

TOWN OF CHEBEAGUE ISLAND COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING COMMITTEE

A Vision for Chebeague?

2009 Chebeague Visioning Survey

Elizabeth A. Howe

July 26, 2009

2009 CHEBEAGUE VISIONING SURVEY

Visioning is used in the development of comprehensive plans to provide a way for members of the public to articulate how they would like their community to develop over the period of the plan. Visioning is generally done in meetings where people can discuss ideas, get feedback and hopefully, converge on a common vision of where the community should go in the future.

The schedule of Chebeague's planning process would logically have produced a visioning process that would occur in the fall or winter. However, the Town has a large and stable summer population, many of whom have been coming to the island for several generations. These people own houses and land and have a significant financial and psychic investment in the community. Meetings during the winter would have excluded this group. Instead the Comprehensive Planning Committee decided to do a survey that could be sent to everyone.

A Survey Committee made up of Mabel Doughty, Donna Damon, Jane Frizzell, Beth Howe, Peter Olney and Hugh Coxe, worked on several approaches to asking the questions and finally decided that, given the relatively small number of total respondents involved, a survey with largely open-ended questions would be the best way to elicit people's ideas about the future of the Town without putting words in their mouths. The questions describe the present situation for each planning topic – such as transportation to the mainland or land use – and ask the respondent what they would like to see “for the next generation”.

This strategy had some drawbacks. The major one is that writing a paragraph in answer to each of a series of these open-ended questions is much more difficult and time consuming than checking boxes. Respondents did skip questions or sometimes wrote that they had no ideas on a topic. But having open-ended questions undoubtedly reduced the response rate. Since response rates are generally high for Chebeague surveys, this did not necessarily pose a major problem. But the bias toward people who were willing to work through 11 small essays is real.

The Survey Population

Because the questions in the survey asked about issues largely relevant to residents of Great Chebeague, the population surveyed did not include residents and owners on the outer islands. A separate survey of people who live on the outer islands is planned.

The island's population, even with summer people included is so small that sampling is not relevant. The population for this survey was defined primarily as the year-round and summer people listed in the Chebeague Directory which has about 750 listings of people who live on Great Chebeague.

The Chebeague Directory includes year-round residents and summer people who own property on the island. It also includes grown children of property owners who come regularly, and a few people who are regular renters.

In addition, 105 people and family trusts on Great Chebeague which were not listed in the Directory were added to the list from the Town property tax records. Many of the 26 family

trusts are made up of people who did get surveys as part of the Directory population. But 79 are people who simply own property on Great Chebeague.

Surveys were sent to individuals rather than households, since even people in the same household might have different ideas about how they would like to see Chebeague develop in the future. The two lists produced a survey population of 834 people – 32 percent year-round residents, 55 percent summer people and 13 percent property owners.

Survey Distribution

The survey was administered in two forms. One was a traditional paper questionnaire, sent by U.S. mail, with return postage. The other was an on-line version at surveymonkey.com. All adult, year-round residents, 267 people, were sent paper questionnaires on January 16, 2009. These also included an insert saying that if the respondent could not write the survey out, they could call the Comprehensive Planning Committee and someone would come to interview them. A small number of respondents took up this invitation. Finally, the letter explained how to get to the [surveymonkey](http://surveymonkey.com) website, which 44 year-round residents did.

The survey also included a stamped postcard with the respondent's name on it. They were asked to mail it in separately from their questionnaire so that the Committee would know who not to send reminder postcards to.

An additional 304 people off the island were sent paper questionnaires exactly the same as the island ones except without the offer of an interview. The 105 property owners were also sent the same questionnaire.

Finally 159 people off the island who have email addresses in the Chebeague Directory were sent an email explaining the survey and giving the respondent a link to the [surveymonkey](http://surveymonkey.com) site. They were also told how to get a paper survey if they preferred that way of filling it out. Those who filled out the survey on line were asked to send an email to the committee saying they had completed it.

At the beginning of February reminder postcards were sent to people who had not returned their postcards. The people who had been sent the [surveymonkey](http://surveymonkey.com) link by email were given an email reminder, and, if they still didn't respond, a postcard reminder. The questionnaire on [surveymonkey](http://surveymonkey.com) was closed on March 15. Mailed questionnaires were accepted until April 1.

Responses

In the end, 298 people returned their surveys, for an overall response rate of 36 percent. Of these 297, 89 were returned by year-round residents, 171 by summer people and 1 by a person who only owns property. However, 37 people did not send in any demographic information. Several were people who declined, but most were people who did not realize that there was a separate section on demographics after the main questions in the [surveymonkey](http://surveymonkey.com) version.

As a practical matter, this turned out to be a survey of 297 year-round and summer residents, if the surveys sent to property owners only are taken out. The response rate for the two groups was about the same: 33 percent of the surveys sent to year-round residents were returned, while 35

percent of those sent to summer people were. The 37 people who gave no background information are not counted here.

The demographic information on the individuals (not households) who filled out the survey is given in Table 1. The table does not produce many surprises. Most everyone,

Table 1: What Kind of People Responded to the Survey?

	Year-Round	Summer	Total
	N = 89	N = 171 max	N = 260 max
How long have you lived or been coming to Chebeague?	Average 29 yrs plus 10 “lifelong” range 1 – 86 yrs	Average 42 yrs plus 15 “lifelong” range 2 - 85 yrs	
Are you a property owner?			
Yes	84 94%	147 89%	231 85%
No	5 6%	19 11%	24 15%
Where do you work?			
On Chebeague	27 30%	4 2%	31 12%
Commute to mainland	16 18%	6 4%	22
Both	13 15%	7 4%	20 8%
Unrelated to Chebeague	0	92 55%	92 36%
Not employed or retired	32 36%	59 35%	91
Partly retired	1 1%		1 .3%
Do you own a business on Chebeague?			
Yes	22 25%	7 4%	29 12%
No	65 75%	157 96%	222 88%
Do you have children at home?			
No	64 72%	Not Relevant	
Pre-school	3 3%		
Elementary school	12 13%		
School on mainland	10 11%		
Age N = only paper surveys	N = 41	N = 34	
<20	0	0	
21-40	0	1 3%	
41-65	15 37%	13 38%	
>65	26 63%	20 59%	

year-round and summer, owns property on the island. Year-round residents work on Chebeague or its waters, commute to the mainland or do some of each, while summer people mostly work somewhere “away” and come to Chebeague on vacation, though 10 percent work while they are here. Similarly, a quarter of year-round people own businesses on the island compared to only 4 percent for summer people. The proportion of retired people who responded to the survey was almost exactly the same for the two groups.

The average length of time that people have lived on the island is lower for year-round residents. This is probably due to two factors. One is that there were more young year-round people who filled out the survey. The other is that retirees who move to the island, who were not summer people with a long island history, show up as living only a few years on the island. But length of time on Chebeague cannot be used as a surrogate for age.

The small amount of data on age of respondents who sent in paper questionnaires just tells us that people, summer or year-round who did it on paper tend to be in older age groups.

How Representative of Year-Round Chebeaguers Were the Survey Respondents?

With an overall response rate of only 37 percent, one question that the demographic information raises is whether the group who filled out the questionnaire is at all like the population as a whole. However, we only have independent demographic information for year-round residents of Chebeague; there is no definitive way, outside a survey, to know the demographics of summer people. The data on year-round residents comes from the 2000 Census and the 2008 population count by the Comprehensive Planning Committee.

Perhaps the most relevant issue for exploring the correspondence between respondents and the population as a whole is whether the age range of respondents was different from that of the population as a whole. A number of the topics explored in the survey produce different problems or issues for residents of different ages. Unfortunately, by accident the question on age was not included in the on-line version of the questionnaire, so it is impossible to see the overall age distribution.

The only way to get at whether the 44 year-round people who filled out the survey on-line were different from the 44 who filled it out on paper is to look at the presence or absence of children in households. Among people who filled out the survey on line and provided information about children in the home, 28 or 70 percent had no children at home and 30 percent had children. Among the 37 people who filled out the survey on paper and reported on children in the home, 89 percent had no children at home, while 11 percent did. So the two ways of filling out the questionnaire clearly drew different respondents.

Taken together the total number of individuals who reported that they had children at home was 25 and the number who did not was 64. How does this compare to the proportions in Chebeague's 2008 population? There were 74 individual adults in households with children in 2008 and 259 people in households without. This indicates that 34 percent of people who had children at home responded to the survey, while 25 percent of people who did not responded. This indicates that younger people were somewhat more likely to respond, maybe not surprising given the work involved in filling out the questionnaire.

Analysis

The analysis of open-ended responses to questions is cumbersome since they cannot and should not just be reduced to a numerical coding scheme that can then be used to look at averages or medians or cross-tabulations between, say, age and support for preserving open space, or year-

round versus summer residence and evaluation of the adequacy of the transportation to the mainland.

The method used was to sort the survey responses by a few variables that seemed as if they might tell about differences and then look at all the responses for one question, looking for patterns – what ideas were mentioned by many people, which by only a few, and what ideas were put forward by a single person.

The primary variable that was used to sort the surveys was year-round versus summer residence on the island. While many people in both groups have been associated with the island for many years, often their whole lives and have strong commitments to Chebeague, coming to the island in the summer on vacation is a significantly different experience from living on the island all year and working there. Of course some year-round residents are retired, and some go to Florida in the winter, so there is something of a continuum rather than two entirely different groups. But most year-round residents have no other community that they belong to as they do to Chebeague's, while summer people do have other places they come from. Voters are largely year-round residents, and summer people are not. A survey such as this one for a comprehensive plan can give voice to the concerns and desires of people who do not have a vote, but the two groups should not be confused.

Even so, there are obviously other ways to divide the respondents. Year round residents with children may have different concerns from those who are elderly, for example.

While most of the analysis focused on responses to individual questions, at the end, as part of the analysis of respondents' priorities, each whole survey was looked at as a unit to be sure that the "the whole" really was "the sum of its parts".

Transportation to the Mainland

The question on transportation only described current ways to get back and forth by water to the mainland from Chebeague. But Chebeague has a 50 year history of actual and proposed changes in transportation to the mainland, so residents have a fairly wide image of the options – bridge, car-ferry, passenger-ferry and water taxi. And because of the conflicts these efforts to change the system created, many people have strong preferences about what they consider useful and practical.

So, 7 percent of respondents said they wanted a bridge, with little difference between year-round and summer residents. Most, like the one below, however, did not see it as a very practical option any more.

It might be time to revisit the bridge issue, though funding one would be a tremendous challenge. The boats are no problem for summer people, but no fun when the weather gets cold. Traffic would increase, but we've already seen a huge increase in summer

traffic just from people barging cars over for a couple of weeks of vacation. If open space is protected, the quiet charm of the island could be preserved.¹

One respondent from Washington State suggested a floating bridge, something that does exist there.

On the other side, again with little difference between summer and year-round residents, 17 percent of respondents saw having a bridge as a nightmare:

First and foremost ... NEVER a bridge, ALWAYS by boat(s) Bridges destroy the character of an island ... ☒ allows the ominous criminal element easy -- and anonymous -- access

No Bridge. The current situation is working, perhaps not well, but it is working. I think that it can continue to work, but the fees are difficult and expensive. it would be great to have a more affordable way to get back and forth.

Once in favor of a bridge, I'm not any more even though lugging, tugging and wagging (?) is hard sometimes. It what keeps us unique and a community. The boat has us talking to folks we don't see every day.

Similarly, 6 percent, with no difference between year round and summer people, were beguiled by the idea of a car ferry, though they tended to want it to be "limited" or "exclusive" -- allowing people with Chebeague connections to travel back and forth but not others. Such a ferry would have many benefits in terms of convenience and cost savings.

Consider a very exclusive -- like, by subscription available only to island residents -- CAR ferry Potential benefits ... ☒ significantly reducing parking needs on the mainland; ☒ reducing the number of vehicles having to be owned by islanders; ☒ cleaner air if island cars are newer and/or better maintained and/or fewer vehicles on- and off- island. ☒ fuel purchases can be made off-island -- at real world prices rather than the has-to-be-astronomically-marked-up prices of boat-delivered fuel.

My family has been coming for summer vacations for the past 60 years, and I have seen the advantages and disadvantages of the two ferries as well as the water taxi. I dislike the business of having to take the bus to and from the lot on Rte 1, and wonder how I would find that as a regular part of my life if I fulfilled my dream of living on Chebeague. It seems a special car ferry like the people that live on the islands in Puget sound near Seattle enjoy might be a good option; Note that in this case I would recommend this only for People who live on the island. Such a ferry might take 8 cars at a time. There could be a morning and afternoon car ferry, so that you could drive to town, pack up your purchases and drive it back to the island in the afternoon. Similarly, for doctors appointments for ill or disabled people, all the changes of transportation would be

¹ The quotes are reproduced just the way people typed them into surveymonkey -- spelling, punctuation and font.

Table 2 : The Future of Transportation to the Mainland

	Year-round		Summer		Don't know		Total	
N	N = 84		N = 156		N = 14		N = 254	
Current system ok	42	50%	54	35%	6	43%	102	40%
Keep two ferries	3	4%	33	21%	2	14%	38	15%
Want a bridge	4	5%	11	7%	2	14%	17	7%
No bridge	14	17%	26	17%	1	7%	41	16%
Want a car-ferry	6	7%	9	6%	0		15	6%
No car-ferry	8	9.5	5	3%	0		13	5%
The cumbersome trip is a good thing	7	8%	14	9%	1	7%	22	9%
Parking on Chebeague								
Parking at Stone Wharf a problem	7	8%	26	17%	4	28%	37	15%
Move ferry to Sunset Landing	18	21%	12	8%	0		30	12%
Have remote parking lot	12	14%	6	4%	1	7%	19	7%
Have a round-island shuttle bus	12	14%	18	11.5%	0		30	12%
Have better taxi service	6	7%	5	3%	1	7%	11	4%
Cost								
Parking and ferry are expensive	12	14%	16	10%	2	14%	30	12%
Have lower fares	7	8%	0		0		7	3%
Cost excludes family & friends	6	7%	4	3%	0		10	4%
Get gov't subsidy	6	7%	7	5%	1	7%	14	5.5%
Explore Town takeover of CTC	15	18%	9	6%	0		24	9%
With Town subsidy	6	7%	4	3%	1	7%	11	4%
No takeover	1	1%	2	1%	0		3	1%
Other								
Rt. 1 lot works	0		6	4%	0		6	2%
Rt. 1 lot does not work	0		18	11.5%	0		18	7%
Keep good relations with	3	4%	0		0		3	1%

Yarmouth				
Keep good relations with the State	3 4%	0	0	3 1%

removed by driving onto the car ferry and returning the same way later that day. It also saves the money needed to own and maintain and insure two vehicles. It would lessen the

need for larger parking lots at the ferry wharves. I suppose summer residents (who own property and pay taxes) could pay a premium to use the car ferry, which would subsidize the cost for lower income island residents. It could operate 6 days a week. The idea is to lessen the need for all the cars and parking lots and buses and carrying of bags on and off boats and so forth, without increasing traffic on the island. It seems Chebeague has maintained all the charm of a beautiful wild island for generations, yet in the modern world, for people to live on the island, they pay a price in difficulty of transportation for the rest of us to enjoy the benefits of it being remote. There needs a way to keep it remote to outsiders, while relieving the difficulties of the current access to those who do live there. Such a ferry could go to and from Portland to the Bennetts cove ramp the way trucks do.

The supporters of a car-ferry were countered, in turn, by 5 percent (including 10 percent of year-round people) who specifically wrote that they did not want a car-ferry.

As unfriendly as it may seem, if the island is to stay a quiet, safe and close-knit community, getting to and from the island should not be made entirely easy. A car ferry, for example, would provide easier access.

So altogether, 13 percent of the respondents wanted to make the transportation easier by enabling people to go back and forth in cars. They were greatly outweighed by the half of all year-round residents and the 35 percent of summer people who said that they were satisfied, though not uncritically, with the existing ferry services. As a 58-year summer visitor wrote, perhaps ironically:

What other choices are there? Helicopter?

Another summer person put it quite differently:

Since I am a summer person, I am very happy with the transportation as it is. It may be inconvenient, but it adds to the sense of other-worldliness which is what keeps Chebeague special (sacred?)

Or a year-round person:

The current means of travel between the island and the mainland is complicated but it is also an intrinsic aspect of Chebeague life. If you don't want to structure your life around a ferry schedule, and the limitations that imposes, choose to live elsewhere.

While there seemed to be a difference between year-round and summer people on their evaluation of the present system, this may be misleading because 21 percent of summer people, but only 4 percent of year-round residents, specifically said that they hoped that nay future transportation system would continue to have both the CTC and the Casco Bay Lines. They gave a variety of reasons for this:

Having grown up during the summers on the Island, and experienced all of the above modes of travel to and fro, it seems that the 2 current ferry companies/corporations are both needed to fulfill the year round needs of residents and visitors. Even though the majority of locals appear to gravitate toward CTC, there was a time when four to six landings were in constant use at Chebeague. I cannot count out Casco Bay Lines service, as it serves many non-automotive Portlanders, who otherwise would have to land taxi or otherwise get to Cousin's landing and need to return to town later. The CTC meets the needs for commuters and school children to a better degree, of course, due to their busy schedule of boats and buses. The Casco Bay Lines is well situated to avail itself to foreign visitors, for example, who are used to inter city travel. In regions of our country, like the Cape Cod area, Seattle and San Francisco Bay, larger ferries run constantly (of course to larger localities). Our Island would seem to be better able to serve day trippers, who can contribute to our economy, via Casco Bay Lines.

Adding these two-ferry supporters to those who said they were generally satisfied with the present service suggests that 55 percent see the existing system as viable and reasonable:

At this point I don't know how the system can be approved upon. I think my only minor complaint is the cost of visitor parking at the lots. If people are going to come to the island to visit and spend money, paying \$15 a day gets pricey. But on the other hand I don't want my rates to go up to compensate for lower visitor fares, so I am not sure what the solution is.

Like this person, no one saw the existing system as perfect. Many more people had suggestions about the CTC than about the CBL. But only three respondents had nothing but complaints about cost and cumbersomeness. The rest either saw some redeeming feature or suggested ways to make the ferry services better.

The most-cited redeeming feature of the present system, and the problem with the ideas of a bridge or a car-ferry, is that easier automobile access to the island would encourage many more people to come. Two year-round people pointed out the shaping effect that the transportation system has on the population:

The way they do now, by ferry, private boat or water taxi.....but cheaper! Focus on parking and transportation alternatives...perhaps CTC should be town-owned. There should always be some effort involved in getting here....that way, only the loyal and true will persevere, and our community will keep it's dedicated citizenry. A bridge would be too easy....heaven knows who would invade, not to mention the Sunday drivers. And a

regular car ferry might have a similar effect. Barging should continue to be the only car access.

One of the characteristics of the island is that it is difficult and expensive to bring vehicles to the island and another is that the ferry ride is particularly cumbersome. This “filters” the pool of potential residents and helps to create ‘new islanders’ (people from away) of a certain type.

And so did a summer person who comes only two weeks during the year:

I really want to preserve CTC as a way to get to the island. Many people are short term visitors (even those like me who come every year but only for 2 weeks) who don't own boats and fly into Portland to visit. The CTC provides a faster and more flexible way to get to the mainland. The island needs to be accessible to a wide range and age of people and the CTC most easily fulfills this role. The parking fees and cumbersome nature of the whole transportation issue is fair and needed and helps Chebeague keep its rural character and only those who care enough to make the trip will come. We want folks who care. :-)

So what did current residents think should be changed for future generations? The two major issues were parking and cost. Not surprisingly, more summer people than year-round mentioned the problem of parking at the Stone Wharf. Some were also golfers who saw the issue from both sides. One way to solve this, mentioned by 12 percent overall (21 percent year-round and 8 percent summer) would be to build a new wharf with parking at Sunset Landing

I suggest rekindling the dialogue on the idea of establishing a CTC ferry landing at Sunset Landing. The Stone Pier has forever had inadequate parking and at the height of the summer season, cars parked all along Wharf Rd create an unsightly blight in an otherwise open and beautiful part of the Island. (Not to mention a hazard for golfers!) Moving the public ferry landing to Sunset would allow us to dedicate the use of the Stone Pier for the Island's fishing industry and for private boating and will help in attracting Casco Bay cruisers to come to Chebeague.

Another idea, mentioned by 7 percent (14 percent year--round and 4 percent summer) would be to have a remote parking lot on the island served by a bus (maybe electric or hybrid), either just to the Stone Wharf or to Chandler's Cove as well. Several variants of this idea were floated. This one proposed such a lot for commuters, but others suggested allowing only commuters and fishermen to park at the Stone Wharf while everyone else went to the remote parking.

The combination of CTC and Casco Bay Lines works for me. The parking issue on Chebeague has always been a tough one. I guess the problem has gotten worse with more islanders out of necessity commuting to the mainland for work. Any chance of an off site lot from the stone pier with a shuttle bus to and from the pier specifically for commuters? The shuttle would only have to meet a limited number of boats. Individuals using the shuttle could get reduced commuting tickets for the inconvenience.

And 12 percent dropped the idea of a parking lot and just suggested having a shuttle bus around the island that would go to the wharves as well as other places.

Has anyone considered a bus route on the island that would meet boats, get people to church, shopping, the Library? Other communities are going back to buses as an important method of mass transit that would eliminate some of the cars parked on the docks. I would still like future generations to arrive by boat. We are an island community, and maintaining that continuity is important to the future of land use on the island.

The cost of the ferry and parking was a sore point for 15 percent of respondents (22 percent year-round and 10 percent summer), while an additional 13 summer people complained specifically at the cost of parking at the Route 1 lot.

Until you lower the costs for living on the island, and I specifically mean the transportation costs, it doesn't matter what I'd like. \$15 a day for parking is more than it costs to park at the Maine airport or Boston! And the CTC Board is willing to continue raising rates vs. seeking alternate revenue sources. Your boat ticket prices continue to escalate with no stopping in site. Living on the island requires two vehicles; one on the mainland, one on the island. Double the insurance. Just think how liberating it would be to eliminate those costs for taxpayers on the island by making it, let's say, part of the tax base, or by making CTC a not for profit that accesses grant funds or federal dollars, or at least those costs become write-off's on your state taxes. It would make Chebeague far far more attractive to all ages. Right now it is becoming more and more 'exclusive' simply because of the transportation issue.

Both summer and year-round people commented on the impact of the cost on family and friends on the mainland. A year-round person wrote:

I wish transportation could be cheaper. I know it takes a lot to run such a business, but more people would come if it wasn't as high. It's less embarrassing to meet old friends in Town than have them come here.

And a summer person worried about the future:

It is so expensive to be a visitor to Chebeague. The overnight parking and cost of the boat for a family of 5 plus a dog is really difficult to stomach. I worry that the next generation of my family may decide to opt for a vacation spot that is more convenient and less expensive to get to. I wish there was a way to bring those costs down. I have heard the argument that it is exactly this challenge that makes Chebeague the charming place that it is. True, part of the charm is its remoteness; however, it needs to be somewhat affordable to continue to attract visitors.

State, federal or Town subsidies were one, if vague, answer to this problem. Changing the organization of CTC to a non-profit or an agency of the Town were seen as the likeliest routes to these subsidies – 18 percent of year round residents suggested at least considering Town ownership.

I do feel that the CTC should become part of the town. There will be greater oversight of the day-to-day operations, create a strong management structure, and provide greater stakeholder involvement in company operations. We as riders have no control over rate hikes etc, whereas if this were to be a municipal entity, residents would have a greater say in the changes that take place.

Some had an almost utopian vision of this future. One year round resident said that future generations should travel

Free on ferries supported by the town's taxes and mainland parking underwritten with property taxes.

Other people had ideas for saving money by improving efficiency (1) to reducing the number of trips per day (5). Of course they were balanced out by others who had ideas for more trips in the summer (1) or for kids going to and from school activities (2), and others who wanted a parking garage on Cousins Island (5) or warmer waiting sheds (1).

Finally, there were some respondents who make an effort to think about how Chebeague's transportation system might adapt to changes in energy supplies and costs. Most just mentioned electric vehicles, but this summer person had a coherent image of Chebeague's place in a different energy economy:

I would like to see an increased use of electric vehicles on the island where possible and a decrease in fossil fuel use. Increased business opportunity on the island could reduce the demand for off-island commuting. The ferry system works well but will become increasingly expensive due to likely inflationary trends set in motion by US money supply expansion as well as fossil fuel depletion in the years to come. I believe the link to Portland proper is essential. In the years to come, I believe local ports will handle an increasing responsibility for basic supplies. The trucking industry will become less viable as a means of transporting goods and it remains to be seen whether rail service is resuscitated in the US. Communities on the water will be well situated to maintain their supply lifelines.

The Chebeague Economy

The question about the economy described the variety of work that Chebeague people do: marine activities including fishing, construction, local service, arts and crafts, farming, forestry, vacation related work, commuting to jobs on the mainland and working for island non-profits. The responses were interesting because of which of these elements year-round and summer respondents did and did not discuss. They show the tension in a small community between having a successful, working-class "summer" economy and the desire to have an economy that provides more middle-class, stable year-round jobs with better income.

A basic ten to 20 percent of all the respondents thought the mix of businesses in the economy was good as is. Indeed, 6 percent pointed out that the current diversity of the economy was a strength. A few people in both groups noted that the small size of the population made the

Table 3: The Future Chebeague Economy

	Year Round	Summer	Don't Know	Total
N=	80	152	11	243
Eco is ok as is	16 20%	14 9%	1 9%	31 13%
Fishing is central	13 16%	24 16%	3 27%	40 16% ^x
Keep fishing going		13 9%	1 9%	14 6%
Mixed eco is good	7 9%	8 5%	0	15 6%
Vacation eco & fishing both central/balance	4 5%	17 26%	2 18%	23 9%
Tourism is central	0	16 10%	0	16 7%
Promote it		8 5%	0	8 3%
Promote it but carefully	3 4%	4 3%	0	7 3%
Eco tourism	0	7 5%	0	7 3%
Day-trippers	0	4 3%	0	4 2%
The Inn is important	0	6 4%	1 20%	7 3%
Create more jobs	12 15%	4 3%	1 9%	17 7%
Support existing businesses	0	10 7%	1 9%	
Market Cheb.	5 6%	5 3%	1 9%	11 4%
>Summer people = more jobs	5 6%	0	0	5 2%
Commuting ok	2 2.5%	14 9%		16 7%
Keep CTC commuting fares low	0	8 5%	1 9%	9 4%
Encourage > retirees	1 1%	6 4%	0	7 3%
Keep island affordable	3 4%	4 3%	1 9%	8 3%
Population size	4 5%	5 3%	0	9 4%
Some Town role in eco dev	7 9%	32 21%	0	39 16%
Low property tax helps eco	3 4%	0	0	3 1%

expansion of existing businesses or the development of new ones difficult, and that a larger population might help the economy:

We need a larger island population as well as additional 'high quality' tourism, therefore creating a larger 'customer base'. This would then allow existing island businesses to grow and encourage development of new enterprises. It is unlikely that a year-round population of 350 to 400 is enough to sustain even one year-round restaurant business

Among both year-round and summer residents. 16 percent of respondents thought that fishing should continue to be the central focus of the economy. An additional 9 percent of summer people did not see it as central but thought it would and should continue. A year-round resident made suggestions about improved facilities for fishermen:

Essentially I believe the economy as you have described it seems worth sustaining in more-or-less current proportions. Looking at improving existing shared facilities for marine use (docks, floats, water access) and creating new ones like a boom to load-off load gear, places to leave your work boat for 2-3 day periods to work on seems critical to the marine industry.

A summer person took up the idea, mentioned by ten others, that has been discussed by the island fishermen of “branding” Chebeague’s lobsters:

The challenge will be to keep the fishing industry viable, because that is the backbone of the community. Maybe we need to brand Chebeague island lobsters they way Bangs island mussels are branded

Aquaculture was suggested by 4 year-round and 9 summer people:

I think Chebeague should do what it can to support the marine economy. I think fish farming, such as mussel farming should be encouraged. I think boat building is important. I am very pleased that the boatyard stayed a boatyard and was not sold for the best and highest use, such as housing.

Only a few people in each group thought that fishing was in decline.

Respondents made many suggestions of specific businesses that they thought might be useful and viable on the island (Table 4). By and large, year round and summer people had similar ideas. As Table 2 indicates, among the top suggestions, jobs that involve telecommuting (sometimes with the desire for better internet service) were discussed by 16 percent of year-round and 23 percent of summer people.

While the wireless internet is a big improvement over dial-up, we should pressure FairPoint to make DSL available. The town should encourage development of internet based occupations, and encourage writers, researchers, etc. to come and live here...there are many occupations which allow one to live pretty much anywhere as long as high-

speed internet is available. Transportation and other costs will always put us at a competitive disadvantage; our advantage is our quality of life and the novelty and marketability of 'Chebeague Island' products.

Table 4: Suggested Future Jobs or Businesses

	Year-round	Summer	Total
	N = 80	N = 152	N = 240
Energy utility	11 14%	7 5%	19 8%
Telecommuting	13 16%	35 23%	50 21%
Agriculture	14 18%	22 14%	36 15%
Forestry	4 5%	2 1%	6 2%
Island arts and crafts	7 8%	21 14%	28 12%
Fresh fish market	0	4 3%	4 2%
Aquaculture	4 5%	9 6%	15 6%
Boat building school	4 5%	4 3%	8 3%
Appliance service	4 5%		4 2%
Restaurant	5 6%	5 3%	10 4%

Another wrote:

As the definition of "workplace" changes to things more virtual, the island should be a place where people can, with great ease and facility, work remotely and virtually. . . . The town and the island ought to encourage on-island, off-island real, and off-island virtual, entrepreneurs. In other words, the town ought to encourage commercial ventures on the island, with land use controls as needed. The town must and should maintain the virtual accessibility of "commerce" via the internet.

A third who actually does work on the internet was one of the few to give an example of a specific business that might be a model for Chebeague:

:

We should try to develop some island based business enterprise that would provide year round employment at a variety of skill levels (management, sales, product creation, shipping, etc.) and perhaps with flexible schedules to accommodate child care. With internet sales and the presence of our post office there are surely craft or food oriented businesses we could undertake (look at Stonewall Kitchen in York as a stellar example of doing something with very little to start!)

Also popular, but at the other end of the technological spectrum, 18 percent of year-round and 14 percent of summer people thought that a revival of agriculture would be good for the island – preserving open space while creating income and jobs:

For some time I have thought the island could do more with agricultural use of the open land. Many small vineyards and microbreweries throughout New England have continued

to do well even in this bad economy. I have a relative who just opened a small wine business and has done very well. Other areas of agriculture could include farming for honey, wild berries, and orchards.

This same person went on to say, along with 14 percent of year-round and 5 percent of summer people:

Another possible business benefit would be to invest in alternative energy to offset the cost of electricity. Perhaps solar and/or wind power.

Others mentioned tidal power as well.

Other businesses suggested particularly by summer people were a fresh fish market, including but going beyond lobsters, and more island arts and crafts. Ideas suggested by both year-round and summer people included boat building, a boat-building school, boat or kayak rentals, summer camp, and some kind of summer or year-round school or research center.

The major difference between year-round and summer people was in how they wrote about the “vacation”, “summer” or “tourist” sector of the economy, showing that “where you stand depends upon where you sit”. Only 4 percent of year-round residents saw the vacation economy as being as important to the island as fishing, compared with 26 percent of summer people. Indeed, 10 percent of summer people thought of tourism as the mainstay of the economy, with the best potential for growth:

The economy is a very important component of Island life and it is interconnected. Tourism is the future for the Island. The Island can become a tourist destination. It is a good thing if a sensitive balance is approached. Tourism creates ideas and many ideas have [been] realized. . . . A safe and beautiful community all adds up to be a tourist destination.

Another summer person from the West Coast wrote:

I know that maintaining these elements is important to the island economy. I am not sure I can begin to guess the ratio of importance. In our west-coast community, the "vacation" related establishments, particularly hotels, B&Bs, and vacation rentals, contribute to the local economy in several ways: 1. pay a county or city "transient occupancy tax" (10%!) that is collected from the visitor--- these funds go directly to the county or city general fund; pay a self-assessment percentage (1%) that goes directly to the lodging association for tourism promotional efforts; attract visitors who frequent our restaurants and businesses. The danger is in the balance... or lack thereof. Our community has undergone the transition from natural industries, logging and commercial fishing, and now "hospitality" is our primary industry. A better balance is better.... tourism is too fickle to be the mainstay of a stable economy. Island arts are good, but need a venue outside the island to also sell. Reliable cell phone and internet access is essential to broaden markets and allow for low impact industry and individual work opportunity! Perhaps some

educational facility--- even if only in the summer--- arts, sailing, marine biology, meditation, retreat center, could help in the balance.

Like these people, many summer people saw the need for balance, partly because over development as a tourist destination would destroy what brought them to the island. Nantucket, Bar Harbor and Peaks Island were all mentioned as negative object lessons. But 5 percent thought that tourism should be promoted, while others spun out ideas about what this increased tourism might be like:

Seven people (5 percent) suggested eco-tourism:

I worry about long term viability. Would like to see the tourism industry grow, with both day trippers and over night guests. Would like tourism to be a good fit with community and eco-friendly...e.g., kayaking / sailing / fishing / photography expeditions / schools.

Chebeague now has jurisdiction over several uninhabited islands. I see a possible future, similar to eco-tourism, which would allow people to visit and learn from these valuable and beautiful assets.

Four suggested being more open and hospitable to day-trippers:

Given the limited access to the island and the lack of transportation options once you arrive at either dock, the island is not exactly availing itself of the potential day-tripper market. Maybe it doesn't want to. Maybe it wants to stay a retirement haven, a bedroom community, an ever-shrinking lobstering town. I don't know. Has anyone ever thought of renting bicycles or golf carts at either or both ferry docks? Is that something the Rec Center kids could do? Would it be worthwhile to host an arts festival--either one- or two-day events?

Year-round people do see the advantage in the summer economy:

People who come here [in the summer] don't come to work but there will be people who need to work. People will work for summer people – more people more work – construction, etc.

Three even thought more vacationing on Chebeague should be promoted, though carefully.

But the problem is that a summer economy **is** a summer economy. Twenty percent wrote about the need for more year-round jobs, mentioning the Boatyard, and non-profits as good examples. Several others mentioned the need for island jobs to provide decent salaries and benefits.

On the other hand, few year-round residents wrote about work on the mainland as part of the island economy. The two that did simply presented it as a temporary expedient when island jobs were scarce. The 9 percent of summer people who wrote about commuting saw jobs on the mainland as an ordinary job option, maybe less attractive than telecommuting but providing

access to a broader range of job opportunities. Five percent in addition emphasized the need to keep the CTC commuter fare affordable.

Here the problem seemed to be that working on the mainland and having a viable year-round economy on the island were thought of as mutually exclusive. A “realistic” summer person concluded:

Whether good or bad, I think that realistically, most will have to commute to mainland and I think most workers will have to commute to [the] Island from mainland.

Should the Town Encourage Economic Development?

Most respondents did not address this issue, though a larger proportion of summer people suggested things the Town might do. Nine percent of year-round residents wrote in general terms about the Town playing some kind of role. An additional four percent said that keeping property taxes low would help the economy. Several summer people argued that the Town should not burden business with regulations. Others suggested small business loans from the Town or an economic development non-profit. Providing professional advice to businesses and continuing education or other training to residents were also mentioned.

Education

The Chebeague School enjoyed overwhelming support from survey respondents. In general, year-round residents tended to write about issues of current discussion, while summer people provided general support or general, somewhat abstract ideas for possible improvements.

Almost a third of summer people emphasized how young families would not live on the island without the school and how much the school was the heart of the community.

The school is a vital part of the community--without it the Island will be a "summer only" island. Every effort should be made to keep at least up to 5th grade on the Island. Perhaps the school could sponsor trips for adults that require a donation to the school to attend -- similar to the Historical Society Trips? I am happy to pay more school taxes to assure get great teachers/aids to assure that our kids get an excellent education

The Island Institute's definitive study hangs over all of this. A viable school is the key to a viable year-round island. What I see of the current school is pretty amazing. I compare the kind of intimate, engaged, richly comprehensive education my grandson is getting on Chebeague with the experience of his age-similar cousins around the country and there is no comparison. Perhaps some folk underestimate how good the island school is.

This view was echoed by 16 percent of year-round residents as well:

The school is what will help bring young families to the island. So we should be looking towards what we can do to make the education of Chebeague children one of the best in

the state. Maybe it's to build a new school that connects to the Rec Center and send our students to NYA or Yarmouth. If you have a fantastic opportunity to educate the island's youth, families will see this and want to move here and become part of this community.

Both groups (13 percent of year-round residents and 9 percent of summer) described the island school and the community as intertwined – the one engaging the other.

At a slightly more concrete level, 22 percent wanted the school of the future to be like the school of today, and 6 percent wanted it to aspire to excellence. As two parents with children in the school said:

I would like to see our school become the exceptional school that it has the ability to be. I think that focusing more in experiential education and learning from the island and the life around us is an incredible tool for learning that is not used nearly enough. We should be looking toward members of our community to play more of a role in educating our children.

I believe that the island school is a gift that we should recognize and value. The children at the island school receive a good education and have a lot of authentic learning experiences, do in no small part to the role that volunteers play at the school. We need to be sure that we allocate funds adequately for the school, for continued use of technology, for good quality teachers, and for school staff to meet the needs of the children.

Eight percent of year-round and 17 percent of summer people thought that the present system of having pre-K through 5th grade on the island and middle and high school on the mainland should be continued. Year-round residents, like this one were more attuned to the stresses that the system created:

We must maintain our pre-K through 5 school, and we must provide a rigorous curriculum with adequate supports in place to ensure that our children are adequately prepared to meet the challenges of the mainland single-age classroom. Multi-age teaching is a challenge, and while it can provide many benefits, there is also a risk that island children are not receiving equivalent instructional time in core areas like mathematics and are at a disadvantage academically when they make the transition to the mainland. This is extremely important if we are to attract more families to the island and to ensure that all of our children achieve their full academic potential. Extracurricular opportunities for children in SAD 51 are fraught with difficulty. I would like our children to have an opportunity to transition to Yarmouth public schools as soon as possible, both for academic and extracurricular reasons. The burden on families of middle school and high school kids is enormous: constantly trying to juggle their time and finances to make it possible for kids to participate in extracurricular activities (sports, clubs, drama, music). Many families simply cannot do this, and their kids suffer the loss. Others move off the island either temporarily or permanently.

There was also support from 7 people for the Pre-K program and enthusiasm from 7 percent (18 people) for the new day care program.

Table 5: Education in the Future

	Year-Round		Summer		Don't know		Total	
N	N= 85		N = 151		N = 9		N = 245	
School keeps young families	14	16%	34	22%	0		48	20%
School at heart of community	0		13	9%	1	11%	14	6%
Keep school similar to now	27	32%	24	16%	4	44%	55	22%
Have school be excellent	7	8%	7	5%	0		14	6%
School engage community and vice versa	11	13%	13	9%	0		24	10%
Pre-k-5 on isl/6-12 on mainland works	7	8%	26	17%	1	11%	34	14%
Have simpler, cheaper school	4	5%	1	1%	0		5	2%
Student decline will close school	0		4	3%	0		4	2%
Future Mainland School								
Yarmouth	13	15%	2	1%	0		15	6%
School choice	9	11%	3	2%	0		12	5%
One mainland school	0		2	1%	0		2	1%
School of Excellence								
Have a charter school	0		5	3%	0		5	2%
Have a magnet school	5	6%	1	1%	0		6	2%
Add 6 th grade	3	3.5%	5	3%	0		8	3%
Have a middle school	5	6%	9	6%	0		14	6%
Have a high school	10	12%	10	7%	1	11%	21	9%
More use of internet	1	2%	8	5%	0		9	4%
Build school-Rec connector	4	5%	0		0		4	2%
Help older kids	4	5%	3	2%	0		7	3%

with transportation					
More college scholarships	3	3.5%	2	1%	0
Need good daycare	7	8%	9	6%	0
Have adult ed.	1	2%	5	3%	0

The daycare and the school are key to attracting and retaining young families. The daycare should be subsidized (reduced fees for every island family regardless of circumstance) and the school needs to have an outside consultant (perhaps via a grant) to help establish benchmarks from professional educators who have developed multi-age small schools. Excellence in these areas will attract families that can afford to purchase homes and survive the difficulties for living on the Island. The Island needs to capitalize on its excellent life for children and families while being commutable to an urban area.

Two summer people said they thought it should be a volunteer effort, not supported by tax revenues.

There were a few nay-sayers to this generally positive and hopeful image. One life-long couple wanted simpler, less expensive education:

THE SCHOOL HAS ALREADY BEEN PUT ON A PEDESTAL. AND IT'S HIGH ENOUGH. THE CHILDREN ARE ALREADY TUTORED TO THE HILT! ELIMINATE SOME OF THESE TEACHERS BY COMBINING JOBS. MORE EMPHASIS ON ACADEMICS. LESS FIELD TRIPS. THE SCHOOL SHOULD NOT DEVOUR OUR TAX MONEY UNNECESSARILY. HOW ABOUT A SMALLER SCHOOL BUS?

There were three other people who more gently suggested “saving when we can but keeping the school good”.

And four summer people doubted that the island would be able to attract enough families with children to keep the school going:

I'm not sure there will be a next generation of school children on Chebeague that will warrant keeping the school open. Unless more 20-30 year old couples relocated to the island the kid population will diminish quickly.

Beyond these generalities, respondents wrote about ways in which education might be changed and improved. Two issues got particular attention. One was the very practical and fairly immediate issue of where older students should go when the SAD 51 contract ran out. A second focus was the idea of charter and magnet schools.

On the first issue about education on the mainland, thirteen year-round and two summer people wanted Chebeague to enter into a contract with Yarmouth, for some, the sooner the better:

I would like to see the Middle and High School children go to Yarmouth. It makes sense to send them there because it is closer, they have a bus that already comes to Cousins Island, and the classes would be a little smaller than they are now. The children would also have a better chance at participating in sports as the school doesn't make sports the highlight of their school.

I would like our children to have an opportunity to transition to Yarmouth public schools as soon as possible, both for academic and extracurricular reasons. . . If we wish to keep the families we have, and encourage others to move here, we must make this transition now. The cost to our community of losing more families will be much greater than the cost of transitioning these students to Yarmouth before 2014.

On the other side, nine year-round and three summer people thought school choice at some level would be the better alternative. A year-round resident wrote:

I think the k-5 or k-6 school should continue. I think that parents should be allowed to tuition children to whatever school they want, including both private and public schools. Chebeague should not enter into a contract with another town to take Chebeague school kids.

And a summer person who has been coming to Chebeague for 59 years, thought that the ability to have school choice might in itself draw families to the island:

The current arrangement of grades seems reasonable and workable. In the future, however, I think that making Chebeague a tuition paying town might actually increase its attractiveness to families with teenagers who want more choice in education and who want to live in greater Portland or Southern Maine.

While these two respondents were thinking of complete choice of schools, one year-round resident asked only for transportation support to any school and another only included public schools.

But it was left to a graduate of the existing system to penetrate beyond the general attractiveness of school choice:

I am confident that the island school will continue to provide a high-quality education to our elementary-age children. I had a wonderful experience at CIS as a child in the 1990's, and I know that the talented staffers and board members at the school continue to insure the quality of elementary education. I am more concerned about the secondary school students. I feel very lucky to have attended Greely High School, and I am happy to have made so many wonderful friends in Cumberland and North Yarmouth. Yet many of my age-mates did not adjust to the mainland schools as well, and some felt alienated from the mainland. I wish something could be done to address this issue. My deepest fear is that if island students stop attending Greely High School and Middle School, they might be scattered among different mainland schools. I think that would destroy the already fragile sense of community among island students in grades 6-12. If island students are no

longer able to attend Greely, I hope they can switch to a different school as an entire group.

In relation to the Chebeague School, rather than the mainland school, a number of people were interested in the idea of making the school itself a greater draw for families with children by making it a charter or a magnet school. The two ideas are not the same – charter schools are private or quasi-private schools and magnet schools provide a specialized curriculum such as science or the arts that attracts especially good students. But here both were used to describe a future Chebeague school that would be excellent, innovative and technically advanced.

I would love to see the school pick up a theme and work align the learning results around those activities. Some ideas - Coastal habitats, leadership, life cycles or even more general - science, art, With the small staff it would be important that it was not dependent on any one teacher as we would not want the institutional knowledge to leave with the teacher. The school embraces many volunteers who faithfully serve year after year and they could play primary roles in the learning process. Personally I have always wished we could serve our students grade 6-8 but the students and the parents of those students have for the most part indicated an eagerness to have the mainland experience at that time.

Like this person, others thought that this kind of strength might make it possible for the school to expand back to 6th grade (8 people), to a middle school (14 people), or even to a full Pre-K – 12 school (21 people though seven of these said they thought the idea was good but probably not practical). A summer person gave instructions for where to go for information:

“It is vital to make Chebeague attractive, financially feasible, and even exciting place to raise children. Here is a beginning list of options to explore: Work with Maine Association for Charter Schools <http://www.mainecharterschools.org/> establish the Chebeague Island School as a charter school with the focus on identifying best practices for rural/island schools and seeking out excellence in the teaching staff. It is vital that all interested on the island consider this school 'theirs' and be invited in timely and effective ways to offer their time, talent, and service.

One year-round resident used another unconnected island as a model:

Work towards a K-12 full school, with both day students and boarders for children from off-island. Make the upper school a magnet for students from away (like the North Haven School).

And a second saw internet technology as the key to this idea:

Our current, Town of Chebeague model seems to work. With a more secure/stable internet connection, more virtual/online/interactive learning opportunities should be pursued and implemented. It would be exciting to pursue the possibility of establishing a 'magnet' middle/high school on Chebeague which would support our island children and attract mainland children.

There were also many other specific suggestions for things respondents would like to see:

- Experiential education (5 people)
- Renovating the existing school building (1)
- Building a connector from the school to the rec (4)
- Making more use of volunteer helpers in the school (2)
- Encourage higher education by having more scholarships (6)
- Having some adult education at the school (6)
- Having students preserve island history by interviewing older residents (1)
- Look for ways to make commuting to and from the mainland for extracurricular activities easier (7)
- Summer school for island and mainland kids (2)
- Better lights on the Cousins Island Wharf for kids going to and from school in winter (1)
- Have home-schooling after 5th grade (1)
- Working more with schools and Long and Cliff Islands (1)
- Having a place on the mainland where parents and students could stay if necessary (1)
- Teaching kids that gossip and backbiting is bad (1)
- Support the program with more grants (1) and special programs (1)

Community

Maybe not surprisingly, the answers to the questions about what the future community should be like and what the future population should be overlapped and reflected what respondents had said about the school, as well. Many people saw connections between who the future population might be and what kind of community and school they would create.

Overall, a third of all respondents just said they liked the character as it is now:

**WHY CHANGE ANYTHING? CHEBEAGUE'S SIMPLICITY, CHARACTER,
BEAUTY, DIVERSITY AND SENSE OF COMMUNITY CAN'T BE BEAT! LET'S
PROTECT IT FOR THE FUTURE GENERATION.**

In fact most people who went beyond the most simple statements of support, basically described what they liked about the community rather than thinking about how it might change in the future. An additional quarter of the year-round respondents described it particularly as a caring community – one that gave people autonomy but provided help if it was needed. Two had similar thoughts:

Chebeague is a caring community! What could be better than to be sure we know our neighbors' needs and respond to them as people are doing at the present, whether on the island year-round or away, but still concerned and in touch.

I love the caring and concern that Chebeaguers show for one another and I hope that will always be a quality that we hold dear and try to continue. In times of crisis (which can arise when least expected) there will be people that will come together and solve (or at least try to) the problem. When people live with the expectation that everyone helps and

we are all part of the whole we become a much better place. I think many Chebeaguers take that for granted until they go elsewhere and notice the autonomy. People learn a certain patience and tolerance living on an island . . .

Nine percent of summer people said the same,

I see Chebeague as having a true sense of community, where people pull together, care and really look out for each other. It is a year round working community with a population diversified by age, income, summer and year round residents. Preservation of this community depends largely on keeping the school and keeping housing affordable for all segments of the population. As a summer resident, I like the friendly, low key environment . . .

It may be that living year-round on the island through winter storms and with a smaller population makes this caring quality not only more evident to year-round residents, but also more important. Instead summer people tended (5 percent) to say that the community was welcoming and inclusive.

Both year-round and summer people wrote about the importance to the idea of community of the island's history

Heritage, sense of history and local traditions. We must not forget where and how we came to be on this great island. Our families for generations have survived doing as our

forefathers have done and I want my children and grandchildren to be able to enjoy and prosper from their heritage.

Eight percent of all respondents (19 people) wrote about the role that the many island non-profits played in maintaining a sense of community. Six percent emphasized the importance of participation in these organizations. An additional six summer people emphasized particularly how they made it possible to meet other people. Most of the people who wrote about them favored maintaining many organizations, though three year-round residents did suggest some consolidation. In the same vein, 6 percent of all the respondents mentioned the plethora of activities on the island as contributing to the strong sense of community.

Two summer people captured this aspect of community:

I have been a summer native my entire life (60 years) and in that time, I have seen few obvious changes in Chebeague's community characteristics. I have noticed, though, that there seems to be more of a sense of community over the last 20 years or so - due largely to the website (posting activities, etc.), the Rec Center, Commons, and other organizations that bring people together. This is what I hope will continue for future

Table 6: The Future of the Chebeague Community

	Year-Round		Summer		Don't Know		Total	
	N = 81		N = 159		N = 11		N = 251	
Keep as is	31	38%	49	31%	2	18%	82	33%
A caring community	20	25%	14	9%	3	27%	37	15%
An inclusive, welcoming community	0		8	5%	1	9%	9	4%
Keep heritage alive	6	7%	20	13%	2	18%	28	11%
Keep it simple	7	9%	5	3%	0		12	5%
Protect island env't/open access	7	9%	8	5%	0		15	6%
Keep having many non-profits	9	11%	9	6%	1	9%	19	8%
Consolidate non-profits	3		0		0		3	1%
Participation in organizations is important	9	11%	6	4%	1	9%	16	6%
Having many activities adds to community	4	5%	10	6%	0			
Feeling of safety	0		3	2%	0		3	1%
Make island more affordable	4	5%	7	4%	0		11	4%
Socialize new residents	5	6%	0		2	18%	7	3%
Have another bar	1	1%	0		2	18%	3	1%
Have a bridge	0		1	.6%	3	27%	4	2%

generations..... a great part of this is intangible & hard to describe, but it's that "feeling" and sense of home that I get when I step onto the stone pier for the first time each spring. It fills my soul.

It's an amazing place with so much energy and commitment. Few small communities can rival it. It seems to draw the best from all, including the infusion of funds from vacationing families and support of core activities and social events from the long-term residents. I'm very impressed with how this all works so well on Chebeague.

And a year-round resident wrote about the centripital effect of modern media that even a small, caring community is subject to:

The single most important thing in maintaining Chebeague's unique culture is participation in community at high levels. Keeping a large workforce, like fisherman and builders on the island (i.e. people who live and work there) enables and encourages that participation. I think that anything that can be done to get people to get out and interact regularly will work toward that end. Technology is biggest threat to that. Watch TV, calling on the phone instead of "calling on" your neighbor, the web. All important components of modern society that aren't going away; the challenge is to make the personal experience more enticing. I think the community here does that well but it must be encouraged more and more as the technology increasingly becomes part of the island. The Boat, the store, the hall are all important centers to me.

Another thread in the fabric of Chebeague's community that people commented on was its simplicity and the desirability of maintaining it. Year-round people tended to think of it as not becoming like the mainland:

I am loathe to see the rush to conformity with the mainland. People from away ask what makes the island so special? The answer – it's not the mainland. To be sure not all things are convenient, but it seems to me for every "amenity" gained, we edge a bit more away from the character of what we love most about this place.

But "mainlanders" expressed somewhat the same sentiments in saying that they wanted island life to remain slow and quiet.

Finally, there were a number of respondents who included in their idea of the "community" the natural beauty of the island and the fairly free access to places on it.

As a summer resident, I like the friendly, low key environment, the natural beauty of the island and the views, the open spaces and access to the beaches and water, the freedom of movement and the escape from the mainland hustle and bustle.

A year-round resident explained how the community defined attitudes toward the natural environment and how this was its most attractive characteristic.

Chebeague's sense of community is its strongest drawing factor for old and new residents. Need to protect it. There is an opportunity for these values to shape more of our physical environment - e.g. keeping the coast open - sharing access and responsibilities for maintaining shared areas - shared sense of land and sea stewardship. Make our character part of a strengthened export - branding of Chebeague - whether it is our lobsters- our crafts - our summer rentals - our internet-based businesses ...

Given all this enthusiasm for the various elements that create a unique sense of community on Chebeague, some people did write about how it might be maintained, or even improved. Some

year round people emphasized the need to socialize newcomers to the heritage and traditions of the island:

The community should welcome newcomers but inform them about island history and traditions so that fishing rights, shore access, trails, etc. remain a part of island life.

Population

Thinking about the nature of the community led some people to think about what kind of people they thought were particularly important contributors to the sense of community. The two most common ideas were that diversity of age is a strength of the present community, combining the wisdom of age and the new ideas of youth, and that attracting more young families would strengthen it more, especially by bringing new blood into the island economy and maintaining the island school.

This turned out to be a good introduction to people's answers to the question of what kind of population mix they thought the island should have in the future. There was a small proportion (5 percent) of respondents who thought it was pointless or even improper to think about shaping who lives on Chebeague in the future.

Populations have waxed and waned and will continue to do so. Let people decide what is in their self interest. Look! There are cellar holes all over Maine as agriculture moved to the midwest....that's OK. We now have more forest! Don't even think of subsidizing specific industries, or populations...let people and the market decide!

Another 17 percent said they thought the current population mix was fine and that it should be maintained. A year-round resident wrote:

I would like it to be as is. It is a hard way of life in the winter but in the summer we get many outsiders and that helps keep everyone going in the winter. We must not be taken over by the large city influences. Internet services and cable tv. Would help a lot of people stay on the island and work from their homes on a cottage industry business. Keep the transportation fees for commuters in line with gas prices. I have not heard one person that goes to work every day complain about riding the boats! That is because they want to live where they do. Just keep taxes and prices of services affordable for us all.

Another said:

I really don't see anything wrong with the way it is. *Why not?*

But the question itself, by highlighting differences between the island's demography and the state's as a whole, nudged people, and especially summer people, away from simply accepting the current pattern. This produces ideas that might not otherwise have emerged and produced a

Table 7: Future Population

	Year-Round		Summer		Don't Know		Total	
	N = 76		N=153		N = 12		N = 241	
Keep same mix	18	24%	20	13%	2	17%	40	17%
Stay diverse	10	13%	22	14%	2	17%	32	14%
Larger population	0		7	5%	1	8%	8	3%
Age								
Mix of ages	13	17%	18	12%	0		31	14%
Not just a retirement com.			4	3%	0		4	2%
Attract/keep young families	30	39%	53	35%	5	42%	88	37%
Encourage more retirees	6	8%	17	11%	0		23	9%
New & long-time families	3	4%	0		0		3	1%
Youth 18-29								
Encourage to stay	6	8%	14	9%	0		20	8%
Leaving is normal	6	8%	4	3%	0		10	4%
Some come back	5	7%	3	2%	0		8	3%
Eco & social life not good for them	3	4%	12	8%	0		15	6%
Income								
Mixed income	8	10%	9	6%	1	8%	18	7%
Keep island affordable	0		5		0		5	2%
Higher median income	0		8	5%	2	17%	10	4%
More job opportunities	0		16	10%	0		16	7%
Summer Population								
Not just summer	7	9%	6	4%	0		13	5%
Have balance of summer & YR	0		12	8%	2	17%	14	6%
Summer people are important	4	5%	0		0		4	2%
Can't/shouldn't control who comes	5	7%	6	4%	2	17%	13	5%

diversity of views about how some issues might be dealt with that amounted to a “conversation” on policy options.

Fourteen percent of respondents (with no difference between year-round and summer people) said that the population should be diverse. It should not become either an island of summer people (13 people) or a retirement community (4 people). An additional 17 percent said they wanted diversity of age groups, but added that they also wanted to see more working families with children.

I would like the current levels maintained, with perhaps more families with young children. Young families tend to invest themselves in building community, and they have infectious energy and positive attitudes. Not to say others don't, but I think the young families are effective engines.

I would hope the year-round population would be more aligned with a cross-section of 'anywhere, USA', with a mixture of growing families, working head(s) of families, and retirees... some children will move away, but some families will move on island if there is a steady economy, and good connectivity to the mainland (data, transportation, healthcare, etc.) - I thought the summer population was bigger, but 1-3000 is probably fine... the houses aren't really crowding each other yet like some of the other islands nearby - could probably sustain a larger 'snow-bird' population, or whatever the reverse is called for the folks who summer on Chebeague 4-6 months a year, rather than the 4-6 week vacationers...

A few saw this as essential to balance out a likely future increase in both retirees and summer people. The retirement of the baby-boom generation would be likely to bring more retiring summer people – three summer mentioned in the survey that they hoped to retire to the island, while the expansion of summer families over the generations could increase that population as well:

Again more people between 18 and 30, and older but still in child-bearing years. Probably will have a lot of baby-boom native islanders and summer people retiring to/on Chebeague over the next 10 years, need to balance them out. Probably will have major growth of summer people as long-time families have more generations. These latter two groups will bring income into the community, but again, balance with younger people.

Another 30 percent wrote primarily about keeping and attracting young families

I would like to see an increase in the number of people with young children. I believe that the school and families are central to keeping the year round population growing and healthy. But we can't depend on children raised on the island to always return here to raise their own children. We have to look at making the island an appealing place to people from outside so that we can attract families and create diversity.

The focus on the importance of the school during the secession movement seems to have raised consciousness about the need to keep it well supplied with children as one central piece of a sustainable year-round community.

Focus on increasing the share of the year-round population in the 30-55 age-group. This means attractive on-island job opportunities and easy access to work on the mainland - minimum critical mass of younger people in this age group, about 40 couples, essential - need the kinds of services that attract this age group - great school (we already have the nucleus); childcare (getting started!); fun places to hang out together in the evenings during the winter (nothing at all in the winter except organized social activities) - If we achieve this - the rest of the demographics will be much healthier - and better supported whether through volunteer services like the fire department and rescue or family/friends/community networks.

Like this person, some people wanted incentives to get families to come

I believe we need to create an environment where young people and young families will be attracted to the island. This could be achieved by offering a subsidized daycare, an excellent school (not a Cumberland clone), a well-supported middle and upper school program with assistance for transportation issues and reduced-rate hotel rooms, reduced income housing (to attract skilled tradesman) and a robust recreation center.

Others argued for being cautious about the possible problems associated with incentives for people “from away”.

The statistics presented here are helpful. A mix of ages and incomes is essential. It would seem that we are a little high on retirees and a little low on young children. I think it is important to have young families on the Island, but not to the extent of luring them here with offerings, as I have heard suggested. Many people are not suited to Island life, and incentives to live here would bring people for the wrong reason, and they would not stay. I know we need to plan for the future but I think the population makeup has been working well as is, without "manipulation".

One summer person did raise the argument often heard in mainland communities about the problems that could result from attracting young families with children.

It looks good now. If we had a huge influx of younger people they would possibly need more tax dollars to educate children. And like a lot of seasonal communities, the tax \$ would come from the summer cottages and year-round water front homes – pushing prices higher as 2nd and 3rd generations inherit and can't afford higher taxes. As the waterfront values increase, so do the interior lots and then no one with an average income can live on Chebeague. It's a fine balance. Be careful.

Though, as the year-round resident above noted, the island is “a little high on retirees”, 8 percent of respondents thought more retirees would be useful because they have the time and skills to work for voluntary organizations, sometimes pay substantial taxes and, mirroring the concern of

the one just above, they don't have children in the school. The same arguments were made about summer people

It seems to have a very nice mix at present. Summer residents don't use the school or other facilities, but do pay a good deal of taxes. I can only imagine that this helps the town with much needed income.

The relatively small proportion of Chebeague's population between 18 and 29 generated what amounted to a conversation on the reasons and possible solutions. Eight percent of respondents wrote about encouraging young people to stay on the island.

We need to figure out ways to incentivize young people to stay. I think there is some indication that there is an indigenous boat building skill base that someone should galvanize and create a business that could be an alternative to lobstering.

But 10 people (4 percent) said it was natural for young adults to leave the island – to go to college, to explore themselves and the world. As a year-round resident wrote:

This is a difficult place for 18-24 year olds. That is an age where you're going off to college and spending time with peers. Chebeague limits those activities.

And another:

It is notable that there is a lack of young adults compared to the state population but I don't think this is a bad thing. It's worse if people grow up here and never leave and experience other places. If they come back they usually are committed to the island and realize its specialness compared to other places. I am not sure it's particularly "healthy" place for young adults in terms of opportunities for work, recreation and social things.

Like this person, five year-round people pointed out that some return later, with stronger commitment to island life. Another 18 (7 percent) had a darker view, saying that the present economy has few good jobs for young people and a pretty slow life-style.

The lower than state normal (and even lower than national I think) % of 18-29 suggests a problem with attracting or retaining young adults who will be the next generation. This is probably due to the slow lifestyle and limited job opportunities. The slow lifestyle, of course, attracts retirees. I'm not sure this will really change given the over characteristic of Chebeague. However, I think it would be desirable to increase the % of young adults in order to keep the community alive and vibrant.

The most common solution to this problem, mentioned by 10 percent of summer people, was the creation of more job opportunities. Seven particularly mentioned telecommuting jobs as a possibility but were not specific about how this would work.

The fairly low island median income on Chebeague seems to have been known to year-round residents, but it seems to have come as something of a shock to some summer people. One summer person wrote:

It seems obvious that on a median household income below statewide average, it would be crazy to assume Chebeague could attract many "average" families. Housing, land, transportation, school complications are all working against the average family trying to make a go on Chebeague. Young adults must either get very creative in their income generation and budget well, or have access to more than the average year-round income. This is an unfortunate trend. It seems we really need to figure out a way to retain families, attract and hold small businesses on Chebeague.

There were two different "takes" on this issue. One, discussed by 17 percent of summer and 10 percent of year-round people, was to try to create jobs that would provide more income. The other, mentioned by five summer people (2 percent), was to make living on the island more affordable.

As some respondents had said in relation to the economy, 7 people thought that a larger year-round population would help the island economy and community.

I would like to see the year round population continue to increase so that opportunities for additional year-round businesses could also increase. We need more people. Those who are here year round are shouldering an enormous burden in terms of time and resources trying to keep all of our many island institutions alive. We need to encourage people of all ages who have the both the desire to live here and the willingness to contribute to our community.

Finally, summer people had some specific concerns about the summer population. They were the 12 people who mentioned the desire to have a balance of summer and year-round residents. This may have reflected some ambivalence since two additional summer people wondered what rate of growth in the summer population would be appropriate for the island, and three others said the proportion should be no larger than it is now, and maybe even smaller.

At a much more specific level, a few summer people worried about the end of summer life on Chebeague as they had known it.

Seems like we're losing so much of the island character as life-long residents and long time summer residents die off. In another 20 years all the baby boomers that came to the island post WWII and spent all their summers there will be gone. None of our children, even though they would love to, can afford to spend their summers on the island with their kids. With the economy as it is, those of us that live year round more than 300 miles away may not be able to get back. I would love to have Chebeague keep going as it is, but I see short term renters from neighboring states becoming the mainstay of the summer population by 2030. It's too bad, but the island will never be the same once that happens.

Land Use

The responses to the questions on future land use show Chebeaguers, both year-round and summer, grappling with what the balance on the island should be between the natural and the built environment. The question itself posed this dichotomy, briefly describing the current mix of single family houses, businesses and public and private open space. The people who answered the question (33 did not) gave these elements their own policy “spin” producing several distinct images of the future and a wide variety of policy ideas for getting there.

Chebeague has had a human landscape since the 18th century. Though its maximum year round (and probably summer population) were reached in about 1890 to 1900 (about 600 year round residents), the landscape remained rural – scattered farms with open fields, denser settlements at ferry wharves and a few other spots. Even as late as the 1960’s there was still some farming, and as the farming stopped, many of the fields grew up into second-growth woods. Some wood is still harvested for use. So the island still “feels” rural. But residents and summer people alike see that the development boom that began in the 1970s makes the survival of this rural character increasingly tenuous.

The single most common response on the land use question, mentioned by 41 percent of all respondents, was the preservation of open space. Access to the ocean, the Town’s largest open space, and a central part of its economy, was the second most common response, mentioned by 25 percent of all respondents.

While these were the two most mentioned issues, the respondents wrote about development in somewhat different ways. Just over ten percent (11percent) only wrote about the need to preserve the natural environment, not only woods, wetlands, beaches and views, but also farming and managed forestry.

I very much like it that land development has been limited. I love that the access to the beaches is unmarked and parking is limited but available at the hook, Johnsons beach, chandlers cove, Roses point, etc. I would love to see an inland park with a view of water somewhere. But t keep the wildness wild, we need to keep limiting development. I would love to see my children's children enjoy the same Chebeague with no road signage, no public water or sewer, because the population density is low enough it is not needed. There should be no need for urbanization. Just preserve the natural beauty that is Chebeague.

Some were briefer:

It would be nice to be able to leave some land undeveloped.

At the other end of the spectrum, 25 percent of the respondents wrote only about the built environment – both about what they would like to see and what they feared might occur in the future:

I'd like to see sprawl discouraged. Perhaps creative zoning could encourage more hamlets, although the soils and water table pose challenges when it comes to wastewater disposal (most of the current hamlets would fail the state plumbing code). Inland hamlets

(maybe with communal waste disposal systems and even apartments) would make housing prices more affordable. Some apartments would provide better housing options for young adults and the elderly.

In between, somewhat more than half the respondents (52 percent) wrote about balancing the built and natural environments – how the development that they knew was inevitable could occur, with guidance from public policy, and not at the expense of the island’s natural resources and rural character. It seemed as if where they started was important. Somewhat more than half (29 percent of all respondents) started with their desire for open space and then described how they thought development might occur without sacrificing that.

No matter where you are, the balance between development and preservation is challenging. First and foremost, I believe any future "growth" must be managed with our natural resources and carrying capacity of the island in mind. Water is the number one resource we must preserve and use wisely, much more so than mainland communities. Open land for farming will be, in my opinion, increasingly important. And the natural beauty of the island is part of the reason we all love Chebeague and must be preserved. Having said all that, I am a strong believer in private property rights and have experienced governmental intrusiveness first hand. I think that planning must occur within the framework of preserving and enhancing "community life" and that personal property rights must be upheld within the context of personal responsibility to that life. The one thing I want to avoid is having Chebeague become reduced to a "resort" island.

Another 18 percent started with housing or economic development. They focused first on the development they wanted or didn’t want but added ideas about open space as well. A year-round resident said:

- We should encourage development in existing, perhaps new hamlets to discourage sprawl.
- We should preserve open space for aquifers and wetlands protection, special habitats and marine resources
- We should maintain and increase public access to the shore
- Develop and sustain affordable housing.

A second said:

Continue zoning as is – I do believe we should always give positive consideration to any small business applications. It is rewarding to me to see jobs becoming available in a place like the Commons, Boatyard, Rec Center, etc. – a positive direction to encourage people to come/stay on the Island. Continue to accept gifts of land for open air purposes and seriously make an effort to secure more ROWs to beaches. Consider selling waterfront property with a rider that people be allowed to walk their beaches above high water mark.

A third emphasized more what s/he did not want:

Stay away from multi-family housing such as apartments, etc. as I am concerned about the island’s resources for supporting us – i.e. water mostly. Also sewage systems impacting groundwater. Keep zoning for new houses to require large lots. Cap the size

of new construction (square footage and height) as massive houses use up unfairly disproportionate amounts of resources. Require new houses to have some “green” features? Keep up the good work of the Land Trust, etc. to preserve large natural spaces. Maintain public access to beaches and make them more obvious . . .

There was a final small group of “balancers” who were so even handed between the two that they had to be coded as trying to strike an even balance:

Land use and development should be managed based on a comprehensive plan and integrated zoning ordinance. Which this survey is starting, thank you! Preservation of open space needs to be addressed while also creating development opportunities for lower cost housing. I personally support "cluster housing" where hamlets are created and larger blocks of open space are preserved.

And there were 10 percent of the respondents who didn’t really fit neatly into any of these categories. Some were primarily concerned about keeping taxes low.

One and a half acre lots are fine. If they get larger than the cost increases and the average young guy is out of luck. Of course, the shore property is already way beyond affordability. If we do not want to lose more tax revenue we had better slow down on the land trust idea.

Some, respectful of private property rights, did not want the Town to play a large role in development decisions:

Truthfully, I believe the landowners should be able to make those [land use] decisions. Of course we want to maintain the island’s beauty, but sometimes in order to grow there needs to be change.

Summer and Year-round Residents

Overall, as Table 8 shows, there was surprisingly little difference between year-round and summer people. More than half (52 percent) of the year-round people wrote about preserving open space – woods, fields, natural beauty, trails, wildlife, or encouraging forestry or farming – compared with 42 percent among summer people. But this issue was mentioned most often by both groups. The difference was less on preserving access to the shore – 29 percent for year-round and 23 percent for summer people. In both groups there were some respondents who particularly emphasized the need for fishermen to have water access and wharves.

When people thought about what development in the future should be like, the respondents followed two rather different strategies that we just saw above. One, taken by 39 percent of year-round and 42 percent of summer people, was to say that they liked the current low density pattern of development and did not want to see it change. They wanted minimal development, done “slowly”, “carefully”, “sparingly” or “cautiously” as various people said. As a summer resident said:

Table 8: Year-Round and Summer Residents’ Ideas About Future Land Use

	Year-Round	Summer	Don’t Know	Total
N =	82	153	9	244
Open space	43 52%	57 37%	1 11 %	101 41%
Shore access	24 29%	35 23%	1 11%	60 25%
Low density/as is	32 39%	64 42%	3 33%	99 41%
Higher density OK or cluster w open space	12 14%	25 16%	0	37 15%
Afford. housing	16 19%	27 18%	1 11%	44 18%
Attract/keep young people	10 12%	19 12%	0	29 12%
Monitor wells/septic system	8 10%	11 7%	1 11%	20 8%
No more big/high priced houses	3 4%	16 10%	0	19 8%

We should make it possible for the future generations to enjoy Chebeague as we have. I hope for as little change as possible.

Some, not all of whom were year-round residents, said that growth in the year-round community was more acceptable than growth among summer houses. Maybe year-round residents could be given preferential tax treatment, or even be the only ones allowed to develop at all.

They often listed the kind of development they did **not** want – no condos (7 people), no duplexes (7), no apartments, sometimes described as multi-family or high rise development (24 people), no subdivisions (3), no large developments (9) – only single family houses (9 people).

I feel strongly that the island should not allow - or at least restrict - multi-family development, specifically condos and/or apartments. As I mentioned before, I support slow, responsible development, if any, and there should be strict zoning regulations to that effect (there may already be such regulations).

The other strategy, taken by somewhat more than 15 percent of year-round and 16 percent of summer people, was to say that higher density development could be appropriate for the island in certain places or for certain purposes. People in this group were particularly likely to suggest cluster development where subdivisions are designed to maintain an overall low density but use smaller than usual lots for the housing while keeping a sizeable part of the land in open space or farming. Overall, 18 percent of respondents mentioned cluster housing either by itself or as a way to retain open space.

Traditional zoning is the death of community. I would LOVE to see smart development that strengthens the island's "hamlets," as you call them, and preserves its open spaces.

I'm all for well-designed cluster and multi-family developments. If the island builds out in 1.5 acre increments, it will be nothing more than another suburb, just harder to get to.

As this respondents shows, for this group apartments and duplexes were more acceptable; 19 percent thought they would be ok, with no difference between summer and year-round people. There were also nine more people than this one who picked up the idea, mentioned in the question, of “hamlets”, traditional or new, that might become the focus of development. One person did ask whether the “hamlets” recognized themselves as such. Some did specify particularly that such higher density housing should be built to fit into the traditional “look” of the island, and a couple hoped to do it simply by subdividing existing large houses. A couple of people noted that it would be easy to hide such development by keeping it away from the roads.

The primary reason most respondents gave for being willing to have duplexes, apartments or clustered houses was to provide affordable housing (20 percent of year round and 18 percent of summer) to keep or attract young people, especially families, to live on the island. A few summer people also said it would be nice to have apartments or condos for seniors who were tired of home maintenance.

The Cumberland zoning concepts and whatever vision they embody/embody need to be revisited and adjusted to reflect an overall vision and plan that preserves precious open space, forest, water access and identifies places and ways that can be further developed, including the idea--mentioned above--of creating more affordable housing for young island families seeking both to stay and grow on the island. This will inhibit some individual use, too much objection, but unfettered do-your-own-thing will produce clutter, privileged enclaves with increasingly exclusive waterfront use and a serious socio-economic division that will erode the character of the island community.

Aside from these general ways of thinking about development, the supply and quality of water was an important issue for many people. Some focused largely on it, while for others, like the person who didn't want multi-family housing above, it was an underlying reason for their policy ideas. A number of year-round and summer people wrote about the need to make sure that development did not exceed the capacity of the aquifer, or the need to monitor possible interactions between wells and septic systems. There were even five people who were so concerned about the quality of the groundwater that they thought the island should build public water and sewer systems.

Finally, the respondents had many other, particular ideas about future development on Great Chebeague and how it might be achieved. These are just some:

- Green building 4
- Alternative energy 8
- No private piers 2
- Construction loans to young people to build houses 1
- Build a bridge 2
- Historic districts 1
- Plan for Sunset Landing 2

Use summer houses for winter rentals 1
Rental storage facility 1
Mini-boardwalk along the shore with shops and restaurants, like Bailey's Island. 1
Allow home occupations 1

Town Facilities and Infrastructure

What would you expect residents to say about future town facilities and infrastructure – repair the roads? Test the water? Have a new gravel pit? Humdrum and predictable. In fact what they said – encouraged to think broadly by the question – was that they *were* interested in road repair (19 percent) but even more in energy independence (about 32 percent) and more and better electronic communication – internet (18 percent) and cellphones (16 percent).

As with most of the other questions 13 percent of all respondents said they were satisfied with the facilities and infrastructure that the Town has already.

I think our current infrastructure will be adequate, perhaps with minor enhancements or refurbishments.

An additional 5 percent of year-round residents (4 people) said specifically that they didn't want the Town to do more than it was doing now.

Among what might be thought of as humdrum or routine facilities and infrastructure, the highest priority was for road repairs (19 percent or 44 people). Not surprisingly 25 percent of year-round people who see the roads deteriorate in the winter cared about this, but 15 percent of summer people did as well.

Most of the island's roads are deplorable, one of the biggest frustrations I had with Cumberland governance. I would like to think that our existing tax base can support a meaningful re-paving effort.

They were not naïve about the cost; many mentioned it as likely to be significant:

The roads need to be upgraded - can we afford to do this?

However, there were a few contrarians who argued for leaving the roads as they are.

I think the Island infrastructure is excellent for what the Island is. If you build better roads, there will be more speeding and a good bump in the road builds character. What you currently have is very special.

A larger Town Office (3.5 percent or 8 people) and a larger fire barn (2 people) got some attention as well; and 7 people or 3 percent said that emergency services should continue to be a priority. One of the most elaborate answers on this question from a year-round resident covered

Table 9: Town Facilities and Infrastructure

	Year-Round	Summer	Don't Know	Total
	N = 80	N = 140	N = 6	N = 226
OK as is	9 11%	20 14%	1 16%	30 13%
No added facilities or services	4 5%	0	0	4
Repair roads	20 25%	21 15%	3 50%	44 19%
Don't repair roads	1 1%	1		2
Have trail system	12 15%	7 5%	0	19 8%
Larger Town office	4 5%	2 1%	2 33%	8 3.5%
Monitor water quality	1 1%	13 9%	0	14 6%
No Town sewage treatment	10 12%	14 10%	1 16%	25 11%
Septic system maintenance program	5 6%	7 5%	1 16%	12 5%
Alternative energy- general	13 16%	6 4%	0	19 8%
Wind energy	25 31%	29 21%	0	54 24%
Solar energy	9 11%	20 14%	0	29 13%
Biomass energy	4 5%	5 4%	0	9 4%
Tidal energy	2 3%	9 6%	0	11 5%
Geothermal energy	4 5%	0	0	4 2%
Better cell phone service	14 17.5%	22 16%	1 16%	37 16%
No cell tower	0	2 1%		2 1%
Better internet service	11 14%	30 21%	0	41 18%
Support Chebeague.net	5 6%	12 9%	0	17 7.5%
Want cable service	4 5%	9 6%	0	14 6%
Town support/explore supporting CTC	3 4%	3 2%	0	6 3%
CTC & parking at Sunset Land.	4 5%	6 4%	0	10 4%
Bus/shuttle service on Island	7 9%	17 12%	0	24 11%

this ground and more:

Public facilities should support the basic needs of the population. They should be well cared for and optimized to deliver specific required services at minimal cost to the taxpayers. Infrastructure that is directly connected to public safety is the highest priority. Safely storing fuels sources, road surface and ditching practices, driver visibility, disposal of hazardous waste, fire & Rescue – snow removal, facilities to encourage proper maintenance of septic systems and the like... Next is infrastructure that can reduce the burden to taxpayers: improved efficiency in delivering services, energy savings through

improvements, energy projects to reduce energy consumption requirements, assistance to water transportation systems. Facilities to support administrative functions of government Lastly infrastructure that improves the quality of life; supporting library and rec center, communications, trails. Infrastructure such as roads and bridges currently present the biggest challenge.

In terms of water and sewage which was mentioned in the question, 11 percent rejected the idea of a public sewage treatment system as unnecessary and expensive. A few said it might be needed if there were areas that would have higher density development and a few more pointed out the down side:

The risk of expanding infrastructure is that it facilitates more development. All decisions regarding infrastructure development must be made after first asking is this going to have positive long-term benefits or will it, in the long run, only hasten change that impacts on the character of the island. In the case of high-speed internet service, for example, that enhances the quality of life on the island without altering the fundamental character of Chebeague. A sewer system, while totally impractical, would unleash development that would destroy the island.

And 5 percent (12 people) suggested that the Town have a septic maintenance program or at least get rid of the still-extant cesspits and outhouses. Six percent also thought that periodic testing of the island groundwater would be a good idea.

Maintaining the system of paths, also mentioned in the question, was supported by 8 percent of respondents while 4 percent mentioned keeping rights of way and access to the shore. Most people simply mentioned these things in passing:

I would love to see a more public walking trail system encouraged and set up all over the island which also could be used for cross country skiing. All paths to the ocean should be made public when possible. The more we have, the less of a burden it is on a few.

But one summer person had a more elaborate idea of what a trail system might be like:

Perhaps a marked walking trail system -- with simple markers as to historical sights, tree and plant names -- would be nice for visitors to the island to access. Might be difficult over private lands -- perhaps but in the Trust and town areas. Is there an Eagle Scout troop that could take this on as their mission?

But in a year when energy prices spiked, the economy nose-dived and Chebeague had a visit, courtesy of the Island Institute, from Soren Hermansen from Denmark's energy independent island Samsø, the major focus in this question was on providing the a Town the capacity to generate its own power and/or heat. A quarter of the respondents (24 percent or 54 people) specifically were interested in exploring the possibility of wind energy. Another 8 percent mentioned having some kind of alternative energy sources without focusing on any particular kind. Many people mentioned several sources besides wind, especially solar power.

A young year-round resident said:

Seek community development facilities by creating study groups or task forces to determine realistic, practical projects worth pursuing such as:

1. Energy alternatives to reduce residential costs and needs. CMP electrical current costs 18 cents/KH. Oil, gas, propane, kerosene up to 50 percent surcharge compared to mainland costs. Obviously more than just shipping surcharge!!

Task force/study group to determine feasibility to develop:

- A. Wind power – windmills on high elevation in center of the island or on outer, uninhabited islands under Cheb, jurisdiction.
- B. Geo-thermal energy – residence energy needs by driving into the earth.
- C. Road resurfacing – improvements – roads with horrible, numerous potholes that patching will not correct.

Wind energy, thermal energy, road improvement issues could be explored to determine funding available to town with Federal and State funding support (participation usually up to 80% of cost, maybe more today for alternative energy projects. Explore bank lending availability at low interest. If successful, residents' energy cost would be minimal and Town could sell excess energy to other islands and mainland locations to create island profitable energy stream. Should start process by pressing the Pingree legislators who are understanding and sympathetic to island way of life.

A summer person added:

In the coming era with its focus on energy independence, environmental protections, and need for state of the art communications, Chebeaguers have a great opportunity to exercise leadership in all three areas. Following the lead of Vinalhaven establish an island electric cooperative with neighboring islands such as Long and then working together develop commercial grade wind farms, solar power panels, and other sources of green power; and working through this cooperative work to develop 'smart' electrical power use which closely monitors and encourages a smarter island grid and smarter home usage.

Encouragement and support for the internet capability already up and functioning is fine example of what island initiated and operated cooperatives are possible.

Not surprisingly, 48 percent of year-round residents, who spend the winter on Chebeague with snow, ice and power outages, mentioned alternative energy in general or wind energy specifically, compared with 25 percent of summer people. But for both groups this was the most salient infrastructure issue they wanted addressed.

Like the last person quoted, many people thought that good internet service was another high-priority issue that the Town needed to address. Overall, 18 percent of respondents said this was important, 11 year-round (14 percent of all year round) and 30 summer (21 percent of summer) people said that the island needs better/faster/more reliable internet. Six percent suggested having cable. On the other side 8% said they like and support Chebeague.net.

These answers suggest that the question was asked not only during a time of transition of internet service on Chebeague but also at a time when a variety of internet technologies are in use² that mainland residents have gotten used to. Hardwired internet by cable, T1 or DSL is more reliable and uniform than wireless. Chebeague has hardwired service to a few sites like the Library. Chebeague.net, which has been in existence since 2007, then uses these sources to deliver internet wirelessly to its customers. DSL is provided through telephone wires and switches and so require the participation of a telephone company which Chebeague does not have. This means that some people who want cable or “better” internet want hardwired service that they are used to in other places. There are probably others who are simply unaware of Chebeague.net, or do not choose to subscribe.

The other communication technology that many people wanted to be better is cell-phone service. Sixteen percent said they wanted this or even explicitly suggested that Chebeague have a cell-phone tower (possibly disguised as a lighthouse or located on a wind turbine). There was little difference between year-round and summer people. Two people, seeing the increasing use of cell-phones everywhere said they did not want a cell-phone tower on Chebeague.

About these communication technologies, most people simply said they wanted them, without elaborate explanations:

I'd like to see better internet and cell phone service (to foster the internet remote economy).

We love the increased ability to get on the internet and get cell phone access that has happened over the last few years.

Finally several issues related to CTC and parking for the Stone Wharf got some attention. Three percent said the Town should provide support for or should explore support for CTC. Three percent wanted something done to improve the parking situation at the Stone Wharf, and four percent urged moving the ferry and its parking to Sunset Landing.

² This information about internet service is courtesy of Herb Maine.

An alternative to more or different parking was suggested by 11 percent who wrote about having a bus/jitney/trolley/van that would go around the island and to the Stone Wharf. This was a somewhat more popular idea among summer people (12 percent) than year-round residents.

In addition to these ideas what were suggested by more than five people, there were a variety of other facilities or services that were laid out by one or a few people:

- Encouraging more recycling 2
- Building materials recycling
- Trash pickup 2
- Public toilet at Chandler's Cove wharf 1
- Town-owned boat yard 1
- Town health clinic 2
- Town owned library 1
- Larger library 3
- Have a larger fire barn 2
- Expand or build new school 2
- Create historic districts 1
- Bury all overhead wires 1
- Town assume ownership of some private roads
- Heliport for emergencies 2
- Have all roads paved with gravel 1
- Pave all gravel roads 1
- Speed bumps 1
- Have a paving machine 1
- Open a new gravel pit 1
- Use less road salt 2
- More land for Chandler's Cove Beach 1
- Have a public water supply system 1
- Regulate construction of private wharves 1
- Require cars to be electric 1
- More taxi service 3
- Deal with deer ticks 1

Regulation by the Town

People in the United States have strong opinions, pro and con, about public regulation of private activities, and Chebeague is no exception and there was not much difference between year-round and summer people on this score. How much regulation is enough? Five percent of respondents said they approved of regulation and another five percent said it was necessary to protect public health and safety. On the other side, 11 percent wanted as little regulation as possible. Two year-round people put it succinctly:

We have entirely too much government regulation. The minimum necessary to run a town and no more.

I believe in regulation. I would not hesitate to regulate more but at present do not see the need.

Overall, however, 22 percent said they thought the Town of Chebeague Island had about the right amount of regulation now.

The regulations as they are now seem suitable –

Fifteen percent said it would make sense to revise the Zoning Ordinance, inherited from Cumberland, to adapt it better to Chebeague’s needs and values. But nine percent urged that any other new regulations be as simple and clear as possible, and five percent said that changes should be made very carefully. A summer person wrote:

This is a tricky one! I think that Chebeague has to be careful not to over regulate too quickly. The new town needs to prioritize what it regulates based upon the most important values of the community. For example, it might be more important to focus on building well constructed, safe homes than to police for mooring stickers! Monitoring shellfish harvesting is a matter of public health but tight regulation of cars left overnight at the stone pier maybe less important. What we choose to monitor will be a reflection of what we value as a community and we need to focus on the most important, long range items in the beginning!

A year-round resident said:

I believe that we should look to trust and not rules as the basis for a community. We need rules to live by but they should be simple and clear, accessible to all and the fewer the better. I think a commitment to simplifying local ordinances over time would be beneficial to the community. Parking regulations are currently a necessity but with good land use practices we may be able to remove them. The optimal rule addresses public safety, is clearly understandable and is enforceable.

Others, (see Table 10) said that regulations should be fair and enforcement of them consistent.

Many people left their comments at that general level. But a minority went on to discuss their reactions to specific Town regulations or regulators. They wrote about how much police protection the island should have, their experience with building and plumbing code enforcement, the Harbormaster and the parking regulations at the Stone Wharf. On the first three issues, those who commented were divided. On traffic and parking the people who wrote about the issue largely favored regulation and enforcement.

But at another level a number of respondents searched for a balance between enforcing regulations and allowing people to do as they pleased that they thought of as one of the hallmarks of life on Chebeague. Not being “too hard” on island businesses was one element of this, while protecting the island’s environment was another.

Table 10: Responses on Regulation by the Town

	Year-round	Summer	Don't Know	Total
N	N = 77	N = 136	N = 9	N = 222
Approve of reg in general	3 4%	6 4%	1 11%	10 4.5%
Reg nec for public health & safety	0	9	1	10 4.5%
As little reg as possible	9 12%	15 11%	0	24 11%
Reg about right now	21 27%	27 20%	1 11%	49 22%
Need consistent enforcement	4 5%	4 3%	2 22%	10 4.5%
Need fair regs	5 6%	3 2%	0	8 4%
Revise zoning to fit Chebeague	14 18%	19 14%	1 11%	34 15%
Adopt regs carefully	0	10	1	11 5%
Encourage businesses	5 6%	4 3%	0	8 4%
Protect env't	1	6	0	7 3%
Zone for limited development	0	7	0	7 3%
Police				
Ok now	1	1	0	2
None in winter	2	0	0	2
Not full-time in summer	3	0	0	3
Want full coverage all year	5	1	2	8
Building/Plumbing				
Pro	0	6	0	6
Con	1	7	0	8
Harbormaster				
Pro	1	5	0	6
Con	7	1	0	8
Parking Enforcement				
Pro	6	7	0	12
Con	2	1	1	4
Traffic Regulation				
Pro	2	4	0	6
Con	0	0	0	0

A balance might be difficult to achieve, but desirable. Obviously we all need to abide by the law, and respect the rights of everyone on the island, but one of the joys of growing up on Chebeague was the relative lack of supervision: I learned to drive sitting on my grandfather's lap in his jeep, had fun going from house to house in the back of a pick-up truck, and to this day my own kids think Chebeague is the greatest place on earth because they don't need seat belts and car seats.... we need to be sure that we regulate what is important and leave alone those small things that make the island life unique.

Zoning ordinances should be reviewed and revised with ISLAND LIVING in mind ... road widths and setbacks of mainland proportions are SO inappropriate on an island, etc. Regulations should be reasonable and flexible enough to encourage -- not DIScourage -- development of island business, especially if such business opportunities utilize existing buildings.

Seems reasonable to me. Chebeague is nice because it is more relaxed than other places. I'd hate to lose that but we must protect safety and the environment

Prior to Chebeague's separation from Cumberland, it seemed to me that regulation on the Island was somewhat more "relaxed." That is not to say it was more inefficient or ineffective, but there seemed to be a greater emphasis on, what I would call, "common sense." I recognize that many of our regulations are not formulated, as such, on the Island, but instead represent state and federal directives. But, put simply, to the extent we make the personal choice to "over-regulate," I think we diminish our sense of community, and to the extent we regulate disparately, I think we fall to the same result.

Enforcement is necessary for compliance however 'over-zealous' town officials should be avoided if possible (as in the case of . . . It should be remembered and promoted that one of the advantages of living on Chebeague is a greater level of 'freedom' than allowed on the mainland.

Several people did try to think of ways to actually achieve a publicly-acceptable balance through education and appeal procedures.

The Town should review and revamp those Cumberland ordinances to determine which are really applicable on the island. Communicating any ordinances or codes to the island residents is extremely important... The Town cannot "assume" that islanders, part-time or full-time, know the rules. Because it is a small community, we do not want the Town Government to make it impossible for the enforcement personnel to do their job reasonably.

Obviously the regulation is needed. There is chaos without regulation, but then again it should be humane. As long as there is a board to consider zoning variances when they are requested, as long as there is a government that seeks to carry out the spirit of the law above the letter of the law, then the law is good to have. The law should seek to empower

businesses that bring wealth to the islanders, to boost that economic statistic we just learned about earlier in this survey! However, the law should also protect the natural beauty of the island and the safety of all who dwell there.

For some people regulation was about some people taking advantage of others:

Some but only what is absolutely necessary. Some is really required but my observation is that most people want to do their job and in the case of regulatory people and police, if they don't have enough to do they will complicate matters by being overzealous. Meanwhile the large money people . . . go almost as if no regulations existed. XXX will cut right to the shore if [s/he] wants and if [s/he] gets caught, will pay the fine. Most regulations end up affecting the small guy.

First: there is a basic misconception by a fair number of people that when we seceded we also seceded from the State of Maine and the United States. This needs re-education. Second: all enforcement codes, sheriff, shellfish warden and harbormaster are following mandatory state and Federal laws, so our local ordinances are the only place we have input and that must be in synch with Federal and state. Third: we need sufficient ordinances, strong enough to prevent external "hot shots" with \$ from taking advantage of the misconceived and unrealistic view that "thi9s is Chebeague, we can do what we want." Our neighboring towns are better protected than we are. There will be spillover, if we fail to protect.

Finally, as with other questions there were a variety of suggestions that didn't neatly fit into group category:

Don't allow non-island businesses on the island 1

Enforce the leash law 3

Have a noise ordinance for night-time 2

Do away with most zoning 1

Want freedom 4

Solutions for parking at Stone Wharf 2:

Stone Wharf parking stickers for year-round residents; a but for others

Have remote parking, give Stone Wharf parking permits to commuters, fishermen and handicapped.

Don't allow messy outdoor storage 2

Require that gas-lines and monitor heater connections be inspected 1

Be strict about driving when drunk 1

Don't allow dumping of old cars

Community Services

As the question on community services itself explained:

Because of the way Chebeague evolved as part of Cumberland, we have some services that have always been provided by the Town and paid for by property taxes and debt such

as education, police, the volunteer fire and rescue services and the basic road system.. Some Town services, like the Shellfish Warden, are also paid for by user-fees, licenses and permits. Over the years, other community services have been added by creating non-profit organizations which are supported by voluntary donations -- the Commons, the Health Clinic and open space preservation by the Land Trust, for example. In addition to voluntary contributions, the Library and the Rec Center have historically had support by the Town, because they provided municipal services.

Now that Chebeague is an independent town, there is an opportunity to think about how well this mixed public/non-profit system will serve the island in the future.

More than a quarter of all survey respondents thought that the existing set of services should continue (24 percent):

[They should] stay the same for the most-maybe some more town support in areas.

Or that the current balance between public and non-profit services should continue (11 percent):

Basic services available in any town should be part of Chebeague - school, roads, library etc. The other services that are currently available have evolved as people have needed them and people have found a way to support them. I think that is a good way to continue - it prevents an overly burdensome collection of services being provided. It is a small town, it needs to keep infrastructure and services in line with the size and affordability of the population. You need enough to attract a diverse population, but you don't want to create a behemoth that can't be supported. If someone wants that, they can move to any town on the mainland.

A small number of people (5 percent) said that the Town was already paying too much for services:

[The] rec center and library should be paid for by voluntary contributions, so the bad roads can be repaired. other services such as education, police, volunteer fire and rescue, seem appropriate to be paid by the town/property taxes.

Or at least should not take on providing more:

SHOULD NOT HAVE TO SUPPORT MORE SERVICES OR ORGANIZATIONS THAN WE ARE DOING PRESENTLY. ENOUGH IS ENOUGH.

More people (16 percent overall) said that the Town should continue to provide at least the same amount of support as it is now or should increase its contributions. Many went on to list which organizations they thought the Town should support. The Library and Recreation Center, which

Table 11: Future Community Services

	N = 78		N = 127		N = 9		N = 214	
Continue existing services	25	32%	25	20%	2	22%	52	24%
Balance between Town 7 non-profit is good	5	6%	18	15%	0		24	11%
Town pays too much already	3	4%	1	1%	1	11%	5	2%
Town should not take on more services	10	10%	8	6%	2	22%	20	9%
Provide support to same or more	1	1%	7	5.5%	1	11%	9	4%
Library	13	17%	20	16%	1	11%	32	16%
Rec	12	15%	20	16%	0		32	15%
Health Clinic	14	18%	20	16%	0		34	16%
Commons	3	4%	5	4%	0		8	4%
Hist. Society	4	5%	1	1%	0		5	2%
Open space	1	1%	5	5%	0		7	3%
Support Fire and Rescue	4	5%	5	4%	0		9	4%
Town take over and fund								
CTC	8	10%	3	2%	0		11	5%
Library	4	5%	2	2%	0		6	3%
Too many orgs are raising money	10	13%	1	1%	0		11	5%
Use Fee for service	0		9	7%	2	22%	11	5%

Combine non-profit fundraising	0	4 3%	0	4 2%
Combine non-profits	2 3%	0	0	2 1%

already get Town support were mentioned often.

Certainly, the library and rec center should continue to receive town support thru taxes. Their successful fund raising and public support efforts will hopefully continue in the future. The Rec Center's summer programs have been so instrumental in 'shrinking' the island and ensuring that 'summer kids' get to know the 'island kids', both groups of which, eventually and hopefully, become the adults who populate and contribute to, and run, our community. Today's investments are tomorrow's returns

The health clinic, which does not get any assistance from the Town now, was also mentioned by 16 percent of respondents. Indeed, in relation to health services some people ask specifically for more hours or more staffing by a doctor or physician's assistant. A summer person wrote:

Essential is more extensive Health Services and it should be public...if taxes can support education for children without going off-island, then taxes can support the elderly who need easier access to health care without going off-island. It feels ad hoc, and appears to be crowded. This aspect needs to be extended and professionalized. Land Trust is voluntary donations? How silly. This too should be part of the Town services.

A much smaller proportion, from three to five percent, went further to argue that at least some of the services – the Library and CTC were particularly mentioned -- should be taken over by the Town.

My initial reaction . . . is that The Commons, The Health Clinic, the Rec Center and the Library should become "Town Services" financed by tax revenue, with enhancements provided by volunteer activity or donations. In a way, I hate to give up the "freedom" a volunteer supported operation provides, but I know the volunteer pool is drying up and is over extended. Times have changed. Most younger families include two working spouses, or single working parent, and there is not much time to offer up as a volunteer. The older inhabitants have volunteered for years and feel ready to step aside. The Town should include these facilities as part of its infrastructure as they provide service typically included in most towns' responsibilities. The Commons might not be as strong a contender.

Like the person above who wanted more support for the Health Clinic, seven people wanted the Town to be responsible for acquiring and protecting open space.

Others said that many services should at least be substantially paid for with taxes. In part this was because people thought it would be simpler just to pay through taxes rather than through voluntary donations

I support having a millage for the island non-profits Commons, Health Clinic, Historical Society etc as well as the library and rec center. All the island organizations spend a tremendous amount of time on fundraising and most of it ends up being targeted back at islanders. If all paid a small amount then the annual letters or one annual event might enable them to spend more time on programming and less on fundraising. Some warrant more as they are in my mind critical services (library, health clinic and rec) Museum is close behind as it is the Town archive.

One year-round person who was involved in doing the fund-raising wrote:

We get so much money from the public for running all the non-profits and I wish there was a way that we didn't have to be so dependent on fundraising for everything. It is a lot of work -keeping that up - I wish some of it were through the taxes paid but that could be controversial. I think the rec, the library and the CTC should be town entities but I do think it would be hard to give up local control, but with the formation of committees or boards similar to what we already have we could do it.

Another year-round person who was primarily on the donating end said:

As I have already mentioned, most of the community services should be paid for by the Town, in addition to seeking State and Federal grants. Continuously asking for donations is becoming very annoying. Many people cannot afford to donate. I have recently known of a person who was pretty much harassed to donate to a Chebeague organization, not once, but twice. If we are to be our own Town, we need to pay for our own community services.

Some others emphasized the particular benefits that Town ownership might provide in terms of efficiency, stability and jobs:

Because Islanders had the initiative to build for themselves what Cumberland would not provide, we have infrastructure here which in most places would town-owned: Rec Center, Library, Hall. Perhaps it would be more efficient for these things to be town-owned on Chebeague. These are all important to the life of the community; the efficiencies of having their operation & maintenance under one umbrella would perhaps do much to ensure their long-term viability. This could also provide a few more of the coveted stable, long-term, full-time-with-benefits jobs so crucial to our communities survival. The list of redundancies on Chebeague in terms of organizational function and oversight is long. Yes, this would mean an increase in the town budget, but I do believe that at some point, this will be worth looking at. Though property taxes may seem burdensome, the 'volunteer tax' of living on Chebeague is ENORMOUS. The more months of the year one spends here, the more one is called upon and depended upon to

'make it all happen', and it's worse in the winter when there are so many fewer of us to keep our organizational boats afloat.

This resident referred to the “volunteer tax” of living on Chebeague. A few others were concerned about the distribution of the property tax burden that Town services would bring:

The system needs to be reworked so the burden is equal to some extent. You have the same vote with 200\$ taxes as you do 5000\$ taxes. It becomes selfish and biased. More needs to be done in a way that allows everyone an equal burden to some of this expense to get a fair outcome.

One summer person wrote that non-resident property owners should have a role in Town decisions on taxation.

On the other side of the public/private equation, a number of respondents explained why they like having non-profits provide many of the island services, arguing that this way they are more responsive and participatory, including for summer people. This was the argument made by one year-round resident:

I am in favor of small government at most levels. The highly participatory nature of the island community may partly be a result of the structure you describe. These organizations not only distribute the responsibility for services to a broad group, they work on the fundamental principal that if they don't do a good job they risk being diminished and even eliminated. Another important aspect of civic organizations is that it allows summer folks to participate and shape the island in a meaningful way. They can sit on these boards and have a vote, unlike Town Meeting.

A summer person added:

Chebeague's tradition of private, voluntary organizations providing public services is unique and priceless. Would like to see it continue and be strengthened, as opposed to the Town assuming larger responsibilities that duplicate or displace these community organizations

Another year-round person could see a central problem with Town services but thought they might evolve, nonetheless:

I like having many services provided by non-profits. It allows people to support services they agree with and not make the Town pay out of taxes. Also it involves people actively in the community and does not let them "leave it to the Town". I'm for having the Town contribute money to the non-profits. Town services might grow gradually, especially once the secession debt is paid off. Volunteer fire and rescue seems to work well.

Suggestions were also made for dealing with the number of non-profit organizations and the number of fund-raising appeals. Consolidating the services themselves was one idea:

The Commons, the Health Clinic, the Library, and the Rec Center should all be supported by the town in some small way because they are all very important to all generations. The Rec Center should become part of the school and the Health Clinic should become part of the Commons. The Library should be combined with Chebeague.net and be the hub for communication and growing technology on the island. We will pay with them with a greater support from our community because there won't be so many different nonprofits and organizations asking for money all the time.

Having a combined Chebeague United Way fundraising effort was suggested for dealing with the flood of requests for donations.

But some respondents liked the present voluntary fundraising system just fine. A summer person wrote:

The non-profit organizations have done well through the generous donations of people who can afford to do so. Fund raising events are a great way to raise money and provide the community to interact with summer and year round residents.

Finally, there were a number of people who had specific ideas about particular services they hoped might be provided:

Having the Health Center be run by Maine Medical Center

Having an ATM at the Post Office (which already is done)

Going back to having Meals on Wheels

Having a free-large-item dump day in the spring so fishermen could bring in lobster traps

A community garden and nature center

And a year-round resident wanted an orphanage

Town-owned ferry. Town-owned on-island bus service that operated around the ferry schedule, paid for by fees. And let's not forget the Orphanage, a community service in that it would employ islanders, add to the island population possibly long-term, keep the school busy, and give Chebeaguers the opportunity to do what they do best - give of themselves

Priorities

The last question in the survey asked respondents to think all the issues they had written about and list the three issues that they thought were most important. These priorities were combined³

³ The summation of these priorities was very simple, not highly rigorous and gives more of a general idea of the importance of the issues than a scientific ranking. Each person's choices were ranked from one to three, with three being the first choice and one the last. If someone gave only one priority it was given a score of three. If someone listed four priorities, they were similarly ranked from one to four. The basic score was based on the answer to question 11 on priorities, but if the respondent mentioned other issues in their answer to the first question that asked for an overview, these issues were given 1s as well. Some issues were mentioned by many

to produce an overall ranking of all the issues that were mentioned as priorities. This gives a picture of the general consensus on what the most salient issues were, and in addition a picture of the diversity of views on many of the others.

It is also important to remember that when a respondent said that “transportation” was his or her highest priority, this might cover any number of policies related to the issue. In the case of “transportation” respondents gave it high priority who wanted transportation to be made easier by having a bridge, for example, and by people who approved of its being cumbersome and expensive as a deterrent to more rapid development on Chebeague.

The issues that topped the priority list for both year-round and summer residents are hardly a surprise since most have been sources of concern, discussion and policy effort for many years. As Table 12 indicates, the top priorities were:

- Education
- Transportation
- Economic development
- Land use including open space, and
- Maintaining the character of the community

Sustaining a “real” Island Economy

The Island Institute’s research that unconnected islands without schools cannot survive as year-round communities is both widely known and intuitively obvious. The corollary is that keeping island living affordable and attractive to young working families is essential. Awareness of both of these island “requirements” put education at the top of the priority list, with having jobs on the island, keeping and recruiting young families and affordability further down the list.

The logic is that attracting young families to the generally more expensive and harder-to-get-to life on an unattached island requires that the island school itself be excellent and that post-elementary education be of good quality and not too cumbersome to manage on a day to day basis. Additional services to support young families such as day care, recreation and health care also figured into this equation for some survey respondents.

Jobs and economic development are the other side of this same issue. People who live and have children on Chebeague can and do commute to jobs on the mainland. But this was not seen as a mainstay of the future economy, at least by year-round residents. There was also some interest in the idea of working on the internet, and there were a few respondents who actually do it. But no one had any very specific ideas about what kinds of jobs this would actually involve.

But for Chebeague to survive as a “real” community, jobs on the island are necessary. Of the traditional resource-based occupations – fishing, timber harvesting, farming and tourism – only fishing and tourism employ a significant number of people now, and both are very important to

people, some by only one or a few. The sum of all the rankings for a particular issue is its “priority”. Thus an issue could get a higher score if more people chose it as a priority, and it could get a higher score if more people gave it a higher ranking.

Table 12: Priorities

	Year-Round priority/person		Summer priority/person		Don't Know priority/person	
	N = 84		N = 142		N = 15	
Sustaining a “real” economy						
Education	84	1.00	100	.70	9	.60
Retain young families	31	.37	30	.21	3	.20
Maintain non-profit services	34	.40	22	.15	3	.20
Economy						
Economic dev.	22	.26	56	.39	1	.06
More jobs	25	.30	24	.16	11	.73
Sustain fishing	17	.20	6	.04	0	
Affordability, general	8	.09	27	.19	11	.73
Affordable housing	32	.38	35	.25	0	
Transportation to the Mainland		.9		.6		
Build a bridge	0		7	.04	0	
Provide stable access to the mainland	52	.62	72	.51	3	.20
Cost of transportation and parking	24	.29	8	.06	3	.20
Land Use		.7		.9		
Land use, general	0		32	.23		
Preserve open space & natural env”t	41	.49	47	.33	1	.06

Shape development	0	29 .20	
Limit development	20 .24	24 .17	3 .20
Preserve clean groundwater	13 .15	16 .11	3 .20
Maintain Character of the Community	42 .50	48 .34	8 .53
Town Governance			
Create sustainable government	0	13 .09	1 .06
Repair roads	19 .23	13 .09	1
Reduce property taxes	25 .30	26 .18	0
Have a fair assessment system	3 .03	5 .03	0
Miscellaneous			
Develop alternative energy sources	17 .20	17 .12	0
Don't change anything	9 .10	12 .08	3 .20

defining the island's identity. There was support on the survey, especially from some year-round residents for working to maintain the fishing industry even though now it is largely a two-season occupation. Respondents were more divided on tourism, with summer people seeing it as an engine for job growth, while year-round residents, wanting year-round, good-paying jobs, were less enthusiastic. There was also some interest on the survey in reviving farming and forestry.

Finally, related to sustaining the year-round, working community, a number of respondents were concerned about the expense of living on Chebeague as a barrier to the kind of working people who have made up the island economy in the past. First and foremost was the price of housing, but respondents also mentioned the overall higher cost of living, often driven by the high cost of transportation.

Getting to the Mainland

The other major priority for everyone was transportation to the mainland. This is an issue that has been central to Chebeague's efforts to sustain the island's economy and community since the 1950s. The survey indicated that the ideas from those early years of having either a bridge or a car ferry now garner relatively little support. More than half of all respondents, year-round and summer alike accepted the existing system of two ferries, one to Portland and one to Cousins Island. Indeed some residents explicitly saw the cumbersome and expensive transportation system as a useful bulwark against pressure for development on the island.

Beginning in the 1970s, though, the survival of the two ferries came under pressure. The private Casco Bay Lines went bankrupt and was reorganized as a public ferry district with a board elected by the residents of the islands it served. The Chebeague Transportation Company has had a more difficult time establishing its role as Chebeague's primary ferry. Conflicts with residents of Cousins Island over increased use of the Cousins Island wharf as well as increased parking near the wharf led to lawsuits, restrictive court settlements and, ultimately, the threat of closing the parking lot. The solution of limited parking at Cousins Island and a remote parking lot in Cumberland with a shuttle bus evolved over the years. In recent years the State DOT has intervened to take the Blanchard lot by eminent domain, establish the existing Route 1 parking lot and rebuild the road down to the Cousins Island wharf, thereby formalizing and legitimizing the CTC's role as a provider of transportation to Chebeague. So it is no wonder that survey respondents gave high priority to maintaining stable access to the mainland.

Now, however, the survey indicates that specific concerns about the ferry service have shifted more to the cost of the service, the ownership and management of CTC, and the problem of providing enough ferry parking on the Island. The survey indicates that there is not broad agreement on solutions to these issues, or even that they are issues to everyone. Some want to see Town ownership of CTC. Some want the ferry and parking to be moved to Sunset Landing while others suggest having a round-the-island shuttle to reduce or end the need for the parking at the wharves. Some want the costs of transportation to be reduced by some kind of subsidy from the Federal, State or Town governments.

Land Use

In the past Chebeague's economy has been based on its land and water – land for farming, forestry and vacationers and water for fishing and vacationers. Not having continuous 1.5 acre development across all of Chebeague was important to both year-round and summer people but when they listed their priorities, they looked at the issue a little differently. Year-round people's priorities were simply to preserve open space and the natural environment and limit development. Summer people saw more room to allow development to occur while still preserving open space. But this probably overemphasizes the difference, since, in their answers to the question about land use, almost the same proportion of summer and year-round people mentioned cluster housing or allowing higher density housing in order to preserve open space.

By now most people on the island recognize that, whatever their concerns about the school, the economy or the transportation system, keeping the aquifer unpolluted is the basic key to maintaining any kind of community on Chebeague. Only a minority mentioned it as one of their

three highest priorities, but it does pose some constraints on where and how much development can occur on the island.

Maintaining the Character of the Community

Respondents saw maintaining the character of Chebeague's community as equivalent in importance to preserving open space; only education and maintaining stable access to the mainland were more important. They described it as a caring, inclusive energetic, active and free-spirited community.

Town Governance

Town governance itself was not a high priority. Some summer people saw the development of a sustainable town government as a priority, but year-round people seemed to take that for granted. They only had as a priority that the Town should operate efficiently. On the other hand, several tasks that lie within the purview of the Town were of concern to some, especially year-round, people. Road repair was one, perhaps not surprisingly since the survey reached people in January when the winter wear and tear was reaching its peak.

Reducing property taxes also had a fairly high priority for year-round residents, higher than road repair and comparable to reducing the cost of reducing parking and ticket prices for CTC. The need to keep taxes down was, in fact, a central tenet of the viewpoint of 20 percent of year-round respondents. They supported the idea that the Town's role on the island should be to provide basic services and not much else. A retired year-round resident said that the most important issues were:

Maintaining necessary services, paying off the debt incurred by the separation from Cumberland and keeping taxes affordable to *all* residents. The Town of Chebeague will do well to provide the necessary services at a cost to the taxpayer that is affordable in the future.

This person wrote that the community as it is now is "fine, better than most. Do not mess with it." "The economy will take care of itself; leave it alone." "Maintain current level of education." Regulate only "what is necessary". This person did want the Town to do a full and correct revaluation of all property that would be fair.

This perspective contrasted with the views of 30 percent of the respondents, who wanted the Town to play an activist role – changing the patterns inherited from Cumberland by providing and funding through taxes and fees a variety of services now provided by other island organizations. For example, another retired year-round resident laid out

For me, the most fundamental question for the future is do we try to shape the size of our community and its economic and demographic makeup. For me a beautiful place enjoyed by everyone may be selfish, but to me it is a necessary consideration for us. Our choices may be more black and white than we like. The outside world is a great place, but we have chosen this one to live in – and we could be considered an endangered species.

This person wanted the social character of the island to remain as it is, with a strong volunteer element. But the future needed to be “shaped”. Young families would be encouraged to come by having an excellent school. Consideration might be given to having a pre-K – 12 school. Cluster housing would help to preserve open space and rental housing could help affordability. The economy would build on fishing, farming, forestry and internet jobs, not tourism. This person would move the ferry landing to Sunset, and CTC would become part of the Town, which should also be considering investing in alternative sources of energy, more open space and the range of non-profits on the island. “Given the above, we still need to keep the taxpayers in mind and understand that none of us can have everything.

The two ends of this traditional conservative – liberal spectrum were balanced by the 50 percent of year-round people who were “moderates”. They often proposed some issues on which they thought the Town might play a larger role, but they really did not want much change from the way things have been done in the past. They tended to begin their surveys not with an overview statement but with a list of things they thought were important. Another year-round retiree wrote:

Water conservation

Land conservation

Maintaining the island for what it represents to us. Why do “we” want to live here, what brought us here to begin with?

This person liked the ferry because it slowed growth. Parking at the Stone Wharf should only be for year-round residents while everyone else would take a shuttle to get there. The island economy is “self-adjusting” in that islanders are adaptive, developing businesses that will survive. The school does an “excellent job” and just needs to stay up to date with computers, etc. The status quo with the Town and the various community services was fine, though more grant-writing could increase resources. Development should be kept to a minimum. The island “needs to be protected just as those who are concerned about the development of the Moosehead region.”

It was much more difficult to choose a “typical” example of a “moderate”, and one more example will have to suffice. A lobsterman with children in the school wrote:

We need to continue on the path of increasing affordable housing opportunities. This and many other islands are unique in that people of extremely different economic circumstances exist in such close proximity to each other. I believe that both communities have a degree of respect for each other. We need to keep property taxes from climbing too high while also *gradually* replacing degrading roads etc. Hopefully we can keep young people on the island and keep a good number of kids in the school, but at least we know that nobody else can take the school away because of small enrollment.

What all but a couple of people agreed on was that the island that they knew should be preserved for future generations.