

Maine Land Use Planning Commission

Recreational Lodging Facilities Stakeholder Input
Meeting Report

Wednesday, September 12, 2012, Lincoln, Maine



Good Group Decisions

Contents

About the Meeting	1
Overall Project Objective	1
Meeting One Objectives	1
Attendance	1
Opening Remarks	2
Agenda and Process	2
Ground Rules.....	4
LUPC Overview and Role with Recreational Lodging.....	5
Large Facilities	9
Top Issues as Identified by LUPC Staff.....	9
Top Issues as Identified by Stakeholders, and Discussion	10
Medium Facilities	15
Top Issues as Identified by LUPC Staff.....	15
Top Issues as Identified by Stakeholders, and Discussion	15
Small Facilities	17
Top Issues as Identified by LUPC Staff.....	17
Top Issues as Identified by Stakeholders, and Discussion	17
Other Issues	19
How Facilities Should be Categorized for Regulatory Purposes	21
Summary	21
Discussion.....	22
Emerging Guiding Principles	24
Summary	24
Discussion.....	25
Next Steps and Next Meeting	26
Closing Comments	27
Appendix A: Agenda	28
Appendix B: List of Issues	31

This report is organized by topic, not necessarily the order in which things were discussed.

About the Meeting

Overall Project Objective

At the end of the entire project, including stakeholder input, rule making, and Commission approval, the objective is to have in place a set of rules that efficiently and effectively regulate recreational lodging in LUPC's jurisdiction for the benefit of facility owners, visitors, and Maine residents, striking an appropriate balance between private enterprise and resource protection.

Meeting One Objectives

- Shared understanding of LUPC's role with regard to recreational lodging facilities.
- Shared understanding of this stakeholder input process.
- Initial ideas for improved rules, including general consensus around some specific approaches and identification of areas of contention.

Attendance

1. John Willard, The Birches
2. Suzie Hockmeyer, Northern Outdoors
3. Al Cowperthwaite, North Maine Woods, Inc.
4. David Potter, Eagle Lake Sporting Camps
5. Doug McCafferty, Maine Sporting Camp Association
6. Matt Libby, Libby Sporting Camps
7. John Rust, Maine Sporting Camp Heritage Foundation
8. Don Lamson, Chewonki Foundation
9. Greg Shute, Chewonki Foundation
10. Joseph George, Rangeley area - considering a children's camp project
11. Tom Dubois, Main Land Development Consultants, Inc.
12. Bryan Wentzell, Appalachian Mountain Club (AMC)
13. Tom Abello, The Nature Conservancy
14. James May, Commissioner, LUPC
15. Durward Humphrey, Commissioner, LUPC
16. Rod Falla, LUPC, Permit and Compliance Group
17. Nick Livesay, Director, LUPC
18. Tim Beaucage, Senior Planner, LUPC
19. Hugh Coxe, Senior Planner, LUPC
20. Craig Freshley, Good Group Decisions
21. Kerri Sands, Good Group Decisions

Opening Remarks

Nick Livesay, Director, Maine Land Use Planning Commission (LUPC), welcomed participants with the following remarks:

- I'm the relatively new director at the relatively new LUPC
- Thanks for joining us today; we appreciate you setting aside time to come
- We are looking at the wide range of uses for recreational lodging and I'm looking forward to working together and helping you deliver your quality of service for those using your facilities
- We have observed some trends that our rules did not have specificity or were not structured to reflect the world in which we live, in terms of customer demand and expectations that the public has of us
- Hugh [Coxe] and Tim [Beaucage] have taken a personal interest in taking a look at our rules and making them work better for everyone
- We are confident this process will be productive
- Our Commission is excited about this process – we have two folks from the Commission who are here today: Jim May and Durward Humphrey. It's important that you have the opportunity to communicate directly with them.

Agenda and Process

Craig Freshley, facilitator, introduced himself and his company, Good Group Decisions, making the following comments:

- I'm from Good Group Decisions in Brunswick, Maine, and we work with groups of all types including municipalities and public input processes
- I've been hired to be your neutral facilitator; land use planning is not my primary expertise
- My expertise is in helping groups make good decisions
- My part is to manage a good process, and your part is to give us good input about what these rules should be

Craig reviewed and explained the following overall objective:

At the end of the entire project, including stakeholder input, rule making, and Commission approval, the objective is to have in place a set of rules that efficiently and effectively regulate recreational lodging in LUPC's jurisdiction for the benefit of facility owners, visitors, and Maine residents, striking an appropriate balance between private enterprise and resource protection.

- "Efficiently" means streamlined and "effectively" means that they've got to be good

- rules for the benefit of facility owners, visitors, and Maine residents
- Private enterprise and resource protection are big things to strike a balance between
 - We want private entrepreneurs to make money, but we must also protect external natural resources

Craig reviewed and explained the following process and today's agenda (See Appendix A for Agenda):

Public Input before Rule Making

- Meeting One
 - Today
 - Input on top issues by type of facility
 - Meeting Two
 - October 17
 - Input on top issues by type of setting
 - In between Meetings Two and Three
 - Staff will develop specific approaches for consideration
 - Meeting Three
 - November 14
 - Presentation of, and reactions to, specific approaches for regulating all types of facilities in all settings
-
- Today is about hearing input even before the rulemaking process
 - We'll have Meetings One and Two, then some time, then Meeting Three
 - We decided to take two cuts at this, as rules make a difference based on two major things:
 - The size of your facility (a campground might not need the same rules as a larger lodge)
 - The setting that the facility is in (is it waterfront? A developed area? Does it have access by road, and what class of road?)
 - Today we will explore ideas by size of facility. In Meeting Two we'll do a similar exercise, but by type of setting
 - Those are the two big input conversations, then LUPC staff will develop approaches and a proposal for rules
 - Then we will present the proposal and get your reactions
 - Then rules will be drafted, there will be a public hearing process, etc.
 - Today, first we will hear an overview of LUPC, since some of you more familiar than others with LUPC
 - Then we'll roll through the each of the cases by size of facility: Large, medium-large,

medium-small, and small

- In each case we'll do the same drill
 - First we'll hear from staff on what they have recognized as top issues for rulemaking
 - Then we'll hear what you think are the top issues
 - Then we'll discuss potential solutions

A quick exercise showed that many of the facilities represented at the meeting were comparatively large facilities (i.e. multiple or larger-capacity camps, cabins, or camping areas; some with a wide range of client services).

Ground Rules

Craig reviewed the following ground rules, things to keep in mind for an effective and efficient discussion:

- **All views heard** - We want to hear from everybody. LUPC staff is here as resource, not to tell you what they think. They are here to serve you and the people of Maine, and answer your questions.
- **Please be recognized to speak** - Raise your hand before speaking; if I see more than one hand up at once I will call on the people we haven't heard as much from
- **Differing views welcome - No need to agree** - If you have a different perspective, that's okay. We are not getting personal but we are allowed to criticize ideas.
- **How should it be in the future?** - We're not here to grumble about past, but we can look at the past to consider how things should be going forward.
- **Private enterprise AND resource protection** - keep in mind the balance we spoke of
- **A few laughs won't hurt us** - Having a little fun is fine; it's a long day
- **Neutral facilitation and report** - I don't have an opinion on what the rules should be; I'm here as a neutral facilitator, and our report of the meeting will be neutral as well

LUPC Overview and Role with Recreational Lodging

LUPC Senior Planners Tim Beaucage and Hugh Coxe provided a brief overview of what LUPC does, a little relevant history, and LUPC's role with regard to each type of recreational lodging and particular attention to the issues on which LUPC is seeking input. Their presentations and the following discussion comments are summarized below.

Tim Beaucage's Presentation

- Thanks again – we appreciate your investment of time
- In case there are varying levels of knowledge about us and our rules, this presentation will help us get on same page
- LUPC purpose and scope
 - Comes from Maine statute/law, which gives us the parameters
 - We are the planning/zoning authority for the unorganized territories
 - We preserve public health and welfare
 - We Support and encourage natural resource based economies and strong environmental protections
 - We encourage appropriate development
 - We honor the rights and participation of residents and property owners
 - Residential, recreational, commercial and industrial uses interact with each other and with the resources
 - Important to reflect on this interaction during our discussion today
- The unorganized territories or “the Commission’s jurisdiction”
 - We use the terms interchangeably
 - Includes 10.4 million acres; 459 towns, townships, or plantations
 - Area known at the “woodbasket of Maine” – it’s also the recreation and natural resources basket
- We cover the land use permitting end of regulations – towns handle other regulations
- Our statutes
 - We have a comprehensive land use plan (CLUP) that sets the framework for getting common understanding of facts and figures and where we will head in the future
 - Covers land uses and economic development
 - CLUP ensures region retains “Principal Values” which include “diverse and abundant recreational opportunities”
 - CLUP policies focus on size, scale, balance between development and resource protection
 - Hopefully we can help you grow but also meet balancing point of resource protection
 - Land Use Districts and Standards, or “Chapter 10” – this is where most of us

- will be focusing in this process
 - Other guidance informs LUPC -
- Rules - a few key points
 - Think of it as an encyclopedia – don't sit down and read it, but go to the piece you need
 - 3 General Districts – each with Subdistricts
 - Development - 0.40% or 41,000 acres
 - Management - 78.8% or 8.2 million acres
 - Protection - 20.8% or 2.17 million acres
 - Some subdistricts might have a specific focus – highland areas, vs. wetland protection, vs. aquifer protection
 - Each one does allow some level of development and usage – there is variability between them
 - Within each subdistrict, there are use listings (pre-identified uses) to give predictability on the landowners/users end and also to help us preemptively deal with issues that might arise there
 - Home occupation might be allowed and there would be rules associated – setbacks, vegetative buffers, number of vehicles, bridges, roads, filling and grading, etc.
 - Most pertinent in this conversation are the rules about dimensions, setbacks, etc.
 - There is a big list of subdistrict types
 - Consider the natural differences in each area
 - For example, steep high cliffs vs. shoreland protection
- We have identified issues in recent years, and the list gets longer and longer
 - Many of you have tried to get a permit in the past and are familiar with these issues
 - We identified the ones we were aware of; the Commission immediately saw the problems presented and the importance of recreational lodging facilities
- This is a priority for Commission and for staff, along with our other priorities
 - We want to work to resolve as many problems as we can and pull together a set of rules by the end of the year
 - You will have an opportunity to comment on the product going forward, as will others who are not here today or next month
- Two cautions - to be realistic and so there are no surprises
 - We will solve as many issues as we can, but there may be some things we can't get to resolution. We will keep track of them - there may be other processes that we can use.
 - We know that the stakeholder process has limited time and we have tried to focus on those topics most conducive to the conversation and dialogue – there are some other issues we intend to vet through the public input process, such as permit expiration
 - I hope you won't be surprised when you see new items in the rulemaking – we are not trying to “slip anything by”, but rather trying

to be efficient

- It may be that we need to go to the legislature and ask to have our laws changed – which would take more time than changing rules
- We need to meet somewhere in the middle between these statements
 - Anything everywhere < -- > Nothing anywhere
 - Encourage new business < -- > Conserve existing business (ie. promote economic development but not at the cost of existing businesses)
 - Enable recreation lodging < -- > Resource protection
 - Simplistic yet restrictive < -- > Flexible yet complex
 - Sometimes we find simple is too heavy handed or does not achieve purpose. Flexibility brings complexity.
 - Development of today < -- > Communities of tomorrow
 - Today vs. tomorrow – the purpose of sound planning and zoning
 - This is a big charge but we are all up to it
- This conversation covers the gamut – we need to consider:
 - Small operations, those with a handful of rental cabins, but we also need to cover “resort” development which would include hotels, conference centers, development, etc.
 - A property with one rental cabin and with a proposal for 45 cabins
 - Differences between campgrounds – they look very different but are currently treated the same
 - Campgrounds vs. structures – bathhouses, RVs, tents, year-round campers, etc. There are some problems with our rules.
 - We need to consider youth camps or group camps

Tim’s slides are available at:

http://www.maine.gov/doc/lupc/projects/recreational_lodging/recreational_lodging.shtml

See Appendix B for the list of pre-identified issues that was handed out at the meeting.

Hugh Coxe’s Comments

- Tim and I have visited sites many of which are operated by folks here. Thanks to everyone for your hospitality and for bringing us up to speed on what issues mean on the ground and helping us see your perspectives.
- Changes at the LUPC
 - Changes in the agency legislation and personnel
 - Changes took effect two weeks ago
 - For zoning, “demonstrated need” clause was removed
 - Anything that would trigger site law is now handled by DEP
 - New community-guided zoning and planning process to identify development areas is underway and might get started this year – this might have some impact on thinking about recreational lodging going forward

Discussion

- How is recreational lodging different from some other kind of vacation home?
 - Things of a commercial nature
 - We are trying to be inclusive but for most part leaning towards commercial endeavors
 - We are not narrowing it down too much
 - We are not sure how hotels, B&B, etc. will fit in
 - If someone owns a summer home that they rent out – perhaps that is part of this conversation
- Municipalities have comprehensive plans, *and* rules and regulations in their ordinances that drive development. I have always been confused by the use of the Comprehensive Land Use Plan and Chapter 10 – are they more intertwined?
 - This is a fundamental issue for us and something we want to look closer at in terms of how it impacts two distinct and key functions we perform: rezoning and permitting/certification.
 - The site law of DEP has thresholds
 - We need to ensure that our land use standards are met; effectively they will be reviewed by DEP
 - Nick Livesay explained that he is very familiar with zoning ordinance and comprehensive plans and how land use standards flow from one to other and need to be consistent
 - Sometime land use plans are is not treated as a standard
 - Historically this is a result of the way we are structured as statute – intertwined with the permitting end of things
 - There is more to come – I appreciate you raising the point
- You mentioned encouraging new business while preserving existing business. That makes me concerned as entrepreneur – should I be reined in by an existing business? Why does there have to be juxtaposition? Why is that LUPC's role?
 - I don't want to communicate that we would discourage competition
 - We were thinking: If you have a recreational lodging operation and a neighbor wants to set up a manufacturing facility - how would that impact your business?
 - It is actually part of our work, and a legislative mandate, to assess impact on existing uses and resources
 - We are not trying to say what business should happen and what shouldn't

Large Facilities

With a focus on facilities that are comparatively large, LUPC staff presented what they have heard and determined to be the top issues needing improvement. Then stakeholders added issues to the list and the group discussed.

Top Issues as Identified by LUPC Staff

- Use listings
 - Residential housing, timber harvest. etc.
 - We typically have campgrounds and commercial sporting camp listed
 - We don't have clarity on how a commercial sporting camp can also have a campground or run other types of activities
 - Need to be expanded to better reflect lodging opportunities
 - Scale
- Conversion
 - Many operations were permitted last year and chose or were forced to convert to other use
 - For example, if not viable as a business anymore, they might subdivide cabins and sell them off as homes
 - Need to clarify how to convert to other uses while being fair to other people
 - If one person wants to convert existing cabins/structures to homes but down the street someone wants to put in a subdivision, that has a different set of standards
- Campgrounds standards
 - Transient occupancy – 120 consecutive days per year
 - Bread and butter of campground business are folks who want to leave an RV there year round even though they only use it a few weeks per year
 - Owner has to move the RV around during the year
- How do we define a road?
 - Currently: something you drive on that's over 1000 ft. long
 - There are interior infrastructures over 1000 ft. that people drive on, which means there are certain setbacks for structures including gravel pads for bathhouses, etc. These standards don't make sense, they were meant for busier more developed areas
- Flexibility
 - We are always looking for opportunities to be flexible but also predictable and not complex
- Accessory uses
 - Example: camp stores. Many operations have a store to sell ice, beer, soda, ammo, bait, t-shirts, gas, etc. – but right now our rules don't allow this for

- some places.
- We are forced to read the rules strictly by law and to be fair
- ATV and snowmobiling tourism relies on gas – but our rules might not specify that that can happen
 - If a gas stop turns into a convenience store and mushrooms into different uses, at what point does it go beyond an “accessory” use?

Top Issues as Identified by Stakeholders, and Discussion

- Signage - any restrictions?
 - Once you start adding additional signs beyond the 64 sq. ft. area it triggers a need for a permit
 - Depends on location and distance apart from signs
 - If you want to list everything you sell at your store, you eat up the allowed square footage in a hurry
 - Directional signs?
 - Some signs are for general recreational use, and not necessarily on the property
 - They are considered under the same rules
 - Generally signs are signs
- Conversion and rezoning
 - If I wanted to rezone some property around my sporting camps, is the “need standard” still there?
 - That has been removed
 - We are trying to figure out how rezoning has changed
 - If I wanted to rezone to build another building, is DEP involved?
 - Depends on the project size – 3 acres triggers site law and the DEP
 - For rezoning, often just LUPC
 - For example, in order to have rafting business at your sporting camp, you have to have a change of zone – it’s a more intensive use
 - It would be good if logical natural conversions did not have to trigger a rezoning
 - Does conversion include expansion of an existing facility if they want to include a new activity – can they expand on an existing footprint?
 - This would come under use listings
 - Conversion refers changing to a totally different category of use
 - Conversion should be encouraged
 - Use listings are very limited in some districts – by increasing flexibility there, you would capture some of the conversion issues
 - We need to offer clientele as many different opportunities as we can
 - Keep them coming back and invite their friends
 - To get as nitpicky as we have in terms of what you can do in one

- development district vs. another – it seems arbitrary
- The descriptions at beginning of each district might say “light commercial”; and the Commission says we have flexibility built in but so far we haven’t used it
- What if there is a large cabin, and someone wanted to make a private club and sell memberships? It would be ideal if zoning would be just be the same – it shouldn’t make a difference whether it’s sporting camp. The USE hasn’t changed.
 - This is different than everybody having their own cabin each with a different amount of frontage
- Use listings and conversion ideas are one and the same. You are looking at the impact of one facility vs. another on the district. The human capacity is one aspect – more so than the activity. You can have a lot of people in an area in a managed, structured, way and it can actually have a lot less impact than residential homes. Very focused, managed tourism activities. It seems that there are few uses that would be incompatible if managed properly. A neighbor might not like snowmobiles coming and going or a speedboat business next door but that’s not a jurisdiction thing.
- If sporting camps become rental cabins, then condo-ized, I worry about not being able to go back – if someone wanted to return to their original operation. With the same amount of guests.
- Conversions aren’t always all or nothing – you can convert a portion of your facility. It might make sense to condo-ize some but also keep serving sporting camp clients.
- Make a distinction between *conversion* and simple *diversification* of business in response to changing economy - of course, with reasonable standards and recognition of environmental issues.
- Conversion could fall into the two categories; they are not all are the same.
 - Those that are converting to allowed uses it should be relatively easy. Those that aren’t should be looked at more closely.
 - Perhaps if you convert from commercial to residential use?
- You can use different scenarios to develop recreational lodging use listings
 - In the tourism industry a “sporting lodge” is a higher end, permanent, large building with a foundation. In other parts of the country these are popular. For us to achieve that -- maybe by buying an existing facility and converting it, including all the activities -- this should be allowed somehow. But it should not be called a “sporting camp”.
 - There’s no reason something like that couldn’t be in the North Woods, with managed impact.
 - You could call it a conversion or a new facility – you could get there a couple of ways.
 - The uses are the same, the amenities very different.
- Adjacency issues
 - My facility has been there for 120 years – I don’t want to see things change

- Development on the lake means that what clients came for isn't available any more
- I would like to see this reflected in the rules somehow – protect against too much impact on the culture/wilderness aspect
- Use listings and space limits
 - We bought the assets to run a wilderness youth camp. The only bucket it fell into was “sporting camp” that was its previous use. The state owns the land and we are on a state lease. When we looked at the property we discovered some things that were unpermitted or not located properly. When we tried to convert to a youth camp we learned that the sporting camp designation restricted useable square feet of space – if we had known that we might not have chosen that spot.
 - We have choke points where we can't grow any bigger, and we have plans to grow bigger. We need the ability to cook and feed everybody.
 - We are very sensitive to the ecological preserve.
 - Our potential solution would be to allow expansion on our big lodge, but it's a non-conforming building and we can't make it any MORE non-conforming.
 - Would be helpful if it could loosen up so we could make the building no more non-conforming but get the square feet we need
 - There should be more categories
 - Lots of people call themselves “sporting camps” – Maine Huts, rafting businesses, etc.
 - Should we add more categories for different businesses that have similar ideas on how they operate?
 - If you give someone a specific status, like “sporting camp”, maybe they can then convert to, say, rafting, but they wouldn't have been able to do that on their own
 - 10,000 sq. ft. is allowed for principal uses – lodge, guest cabins, caretaker cabins, dining, etc.
 - We tend to exclude woodsheds, generating sheds, workshops, etc.
 - Clarified that basements, storage, etc. are excluded
 - Calculations have been interpreted differently in different places, to try and fit different camps into that box.
 - What's the history of where 10,000 sq. ft. came from?
 - The Commission worked with the Maine Sporting Camp Association in 2000, it was back and forth, but “10,000 would be fine” was the sentiment then.
 - Clientele expectations are changing: A 500-700 sq. ft. cabin no longer does the job. You get to 10,000 sq. ft. in a hurry.
 - Could we lift 10,000 sq. ft. and put a provision in that says you need to come before LUPC with your proposal? I want to take more people and make them more comfortable.
 - We have added remote cabins on leases in various other regions, maybe even

in different counties, but it still counts towards our 10,000 sq. ft. It's crazy that it impacts our main area.

- It's not exclusive to guest use in our case
- Remote cabins are an issue – they have no interaction with the main lodge area; they shouldn't count towards the limit
- 10,000 sq. ft. limit is a real impediment to meet the needs of the changing marketplace. We desperately need to increase our kitchen area.
 - And factor in federal law re: handicapped accessibility
- Youth camps are not permitted in general management zone
 - Though some have gotten in by carrying over as a sporting camp
 - They should be considered – in relationship to size, same as campgrounds should be
 - Rules for a youth camp with 100 kids should be different than those for one with 600
- Setbacks
 - Requirement to move back when destroyed by fire
 - If we can't (swamp, other buildings in the way), we should be allowed to rebuild in the same spot
 - If historic, should be allowed to rebuild in same spot
 - The hole is already here, the trees have already been cut
 - It can be expensive to move back
 - Can there be tradeoffs? For example, if we want to tear down several cabins and replace with one
 - A lot can be done with design
 - Allow the owner to present a design concept to you that addresses environmental issues, etc. You can end up with something better than what was there before.
 - Rather than lots of strict issues about specific setbacks
 - Setbacks rules for sporting camps:
 - 150 for lodge
 - 100 for cabins
 - 150 for other structures
- Campgrounds
 - Allowing for seasonal campers to be onsite for the long term was helpful, but we ended up dealing with lots of trailers
 - I can't say we were protecting the resource – lots of trailers just sinking into the site, becoming part of the site. At some point during the year, they need to move. This created problems for people who were moving off site – we mitigated by offering them a place to store trailers in the off-season, off the property.
 - Seasonal people are very resistant to the idea that they have to take campers off-site
 - We charge them for the winter – they have to move them, and they have to have wheels underneath, etc.

- People will comply with the regulations, it's just a practical matter of how to accommodate them
 - They need to help make sure trailers are not falling apart
 - Perhaps consider a standard about maintaining trailers rather than moving them?
 - Why does the standard exist?
 - Environmental protection
 - Non-exclusive use – gives everybody a chance to use campsites
 - Also, campers don't have to meet same standards as other structures – they become nonconforming subdivisions
 - For a new campground, does a camper site have to be 100 ft. from water?
 - Campsites must be set back 75 ft. from roads, 50 ft. from shoreline.
 - We presume that a site within a campground meets that definition
 - I can build a rustic log cabin 100 ft. from water or a guy can move in with a bright yellow trailer closer to the water. Which is more detrimental?
 - The standards seem inconsistent sometimes
 - Many times people start with a campsite and the intent to build a dwelling later
- Roads
 - How should a road be defined and what should constitute a road being kicked up into the next category?
 - Define roads based on use, not on length
 - Average daily traffic
 - Category – access to campground, etc.
 - Whether the structures on it are temporary or permanent residential structures, and number of them
 - Would campgrounds then need to get a permit to convert – from a “driveway” to a road?
 - Defining based on use would help define width, construction standards, etc. – from an engineering standpoint
 - LUPC and Maine Forest Service can put in a road for a variety of internal purposes and then it can change very quickly to a more public use – and then you have safety concerns (logging trucks, etc. zooming by).

Medium Facilities

The group agreed that most of the issues were already covered in the discussion about large facilities.

Top Issues as Identified by LUPC Staff

- Commercial Sporting Camps
- Accessory Uses
- Standards for Campgrounds
- Defining Roads
- Conversion
- Use listings

Top Issues as Identified by Stakeholders, and Discussion

- In between commercial sport sites and campgrounds are rental cabins – they are strictly rentals.
 - This is covered under use listings
 - Each one of the sized facilities might have a category for this
 - What about mixed use? Would they be in a different category?
 - How SHOULD it be? That’s the question for everybody.
 - Is it used for one purpose in one season?
 - The Sporting Camp Association had a huge argument about what IS a sporting camp. It was defined:
 - As long as you have a base of operations, cabins to stay in, and guide services. And typically staff on site who take care of the facilities and can speak to the history of the place.
 - Then Great Northern started their own, where you stop at an office and rent a cabin – that’s different.
- Can a sporting camp have all three components – restaurant, campground, and cabins where people can cook? We offer fishing, hiking, canoeing, snowmobiling.
 - The Sporting Camp Association says you can have all those things and still be a sporting camp.
 - We are a sporting camp, we’re just bigger.
 - Some people feel strongly about protecting traditional uses.
- What to do when sporting camps ask for the opportunities to add stand alone rental cabins?
- Does a sporting camp get special privileges under current regulations?

- Yes. The biggest distinction is around reconstruction.
- This actually comes from statute – sporting camps are a valued tradition to Maine and are allowed to rebuild as they were – even nonconforming structures.
- Is that equitable to the owner of a larger camp?
- This also depends on another distinction - the zones in which sporting camps and larger operations would be allowed.
- The protections that sporting camps get is huge in some cases.
- It would be logical to allow business to buy certain cabins in certain locations and not penalize them because they still have the traditional core sporting camp.
- Can I assume that if I got a property like Matt’s in his zone and duplicated his business, would I be subject to Matt’s rules, or Suzie’s rules?
 - You would have current setbacks – so, no benefit in terms of reconstruction
 - If Matt condo-ized a structure and it burned down he would have to rebuild under the new standards
 - You can build a new sporting camp in a PGP but it must be to current standards. If it was in an MGN it would have to meet a commercial sporting camp definition in order to be built – it couldn’t just be rentals. Or, you’d have to have a zoning change.
- What other uses should be allowed in the management zone? Are we expanding the ability/use to put rental cabins onto some businesses?
 - The primary hurdle for rezoning issues is the concept of adjacency, meeting the current pattern of development
 - Recreational lodging uses don’t fit the typical consideration of “adjacency”
 - So, imagine I want to build a new sporting camp and my customers want to be right on the water like Libby’s. The setbacks are meant for environmental impact. It’s more likely about wastewater, runoff, roads – not the building. What if I want to be environmentally sound and build cabins on the water?
- What about visual impact?
 - We wrestle with this all the time – what’s uglier, the sound of a generator, or the visual impact of photovoltaics?
 - I think the setback is pretty important – for houses....The more trees you have between a house and a lake, it just takes longer before you have a lawn down to the water. How many cabins are on the lake, and how many will there be in the future? If there’s only one and there’s a conservation easement on areas of lake, put the sporting camp cabins right on the water. That way no one is visually impacted.
- The zoning is the tool that we have to figure out what our impact is on the landscape
 - If we have no way to enforce the adjacency requirement, do we then end up with resorts all through the North Woods?
- Development zones are 0.4% of the unorganized territories – and rental cabins aren’t allowed in the development district. You’ve shrunk that further for anyone

- who isn't a sporting camp to be able to put in rental cabins.
- There will be an attempt to address zoning in future conversations
 - This discussion is about the rules/regulations for all the different zonings
 - Adjacency issues tend to limit recreational facilities development going forward
 - We have heard that more development should be allowed in Management Zone
 - It comes down to impact – either environmental or visual. If you can minimize the impact (via regulations) it's not going to hurt your sporting camp or the other guy across the lake.
 - If you are in a protection zone that says you can't have a store, that's low hanging fruit. Everyone should be able to have a store. As for selling gasoline, there is a difference between selling it to another facility on the lake, vs. opening up to general public.
 - Could we set it up like a sliding scale – in some district some things are allowed on smaller scales or in smaller sizes and amounts than other districts?
 - Maybe we could create “buckets” and say how many districts can we allow this bucket in?
 - Maybe in an aquifer protection zone, only the smallest buckets are allowed
 - Consider this alongside location issues
 - The statistic of 41,000 acres of developed zone is deceiving because there are development opportunities in the other zones – shooting ranges, etc.

Small Facilities

Top Issues as Identified by LUPC Staff

- Campsites and Structures
 - Our statute defines what a campsite is and limits structures to a picnic table shelter, tent platform, and outhouse.
 - Individual lot owners might want to use their lake property as a campsite while they build a house. Then they build a shed to hold lifejackets, tools for building their house, etc. and features that go with a dwelling but not with a campsite. Technically it's no longer a campsite.
- Standards for Campgrounds
- Use listings

Top Issues as Identified by Stakeholders, and Discussion

- A campsites and structures solution: Distinguish campsites meant for public use vs. those meant for personal use – which ones are not going to be available for others to

use.

Craig asked the group if anyone had any concerns with this solution. There were no disagreements.

- So, to clarify, a campsite for private use would be owned by someone who was going to use it vs. a multiple-site commercial compound?
 - Campsites are defined as allowing for up to four camping sites.
- Self contained cabins
 - With their own kitchens, don't use dining services, etc.
 - "Housekeeping cabins"
 - Should the definition of sporting camps include facilities that have this?
 - LUPC definition says outpost cabins are considered part of the commercial sporting camp.
 - Someone might have outpost cabins in other townships, many miles away.
 - It seems pretty clear that we could define them as not connected, not part of sq. ft. Should they be part of allowable reconstruction?
 - How close should an outpost cabin be before it's excluded from sq. ft.? So we don't create loopholes.
 - You can easily imagine that if you have multiple detached camps that are just outside the distance line, all owned by the same owner, when does it become one entity of one owner?
 - How about if it's on a different lake?
 - Or whether it's on the same tract of land – or contiguous
 - Do the inhabitants intend to use the main sporting camp and its services – or are they on their own? The whole purpose of a cabin might be for those who don't want anything to do with the main lodge.
 - If I personally own it and rent it out, that's allowed; if a business like Matt's owns it and rents it out, that's not allowed.
 - I could rent it and ask Matt's business to provide the services
 - If one person manages all the properties in an certain area, it might even be better managed
 - So the four factors are:
 - Same lake
 - Contiguous
 - Distance
 - Relationship with the main lodge
 - Contiguous land is the one that passes the straight face test.
 - There's also how you get there – do cross the lake in boat, drive in a truck to a float plane? Or walk over?
 - Let's say you build a camp next to your existing sporting camp. You can have two businesses: Libby's Sport Camp and Libby Rental Camps. The owner of

- the sporting camp decides he wants to make a rental camp. He just doesn't get the rebuild exemption; his stuff should be regulated separately.
- However, some places already have extra cabins not counted toward 10,000 sq. ft.
 - Currently this would not be allowed in the management zone – should it be?
 - It doesn't matter - as long as it comes down to impact
 - If it's far enough away so that each user (main camp, outpost camp, etc.) can each still have a wilderness experience.
 - Define the limits of sporting camp in a given area – lodge, cabins, infrastructure. If other rental cabins are not part of sporting camp experience but are part of the business model – you WOULD be able to rebuild it.
 - Make a catch-all bucket – “other uses” that are consistent with main sporting camp uses and not detrimental
 - Outpost cabins that are existing and are associated with a sporting camp business should receive the benefit of the rebuilding provision

Other Issues

Participants were invited to ask questions and provide feedback on recreational lodging facilities rules not already covered in today's discussion.

- Can you address coordination of regulation from multiple agencies?
 - DHHS covers wastewater rules and the commercial end of campgrounds, restaurants, youth camps, etc. They have a different definition of sporting camp than we do.
 - People are confused – if they get a permit from DHHS and then they need to know whether to get a permit from LUPC
 - Each agency has its own purposes
- I wonder, is it worth the effort to chase redundant permits or should we focus on other things? I would LOVE to see some coordination on the application/permit process. There's a sizable amount of info that I needed to provide, and to 10 different agencies. Then the 30-day review process took 60 days – it seems that it's way too convoluted. To us, you're all one agency!
- Why make one piece of language different than another piece of language – i.e. in the definition of a sporting camp?
 - At rulemaking level these are all different
- Once we've gone all the way through with LUPC, I'm pretty confident that they've turned over every rock and we can be sure that we are doing what we are supposed to be doing. Maybe LUPC staff could invite other agencies to review our applications – at their option.
- I had a very good experience with the process of dealing with one particular LUPC

person. Friendly field people make a difference. When they say “Hmm, you can’t do that, have you thought about doing this?” It feels like we are not the enemy.

- It’s about 50/50 with LUPC field staff. Some are very helpful, others are not. When trying to get a house built it makes a very big difference.
- The field offices are really handy – you used to have to go to Augusta.

LUPC staff and Commissioners were invited to ask the group for specific clarifications and feedback.

- Hugh asked for feedback on the idea of performance-based approaches – looking at human capacity instead of creating strict use-listings. For example, showing that you can accommodate your intended capacity with no environmental problems.
 - This as opposed to zoning-based; might have some administrative problems
 - Comments
 - Imagine that someone has decided that 24 is the limit for the kind of experience he wants to maintain, but the flexibility is how he builds his structure to house them (private rooms, etc.)
 - Some camps do great at 25 people but tensions start at 35
 - AMC wanted a lot of land away from motorization and has figured out how to space out trails and structures to provide that kind of experience
 - It’s how many people are there and what they are doing and how they are spaced
 - If John wants to run whitewater-rafting trips, how does it really affect the area around the Birches?
 - The business controls the experiences and markets it so the customers get a certain type of experience - it’s hard to put a solid number on this
 - Maybe you give a hard number of sq. ft. but have a “but” clause where you show the tradeoff – where you show that there is no more significant impact
 - How to quantify impact to allow LUPC to regulate according to impact rather than zoning?
 - This is how other agencies work
 - We are not plowing new ground with this
 - You have to watch out for people who just want to make a buck
 - It’s harder to regulate; it’s easier to get around the spirit of it, but its’ worth trying. We could do a 1-year, 2-year, or 5-year evaluation.
 - The long-term development plan idea might work in tandem with this
 - Looking at human impact rather than structural development itself - how would that work on an operational level, especially when thinking about conversion?
 - If you convert those structures to homes, there’s a different human

- based impact with a residential use
- Multiple use businesses – where do they fit? It’s still something to think about

How Facilities Should be Categorized for Regulatory Purposes

Craig posed a question to the group:

- “What if you threw out the way facilities are categorized now? Start with a clean state. How would you categorize? Size, number of visitors, type of use, type of building?”

The group decided to break into smaller groups, by table, to discuss the question “How should facilities be categorized for regulatory purposes?”

Clarifications about the discussion topic:

- All districts are up for discussion. Management, protection, and development. Some facilities here are in management and some are in general development. There are significant differences between districts.
 - Categories might be regulated differently in different districts.
- We are trying to delineate the different activities that fall under the banner of “recreational use”. What might then flow from there is asking whether there are some districts where a use should be permitted and others where it should not, or maybe something can be larger in some areas and smaller in others.

Summary

How Facilities Should be Categorized for Regulatory Purposes:

- Factors
 - Size in square footage or acreage
 - Number of people
 - Types of uses
 - Off-site related uses
 - Types of amenities
 - Size of infrastructure
 - Permanency vs. temporary
 - Historical significance
 - Traditional sporting camp needs its own designation
 - Proportion of the acreage allocated to buildings
 - Setting
 - Traditional uses vs. new uses

- Type of access
- Facilities categorized according to:
 - Impact of the facility on the resource and on tradition
 - Size
 - Buildings
 - Number of people
 - Uses
 - Compatibility with other uses and tradition
- Facilities owners submit long range plans/designs for approval
- Relax the 10,000 square foot limit
- Need predictability for investors

Discussion

Each table reported on their small group's answers to the question "How should facilities be categorized for regulatory purposes?"

- Table One
 - Size of whole facilities
 - Number of people coming/are served
 - Type of use of facility – including exterior uses – whether they take trips vs. staying in that location
 - Amenities (store, etc.)
 - Location – proximity to resources
 - Size of infrastructure – lots of roadways, buildings, etc. – not tied to number of people
 - Permanent vs. temporary
 - Having some kind of recognition of historic significance of sporting camps
- Table Two
 - Size, permanence
 - Portions of a structure that can be allocated among different uses – if your whole 10,000 ft. is all one lodge, it's really not a "sporting camp"
 - We dilute the category of sporting camp
 - A true sporting camp is historical, traditional; it would be a shame to lose these things
 - Look at the resources around a sporting camp – if another so-called sporting camp or rental place wants to build a big lodge nearby and have the lights on all night

- Be careful to keep an eye on little changes like converting from stoves to heaters
 - A problem: the type of demographics/people who want to stay there might want more than a woodstove
 - They might want comfort, bigger bathrooms, more amenities – where do you draw the line for upgrades to keep clientele coming?
- Table Three
 - Outdoor, traditional, recreational uses vs. just recreational uses
 - What are the protections afforded to sporting camps in terms of ability to rebuild a non-conforming structure? If you switched a sporting camp to another use and lost the building, could you rebuild?
 - Would be the same rules as for new facilities
 - Conversions should be able to go back and forth – so you can go back to your original set-up
 - Consider youth camps, huts and trails, and size of remote rental cabins
 - Can they rent them out without being penalized for having that square footage?
 - Consider the benefits: remote cabins allow people to experience beautiful places without adding more structures
 - Expand to more than 10,000 sq. ft.
- Table Four
 - Types of access
 - Private road, public road, fly-in only
 - Flexibility to grow sq. ft. as you need to grow – even if you are serving the same number of people
- Is there another way to achieve sq. ft. goal with another metric? What are you trying to achieve? Why is the cap at 10,000?
 - Historically, a group met and looked at sizes of existing camps
- Why is there a limit at all?
 - Historically, to limit development in the unorganized territories
 - Now, times have changed and the goal has changed from “limit” to “manage” development
 - Sq. footage is commonly used as a proxy for intensity
 - Subdistricts identify uses that are compatible with the setting – sq. ft. helps define what’s compatible
- Put it on the business owner to demonstrate the physical requirements and resources required. Business owners could sit down periodically with LUPC for a review of changes in the business. They would need to demonstrate environmental impact.
- There still needs to be a threshold to get in the door – so people who invest in a piece of land know what they can expect to get in return.
- We do planning on 10-year timeframe. Owners should be able to get to LUPC and submit a 5- or 10-year plan for approval. When they get permitted they then have

that duration to implement that plan. Most permitting works such that if you don't get it done in 12 months, you have to start over with new standards.

- I agree with the threshold idea – create a new foundation for regulations. However, if this process becomes friendly enough for business owners and investors and people who want to make their living using our natural resources – you will have a lot more people who will want to and be willing to do this. Our convoluted process and permit system actually prevents people from doing some development.
- We should be able to reconstruct historic properties – apply the sq. ft. threshold to the non-conforming sporting camps – give them ability to be larger, but also protect historic buildings.
- Separate the satellite/remote rental cabins from the main camp areas
- If there is an existing building and it needs to be enhanced, it should be able to be enhanced without the sq. ft. limitation
- If you want to add a lodge behind a group of sporting camps, new standards should apply. Don't forget that design has a lot to do with it. You can design in ways that protect the resources and the values you want to protect.
- We need some metric in terms of predictability for investors coming into the region and for owners. This happened with Plum Creek – lack of predictability in terms and steps and hurdles to get their permits.

Emerging Guiding Principles

The following guiding principles were developed and revised on the screen during the meeting. After discussing, the group agreed to let the following summary stand as the conclusion from the meeting:

Summary

- Categorize facilities based on impact.
How they impact the resource and how they impact traditional uses.
Look at:
 - Overall size
 - Number and type of buildings
 - Amount of use (number of people)
 - Type of use
 - LocationConsider looking at performance-based impact rather than regulated-use-impact, with specific attention to human impact (number of people)
- Facilities should be regulated based on impact (bullet #1 above) AND where they are located (Development, Management, or Protection zone)

- Provide predictability AND flexibility
 - Assess impact by looking at a facility's long range development plan
 - Allow flexibility and trade-offs between activities and uses that result in more or less impact
 - Within categories, allow for easy changes
 - Fewer restrictions on private facilities than public facilities
- Relax regulations in light of new technology, new customer demands, and other realities, yet balanced with protecting the resource and traditional uses
 - Relax the 10,000 square foot maximum cap
 - Simplify and improve the fairness of how it's counted
- Preserve the tradition of sporting camps by allowing them to rebuild on traditional sites and consider separately regulating their non-traditional uses
- It's really helpful when LUPC staff have an attitude of "we're here to help you plan" rather than "we're here to regulate you."

Discussion

- Exact same facility, in a different zone = potentially different regulations
- There used to be a loophole for big companies to develop closer to town and protect more areas out in the woods. Does it make sense to point fingers at areas that are more developable in the future?
 - Like designated growth areas
- None of us wants a national park, but we all want the ability to use something that looks like a national park. The smaller the landowners get, the harder it's going to be to do tradeoffs with your individual property. Offer options and tradeoffs on a larger scale.
- One of the major efforts of LUPC now is prospective zoning – going and identifying areas that make sense for development, and doing that, on some level, in exchange for not having development in other areas
 - The concept is alive but details still being worked out
 - We are not folding that into this process but we will continue talking about it
 - We don't have a mechanism now that's in place to easily do that
 - Conceptually this is what municipalities have to do – but on a much larger scale

Next Steps and Next Meeting

Craig reminded the group that there would be another meeting, scheduled for October 17, and asked what would be compelling enough for further discussion, or what were particular topics to talk more about. Here are the responses:

- Take a crack at what we just talked about today and see a rough proposal
 - Also hear some pros and cons from LUPC staff, i.e. “This is what we would be worried about; here are the ramifications...”
- Maybe have a working session on some of this
 - To try and help Tim and Hugh as they work through this
- We all care about the resources, but we should imagine what if Donald Trump wanted to build the worlds’ biggest golf course here. Would the rules we make allow that?
- LUPC staff could come back with which ideas can be made into rules already, and then just check off these things
- I’d like to write my own set of rules and see what LUPC thinks of them – if everyone could do that it would be a really interesting discussion
- With land and business owners taking a stab at even one or two pieces of this – we have a much better opportunity to get some great new ideas
- Maybe even come up with a couple of illustrative proposals that demonstrate what some of the road blocks are

For the October 17 meeting, LUPC staff agreed to prepare some draft approaches based on today’s discussion.

LUPC staff explained that Lincoln was chosen for today’s meeting because it was the most accessible for the most number of people in the jurisdiction – it was the shortest longest distance, so to speak. A quick straw poll revealed that for those present today, many would prefer to meet next time in the Bangor area. Some preferred the Rangeley area, others preferred Lincoln. There were a few votes for Aroostook County as well.

LUPC staff invited all participants to share ideas on definitions, uses, specific situations, and even write their own proposed rules. Deadline to send ideas to Tim Beaucage is October 9. Timothy.Beaucage@maine.gov

Closing Comments

All participants had a chance to make a brief closing comment; reflections on the meeting or lingering hopes or concerns.

- Thanks for your investment of time
- Thanks for the offer to participate and the openness
- This was a great discussion – conceptually we made a lot of headway – this could be radical change
- Thanks for the meeting; I look forward to the collection of ideas for next time
- Thanks for the opportunity to voice my opinions – great job
- Great job. Wish I could be here in October. I'm encouraged by what's happened. The more openness and transparency the better.
- We tested a lot of things today and they were positive. The Maine Sporting Camp Association thought the process was not too bad way it was. We addressed a few points today, looking forward to continuing on with this process.
- Thanks everyone for showing up and being open in helping us with the process. If you know of other people who might have an interest – please encourage them to attend. Share materials, put something in newsletters, we want to get many people who are involved at all levels.
- Thanks to the staff and the Commissioners, and thanks for inviting us
- It's nice to see governments reaching out to us – gave us a little food for thought
- Very refreshing. We care about the environment as much as you folks need to regulate it. Together we can come up with good ideas.
- I appreciate everyone's comments. When we finally come to rule revision we want them to be easy for staff to use in field and to help you attain your projects – looking forward to more dialogue.
- Thanks for the opportunity. These facilities are the entities by which many people experience the outdoors for first time; this is the way people connect with nature and the outdoors – it's not just economic activity.
- It's been a good session today – some of what I heard today will fit with the prospective zoning discussion, and it may be part of the resolution.

Nick Livesay closed the meeting with the following remarks:

- I'm appreciative of all the time you spent.
- Apart from dates we discussed, I want everyone to feel that you have an avenue for sharing if you have any concerns - we need to know what we can do better. Don't feel like your only opportunity is the 9th or the next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 3:15.

Appendix A: Agenda

Maine Land Use Planning Commission
Recreational Lodging Facilities Stakeholder Input
Meeting One Agenda
Wednesday, September 12, 2012, Lincoln, Maine

Overall Project Objective

At the end of the entire project, including stakeholder input, rule making, and Commission approval, our objective is to have in place a set of rules that efficiently and effectively regulate recreational lodging in LUPC's jurisdiction for the benefit of facility owners, visitors, and Maine residents, striking an appropriate balance between private enterprise and resource protection.

Meeting One Objectives

- Shared understanding of LUPC's role with regard to recreational lodging facilities.
- Shared understanding of this stakeholder input process.
- Initial ideas for improved rules, including general consensus around some specific approaches and identification of areas of contention.

Agenda

- 9:30 **Opening**
 Welcome
 Nick Livesay, Director, Maine Land Use Planning Commission
 About the Meeting
 Craig Freshley, Facilitator, Good Group Decisions
 Introductions
- 9:50 **LUPC Overview and Role with Recreational Lodging**
 LUPC Senior Planners Tim Beaucage and Hugh Coxe will provide a
 brief overview of what LUPC does, a little relevant history, and LUPC's

role with regard to each type of recreational lodging and particular attention to the issues on which LUPC is seeking input.

10:15 **Large Facilities**

With particular attention to facilities that are comparatively large, we will go through the following steps:

1. Top Issues Needing Improvement - presentation
We will begin with a quick overview of the issues that have emerged so far, as determined by LUPC Staff
2. Top Issues Needing Improvement - discussion
We will add to the list. What do YOU think are the top issues needing improvement? And then we will prioritize the list. What are the very most important to address?

10:45 **Break**

- 11:00 3. Potential solutions - discussion
We will brainstorm, discuss, and develop a collective list of most promising solutions.

11:30 **Medium-Large Facilities**

With particular attention to facilities that are comparatively mid-sized to larger, we will go through the following steps:

1. Top Issues Needing Improvement - presentation
We will begin with a quick overview of the issues that have emerged so far, as determined by LUPC Staff
2. Top Issues Needing Improvement - discussion
We will add to the list. What do YOU think are the top issues needing improvement? And then we will prioritize the list. What are the very most important to address?
3. Potential solutions – discussion
We will brainstorm, discuss, and develop a collective list of most promising solutions.

12:30 **Lunch**

1:15 **Medium-Small Facilities**

With particular attention to facilities that are comparatively smaller to mid-sized, we will go through the following steps:

1. Top Issues Needing Improvement - presentation
We will begin with a quick overview of the issues that have emerged so far, as determined by LUPC Staff
2. Top Issues Needing Improvement - discussion
We will add to the list. What do YOU think are the top issues

needing improvement? And then we will prioritize the list.
What are the very most important to address?

3. Potential solutions – discussion

We will brainstorm, discuss, and develop a collective list of most promising solutions.

2:15

Small Facilities

With particular attention to facilities that are comparatively small, we will go through the following steps:

1. Top Issues Needing Improvement - presentation

We will begin with a quick overview of the issues that have emerged so far, as determined by LUPC Staff

2. Top Issues Needing Improvement - discussion

We will add to the list. What do YOU think are the top issues needing improvement? And then we will prioritize the list.
What are the very most important to address?

3. Potential solutions – discussion

We will brainstorm, discuss, and develop a collective list of most promising solutions.

3:15

Closing Comments

This is a chance for brief closing comments; perhaps reflections on the meeting or lingering hopes or concerns.

3:30

Adjourn

Appendix B: List of Issues

Maine Land Use Planning Commission
Recreational Lodging Facilities Stakeholder Input
Meeting One Notes
Wednesday, September 12, 2012, Lincoln, Maine

Large Facilities

4. Top Issues Needing Improvement – presentation by LUPC Staff
 - a. Use listings – LUPC’s use listings are too limited and therefore not inclusive or flexible enough to accommodate development trends. Examples of uses not adequately covered include various scales and combinations of: rental cabins, resorts; group/youth camps; Commercial Sporting Camps; backcountry huts; and campgrounds. What other types of uses are we missing?
 1. Categorization of scale or impact – How should we think about categorizing or differentiating (e.g. square footage, people, beds, lot coverage, number of sites/cabins/rooms, etc) between uses of various scales?
 - b. Conversion – Over time many facilities seek to convert to some other use (e.g. commercial sporting camp converted to a residential subdivision). Can facilities be converted to another, very different use? If so, how can that conversion occur while maintaining fairness, landowner equity, appropriate review, and predictability?
 - c. Standards for Campgrounds –
 2. Transient Occupancy (Campgrounds) – How do we strike a balance of allowing “seasonal sites/clientele” within campgrounds while providing appropriate resource protections?
 3. Should campgrounds, or components, be exempt from certain existing standards (setbacks, vegetative buffers, etc)?
 - d. Defining Roads – Setbacks are utilized for a number of purposes (e.g. safety, separation of uses, environmental purposes, etc). In regards to setbacks, allowing some development to be closer to interior roads makes sense, but we must also consider what happens as the road use increases or the use converts to another use? How can we achieve both purposes?
 - e. Flexibility – We aim for flexibility within our rules, however flexibility typically brings complexity. How can our standards provide additional flexibilities without making the standards unnecessarily complex?
 - f. Accessory Uses – A number of uses tend to include accessory uses (e.g. a campstore, sale of gas, bait, etc.). This can be especially true in the large, generally undeveloped north woods. However, typically retail stores typically allowed in a development subdistricts. To what extent can we accommodate accessory uses without compromising the gravitational resources or requiring a rezoning?
5. Top Issues Needing Improvement – discussion / **Group ID**

- ii.
- iii.

6. Potential solutions – discussion / **Group ID**

- iv.
- v.

Medium-Large Facilities

4. Top Issues Needing Improvement – presentation by LUPC Staff [**NOTE: no need to discuss items again; only identify any necessary nuances related to branches.**]
- a. Commercial Sporting Camps – Many lodging clients are expecting more amenities or more privacy (i.e. it takes more square footage to accommodate clients today). Because commercial sporting camps are currently limited to 10,000 square feet, this trend can be difficult to address. Should the square footage limit be increased? If so, how much? Should the size depend upon the subdistrict or location?
 - b. Accessory Uses – A number of uses tend to include accessory uses (e.g. a campstore, sale of gas, bait, etc.). This can be especially true in the large, generally undeveloped north woods. However, typically retail stores typically allowed in a development subdistricts. To what extent can we accommodate accessory uses without compromising the gravitational resources or requiring a rezoning?
 - c. Use listings – LUPC’s use listings are too limited and therefore not inclusive or flexible enough to accommodate development trends. Examples of uses not adequately covered include various scales and combinations of: rental cabins, resorts; group/youth camps; Commercial Sporting Camps; backcountry huts; and campgrounds. What other types of uses are we missing?
 - 1. Categorization of scale or impact – How should we think about categorizing or differentiating (e.g. square footage, people, beds, lot coverage, number of sites/cabins/rooms, etc) between uses of various scales?
 - d. Conversion – Over time many facilities seek to convert to some other use (e.g. commercial sporting camp converted to a residential subdivision). Can facilities be converted to another, very different use? If so, how can that conversion occur while maintaining fairness, landowner equity, appropriate review, and predictability?
 - e. Flexibility – We aim for flexibility within our rules, however flexibility typically brings complexity. How can our standards provide additional flexibilities without making the standards unnecessarily complex?
 - f. Standards for Campgrounds –
 - 2. Transient Occupancy (Campgrounds) – How do we strike a balance of allowing “seasonal sites/clientele” within campgrounds while providing appropriate resource protections?
 - 3. Should campgrounds, or components, be exempt from certain existing standards (setbacks, vegetative buffers, etc)?
 - g. Defining Roads – Setbacks are utilized for a number of purposes (e.g. safety, separation of uses, environmental purposes, etc). In regards to setbacks, allowing some development to be closer to interior roads makes sense, but we must also consider what happens as the road use increases or the use converts to another use?

5. Top Issues Needing Improvement – discussion / **Group ID**

- vi.
- vii.

6. Potential solutions – discussion / **Group ID**

- viii.
- ix.

Medium-Small Facilities

4. Top Issues Needing Improvement - presentation by LUPC Staff [**NOTE: no need to discuss items again; only identify any necessary nuances related to sticks.**]

- a. Commercial Sporting Camps – Many lodging clients are expecting more amenities or more privacy (i.e. it takes more square footage to accommodate clients today). Because commercial sporting camps are currently limited to 10,000 square feet, this trend can be difficult to address. Should the square footage limit be increased? If so, how much? Should the size depend upon the subdistrict or location?
- b. Accessory Uses – A number of uses tend to include accessory uses (e.g. a campstore, sale of gas, bait, etc.). This can be especially true in the large, generally undeveloped north woods. However, typically retail stores typically allowed in a development subdistricts. To what extent can we accommodate accessory uses without compromising the gravitational resources or requiring a rezoning?
- c. Standards for Campgrounds –
 - 1. Transient Occupancy (Campgrounds) – How do we strike a balance of allowing “seasonal sites/clientele” within campgrounds while providing appropriate resource protections?
 - 2. Should campgrounds, or components, be exempt from certain existing standards (setbacks, vegetative buffers, etc)?
- d. Defining Roads – Setbacks are utilized for a number of purposes (e.g. safety, separation of uses, environmental purposes, etc). In regards to setbacks, allowing some development to be closer to interior roads makes sense, but we must also consider what happens as the road use increases or the use converts to another use?
- e. Conversion – Over time many facilities seek to convert to some other use (e.g. commercial sporting camp converted to a residential subdivision). Can facilities be converted to another, very different use? If so, how can that conversion occur while maintaining fairness, landowner equity, appropriate review, and predictability?
- f. Use listings – LUPC’s use listings are too limited and therefore not inclusive or flexible enough to accommodate development trends. Examples of uses not adequately covered include various scales and combinations of: rental cabins, resorts; group/youth camps; Commercial Sporting Camps; backcountry huts; and campgrounds. What other types of uses are we missing?
 - 3. Categorization of scale or impact – How should we think about categorizing or differentiating (e.g. square footage, people, beds, lot coverage, number of sites/cabins/rooms, etc) between uses of various scales?

5. Top Issues Needing Improvement - discussion / **Group ID**

- x.
- xi.

6. Potential solutions – discussion / **Group ID**

- xii.
- xiii.

Small Facilities

1. Top Issues Needing Improvement – presentation by LUPC Staff

- a. Campsites – Structures – To what extent should / can we accommodate campsites that warrant structures? Is there a difference between private use versus public/commercial use?
- b. Standards for Campgrounds –
 - 1. Transient Occupancy (Campgrounds) – How do we strike a balance of allowing “seasonal sites/clientele” within campgrounds while providing appropriate resource protections?
 - 2. Should campgrounds, or components, be exempt from certain existing standards (setbacks, vegetative buffers, etc)?
- c. Use listings – LUPC’s use listings are too limited and therefore not inclusive or flexible enough to accommodate development trends. Examples of uses not adequately covered include various scales and combinations of: rental cabins, resorts; group/youth camps; Commercial Sporting Camps; backcountry huts; and campgrounds. What other types of uses are we missing?
 - 3. Categorization of scale or impact – How should we think about categorizing or differentiating (e.g. square footage, people, beds, lot coverage, number of sites/cabins/rooms, etc) between uses of various scales?

2. Top Issues Needing Improvement – discussion / **Group ID**

- xiv.
- xv.

3. Potential solutions – discussion / **Group ID**

- xvi.
- xvii.

OTHER [items that do not fit into categories]

1. Other Issues Needing Improvement

- a. Commercial Sporting Camps (self contained cabins) – If a CSC includes, in-part or in-whole, self-contained cabins is it consistent with the statutory intent and purpose of the codified protections and the culturally historic idea?
- b. Commercial Sporting Camps (outpost cabins) – How far away does an “Outpost Cabin” need to be to no longer be part of the square footage limitation?
- c. Campsites (exclusive use) –
- d. Coordination regulations from multiple agencies