

ORR COMPREHENSIVE LAND USE PLAN FOCUS GROUP MEETING NOTES

January 11, 2002

A working meeting of the Focus Group was held at the City of Oak Ridge's Public Works Building on Woodbury Lane at 10:00 am until 3:00 January 11, 2002.

Attendees

The following members of the Focus Group were in attendance: Steve Alexander, Paul Boyer, Ray Evans, Parker Hardy, Lorene Sigal, David Mosby, Ralph Lillard, Marty Marina, Bill Pardue, Lloyd Stokes, Joe Valentino, Marshall Whisnant, Beth Phillips (Tony Grande alternate), Lawrence Young and Eric Rauch. Ellen Smith attended as an alternate to Dev Joslin. Kingsley Brock also attended as an observer. Pete Craven, Scott Davis, Dave McKinney were unable to attend.

Members of the Facilitation Team in attendance were Leah Dever, Barry Lawson, Pat Parr, Marianne Heiskell, Wayne Tolbert and Mike Deacon. Sharon Bell and Diane McDaniel (from SAIC) provided technical analysis briefings. Approximately 10 members of the public attended all or part of the meeting.

Old Action Items

- A revised Focus Group Area of Interest map (dated 1/10/02) indicating that uses of the ridge behind ED-1 "must be compatible with research" was provided to the Focus Group as requested.
- As a means of getting more input from the Focus Group on the analysis approach and values, a 32-question survey was utilized to solicit input from the Focus Group.

New Action Items

- The Focus Group requested that a more thorough record of meeting activities be provided. The Facilitation team will prepare more detailed meeting notes and attempt to capture more of the discussion. Facilitation team requested the Focus Group respond with any key points they feel have been missed or need amplifying. Updated notes can then be distributed at the next meeting. This approach will be evaluated to see that it meets the Focus Group needs before considering other methods of documentation.
- Arrange for Matt Murray (UT Center for Economic Research) to make a presentation to the Focus Group about regional economic development.
- Obtain map of City Council "strawman" of City's needs (next 10 years, beyond 10 years).
- Listing of "covenants" that will remain in Zone 1 and Zone 2 (i.e., groundwater, digging, etc.).
- Public meeting notices to include opportunity to receive information & provide comments if unable to attend the meeting.

ORR LUPP Focus Group Meeting Notes - 1/11/2002

- Simple map showing within City of Oak Ridge the amount of space utilized and open for industrial, office space, commercial space, etc.
- Arrange for field trip to view Focus Group area of interest.

Welcome/Introductions

The proposed meeting agenda was briefly discussed, agreed upon, and followed.

Notes from Previous Meeting

The meeting notes from the December Focus Group meeting were briefly discussed. Several Focus Group members expressed the desire that future Meeting Notes be more detailed. Additional copies were provided as needed to both the Focus Group and members of the public.

Announcements

Barry Lawson offered the reminder that the next Focus Group meeting would be at the Community Room at the Oak Ridge Mall, February 6 from 10:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. The public meeting will be held January 30th in the Cumberland Room at the Oak Ridge Mall. There will be two "identical" sessions-one from 1:00 to 4:00 p.m. and the other from 6:00 to 9:00 p.m.

Pat Parr distributed two hardcopy maps with data the group has seen before: (1) one showing EM Zone 1, Zone 2, and 5 known radiological areas around ETTP; and, (2) one showing the City of Oak Ridge planning commission proposed zoning for the west end corridor. Pat also provided an update on the pink area north of ED-1. Because of several research projects in that area, DOE has decided that any proposed land uses must be compatible with research. The land use planning map with the legend updated to reflect this decision was provided to the focus group. Copies of letters from three members of the public as a result of the December open house were provided. Additionally copies of two letters from focus group members were provided.

In response to a question a member of the public (Cissy Perkins, DOE Environmental Management) discussed the contamination zones status at ETTP. The current status is that the proposed Record of Decision (ROD) for Zone 1 (surrounding the ETTP site) is being worked but the ROD for Zone 2 (inside ETTP) has not been drafted yet. An explanation of the land use zoning codes used on one of the maps was requested. Lorene Sigal provided them. Further discussion revealed that considerations such as cultural resources are not included on the zoning map. The zoning map portrays a general land use.

Public Comments

JoAnn Thompson stated that she helps rehabilitate injured wild birds. She noted that the laws do not protect some wildlife from some injurious activities. She in particular noted the devastation done to Pine Ridge would more than undo any efforts on her part of rehabilitate injured birds. She expressed concern about legal but unwise development.

Survey Results

Barry Lawson described the survey results to date. About a dozen members had responded by Thursday in time to get incorporated in the first set of results. Some Focus Group members who had not previously completed their survey did so prior to hearing the preliminary results.

Generally speaking Barry noted that people who identified themselves as leaning more toward economic values expressed a willingness to compromise. Likewise, those with stronger environmental leanings indicated a willingness to address economic concerns. Barry also observed that there was good agreement by both groups that residential development in the pink area was less important than other values. There was good agreement among both groups on the importance of 7 items: (1) increase jobs in Oak Ridge, (2) increase the Oak Ridge tax base, (3) concentrate industrial development, (4) conserve natural resources and wildlife, (5) minimize habitat/land fragmentation, (6) air quality, and (7) water quality. The question about conserving natural resources and wildlife had the smallest standard deviation from the mean (suggesting that there was greatest overall agreement on this item).

In the course of the discussion about these results and what they may mean, it was suggested that Matt Murray (UT Center for Economic Research) would be an excellent resource to provide information to the Focus Group about regional economic development. Marty Marina indicated that any analysis of residential development should address cost-benefit. Parker Hardy responded that there are many opinions about doing such cost-benefit analysis but a key problem is properly defining the real costs. Some costs (as well as some benefits) can be intangibles and some synergies may not be apparent. It is not necessarily a straightforward process.

Lorene Sigal suggested that the survey results from the Focus Group should be shared with the public. Barry clarified with the Focus Group there was support for providing results at the upcoming public meeting on January 30.

There was strong support for the facilitation team to compile the remaining Focus Group survey forms and re-do the results before the end of today's meeting. Barry agreed to do whatever was possible in that time period.

Technical Analysis - Economic

Wayne Tolbert reminded the Focus Group of the general analysis plan approach discussed at the last meeting. He pointed out that in order to provide some preliminary results for the Focus Group to consider SAIC would look at two general scenarios-a full development scenario and a full conservation scenario. He emphasized the iterative nature of the analysis. He then introduced Sharon Bell.

Sharon Bell

Sharon discussed an analysis tool that is being used to help better understand what economic benefits can be generated for the City of Oak Ridge given certain assumptions. This tool can be used in doing trade-off analysis among various land use scenarios. Sharon discussed the methodology, the assumptions, and the data used in some preliminary calculations.

ORR LUPP Focus Group Meeting Notes - 1/11/2002

Ms. Bell demonstrated the types of output possible by utilizing some calculations she had performed using a set of assumptions, some standard economic job estimation modeling approaches, and use of multipliers from the Bureau of Economic Analysis or other well-known or recognized sources. She looked at a "best case" industrial development scenario specifically addressing three measures of economic benefits-employment, income, and tax revenues. She noted seven key components needed to compute the jobs and income numbers and explained how the numbers/assumptions were arrived at. These components included:

- acreage available,
- assumption of amount of this acreage which is suitable for development,
- the percentage of developable acreage assumed to be developed,
- the number of jobs created per usable acre,
- the types and mixtures of industry utilizing acreage, and
- how much employment, income and taxes are captured by Oak Ridge.

Sharon's presentation prompted a discussion by many Focus Group members. Realizing that this was a "demonstration" set of calculations, the Focus Group offered many useful suggestions which are noted below:

- Use average wage for the motor vehicle and equipment industry instead of a statewide average for manufacturing.
- Look at a more realistic case (instead of or in addition to a "max" case).
- Provide various multipliers so Focus Group members can do some calculations.
- Use rounding of numbers otherwise they imply a precision that isn't real.
- Look at taxes generated on developed versus undeveloped land--need to add facility improvements for industrial development--could be 10 times higher than property valuation (but will have to do some kind of cost offset for required infrastructure improvements).
- Look at upper and lower bound for industrial and commercial development.
- Someone questioned the use of \$9000/acre for residential property as too low by half.
- Obtain a more realistic value per acre for residential property.

There was agreement to discuss some of the assumptions used to compute jobs and income and seek greater consensus within the Focus Group. Some results of the discussion:

- Acreage determination is a straightforward calculation from existing data bases.
- Twenty percent of acreage actually being developable land for industrial use may be a reasonable maximum.
- Eighty percent of this land actually being developed may be a reasonable maximum.
- Jobs per acre calculation should be specific to the type of development assumed.
- Use to three industries in Fluor study, with a proportional allocation, is reasonable.

Marshall Whisnant spoke about the importance to the City of Oak Ridge to get people who work here to live here. Sharon noted that property taxes but not sales tax revenues were in the tax calculations.

Lloyd Stokes indicated that if tax incentives were likely to be offered to industries to locate in Oak Ridge then this should be considered in any the calculations and cost-benefit considerations come into play.

Survey Results Revisited

Barry Lawson discussed the survey results which had been recalculated to the extent possible using all the completed forms available from the Focus Group. The top ten values were:

1. Increase Oak Ridge tax base
2. Protect Threatened and Endangered species
3. Minimize land fragmentation
4. Increase Oak Ridge jobs
5. Protect natural resources for 15-year research
6. Concern for water quality
7. Protect natural resources for 50-year research
8. Concentrate land development
9. Conserve natural resources and wildlife
10. Increase Oak Ridge commercial development

Maps

Pat Parr discussed three large maps prepared for this Focus Group meeting and intended to be used in the breakout exercise later in the day. She explained that the facilitation team has lots of data, much of which the Focus Group members have seen in the Facility and Land Use Plan or in overlays Pat has shared during earlier presentations. We put a great deal of these data onto the three maps. The first map is a base map, the second map highlights some significant environmental features and has an "environmental" emphasis; the third map includes zoning designations, self-sufficiency parcels and 15 degree slope contours and has more of a "development or economic" emphasis. All three maps have legends.

Technical Analysis - Environmental

Diane McDaniel, a wildlife biologist with SAIC, then gave a presentation of some initial results of an attempt to map/determine interior forest habitat based on the model of interior forest bird species edge effects discussed by Dr. David Buehler at the previous FG meeting. Diane had contacted Dr. Buehler and discussed his model with him. SAIC used 1998 aerial photography to identify six locations within the "pink area". Approximately 700 acres of deep forest interior habitat was identified with an additional 1700 acres needed to maintain this interior forest (total of about 2400 acres). Diane provided maps as handouts and had larger aerial photos showing the source (deep interior) acreage. A 200-meter edge was mapped from roads, buildings, power line right-of-ways, open fields, and open water. Some assumptions were made about degree of forest cover over some smaller roads and streams. Thus, the acreage for some locations were computed two ways-one assuming these smaller features constituted an edge effect and another assuming the streams and gravel roads were too small to affect the birds choice of forest interior.

Bill Pardue observed as a general statement that there were not many large deep interior areas except in the northeast portion of the pink area. Ellen Smith suggested that the entire ORR and environs should be looked in a similar fashion so the deep interior forest habitat in the pink area can be put into a larger context.

Breakout Session

There was a breakout session in which the Focus Group worked with the maps Pat Parr discussed earlier. The Focus Group also had access to the larger habitat maps provided by Diane McDaniel. The Focus Group was encouraged to mark up any of the maps, write comments on the maps, and discuss any items or questions with the facilitation team. They were to address preferred utilizations of land parcels. Marked up maps were collected and any written comments collected. (Results are not reported here but will be made available at the next Focus Group meeting).

City Needs

Ray Evans made a brief presentation on what would most likely be the City of Oak Ridge land needs for the next 10 years. These included mostly industrial land at ED-1, ED-3, Parcel 8 (about 100 acres near Bear Creek Road), a "maximized" Parcel G, and about 50 acres adjacent to and west of the Bethel Valley Industrial Park. Residential land needs are for about 200 acres on either side of Wisconsin Avenue. For needs beyond 10 years, some of the flatter portions of the Solway Bend area of Three Bends was indicated.

Total acreage for 10 year needs would be approximately 1700 for industrial/commercial, 200 for residential. Post 10 years, the Solway Bend is 100 to 200 acres residential.

Eric Rauch requested that this information be put on a map and shared with the Focus Group. Ray will provide info to Pat Parr so she can get it mapped to same scale as some other data overlays. Lorene Sigal stated that no lands south of Hwy 58 (ED-3) should be turned over by DOE. She feared that if a small piece is zoned industrial/commercial then developers will attempt to get more land on either side of it. The result would be that the City will have ugly strip development along the main western entrance to the City. She wants developers to justify the need for any development here.

Marty Marina observed that if both sides of Wisconsin Avenue were developed then this would encroach into the largest parcel of interior forest bird habitat. David Mosby stated that Sigal's observations about strip development highlights that aesthetics is an important value. Marty Mariana wants to know what the City expects to get from these lands and she suggested that the survey questions be refined and the Focus Group retake it later. Several people discussed the apparent need to consider other values; other members disagreed and felt the existing values may need to be consolidated. Ellen Smith wants to be sure that DOE considers how people feel about uses of land. Lloyd Stokes observed that he is a long-time resident of Oak Ridge and does not feel that prior land transfers have really benefited the city residents. He questioned the economic justification for such transfers.

Steve Alexander asked if we assume that the Zone 1 ROD is followed and the cleanup is efficient how many acres are already developed here? Ray Evans indicated that in his opinion there is much of Zone 1 that is encumbered with deed and other restrictions (including water); thus much of it is not really desirable for development. A request was made for information on what "covenants" would be attached to Zone 1.

Beth Phillips observed that the Focus Group would or should not necessarily come up with a common vision but will educate one another to the value of differing points of view. The Focus Group may help come up with the "highest and best use". She clarified that this remark did not necessarily mean it should be developed; the highest and best use could be conservation.

Marty specifically requested that the City provide a justification/rationale for its list of land needs.

Future Planning Activities

January 30 Public Meeting

Barry Lawson discussed the upcoming January 30, 2002 public meeting. He noted the facilitation team was planning two identical sessions—one from 1 to 4 and the other from 6-9 with each session composed of a 30-minute poster session, followed by a 30-minute presentation. Then there will be small group discussions of about 1-hour in which several small groups will fill out the survey form, and mark up maps (indicating what is important to them re: land use; commenting on the planning process, whatever). Then the 3rd hour will be devoted to wrap up involving a spokesperson from each small group reporting whatever the group felt was important for DOE to hear. In addition, individuals can indicate other things for DOE to consider.

In response to Lorene Sigal's inquiry about public notification, the facilitation team explained that DOE was using a large distribution list for letter and email notification, the meeting is listed in the Bechtel Jacobs newsletter, and DOE will announce the meeting in several newspapers in the Anderson, Roane, Knox and Loudon county areas. Lorene also suggested that Focus Group members attending other meetings prior to January 30 should use the opportunity to announce the public meeting.

Barry Lawson explained that DOE was required to involve the public and that it was a good thing to do. Public input is not intended to diminish the contribution by the Focus Group but may enhance it by identifying ideas no one else has thought about. Eric Rauch echoed this sentiment and emphasized that we should try to find out if we have missed something. He also suggested that the facilitation team needed to devise a way to get comments from people who cannot come to the public meeting. David Mosby suggested that during the public meeting we may want to get people to sign the survey forms so we can detect duplicates. Parker Hardy felt we should share the Focus Group "top ten values" with the public as a starting point. Barry Lawson, in responding to a question from Joe Valentino, indicated that the facilitation team will report the results of the public meeting survey back to the Focus Group.

There was some concern expressed about the public getting the Department of Transportation proposed by-pass meeting confused with or too closely associated with our public meeting. It was determined that the TDOT Oak Ridge meeting was mid-February and would not present a problem.

ORR LUPP Focus Group Meeting Notes - 1/11/2002

February 6 Focus Group Meeting

The facilitation team has arranged for Reggie Reeves (Tennessee Heritage Program) to make a presentation and will pursue getting Matt Murray (Beth Phillips agreed to make contact). We intend to continue with and report on technical analysis, and provide results of the survey and public meeting.

There were some concluding remarks about:

- getting down to brass tacks and working on the product for DOE;
- getting data on land the City already has available;
- being sure the Macedonia and other competing industrial sites are considered; and
- getting the Focus Group out on a site visit.

Comments from the Public

There were no additional public comments.