

# Recreation Outgrant Development Policy



## Background

- Districts receive numerous and diverse recreation land and water development requests
  - Richard B. Russell
  - Sardis Lake
  - Nashville Shores
- No nationwide consistent criteria to evaluate these requests

## Background (cont.)

- As a result, districts have taken different approaches that have created inconsistencies in the type and scope of recreation development provided
- Need for nationwide guidance
- Project Delivery Teams (PDTs) established to develop proposed policy

## Guiding Principles to PDTs for Proposed Policy

- **The final land use policy will represent a balance between the interests of all stakeholders**
- **No adverse impacts to project operations missions and purposes**
- **Meet spirit of environmental operating principles**
- **Consistent with shoreline management policy**
- **No change in the private exclusive use policy**
- **Encourage partnerships**
- **Establish standardized evaluation criteria**

## Recreation PDT Charter

- Focus on Recreation only
- Identify and characterize major issues
- Recommend changes or resolution where appropriate
- ID major policy issues that must be resolved by Corps and Army
- Recommend necessary changes to other Corps regulations (RE, OD)
- Recommend final form of guidance
- Review whether guidance for all other outgrants/requests for use of Corps lands needs to be revised.

## New Proposed Policy Memo

- Philosophy
- Applicability
- Policy
- Evaluation Criteria



## Proposed Philosophy

**“The Corps philosophy is to provide public outdoor recreation opportunities that support project purposes and meet the recreation demands created by the project itself while balancing natural resources requirements. This philosophy also considers other multipurpose project purposes such as navigation, flood control, hydropower, and water supply.”**

## Proposed Applicability

- **All recreation development requests**
- **All entities/individuals (public, private and quasi-public)**
- **Previously approved development plans are grandfathered**
- **Anything outside of an existing development plan is considered a new request**
- **All new requests require a conceptual development plan**

## Proposed Policy

- **Must be tied to the natural resources of the project itself.**
- **Focus on facilities that accommodate or support: water-based activities, overnight use, and day use.**

### **Examples:**

**Acceptable:** marinas, campgrounds, picnic areas, trails, swimming beaches, boat launching ramps, and comprehensive resort facilities.

**Unacceptable:** theme parks or ride-type attractions; private exclusive use; sports or concert stadiums; and stand alone facilities such as restaurants, bars, motels, hotels, non-transient trailers, and golf courses.

## Proposed Evaluation Criteria

- **Consistent with project purposes**
- **Reasonable nexus to the project's natural and other resources**
- **Consistent with Master Plan and Operational Management Plan**
- **In the public interest**
- **Justified by the public demand (market study)**
- **Economically viable (feasibility study)**
- **Meets the recreation demands created by the project itself while balancing natural resources requirements**

## Road Ahead

Mid-December 04	HQ briefs OASA(CW)
Mid- January 05	HQ briefs DCW, ASA(CW) and OMB on direction
January-February 05	Release revised draft to field and vet with stakeholders
February 05	Assess comments and revise as appropriate
Mid-March 05	CG and ASA(CW) approval
March 05	Tentative target for final release
March 06	Incorporate into ER

## Questions???

