4	1.4-5.7	.37	.37			
	5-7	40-52- 80	10-41- 50	1- 7- 10	0.57-1.44	1.00-99.00	0.16-0.21	0.1-1.0	3.1-25.0	.32	.32			
	7-11	40-52- 80	10-41- 50	1- 7- 10	0.58-1.45	1.00-99.00	0.17-0.21	0.1-1.0	2.2-18.0	.32	.32			
	11-18	40-52- 80	10-41- 50	1- 7- 10	0.89-1.45	1.00-99.00	0.14-0.18	0.5-1.2	2.2-7.0	.24	.32			
	18-79	—	—	—	—	0.01-100.00	—	—	—					
Tunbridge	0-3	—	—	—	0.17-0.33	10.00-99.00	0.15-0.39	—	35.0-95.0			2	3	86
	3-5	—	—	—	0.17-0.33	10.00-99.00	0.35-0.50	—	35.0-95.0					
	5-8	40-59- 80	10-37- 50	1- 4- 10	1.48-1.54	1.00-100.00	0.12-0.16	0.4-1.3	1.4-5.7	.37	.37			
	8-11	40-59- 80	10-34- 50	1- 7- 10	0.57-1.44	1.00-100.00	0.14-0.21	0.0-0.9	3.1-25.0	.32	.32			
	11-26	40-59- 80	10-37- 50	1- 4- 10	0.58-1.45	1.00-100.00	0.13-0.21	0.1-0.9	2.2-18.0	.37	.37			
	26-28	40-59- 80	10-37- 50	1- 4- 10	1.31-1.58	1.00-100.00	0.10-0.14	0.4-1.0	1.0-4.2	.43	.43			
	28-79	—	—	—	—	0.01-100.00	—	—	—					

Custom Soil Resource Report

Physical Soil Properties—Cumberland County and Part of Oxford County, Maine														
Map symbol and soil name	Depth	Sand	Silt	Clay	Moist bulk density	Saturated hydraulic conductivity	Available water capacity	Linear extensibility	Organic matter	Erosion factors			Wind erodibility group	Wind erodibility index
										Kw	Kf	T		
	In	Pct	Pct	Pct	g/cc	micro m/sec	In/in	Pct	Pct					
Tm—Pemaquid, Todds point, and Damariscotta soils, 0 to 2 percent slopes														
Pemaquid	0-16	0- 0- 0	0- 0- 0	0- 0- 0	0.11-0.32	10.00-100.00	0.18-0.36	—	55.0-90.0			1	8	0
	16-35	0- 0- 0	0- 0- 0	0- 0- 0	0.17-0.42	10.00-100.00	0.18-0.36	—	35.0-85.0					
	35-65	88-93-100	0- 5- 8	0- 2- 4	1.48-1.57	100.00-705.00	0.12-0.24	0.0-0.2	4.0-12.0	.02	.02			
Todds point	0-31	0- 0- 0	0- 0- 0	0- 0- 0	0.11-0.32	10.00-100.00	0.18-0.36	—	55.0-90.0			1	8	0
	31-42	0- 0- 0	0- 0- 0	0- 0- 0	0.11-0.32	10.00-100.00	0.18-0.36	—	55.0-90.0					
	42-65	0- 0- 0	0- 0- 0	0- 0- 0	0.17-0.42	10.00-100.00	0.18-0.36	—	35.0-85.0					
Damariscotta	0-10	70-79-100	0-17- 30	0- 4- 15	0.71-1.47	10.00-705.00	0.16-0.28	0.0-1.4	5.0-20.0	.05	.05	5	8	0
	10-21	70-79-100	0-17- 30	0- 4- 15	0.71-1.47	10.00-705.00	0.16-0.28	0.0-1.4	5.0-20.0	.05	.05			
	21-65	88-93-100	0- 5- 8	0- 2- 4	1.48-1.57	100.00-705.00	0.12-0.24	0.0-0.2	4.0-12.0	.02	.02			
WmB—Windsor loamy sand, 0 to 8 percent slopes														
Windsor	0-1	—	—	—	0.20-0.60	10.00-705.00	0.17-0.38	—	75.0-99.5			5	2	134
	1-3	75-85- 92	5-14- 23	0- 1- 5	1.19-1.49	10.00-705.00	0.05-0.12	0.0-0.4	0.6-6.0	.15	.15			
	3-25	70-85- 98	0-14- 30	0- 1- 8	1.42-1.58	10.00-705.00	0.02-0.11	0.0-0.6	0.1-2.0	.15	.15			
	25-65	70-94-100	0- 6- 30	0- 0- 8	1.48-1.84	10.00-705.00	0.02-0.11	0.0-0.7	0.0-0.5	.02	.02			

Custom Soil Resource Report

Physical Soil Properties—Cumberland County and Part of Oxford County, Maine														
Map symbol and soil name	Depth	Sand	Silt	Clay	Moist bulk density	Saturated hydraulic conductivity	Available water capacity	Linear extensibility	Organic matter	Erosion factors			Wind erodibility group	Wind erodibility index
										Kw	Kf	T		
	<i>In</i>	<i>Pct</i>	<i>Pct</i>	<i>Pct</i>	<i>g/cc</i>	<i>micro m/sec</i>	<i>In/In</i>	<i>Pct</i>	<i>Pct</i>					
WmC—Windsor loamy sand, 8 to 15 percent slopes														
Windsor	0-1	—	—	—	0.20-0.60	10.00-705.00	0.15-0.38	—	75.0-99.5			5	2	134
	1-11	75-85- 92	5-14- 23	0- 1- 5	1.19-1.49	10.00-705.00	0.05-0.14	0.0-0.4	0.6-6.0	.15	.15			
	11-31	70-85- 98	0-14- 30	0- 1- 8	1.42-1.58	10.00-705.00	0.02-0.10	0.0-0.6	0.1-2.0	.15	.15			
	31-65	70-94-100	0- 6- 30	0- 0- 8	1.48-1.84	10.00-705.00	0.02-0.06	0.0-0.7	0.0-0.5	.02	.02			

References

- American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO). 2004. Standard specifications for transportation materials and methods of sampling and testing. 24th edition.
- American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM). 2005. Standard classification of soils for engineering purposes. ASTM Standard D2487-00.
- Cowardin, L.M., V. Carter, F.C. Golet, and E.T. LaRoe. 1979. Classification of wetlands and deep-water habitats of the United States. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service FWS/OBS-79/31.
- Federal Register. July 13, 1994. Changes in hydric soils of the United States.
- Federal Register. September 18, 2002. Hydric soils of the United States.
- Hurt, G.W., and L.M. Vasilas, editors. Version 6.0, 2006. Field indicators of hydric soils in the United States.
- National Research Council. 1995. Wetlands: Characteristics and boundaries.
- Soil Survey Division Staff. 1993. Soil survey manual. Soil Conservation Service. U.S. Department of Agriculture Handbook 18. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/soils/?cid=nrcs142p2_054262
- Soil Survey Staff. 1999. Soil taxonomy: A basic system of soil classification for making and interpreting soil surveys. 2nd edition. Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture Handbook 436. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/soils/?cid=nrcs142p2_053577
- Soil Survey Staff. 2010. Keys to soil taxonomy. 11th edition. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/soils/?cid=nrcs142p2_053580
- Tiner, R.W., Jr. 1985. Wetlands of Delaware. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control, Wetlands Section.
- United States Army Corps of Engineers, Environmental Laboratory. 1987. Corps of Engineers wetlands delineation manual. Waterways Experiment Station Technical Report Y-87-1.
- United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. National forestry manual. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/soils/home/?cid=nrcs142p2_053374
- United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. National range and pasture handbook. <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/landuse/rangepasture/?cid=stelpdb1043084>

Custom Soil Resource Report

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. National soil survey handbook, title 430-VI. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/soils/scientists/?cid=nrcs142p2_054242

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2006. Land resource regions and major land resource areas of the United States, the Caribbean, and the Pacific Basin. U.S. Department of Agriculture Handbook 296. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/soils/?cid=nrcs142p2_053624

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service. 1961. Land capability classification. U.S. Department of Agriculture Handbook 210. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/nrcs142p2_052290.pdf

EXHIBIT 6

Financial Capacity Letter



November 19, 2025

Julie Erdman
Director of Planning and Development
Town of Brunswick
85 Union Street
Brunswick, ME 04011

Re: Coastal Cancer Project

Dear Julie,

The construction cost estimate for the Coastal Cancer Project at 81 Medical Center Drive is \$10,800,000. MaineHealth has the financial capacity to complete this project. The source of funding for the building is capital funds allocated within MaineHealth's approved budget. Upon completion, MaineHealth will have adequate resources to operate and maintain the facility.

Regards,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "C. Richard", followed by a horizontal line.

Rich Bayman
Chief Financial Officer
MaineHealth

MaineHealth - Coastal Cancer Center - 81 Medical Center Drive
Construction Cost Breakout

Item	Category	Total Cost
01-50	Allowances	\$ 30,000.00
02-20	Selective Demolition	\$ 221,118.00
03-30	Concrete	\$ 694,362.00
04-20	Masonry	\$ 63,667.00
05-12	Structural Steel	\$ 57,891.00
05-50	Miscellaneous Metals	\$ 18,300.00
06-10	Rough Carpentry	\$ 16,680.00
06-25	Finish Carpentry	\$ 195,500.00
07-10	Waterproofing and Joint Sealants	\$ 48,706.00
07-42	Metal/Composite Panels & Siding	\$ 170,350.00
07-50	Membrane Roofing	\$ 159,290.00
07-81	Fireproofing	\$ 2,600.00
07-84	Firestopping	\$ 30,000.00
08-10	Doors, Frames & Hardware	\$ 203,965.00
05-56	Glass & Glazing	\$ 30,190.00
09-21	Drywall	\$ 580,360.00
09-51	Acoustical Ceilings	\$ 187,404.00
09-65	Flooring	\$ 404,805.00
09-90	Painting	\$ 99,752.00
10-01	Typical Specialties	\$ 23,548.00
10-95	Wall Protection/Clean Rooms	\$ 362,135.00
12-20	Window Treatments	\$ 16,400.00
13-49	Radiation Protection	\$ 192,345.00
21-01	Fire Protection	\$ 386,175.00
22-01	Plumbing	\$ 369,970.00
23-01	HVAC	\$ 1,915,825.00
26-01	Electrical	\$ 1,552,901.00
31-23	Sitework	\$ 226,928.00
	SUBTOTAL	\$ 8,261,167.00
	Tariff Allowance	\$ 123,917.00
	Contingency	\$ 998,113.00
	Subcontractor Bonds	\$ 120,913.00
	Building Permit	\$ 19,133.00
	General Conditions	\$ 698,400.00
	General Requirements	\$ 280,700.00
	General Liability Insurance	\$ 100,534.00
	Contractor Fee	\$ 197,123.00
	SUBTOTAL	\$ 2,538,833.00
	TOTAL CONSTRUCTION	\$ 10,800,000.00

EXHIBIT 7

Environmental Review (MNAP & MDIFW)

Pine Tree Engineering

From: St.Hilaire, Lisa <Lisa.St.Hilaire@maine.gov>
Sent: Monday, December 15, 2025 12:51 PM
To: Pine Tree Engineering; Stepanauskas, Abby
Cc: Puryear, Kristen
Subject: RE: MNAP & MDIFW Project Review - Maine Health

Hi Tara,

MNAP routinely receives requests from consultants to review development projects-frequently as part of a pre-application review prior to DEP permitting or because town ordinances require a response from us regarding rare, threatened, and endangered plants and rare or exemplary natural communities and ecosystems. Your request is consistent with the types of requests we receive from consultants because a municipal ordinance requires it.

It is part of our authorizing legislation that we can charge a fee for this work, and we have done so for decades. We have not yet raised our fees, though we may in the future as our expenses have increased in the past decade or so. FMI our site review, <https://www.maine.gov/dacf/mnap/assistance/review.htm>, fee structure, <https://www.maine.gov/dacf/mnap/assistance/fee.htm>, and authorizing legislation, <http://mainelegislature.org/legis/statutes/12/title12sec544.html> (in particular note §544, 3, D).

The Salt-hay Saltmarsh at Thomas Point Marsh occurs from Thomas Point, includes the marshy areas at the north end of Thomas Bay, and then extends across Thomas Point Road north along the stream. The property boundary for Brunswick Tax Map 45 Lot 32 includes the stream and the northerly portion of the Salth-hay Saltmarsh mapped at Thomas Point Marsh. The project area shown on the response we sent you is just the northern portion of Lot 32 as you indicated the work is associated with 81 Medical Center Drive versus the entire lot.

You also indicated that the plan is to construct an addition on the east side of the building. It's helpful for us when we know the scope of work and limit of disturbance around projects, and we often receive requests that include site plans and/or project/limit of disturbance boundaries. MNAP's response recommends that an undisturbed and vegetated buffer of at least 250-feet remains around the portion of the Salt-hay Saltmarsh along the stream on the east side of the property. Provided that your addition, and parking or access to it, does not extend into this area, there should be no concerns.

Thank you,

-Lisa



Lisa St. Hilaire, Information Manager

207-287-8044 (office)
she/her [why pronouns matter](#)

[Maine Natural Areas Program](#)
[Department of Agriculture, Conservation and Forestry](#)
177 State House Station | Augusta, ME 04333

From: Pine Tree Engineering <pte@pte-maine.com>
Sent: Friday, December 12, 2025 3:44 PM



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, CONSERVATION & FORESTRY
177 STATE HOUSE STATION
AUGUSTA, MAINE 04333

JANET T. MILLS
GOVERNOR

AMANDA E. BEAL
COMMISSIONER

December 12, 2025

Tara Smith
Pine Tree Engineering
53 Front Street
Bath, ME 04530

Via email: pte@pte-maine.com

Re: Rare and exemplary botanical features in proximity to: Mid Coast Cancer Center Renovation, 81 Medical Center Drive, Brunswick, Maine.

Dear Tara Smith:

I have searched the Maine Natural Areas Program's Biological and Conservation Data System files in response to your request received December 11, 2025 for information on the presence of rare or unique botanical features documented from the vicinity of the project in Brunswick, Maine. Rare and unique botanical features include the habitat of rare, threatened, or endangered plant species and unique or exemplary natural communities. Our review involves examining maps, manual and computerized records, other sources of information such as scientific articles or published references, and the personal knowledge of staff or cooperating experts.

Our official response covers only botanical features. For authoritative information and official response for zoological features you must make a similar request to the Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife, 284 State Street, Augusta, Maine 04333.

According to the information currently in our Biological and Conservation Data System files, the project area abuts and may include portions of Thomas Point Marsh, a mapped Salt-hay Saltmarsh associated with Thomas Bay. Salt-hay Saltmarsh is a rare wetland type in Maine and is considered a Wetland of Special Significance by the Maine DEP. MNAP recommends that no development or clearing occurs within 250-feet of the edge of the Salt-hay Saltmarsh and that a vegetated, intact buffer of at least 75-feet remains along the unnamed stream and adjacent forested wetland directly west of the existing facility and parking lot. MNAP further recommends that the project adheres to local and state Shoreland Zoning, including the use of standard best management practices for erosion and sedimentation. Please see the attached maps and fact sheet for more information about this Salt Hay Saltmarsh.

Feature	State Status	State Rank	Global Rank	Occurrence Rank	Site
Salt-hay Saltmarsh	N/A	S3	G5	C Fair	Thomas Point Marsh

MOLLY DOCHERTY, DIRECTOR
MAINE NATURAL AREAS PROGRAM
90 BLOSSOM LANE, DEERING BUILDING



PHONE: (207) 287-8044
WWW.MAINE.GOV/DACF/MNAP

If a field survey of the project area is conducted, please refer to the enclosed supplemental information regarding rare and exemplary botanical features documented to occur in the vicinity of the project site. The list may include information on features that have been known to occur historically in the area as well as recently field-verified information. While historic records have not been documented in several years, they may persist in the area if suitable habitat exists. The enclosed list identifies features with potential to occur in the area, and it should be considered if you choose to conduct field surveys.

This finding is available and appropriate for preparation and review of environmental assessments, but it is not a substitute for on-site surveys. Comprehensive field surveys do not exist for all natural areas in Maine, and in the absence of a specific field investigation, the Maine Natural Areas Program cannot provide a definitive statement on the presence or absence of unusual natural features at this site.

The Maine Natural Areas Program (MNAP) is continuously working to achieve a more comprehensive database of exemplary natural features in Maine. We would appreciate the contribution of any information obtained should you decide to do field work. MNAP welcomes coordination with individuals or organizations proposing environmental alteration or conducting environmental assessments. If, however, data provided by MNAP are to be published in any form, the Program should be informed at the outset and credited as the source.

The Maine Natural Areas Program has instituted a fee structure of \$75.00 an hour to recover the actual cost of processing your request for information. You will receive an invoice for \$150.00 for two hours of our services.



Thank you for using MNAP in the environmental review process. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have further questions about the Natural Areas Program or about rare or unique botanical features on this site.

Sincerely,

Abby Stepanauskas

Abby Stepanauskas | Ecologist | Maine Natural Areas Program
207-287-8048 | abby.stepanauskas@maine.gov

Mid Coast Cancer Center Renovation, 81 Medical Center Drive, Brunswick, Maine.



Approximate Project Area	National Wetlands Inventory (USFWS)	Estuarine and Marine Wetland
Recommended Buffer	Wetland Type	Freshwater Forested/Shrub Wetland
Rare/Exemplary Natural Community/Ecosystem	Estuarine and Marine Deepwater	Freshwater Pond
		Riverine

Salt-hay Saltmarsh

State Rank S3

Community Description

These tidal marshes consist of expanses of saltmeadow cordgrass, smooth cordgrass, and/or black-grass. Shrubs are virtually absent, and the herbaceous cover is usually >85%. Much of the marsh is high marsh, where saltmeadow cordgrass forms meadows, and where black-grass may be dominant at slightly higher elevations. In the low marsh, along creeks or at elevations just below mean high water, smooth cordgrass is abundant. Salt pannes with abundant seashore saltgrass may dot the high marsh; goosetongue may also be locally common. Sea lavender and seaside goldenrod are often found at the upper tidal fringe. The dominant species typically form bands corresponding to tidal inundation zones.

Soil and Site Characteristics

Spartina saltmarshes are typically associated with beach-dune systems (back barrier marshes) or the outer reaches of estuaries (finger marshes). They are extensive along both sides of the tidal river or stream. The extensive high marsh zone is only flooded by above average tides. Salt marsh peat is typically several meters thick. Most are large (>10 acres), but they occasionally occur as smaller pockets along estuaries and coves.



Saltmarsh False-foxglove


Diagnostics

These types are coastal back dune marshes, or near the outer reaches of estuaries, with saltmeadow cordgrass, smooth cordgrass, and black-grass totaling >35% cover, often in bands. The high marsh is well developed.

Similar Types

Mixed Graminoid-Forb Saltmarshes may also have cordgrasses and/or black-grass abundant, but will also have a mix of other co-dominant species, which tend to occur in patches rather than tidal zones; they are typically smaller, often less than 5 acres, and tend to occur farther upstream in estuaries or in smaller, more protected pockets. Brackish Tidal Marshes, which also occur farther upstream in estuaries, lack saltmarsh cordgrasses.

Location Map



- Community is known from this Ecoregion
- Community may occur in this Ecoregion
- Bailey's Ecoregion
- County



Spartina Saltmarsh – Kinney Shores

Conservation, Wildlife, and Management Considerations

Few of the larger saltmarshes in Maine are pristine, with some having been filled and nearly all ditched at one time or another. With wetland protection in recent decades many of those that remain are reverting to a more natural hydrologic regime. Many of the remaining high quality Spartina Saltmarshes are on public land or private conservation land. Maintenance of appropriate wetland buffers can help reduce degradation that could result from adjacent land uses.

Saltmarshes are important nesting habitat for Nelson's sharp-tailed sparrow, seaside sparrow, and the rare saltmarsh sharp-tailed sparrow. These wetlands also provide foraging habitat for a large number of wadingbirds and shorebirds, including rare species such as the laughing gull, black-crowned night-heron, and least tern. The big bluet, a rare damselfly, inhabits saltmarsh ponds with emergent vegetation in southern Maine.

Distribution

Coastal Maine, mostly southwest of Merrymeeting Bay (Eastern Broadleaf Forest Province); sporadic and less well developed downeast. Extends southward along the Atlantic coast.

Landscape Pattern: Large Patch

Characteristic Plants

These plants are frequently found in this community type. Those with an asterisk are often diagnostic of this community.

Herb

Alkali bulrush
Black-grass*
Common arrow-grass*
Goosetongue*
Purple-stemmed aster
Saltmeadow cordgrass*
Sea milkwort*
Seashore saltgrass*
Seaside goldenrod*
Smooth cordgrass*
Wire rush*

Associated Rare Plants

Dwarf glasswort
Lilaeopsis
Saltmarsh bulrush
Saltmarsh false-foxglove
Slender blue flag

Associated Rare Animals

Big bluet
Black-crowned night-heron
Laughing gull
Least tern
Saltmarsh sharp-tailed sparrow
Short-eared owl

Examples on Conservation Lands You Can Visit

- Bass Harbor Marsh, Acadia National Park – Hancock Co.
- Morse Mountain Preserve – Sagadahoc Co.
- Rachel Carson National Wildlife Refuge – York Co.
- Reid State Park – Sagadahoc Co.
- Scarborough Marsh Wildlife Management Area – Cumberland Co.

Rare and Exemplary Botanical Features within 4 miles of

Project: Mid Coast Cancer Center Renovation, 81 Medical Center Drive, Brunswick, Maine.

Common Name	State Status	State Rank	Global Rank	Date Last Observed	Occurrence Number	Habitat
Alder Thicket						
		S5	G4G5	1995-09-08	1	
American Sea-blite						
	T	S2	G5	1899	4	Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)
Beaked Spikerush						
	T	S1	G5	1921-07-12	3	Non-tidal rivershore (non-forested, seasonally wet),Open wetland, not coastal nor rivershore (non-forested, wetland)
	T	S1	G5	1921-07-12	2	Non-tidal rivershore (non-forested, seasonally wet),Open wetland, not coastal nor rivershore (non-forested, wetland)
Birch - Oak Rocky Woodland						
		S3	G3G5	2015-09-25	21	
Climbing Hempweed						
	PE	SH	G5	1916-08	1	Dry barrens (partly forested, upland),Open wetland, not coastal nor rivershore (non-forested, wetland)
Clothed Sedge						
	E	S1	G4	1898-06-15	1	Dry barrens (partly forested, upland)
	E	S1	G4	2020-06-22	4	Dry barrens (partly forested, upland)

Dry Land Sedge						
SC	S2	G5	2002-09-26	10	Old field/roadside (non-forested, wetland or upland)	
SC	S2	G5	2025-08-19	12	Old field/roadside (non-forested, wetland or upland)	
SC	S2	G5	2020-06-22	16	Old field/roadside (non-forested, wetland or upland)	
Dwarf Bulrush						
T	S1	G5	2010-08-26	12	Open wetland, not coastal nor rivershore (non-forested, wetland)	
T	S1	G5	2017-09-16	5	Open wetland, not coastal nor rivershore (non-forested, wetland)	
Eaton's Bur-marigold						
SC	S2	G3	2017-09-24	1	Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)	
SC	S2	G3	2017-09-26	3	Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)	
SC	S2	G3	2010-09-08	8	Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)	
SC	S2	G3	2024-09-12	12	Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)	
SC	S2	G3	2017-09-12	23	Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)	
SC	S2	G3	2015-08-14	5	Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)	
Estuary Bur-marigold						
SC	S3	G4	2017-08-29	1	Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)	
SC	S3	G4	2017-09-26	5		

Estuary Bur-marigold						
						Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)
	SC	S3	G4	2024-09-12	7	Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)
	SC	S3	G4	2010-09-08	14	Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)
	SC	S3	G4	2010-08-26	19	Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)
	SC	S3	G4	2015-08-14	40	Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)
Freshwater Tidal Marsh						
		S2	G4?	2013-09-11	14	
		S2	G4?	2013-09-25	4	
		S2	G4?	2016-06-14	5	
		S2	G4?	2013-07-02	9	
		S2	G4?	2024-09-12	3	
		S2	G4?	2013-09-25	7	
Great Blue Lobelia						
	PE	SX	G5	1900	2	Forested wetland,Non-tidal rivershore (non-forested, seasonally wet)
Lilaeopsis						
	SC	S2	G5	2011-09-03	5	

Lilaeopsis						
						Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)
Long's Bitter-cress						
	T	S2	G3	2018-08-30	1	Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)
	T	S2	G3	2015-09-20	3	Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)
	T	S2	G3	2017-09-26	5	Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)
	T	S2	G3	2010-08-28	7	Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)
	T	S2	G3	2013-09-11	18	Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)
Marsh Bulrush						
	E	S1	G3	2024-09-12	6	Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)
Mountain Honeysuckle						
	E	S2	G5	2016-06-02	8	Dry barrens (partly forested, upland),Hardwood to mixed forest (forest, upland)
	E	S2	G5	1933-09	4	Dry barrens (partly forested, upland),Hardwood to mixed forest (forest, upland)
	E	S2	G5	1912-06	3	Dry barrens (partly forested, upland),Hardwood to mixed forest (forest, upland)
	E	S2	G5	1911-06	2	Dry barrens (partly forested, upland),Hardwood to mixed forest (forest, upland)
	E	S2	G5	2018-09-20	18	Dry barrens (partly forested, upland),Hardwood to mixed forest (forest, upland)
	E	S2	G5	2020-07-07	20	

Mountain Honeysuckle						
Dry barrens (partly forested, upland),Hardwood to mixed forest (forest, upland)						
Mudwort						
SC	S3	G5	2013-09-11	39	Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)	
SC	S3	G5	2024-09-12	4	Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)	
SC	S3	G5	2010-09-28	30	Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)	
SC	S3	G5	2013-09-25	8	Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)	
Narrow-leaf Arrowhead						
SC	S2	G4	2002-07-19	4		
Parker's Pipewort						
SC	S3	G3	2017-09-26	2	Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)	
SC	S3	G3	2024-09-12	6	Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)	
SC	S3	G3	2010-09-28	24	Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)	
SC	S3	G3	1990-09-25	28	Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)	
SC	S3	G3	2017-08-29	1	Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)	
SC	S3	G3	2015-08-14	40	Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)	

Pitch Pine - Heath Barren						
	S1	G3G5	2002-09-26	1		
Pitch Pine Bog						
	S2	G3G5	2002-09-26	9		
Pygmyweed						
	SC	S2S3	G5	2013-09-25	1	Open water (non-forested, wetland)
	SC	S2S3	G5	2024-09-12	12	Open water (non-forested, wetland)
	SC	S2S3	G5	2017-09-12	15	Open water (non-forested, wetland)
	SC	S2S3	G5	2013-09-25	7	Open water (non-forested, wetland)
	SC	S2S3	G5	1911-09-20	5	Open water (non-forested, wetland)
	SC	S2S3	G5	2013-09-11	31	Open water (non-forested, wetland)
Salt-hay Saltmarsh						
	S3	G5	2011-08-04	41		
	S3	G5	2018-09-20	45		
	S3	G5	2009	25		
Saltmarsh Bulrush						
	T	S2	G5	2011-08-04	2	

Saltmarsh Bulrush						
Saltmarsh False-foxglove						
SC	S3	G5	2018-09-20	39	Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)	
Sandplain Grassland						
	S1	GNR	2020-06-22	4		
	S1	GNR	2014-08-25	3		
Sassafras						
SC	S2	G5	1906	10	Hardwood to mixed forest (forest, upland),Old field/roadside (non-forested, wetland or upland)	
Showy Lady's-slipper						
SC	S3	G4G5	1907-07-09	38	Forested wetland,Open wetland, not coastal nor rivershore (non-forested, wetland)	
Silver Maple Floodplain Forest						
	S3	GNR	2015-05-08	1		
Small Reed Grass						
SC	S3	G5	2018-09-13	13	Old field/roadside (non-forested, wetland or upland)	
Smooth Sandwort						
SC	S3	G4	1890	10		

Smooth Sandwort						
Rocky summits and outcrops (non-forested, upland)						
Spongy-leaved Arrowhead						
SC	S3	G5T4	2013-09-25	1	Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)	
SC	S3	G5T4	2024-09-12	7	Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)	
SC	S3	G5T4	2017-08-29	22	Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)	
SC	S3	G5T4	2008-08-29	28	Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)	
SC	S3	G5T4	2010-08-28	31	Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)	
SC	S3	G5T4	1992-07-30	33	Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)	
SC	S3	G5T4	2011-08-16	49	Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)	
Spreading Sedge						
E	S2	G5	1985-06-31	2	Hardwood to mixed forest (forest, upland)	
Stiff Arrowhead						
SC	S2	G5	1916	1	Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)	
SC	S2	G5	2007-09-07	2	Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)	
SC	S2	G5	2013-09-25	4	Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)	
SC	S2	G5	2024-08-23	8		

Stiff Arrowhead						
						Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)
SC	S2	G5	2011-08-16	22		Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)
Tidal Spikerush						
SC	S2	G2	2000-08-27	1		Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)
SC	S2	G2	2000-10-10	2		Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)
Unicorn Root						
E	S1	G5	1884	1		Dry barrens (partly forested, upland)
Water Pimpernel						
SC	S3	G5	2024-09-12	6		Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)
SC	S3	G5	2017-09-12	8		Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)
SC	S3	G5	2010-08-16	16		Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)
Yellow Pond-lily						
SC	S2	G5T5	2024-09-12	6		Open water (non-forested, wetland)
SC	S2	G5T5	2017-09-11	2		Open water (non-forested, wetland)
SC	S2	G5T5	2013-09-11	11		Open water (non-forested, wetland)
Date Exported: 12/12/2025 3:31 PM						

Conservation Status Ranks

State and Global Ranks: This ranking system facilitates a quick assessment of a species' or habitat type's rarity and is the primary tool used to develop conservation, protection, and restoration priorities for individual species and natural habitat types. Each species or habitat is assigned both a state (S) and global (G) rank on a scale of critically imperiled (1) to secure (5). Factors such as range extent, the number of occurrences, intensity of threats, etc., contribute to the assignment of state and global ranks. The definitions for state and global ranks are comparable but applied at different geographic scales; something that is state imperiled may be globally secure.

The information supporting these ranks is developed and maintained by the Maine Natural Areas Program (state ranks) and NatureServe (global ranks).

Rank	Definition
S1 G1	Critically Imperiled – At very high risk of extinction or elimination due to very restricted range, very few populations or occurrences, very steep declines, very severe threats, or other factors.
S2 G2	Imperiled – At high risk of extinction or elimination due to restricted range, few populations or occurrences, steep declines, severe threats, or other factors.
S3 G3	Vulnerable – At moderate risk of extinction or elimination due to a fairly restricted range, relatively few populations or occurrences, recent and widespread declines, threats, or other factors.
S4 G4	Apparently Secure – At fairly low risk of extinction or elimination due to an extensive range and/or many populations or occurrences, but with possible cause for some concern as a result of local recent declines, threats, or other factors.
S5 G5	Secure – At very low risk of extinction or elimination due to a very extensive range, abundant populations or occurrences, and little to no concern from declines or threats.
SX GX	Presumed Extinct – Not located despite intensive searches and virtually no likelihood of rediscovery.
SH GH	Possibly Extinct – Known from only historical occurrences but still some hope of rediscovery.
S#S# G#G#	Range Rank – A numeric range rank (e.g., S2S3 or S1S3) is used to indicate any range of uncertainty about the status of the species or ecosystem.
SU GU	Unrankable – Currently unrankable due to lack of information or due to substantially conflicting information about status or trends.
GNR SNR	Unranked – Global or subnational conservation status not yet assessed.
SNA GNA	Not Applicable – A conservation status rank is not applicable because the species or ecosystem is not a suitable target for conservation activities (e.g., non-native species or ecosystems).
Qualifier	Definition
S#? G#?	Inexact Numeric Rank – Denotes inexact numeric rank.
Q	Questionable taxonomy that may reduce conservation priority – Distinctiveness of this entity as a taxon or ecosystem type at the current level is questionable. The “Q” modifier is only used at a global level.
T#	Intraspecific Taxon (trinomial) – The status of intraspecific taxa (subspecies or varieties) are indicated by a "T-rank" following the species' global rank.

State Status: Endangered and Threatened are legal status designations authorized by statute. Please refer to MRSA Title 12, §544 and §544-B.

Status	Definition
E	Endangered – Any native plant species in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range within the State or Federally listed as Endangered.
T	Threatened – Any native plant species likely to become endangered within the foreseeable future throughout all or a significant portion of its range in the State or Federally listed as Threatened.
SC	Special Concern – A native plant species that is rare in the State, but not rare enough to be considered Threatened or Endangered.
PE	Potentially Extirpated – A native plant species that has not been documented in the State in over 20 years, or loss of the last known occurrence.

Element Occurrence (EO) Ranks: Quality assessments that designate viability of a population or integrity of habitat. These ranks are based on size, condition, and landscape context. Range ranks (e.g., AB, BC) and uncertainty ranks (e.g., B?) are allowed. The Maine Natural Areas Program tracks all occurrences of rare plants and natural communities/ecosystems (S1-S3) as well as exemplary common natural community types (S4-S5 with EO ranks A/B).

Rank	Definition
A	Excellent – Excellent estimated viability/ecological integrity.
B	Good – Good estimated viability/ecological integrity.
C	Fair – Fair estimated viability/ecological integrity.
D	Poor – Poor estimated viability/ecological integrity.
E	Extant – Verified extant, but viability/ecological integrity not assessed.
H	Historical – Lack of field information within past 20 years verifying continued existence of the occurrence, but not enough to document extirpation.
X	Extirpated – Documented loss of population/destruction of habitat.
U	Unrankable – Occurrence unable to be ranked due to lack of sufficient information (e.g., possible mistaken identification).
NR	Not Ranked – An occurrence rank has not been assigned.

Visit the Maine Natural Areas Program website for more information
<http://www.maine.gov/dacf/mnap>






Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife
Project Area Review of Fish and Wildlife Observations and Priority Habitats

81 Medical Center Drive, Renovation, Brunswick


Project ID 9736, Version ID 11311



Legend only lists resources visible in the map; see response letter for all resources that were evaluated.

- County Boundary
- Township Boundary
- Project Footprint
- Search Area
- Tidal Waterfowl/Wading Bird

Date: 12/15/2025
UTM Zone 19N, NAD83



This map contains sensitive information - do not distribute it beyond the project applicant, consultant, or the permitting agency.



STATE OF MAINE
DEPARTMENT OF
INLAND FISHERIES & WILDLIFE
353 WATER STREET
41 STATE HOUSE STATION
AUGUSTA ME 04333-0041



December 18, 2025

Tara Smith
Pine Tree Engineering, Inc.
53 Front Street
Bath, ME 04530

RE: Information Request - 81 Medical Center Drive, Renovation, Brunswick Project ID 9736-11311

Dear Tara:

Per your request received on **December 11, 2025**, we have reviewed current Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife (MDIFW) information sources for known locations of Endangered, Threatened, and Special Concern (Rare) species; designated Essential and Significant Wildlife Habitats; inland fisheries and aquatic habitats; and other protected natural resource concerns within the vicinity of the **81 Medical Center Drive, Renovation, Brunswick** project, pursuant to MDIFW's authority. MDIFW understands the project proposes expansion of an existing medical office building, tree clearing, grading, and associated site work. Please note that as project details are lacking, our comments should be considered preliminary.

Our Department has not mapped any Essential Habitats that would be affected by this project.

ENDANGERED, THREATENED, AND SPECIAL CONCERN SPECIES

Bat Species

Of the eight species of bats that occur in Maine, four species are afforded protection under the Maine Endangered Species Act (MESA, 12 M.R.S 12801 et. seq.): little brown bat (State Endangered), northern long-eared bat (State Endangered), eastern small-footed bat (State Threatened), and tri-colored bat (State Threatened). The four remaining bat species are designated as Species of Special Concern: big brown bat, red bat, hoary bat, and silver-haired bat. While a comprehensive statewide inventory for bats has not been completed, based on historical evidence it is likely that several of these species occur within the project area during spring/fall migration, the summer breeding season, and/or for overwintering. However, our Department does not anticipate significant impacts to any of the bat species as a result of project activities.

SIGNIFICANT WILDLIFE HABITAT

Significant Vernal Pools

At this time MDIFW Significant Wildlife Habitat maps indicate no known presence of Significant Vernal Pools (SVPs) in the project search area. However, a comprehensive statewide inventory for Significant Vernal Pools has not been completed. SVPs are not included on

December 18, 2025

Letter to Tara Smith, Pine Tree Engineering, Inc.

Comments RE: 81 Medical Center Drive, Renovation, Brunswick

MDIFW maps until project areas have been surveyed using approved methods and the survey results confirmed. Therefore, their absence from resource maps is not necessarily indicative of an absence on the ground. Our Department recommends that any potential Significant Vernal Pool depressions be avoided as well as the 250-foot surrounding the pool, which is the associated Critical Terrestrial Habitat.

If not already completed, we recommend that surveys for vernal pools be conducted within the project boundary by qualified wetland scientists prior to final project design to determine whether there are Significant Vernal Pools present in the area. These surveys should extend up to 250 feet beyond the anticipated project footprint because of potential performance standard requirements for off-site Significant Vernal Pools, assuming such pools are located on land owned or controlled by the applicant. Once surveys are completed, survey forms should be submitted to our Department for review well before the submission of any necessary permits. Our Department will need to review and verify any vernal pool data prior to final determination of significance.

AQUATIC RESOURCES

Fish Habitat

We recommend that 100-foot undisturbed vegetated buffers be maintained along streams. Buffers should be measured from the edge of stream or associated fringe and floodplain wetlands. Maintaining and enhancing buffers along streams is critical to the protection of water temperatures, water quality, natural inputs of coarse woody debris, and various forms of aquatic life necessary to support conditions required by many fish species. Stream crossings should be avoided, but if a stream crossing is necessary, or an existing crossing needs to be modified, it should be designed to provide full fish passage. Small streams, including intermittent streams, can provide crucial rearing habitat, cold water for thermal refugia, and abundant food for juvenile salmonids on a seasonal basis and undersized crossings may inhibit these functions.

Generally, MDIFW recommends that all new, modified, and replacement stream crossings be sized to span at least 1.2 times the bankfull width of the stream. In addition, we generally recommend that stream crossings be open bottomed (i.e., natural bottom), although embedded structures which are backfilled with representative streambed material have been shown to be effective in not only providing habitat connectivity for fish but also for other aquatic organisms. Construction Best Management Practices should be closely followed to avoid erosion, sedimentation, alteration of stream flow, and other impacts as eroding soils from construction activities can travel significant distances as well as transport other pollutants resulting in direct impacts to fisheries and aquatic habitat. In addition, we recommend that any necessary instream work occur between July 15 and October 1.

This consultation review has been conducted specifically for known MDIFW jurisdictional features and should not be interpreted as a comprehensive review for the presence of other regulated features that may occur in this area. Prior to the start of any future site disturbance, we recommend additional consultation with the municipality, and other state resource and regulatory agencies including the Maine Natural Areas Program, Maine Department of Marine Resources

December 18, 2025

Letter to Tara Smith, Pine Tree Engineering, Inc.

Comments RE: 81 Medical Center Drive, Renovation, Brunswick

and Maine Department of Environmental Protection in order to avoid unintended protected resource disturbance. For information on federally listed species, contact the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Maine Field Office (207-469-7300, mainefieldoffice@fws.gov).

Please feel free to contact my office if you have any questions regarding this information, or if I can be of any further assistance.

Best regards,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Andrew J. Wood".

Andrew J. Wood

Environmental Review Coordinator

EXHIBIT 8

Cook's Corner Design Standards Narrative

Midcoast Oncology 81 Medical Center Drive



Existing Building Entrance



Existing Façade Materials



Rendering of proposed addition

The existing medical office building at 81 Medical Center Drive, on the Midcoast campus was built in 2007. The exterior façade consists of a base of concrete masonry or CMU, slightly pink buff colored, a medium color red brick veneer, and slightly pink, buff colored pre-cast lintels at the windows and cornice band at the top of the wall. The aluminum store front windows are white.

Section 3.4 Façade Requirements, and within 3.4.j.

C. Secondary Facades - Secondary facades are any building facades that do not face a public space or street and do not include a main building entrance. Secondary facade design does not need to match primary facade design, but should be complementary to the primary facade. Building utilities not located on roofs shall be located along secondary facades and screened accordingly from public view. Private entrances, such as maintenance or secondary residential tenant entrances, shall be located along the secondary facade.


The two additions to 81 medical center drive are secondary facades according to the definition in Section 3.4 Façade Requirements item C.

The design of these additions take into account the scale, materials and colors of the existing building, by complementing these colors and materials rather than attempting to copy directly as it is difficult to match brick and precast that have weathered for 18 years.

J. Windowless Circumstances - Buildings without windows, i.e. a computer server building or self-storage buildings, shall incorporate a change in siding materials, instead of windows, to create a sense of rhythm and cadence to create human scale. These material scale changes shall be demonstrably compatible with the scale and cadence of adjacent building facade treatments.

We have included floor plans of the additions showing the technical and scientific use of the internal spaces and noted that some of these spaces cannot have windows, or that windows are undesirable for various reasons. The use of these additions is very different from the use of the existing building.


We believe that the proposed design is sensitive to the aesthetic of the existing building, without directly copying it. While we do not provide a facade that are symmetrical, or have rhythm, the proposed design provide compatibility and balance while expressing the use of the spaces within.




Building Addition Plans




Proposed colors for Equitone cementitious exterior wall panels. Final colors to be determined. See rendering provided.




WT-1




WT-2




1 LINAC SOUTH
A4.01 3/16" = 1'-0"




2 LINAC EAST
A4.01 3/16" = 1'-0"




3 LINAC NORTH
A4.01 3/16" = 1'-0"



4 PHARM EAST
A4.01 3/16" = 1'-0"




5 PHARM NORTH
A4.01 3/16" = 1'-0"




6 PHARM WEST
A4.01 3/16" = 1'-0"

DATE	DESCRIPTION
9.23.25	BUILDING 81 CD
10.28.25	BUILDING 81 CD



DATE: 10.28.2025


SHEET TITLE AND NUMBER:
A4.01
ELEVATIONS-
EXTERIOR- BUILDING



1 FLOOR PLAN - 81 LEVEL 1 - LINEAR ACCELERATOR
A1.25 1/4" = 1'-0"

- LINAC FLOOR PLAN NOTES**
1. ALL WALLS TO BE $\frac{1}{2}$ " MIN. UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
 2. ALL WALLS TO BE $\frac{1}{2}$ " MIN. AT CHASES, COLUMNS, AND LINAC VAULT FLOORING UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
 3. SEE PHYSICIST REPORT FOR SHIELDING REQUIREMENTS OF LINAC VAULT.
 4. SEE VENDOR PLANNING GUIDE FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON LINAC EQUIPMENT AND COORDINATION.
 5. DESIGN INTENT IS FOR WINDOW ACROSS FROM VAULT TO BE REMOVABLE FOR LINAC EQUIPMENT TRANSPORT.

- PHARMACY FLOOR PLAN NOTES**
1. ALL WALLS TO BE $\frac{1}{2}$ " MIN. UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
 2. ALL WALLS TO BE $\frac{1}{2}$ " MIN. AT CHASES AND COLUMNS UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.
 3. COMPOUNDING ROOMS ARE A USP DESIGNATED SEGREGATED COMPOUNDING AREA (SCA).



2 FLOOR PLAN - 81 LEVEL 1 - PHARMACY & INFUSION
A1.25 1/4" = 1'-0"

ENVIRONMENTS
FOR HEALTH
ARCHITECTURE

888 718 8441 207 773 8841 75 York St, Suite 3, Portland ME 04101
© 2025 E4H - Environments for Health, LLC e4harchitect.com

RFS
Engineering

MAINEHEALTH

PINE TREE
ENGINEERING

PROJECT NUMBER: 2024014

MAINEHEALTH
MID COAST CANCER CENTER RENOVATION
81 Medical Center Drive
Brunswick, ME 04011

DATE	DESCRIPTION
9/23/25	BUILDING 81 CD
10/28/25	BUILDING 81 CD

KEY PLAN:

LICENSED ARCHITECT
JON M. ROYD, AIA
30281
STATE OF MAINE

DATE: 10.28.2025

SHEET TITLE AND NUMBER:
A1.25
81 - FLOOR PLAN -
LINAC & PHARMACY

EXHIBIT 9

Chapter 4 Development Standards

Brunswick Zoning Ordinance
Chapter 4 — Property Development Standards
MaineHealth Mid Coast Cancer Center Renovation

4.1 Applicability of Property Development Standards

The proposed development is in compliance with the standards set forth in Chapter 4 – Property Development Standards in Exhibit 9.

4.2 Dimensional and Density Standards

The proposed building additions are located in the Growth Mixed-Use 8 (GM8) zoning district. The project complies with the requirement detailed in Table 4.2.3. Dimensional and Density Standards for Growth Area Zoning Districts.

4.3 Natural and Historic Areas

4.3.1. Mapping of Natural and Historic Areas Requirements

The Existing Conditions Plan (AS0.10) in Exhibit 10 shows existing features on site. The boundary of forested wetlands was located east of the proposed building additions during a wetland delineation survey (on file with the Town from previous applications). The proposed building additions have been designed to avoid impacting any applicable features to the greatest extent practicable.

4.3.2. Pollution

The proposed building additions comply with this standard. This project will not result in undue water or air pollution.

4.3.3. Protection of Natural Vegetation

The proposed development complies with this standard. This project is not located in a Scenic Area. Tree clearing is proposed but to the minimal extent practicable.

4.3.4. Protection of Significant Plant and Animal Habitat

The majority of the proposed development is located on developed area and will have no adverse effect on Important Plant and Animal Habitats. The development is outside of the Wildlife Protection Overlay as shown on the Overall Site Plan in Exhibit 2.

Pine Tree Engineering reached out to and received responses from the Maine Natural Areas Program (MNAP) and the Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife (MDIFW) (see Exhibit 7). MNAP recommends a 250' vegetated buffer be maintained along the edge of the Salt-hay Saltmarsh near the development. MNAP also recommends no additional clearing within a 75' vegetated buffer along the edge of the forested wetland West of the development. MDIFW recommends a 100' vegetated buffer be maintained along the stream near the development. The proposed development is located outside of all three of the recommended buffers.

Brunswick Zoning Ordinance
Chapter 4 — Property Development Standards
MaineHealth Mid Coast Cancer Center Renovation

4.3.5. Steep Slopes

The area of proposed development does not contain 5,000 or more contiguous square feet of slopes exceeding 25% grade.

4.3.6. Erosion and Sedimentation

The proposed development complies with this standard. An Erosion and Sedimentation Control Notes and Details plan (AS2.00) is included within the Construction Drawings in Exhibit 10. Erosion and sedimentation within the disturbed areas of the site will be controlled through the use of sediment barriers including silt fence, composite filter sock, stone check dams, and erosion control mix berms to minimize the transport of sediment from the site. The project has been designed to incorporate Best Management Practices (BMPs) as outlined in the Maine Erosion and Sediment Control BMPs as published by the Maine Department of Environmental Control, current edition. Permanent and temporary erosion control features will be detailed in the Construction Specifications. The contractor will be bound to meet both the Construction Specifications for the project and the performance standards of the BMPs including erosion control, stabilization, maintenance, and inspection requirements.

4.3.7. Ground Water

The proposed development complies with this standard. This project will not result in undue adverse effect on the quality or quantity of groundwater in the area. No subsurface wastewater disposal system is proposed.

4.3.8. Surface Waters, Wetland, and Marine Resources

The proposed development complies with this standard. No undue adverse effect on the quality of the forested wetlands East of the proposed building additions will occur.

4.3.9. Historic and Archeological Resources

The proposed development complies with this standard. No undue adverse effect on any historic or archeological resources will occur as a result of this project.

4.4 Flood Hazard Areas

The proposed development is not in the Flood Protection Overlay district.

4.5 Basic and Municipal Services

4.5.1. Sewage Disposal

The renovations at the 81 Medical Center Drive building will lead to a minor increase in the building's fixture units. These minor revisions will not exceed the capacity of the existing sanitary sewer service.

Brunswick Zoning Ordinance
Chapter 4 — Property Development Standards
MaineHealth Mid Coast Cancer Center Renovation

4.5.2. Water Supply and Quality

The renovations at the 81 Medical Center Drive building will lead to a minor increase in the building's fixture units. The modifications to internal plumbing will result in a net increase of 50 cold water fixture units. Combined with the existing fixtures, the new water demand will not exceed the capacity of the existing 4-inch water service.

4.5.3. Solid Waste Disposal

This project will not cause an unreasonable burden on the municipality's ability to dispose of solid waste.

4.5.4. Stormwater Management

The proposed development has been designed to minimize the total area of impervious surface on the development site and shall incorporate stormwater management measures to minimize runoff volume and rate, as well as pollutant and nutrient loadings, from the site. The existing Maine DEP Site Law stormwater management permit will be revised as part of an exemption, as already discussed with Maine DEP personnel.

4.6 Landscaping Requirements

The proposed development complies with this standard. Proposed tree removal has been limited to only what is required for the proposed grading of the LINAC building addition and the proposed generator pad. Additionally, ten evergreen trees will be planted at a spacing of 10 feet along the proposed treeline.

4.7 Residential Recreation Requirements

The proposed development does not include new dwelling units.

4.8 Circulation and Access

4.8.1. Street Standards

The proposed development complies with this standard. There is no proposed change of use for the site and therefore the existing traffic, access, and streets will remain unchanged. Therefore, the proposed development is not expected to cause unreasonable congestion or unsafe conditions on existing public roads.

4.8.2. Refer to Chapter 14 of The Brunswick Municipal Code of Ordinances

This standard is not applicable; this development is on a private road and there is no proposed change of use for the site and therefore the existing traffic, access, and streets will remain unchanged.

Brunswick Zoning Ordinance
Chapter 4 — Property Development Standards
MaineHealth Mid Coast Cancer Center Renovation

4.8.3. Pedestrian and Bicycle Access

The proposed development complies with this standard and will make use of the existing pedestrian and bicycle access on the site. The proposed walkway to the new LINAC unit complies with this standard.

4.8.4. Access for Persons with Disabilities

The proposed development complies with this standard. The existing medical office building provides internal Accessible access to the proposed building additions.

4.8.5. Shoreline Access

There is no shoreline associated with the property.

4.9 Parking and Loading

4.9.1. Minimum and Maximum Vehicle Parking Requirements

In 2007, the original 81 Medical Center Drive building application was approved with its proposed parking, which included 134 parking spaces.

In 2016, 65 additional parking spaces were added to the 81 Medical Center Drive building parking lot as part of a parking expansion project. Since there was no expansion in the building footprint and thus the required parking space quantity was not increased, this is a net of 65 spaces in excess of the required and approved amount.

In the current application, the addition of 3,511 SF of gross building area will require 11 new parking spaces. The proposed development reduces the amount of existing parking spaces by 6. Thus, the net required amount of new parking spaces to be added is 17, which has already been compensated for by the 65 spaces added in 2016. The proposed development meets this standard.

4.9.2. Minimum Bicycle Parking Requirements

As a result of the proposed development, there are 20 spaces required at 81 Medical Center Drive (for 193 parking spaces). This project proposed 25 total bicycle parking spaces, and therefore the proposed development meets this standard.

4.9.3. Design, Construction and Maintenance of Parking Areas

The proposed development complies with this standard.

4.9.4. Parking Alternatives

Section 4.9.1 has been met.

Brunswick Zoning Ordinance
Chapter 4 — Property Development Standards
MaineHealth Mid Coast Cancer Center Renovation

4.9.5. Minimum Off-Street Loading Requirements

The proposed development complies with this standard.

4.10 Lighting

4.10.1. Outdoor Lighting

New outdoor lighting shall not adversely impact road safety or adjacent properties and uses.

4.11 Architectural Compatibility

The relationship of materials, texture and color of the building façade of the LINAC and Pharmacy additions shall be visually compatible with that of the existing building and are designed to complement, but not copy the brick and pre-cast base of the 81 Medical Center Drive building. Please see the Cooks Corner Design Standards Narrative in Exhibit 8 for more information.

4.12 Neighborhood Protection Standards

The Neighborhood Protection Standards do not apply to the proposed development.

4.13 Signs

The proposed development does not involve proposed signs.

4.14 Performance Standards

4.14.1. Operations of Uses and Development

- A. The proposed development shall comply with this standard.
- B. The proposed development shall comply with this standard.
- C. The equivalent sound level measured in dBA (decibels-day/night average) resulting from any activity shall not exceed at any point on or beyond the lot line the maximum levels as set forth in the following table:

Table 4.14.1.B: Maximum Equivalent Sound Level Measured in dBA ^{[1],[2]}		
Districts	Day	Night
Rural Area districts, GO, GN	50	40
Growth Residential (GR)	55	45
GM1, GM2, GM3, GM6, GM8, GC1, GC2, GC3, GC4, GC5	60	50
GM4, GM5, GM7, GA, GI	70	60
NOTES: [1] The maximum equivalent sound level measured in dBA for any activity shall be computed based on representative samples during hours of operation over a one hour period. Daytime hours extend from 6:00 am to 8:00 pm. [2] The sound level meter must be calibrated using manufacturing standards before and after conducting the measurement. The meter shall meet Type I or Type II specifications for ANSC standards.		

Brunswick Zoning Ordinance
Chapter 4 — Property Development Standards
MaineHealth Mid Coast Cancer Center Renovation

This project parcel is in the following districts:

Growth Mixed Use-4 (GM4); Growth Mixed Use-8 (GM8)

The sound level of the standby generator, measured at the closest property line will be between 29db and 50db when running.

This falls within the allowable sound level from table 4.14.1.B, see above.

- If a lot abuts a district requiring a lower noise level, the maximum permitted level for the lot shall be reduced by five (5) dBA, provided, however, that the sound level shall not exceed 55 dBA or whichever is lower at the affected lot boundaries.
- Noise associated with construction may achieve a maximum equivalent sound level measured in dBA of 75 between the hours of 7:00 am and 7:00 pm. *Project activities during construction shall comply with this requirement.*

Fuel Tank Capacity, L (gal.)	Est. Fuel Supply Hours at 60 Hz with Full Load	Max. Length, mm (in.)	Max. Width, mm (in.)	Sound Pressure Level, dB(A)	Max. Height, mm (in.)	Weight, kg (lb.)
Lift base	0	3525 (138.8)	1154 (45.4)	69	1713 (67.4)	1616 (3562)

- D. The proposed development shall comply with this standard.
- E. The proposed development shall comply with this standard.
- F. The proposed development shall comply with this standard.
- G. There are no new uses or activities that will cause inherent and recurring generated vibration perceptible without instruments at any point along the property line, as part of this project.
- H. The proposed development shall comply with this standard.
- I. The proposed development shall comply with this standard.
- J. All installed outdoor lighting will be operated to comply with Section 4.10 (Outdoor Lighting). The building materials do not have high light-reflective qualities and shall not be used in the construction of buildings in such manner that reflected sunlight will throw intense glare to surrounding areas.

4.15 Site Feature Maintenance

The proposed development shall comply with this standard. Site maintenance, including maintenance of the stormwater management facilities, parking areas, and outdoor lighting, will be managed by the applicant in compliance with the Brunswick Zoning Ordinance standards.

Brunswick Zoning Ordinance
Chapter 4 — Property Development Standards
MaineHealth Mid Coast Cancer Center Renovation

4.16 Financial and Technical Capacity

The proposed development complies with this standard. A letter from the applicant has been provided by the applicant showing their financial and technical capacity to meet the standards of the proposed building additions and has been included in Exhibit 6.

4.17 Administrative Adjustments/Alternative Equivalent Compliance

The proposed development shall comply with this standard. The project has been designed in accordance with the Town of Brunswick Zoning Ordinance.

4.18 Affordable Housing

This standard is not applicable to the proposed development.

EXHIBIT 10

Construction Drawings

BUILDING 81

ISSUED FOR: CONSTRUCTION

CONTACT: ASHLEY ROAM

CONTACT: CAITLIN TORRANCE

CONTACT: PATRICK HART

CONTACT: JEREMY PRUE

CONTACT: CHAD WHALEN

SHEET INDEX	
NUMBER	NAME
G0.00	COVER SHEET
G1.00	LEGENDS, ABBREVIATIONS AND NOTES
LS1.02	LIFE SAFETY PLAN - BLDG 81 - LEVEL 1
LS1.03	LIFE SAFETY PLAN - BLDG 81 - LEVEL 2
AD1.01	DEMOLITION OVERALL PLAN - BLDG 81
AD1.02	DEMOLITION OVERALL PLAN - BLDG 81
AD1.20	81- DEMOLITION PLAN - RAD ONC
AD1.21	81- DEMOLITION PLAN - INFUSION
AD1.22	81- DEMOLITION PLAN - MED ONC
AD1.23	81- DEMOLITION PLAN - PEDIATRICS
AD1.24	81- DEMOLITION PLAN - ENT
A1.01	REFERENCE PLAN - BLDG 81
A1.02	REFERENCE PLAN - BLDG 81
A1.20	81- FLOOR PLAN - RAD ONC
A1.21	81- FLOOR PLAN - INFUSION
A1.22	81- FLOOR PLAN - MED ONC
A1.23	81- FLOOR PLAN - PEDIATRICS
A1.24	81- FLOOR PLAN - ENT
A1.25	81- FLOOR PLAN - LINAC & PHARMACY
A2.01	ROOF PLAN - ADDITIONS
A3.20	81- REFLECTED CEILING PLAN - RAD ONC
A3.21	81- REFLECTED CEILING PLAN - INFUSION
A3.22	81- REFLECTED CEILING PLAN - MED ONC
A3.23	81- REFLECTED CEILING PLAN - PEDIATRICS
A3.24	81- REFLECTED CEILING PLAN - ENT
A3.25	81- REFLECTED CEILING PLAN - LINAC & PHARMACY
A4.01	ELEVATIONS - EXTERIOR - BUILDING
A5.00	BUILDING SECTIONS
A5.10	WALL SECTIONS
A6.00	EXTERIOR DETAILS
A6.01	EXTERIOR DETAILS
A6.02	TYPICAL PLANS AND INTERIOR ELEVATIONS - BLDG 81
A6.03	INTERIOR ELEVATIONS - BLDG 81 - LEVEL 1
A6.04	INTERIOR ELEVATIONS - BLDG 81 - LEVEL 1
A6.05	INTERIOR ELEVATIONS - BLDG 81 - LEVEL 2
A6.06	INTERIOR ELEVATIONS - BLDG 81 - LEVEL 2
A7.01	DOORS AND WINDOWS - BLDG 81
A7.02	PARTITION TYPES AND DETAILS - BLDG 81
A8.00	MILLWORK DETAILS
A8.01	MILLWORK DETAILS
A8.02	INTERIOR DETAILS
ID0.10	81- MATERIAL FINISHES
ID0.20	81- ROOM FINISH SCHEDULE
ID1.20	81- FINISH PLAN - RADIATION ONCOLOGY
ID1.21	81- FINISH PLAN - INFUSION
ID1.22	81- FINISH PLAN - MED ONC
ID1.23	81- FINISH PLAN - PEDIATRICS
ID1.24	81- FINISH PLAN - ENT
ID1.25	81- FINISH PLAN - LINAC & PHARMACY ADDITIONS
ID3.20	81- FLOOR PATTERN PLAN - RADIATION ONCOLOGY
ID3.21	81- FLOOR PATTERN PLAN - INFUSION
ID3.22	81- FLOOR PATTERN PLAN - MED ONC
ID3.23	81- FLOOR PATTERN PLAN - PEDIATRICS
ID3.24	81- FLOOR PATTERN PLAN - ENT
ID3.25	81- FLOOR PATTERN PLAN - LINAC & PHARMACY ADDITIONS
E01.20	81- EQUIPMENT PLAN - RAD ONC
E01.21	81- EQUIPMENT PLAN - INFUSION
E01.22	81- EQUIPMENT PLAN - MED ONC
E01.23	81- EQUIPMENT PLAN - PEDIATRICS
E01.24	81- EQUIPMENT PLAN - ENT
E01.25	81- EQUIPMENT PLAN - LINAC AND PHARMACY
AS0.10	EXISTING CONDITIONS PLAN
AS1.00	PROPOSED SITE PLAN
AS1.10	PROPOSED GRADING PLAN
AS2.00	EROSION AND SEDIMENTATION CONTROL NOTES AND DETAILS
AS3.00	CIVIL DETAILS
S0.00	STRUCTURAL NOTES & ABBREVIATIONS
S0.01	TYPICAL DETAILS - CONCRETE
S1.03	TYPICAL DETAILS - STEEL JOISTS
S1.01	PHARMACY PLANS AND SECTIONS
S1.02	LINAC ADDITION PLANS
S1.03	LINAC ADDITION PLANS
FP0.01	FIRE PROTECTION LEGEND, NOTES & ABBREVIATIONS
FD1.01	DEMOLITION LEVEL 1 PLAN - BLDG 81
FD1.02	DEMOLITION LEVEL 2 PLAN - BLDG 81
FP1.01	FIRE PROTECTION LEVEL 1 PLAN - BLDG 81
FP1.02	FIRE PROTECTION LEVEL 1 PLAN - BLDG 81
PD.01	PLUMBING LEGEND, NOTES & ABBREVIATIONS
PD.00	PLUMBING EQUIPMENT UNDERBASIS PLAN - BLDG 81

SHEET INDEX	
NUMBER	NAME
PD1.01	PLUMBING DEMOLITION LEVEL 1 PLAN - BLDG 81
PD1.02	PLUMBING DEMOLITION LEVEL 2 PLAN - BLDG 81
PD1.20	81 - PLUMBING DEMOLITION PLAN - RAD OMC
PD1.21	81 - PLUMBING DEMOLITION PLAN - INFUSION
PD1.22	81 - PLUMBING DEMOLITION PLAN - MED OMC
PD1.23	81 - PLUMBING DEMOLITION PLAN - PEDIATRICS
PD1.24	81 - PLUMBING DEMOLITION PLAN - ENT
PI.00	PLUMBING UNDERSLAB PLAN - BLDG 81
PI.01	PLUMBING REFERENCE PLAN - BLDG 81
PI.02	PLUMBING REFERENCE PLAN - BLDG 81
PI.10	81 - PLUMBING FLOOR PLAN - RAD OMC
PI.21	81 - PLUMBING FLOOR PLAN - INFUSION
PI.22	81 - PLUMBING FLOOR PLAN - MED OMC
PI.23	81 - PLUMBING FLOOR PLAN - PEDIATRICS
PI.24	81 - PLUMBING FLOOR PLAN - ENT
PI.25	81 - PLUMBING FLOOR PLAN - LINAC & PHARMACY
P2.01	PLUMBING DETAILS
P3.01	PLUMBING SCHEDULES
M0.01	81 - MECHANICAL LEGEND
M0.02	81 - MECHANICAL DETAILS
M0.03	81 - MECHANICAL DETAILS
M0.04	81 - MECHANICAL DETAILS
M0.05	81 - MECHANICAL DETAILS
MD1.01	81 - DUCTWORK LEVEL 1 OVERALL DEMOLITION PLAN
MD1.02	81 - DUCTWORK LEVEL 2 OVERALL DEMOLITION PLAN
MD1.20	81 - DUCTWORK LEVEL 1 DEMOLITION PLAN - RAD OMC
MD1.21	81 - DUCTWORK LEVEL 1 DEMOLITION PLAN - INFUSION
MD1.22	81 - DUCTWORK LEVEL 1 DEMOLITION PLAN - MED OMC
MD1.23	81 - DUCTWORK LEVEL 2 DEMOLITION PLAN - PEDIATRICS
MD1.24	81 - DUCTWORK LEVEL 2 DEMOLITION PLAN - ENT
MD2.01	81 - PIPING LEVEL 1 OVERALL DEMOLITION PLAN
MD2.02	81 - PIPING LEVEL 2 OVERALL DEMOLITION PLAN
MI.01	81 - DUCTWORK LEVEL 1 OVERALL PLAN
MI.02	81 - DUCTWORK LEVEL 2 OVERALL PLAN
MI.20	81 - DUCTWORK LEVEL 1 PLAN - RAD OMC
MI.21	81 - DUCTWORK LEVEL 1 PLAN - INFUSION
MI.22	81 - DUCTWORK LEVEL 1 PLAN - MED OMC
MI.23	81 - DUCTWORK LEVEL 2 PLAN - PEDIATRICS
MI.24	81 - DUCTWORK LEVEL 2 PLAN - ENT
MI.25	81 - DUCTWORK LEVEL 1 PLAN - LINAC & PHARMACY
MO.01	81 - PIPING LEVEL 1 OVERALL PLAN
MO.02	81 - PIPING LEVEL 2 OVERALL PLAN
MO.03	81 - MECHANICAL ROOF PLAN - ADDITIONS
MO.02	81 - MECHANICAL ROOF PLAN - MAIN ROOF
M0.01	81 - MECHANICAL SECTIONS
M0.02	81 - MECHANICAL SECTIONS
M0.01	81 - MECHANICAL SCHEDULES
M0.01	81 - MECHANICAL CONTROLS
M0.02	81 - MECHANICAL CONTROLS
M0.03	81 - MECHANICAL CONTROLS
M0.04	81 - MECHANICAL CONTROLS
M0.05	81 - MECHANICAL CONTROLS
EO.01	ELECTRICAL LEGEND - BLDG 81
EO.02	PARTIAL ONE LINE DIAGRAM - BLDG 81
EO.03	ELECTRICAL SCHEDULES - BLDG 81
EO.04	ELECTRICAL PANELBOARD SCHEDULES - BLDG 81
EO.05	ELECTRICAL PANELBOARD SCHEDULES - BLDG 81
EO1.01	ELECTRICAL DEMOLITION LEVEL 1 PLAN - BLDG 81
EO1.02	ELECTRICAL DEMOLITION LEVEL 2 PLAN - BLDG 81
E1.01	LIGHTING OVERALL LEVEL 1 PLAN - BLDG 81
E1.02	LIGHTING OVERALL LEVEL 2 PLAN - BLDG 81
E2.01	POWER OVERALL LEVEL 1 PLAN - BLDG 81
E2.02	POWER OVERALL LEVEL 2 PLAN - BLDG 81
E2.03	POWER OVERALL ROOF PLAN - BLDG 81
E3.01	ELECTRICAL LIGHTING SCHEDULES - BLDG 81
E3.02	ELECTRICAL LIGHTING DETAILS & DIAGRAMS - BLDG 81
E3.03	LIGHTING SCHEDULES
E4.01	ELECTRICAL DETAILS & DIAGRAMS - BLDG 81
E5.00	ELECTRICAL LINC EQUIPMENT DETAILS - BLDG 81
E5.01	ELECTRICAL LINC EQUIPMENT DETAILS - BLDG 81
E5.02	ELECTRICAL CT EQUIPMENT DETAILS - BLDG 81
SEC0.01	SECURITY LEGEND, NOTES & ABBREVIATIONS
SEC1.01	SECURITY OVERALL LEVEL 1 PLAN - BLDG 81
SEC1.02	SECURITY OVERALL LEVEL 2 PLAN - BLDG 81
T1.01	TELECOM OVERALL LEVEL 1 PLAN - BLDG 81
T1.01	TELECOM OVERALL LEVEL 1 PLAN - BLDG 81
T1.02	TELECOM OVERALL LEVEL 2 PLAN - BLDG 81
T1.01	TELECOM DETAILS & DIAGRAMS
FA0.01	FIRE ALARM LEGEND - BLDG 81
FA1.01	FIRE ALARM OVERALL LEVEL 1 PLAN - BLDG 81
FA1.02	FIRE ALARM OVERALL LEVEL 2 PLAN - BLDG 81

DISCIPLINE
DISCIPLINE SUBSET
AD-100.00
SUB-SHEET
SEQUENCE
SHEET TYPE

DISCIPLINE DESIGNATORS	
G	GENERAL
Z	ZONING
EN	ENERGY ANALYSIS
H	HAZARD
BPP	PEPEMENT PLAN
C	CIVIL
L	LANDSCAPE
LI	IRRIGATION
S	STRUCTURE
AD	DEMO - ARCHITECTURAL
AS	ARCHITECTURAL SITE PLAN
A	ARCHITECTURE
I	INTERIOR DESIGN
EQ	EQUIPMENT
PD	FIRE PROTECTION
PD	DEMO - PLUMBING
P	PLUMBING
MD	DEMO - MECHANICAL
M	MECHANICAL
ED	DEMO - ELECTRICAL
E	ELECTRICAL
FA	FIRE ALARM
CM	COMMUNICATION
XF	FOOD SERVICES
X	OTHER

PROJECT NUMBER: 2024014

BULLETIN 3 - 121

SHEET TITLE AND NUMBER

G0.00

COVER SHEET


1. REFER TO ENLARGED FLOOR PLANS (A1.XX SERIES) FOR MORE INFORMATION. REFERENCE PLANS ARE INTENDED TO PROVIDE CONTEXT FOR ENLARGED PLANS.
2. ALL ARCHITECTURAL PLAN TYPES (RCP, EQUIPMENT, INTERIORS, ETC) REFLECT AREAS SHOWN ON THIS REFERENCE PLAN.
3. CONSTRUCTION MAY OCCUR IN PHASES; PHASES ARE NOT SHOWN IN DRAWING SET, AND LOCATION AND TIMELINE TBD BY CONTRACTOR. FINAL BUILT CONDITION IS SHOWN IN DRAWINGS.



PINE TREE ENGINEERING

[illegible]

KEY PLAN:



DATE: 10.28.202


SHEET TITLE AND NUMBER

A1.01


REFERENCE PLAN -
BLDG 81




1 FLOOR PLAN - OVERALL 81 LEVEL 1
A1.01 1/8" = 1'-0"




1 LINAC SOUTH
A4.01 3/16" = 1'-0"




2 LINAC EAST
A4.01 3/16" = 1'-0"




3 LINAC NORTH
A4.01 3/16" = 1'-0"



4 PHARM EAST
A4.01 3/16" = 1'-0"



5 PHARM NORTH
A4.01 3/16" = 1'-0"










6 PHARM WEST
A4.01 3/16" = 1'-0"

Δ	DATE	DESCRIPTION
1	9.23.25	BUILDING 81 CD
2	10.28.25	BUILDING 81 CD
3	11.11.25	BULLETIN 2 - 81

DATE: 10.28.2025

BULLETIN 2 - 81
SHEET TITLE AND NUMBER:

A4.01
ELEVATIONS-
EXTERIOR- BUILDING






1. THE PLUMBING SUB-CONTRACTOR MUST CONDUCT A VIDEO INSPECTION TO CONFIRM THE LOCATION OF THE EXISTING UNDER-SLAB SANITARY DRAIN BEFORE CUTTING INTO THE SLAB. THE FINDINGS FROM THIS INSPECTION WILL BE USED TO ASSESS THE CONDITION OF THE EXISTING UNDER-SLAB SANITARY PIPING AND TO DETERMINE WHETHER IT CAN BE REUSED IN THE RENOVATIONS.

RFS
RFS Engineering
NH: 71 Water St | Laconia, NH 03246
P: 603.524.4647
MA: 24 Federal St, 3rd Floor | Boston, MA 02110
P: 617.494.1464
ME: 82 Hanover St, Suite 2 | Portland, ME 04101
P: 207.761.4647
www.rfsengineering.com
RFS Project #: 10594.001

PINE TREE
ENGINEERING 


PROJECT NUMBER: 2024014

KEY PLAN:



SHEET TITLE AND NUMBER:

P1.00
PLUMBING
UNDERSLAB PLAN -
BLDG 81





1. REFER TO ARCHITECTURAL DRAWINGS, DETAILS AND ELEVATIONS FOR LOCATION AND MOUNTING HEIGHT OF ALL DEVICES PRIOR TO INSTALLATION.
2. COORDINATE MOTORIZED DOOR PUSH BUTTON LOCATION AND MOUNTING WITH OWNER AND ARCHITECT PRIOR TO RUNNING ANY CABLE OR CONDUIT.
3. AS PART OF THE CONTRACT DOCUMENTS, ELECTRICAL CONTRACTOR SHALL REFER TO FINAL APPROVED MANUFACTURER SHOP DRAWINGS FOR WIRING, RACEWAYS, BOXES AND ALL EQUIPMENT. REFER TO E5.01 SERIES DRAWINGS FOR MORE INFO ABOUT ELECTRICAL REQUIREMENTS.
4. PER MANUFACTURER RECOMMENDATION.
5. WIRE TO THIS PANEL USING EXISTING 20A/1P CIRCUIT BREAKER AVAILABLE AFTER DEMOLITION. PROVIDE A NEW PANELBOARD DIRECTORY INDICATING BOTH EXISTING AND NEW CIRCUITS AS REQUIRED.
6. INTERCEPT EXISTING BRANCH CIRCUIT AND EXTEND TO SERVE NEW RECEPTACLE AS SHOWN.
7. ELECTRICAL CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE 2#10 & 1#10G, 3/4" CONDUIT FROM THIS PANEL TO JUNCTION BOX FOR CONNECTION OF ALL OF THE NEW DAMPERS. FOR LOCATION OF DAMPERS, REFER TO MECHANICAL AND FIRE ALARM DRAWINGS.

RFS
RFS Engineering
NH: 71 Water St | Laconia, NH 03246
P: 603.524.4647
MA: 24 Federal St, 3rd Floor | Boston, MA 02110
P: 617.494.1464
ME: 82 Hanover St, Suite 2 | Portland, ME 04101
P: 207.761.4647
www.rsengineering.com
RFS Project #: 10594.001

MAINEHEALTH
MID COAST CANCER CENTER RENOVATION
81 Medical Center Drive
Brunswick, ME 04011

[illegible]

KEY PLAN:



DATE: 10.28.2025

SHEET TITLE AND NUMBER:

E2.01

POWER OVERALL

LEVEL 1 PLAN - BLDG

81