

Four Highland Lake Leadership Team recommendations being brought forward for consideration:

- a. Initiate shoreline photography as a town wide Code Enforcement tool**
- b. Require 3rd Party review of all non individual home development within lake watersheds**
- c. Require minimum manure management requirements for large farm animals within the watershed**
- d. Require follow-up BMP inspections within lake watersheds**

Discussion

Photograph all the lake shorelines for baseline for shoreline development:

Windham is already using this technology on Sebago Lake through photographs taken by the Portland Water District. The first round of photographs would create a baseline, while subsequent surveys would determine if there were violations. This information would stay with the Code Offices for their use only, and be used for the review of permits and as an enforcement tool. This has been successful in making staff time more efficient where this has been used. The Lakes Environmental Association (LEA) does this already and has been for years in western Maine lakes.

Require 3rd Party Review of all major developments within great pond watersheds.

This is intended to close any loopholes as well as enhance third party reviews in both towns. The HLLT recommends that the Towns of Falmouth and Windham adopt mandatory third party review of all storm water plans including phosphorus mitigation plans for all subdivisions within the Great Pond watershed of their respective communities. To ensure that third party reviews are effective, HLLT further recommends that the towns determine the qualifications reviewers must possess to conduct the reviews and to develop a specific scope of work for conducting the reviews.

Establish manure policies for both Towns

The State threshold for manure management is 50,000 lbs, or 50 horses. Even a few horses can be very significant phosphorus sources for a lake. The ordinance for manure policies for five or more large animals should include manure storage in an area with a roof and designed to prevent any stormwater flow into or out of the storage area. Additionally, appropriate BMP's would be required for field paddock areas to prevent the movement of phosphorus to great ponds.

BMP inspection discussion for both subdivision BMPs and 319 grant BMPs to determine status and whether maintenance is recommended

It was learned through the DEP staff that DEP leadership considers following up on required five-year BMP recertifications to be lower priority, and when the reminders are sent out, those who don't respond see no follow-up. The concept is that if required inspections aren't being followed up at the DEP level, it is water bodies at the local level that suffer the consequences.

There are two kinds of BMP's, those overseen by the State/Town, and those built with EPA 319 grants. The latter have no follow-up at all, and should be subject to some periodic review as well to assure that the protections that were expected by the original design are long lasting for the health of the respective great pond.