

## **ORR COMPREHENSIVE LAND USE PLAN FOCUS GROUP MEETING NOTES**

**February 6, 2002**

A working meeting of the Focus Group was held in the Community Room of the Oak Ridge Mall at 10:00 a.m. until 3:00 p.m. on February 6, 2002.

### **Attendees**

The following members of the Focus Group were in attendance: Steve Alexander, Paul Boyer, Ray Evans, Parker Hardy, Lorene Sigal, Dev Joslin, Ralph Lillard, Bill Pardue, Lloyd Stokes, Joe Valentino, Marshall Whisnant, Beth Phillips (Tony Grande alternate), Lawrence Young, Eric Rauch and Dave McKinney. Kingsley Brock also attended as an observer. Pete Craven, Scott Davis, David Mosby, Marty Marina and Robert Kennedy 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. Alauddin Khan of SAIC and Ed Cumesty of DOE also attended. Jim Kopotic of DOE, Brian Bowen of TDEC, and Dr. Matt Murray of UT were also present. Approximately 10 members of the public attended all or part of the meeting.

### **New Action Items**

- Arrange for public access to the Draft ORNL Land and Facilities Plan.
- There was a continuing request for a map showing city properties available for various types of development.

### **Welcome/Introductions/Agenda**

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

### **Announcements**

Pat Parr indicated that a new draft of the ORNL Land and Facilities Plan was now available. She asked that Focus Group members who wanted to participate in a field trip to the site sign up. She announced that handout materials that could be organized ahead of time would be placed in folders for each Focus Group member.

Ed Cumesty relayed status information on a City of Oak Ridge letter which DOE had received requesting sale of about 500 acres of Parcel ED-1 land to the City (instead of leasing it to CROET). DOE and the City of Oak Ridge had a meeting and discussed the proposal. Generally it was felt the proposal was do-able; however, of prime importance would be to insure that the Mitigation Action Plan (MAP) obligations must be met and DOE wants to review how well this Plan has been followed to date. Statutory authority is thought to reside in 10 CFR Part 770 legislation. Process would require proposal to go to Congress for 30 days; DOE-HQ would be involved; it is not a local decision. The timeline is unknown since this process has not been used by DOE before. In response to a question about the range of options for MAP implementation, Mr. Cumesty indicated that DOE was looking at deed restrictions and performance bonds being the most familiar. He repeated that the principle is that MAP obligations be honored.

## Public Comments

Andy Baratah stated there were many empty houses and lots in Oak Ridge. He also asked for public access to the Draft ORNL Land and Facilities Plan.

JoAnn Thompson asked about a 10,000-acre figure in an *Oak Ridger* article. Ray Evans speculated that this figure might be a reference to the Self-Sufficiency parcels agreed to by DOE and the City in 1985. Marianne Heiskell stated that self-sufficiency was a one-time deal where the City identified parcels it would be interested in when DOE had no further need for them. Several focus group members indicated that it should be noted that self-sufficiency was linked to cessation of the "payment in-lieu of taxes" by DOE.

## Public Meeting Results

Barry Lawson discussed the public meeting held on January 30. He noted that the Facilitation Team received mostly positive feedback on the meeting format. Specifically the public liked the opportunity to meet with each other, to talk with the Facilitation Team and work in the small group breakout sessions.

The same survey form filled out by Focus Group members was given to the public prior to sharing results from the Focus Group with them. Barry then discussed and compared the results from the public and the Focus Group (see [Attachment](#) for summary of results).

## Consolidated Comments Map

Mike Deacon indicated that the Facilitation Team had taken input from the Focus Group and the public and mapped areas of agreement (where only one land use was proposed for a parcel within the study area). Areas where multiple land uses were proposed were distinguished. He showed the map to the Focus Group (a handout was provided). Because the public comments so closely matched the Focus Group only one map was used to show areas of agreement and disagreement.

## Presentations

Matt Murray (UT Center for Economic Research)

Dr. Matthew Murray covered five major points during his talk:

### 1. Economic growth vs. economic development

- a. Economic growth — increase in measurable metrics of economic activity (e.g. jobs, income). Easily measured.
- b. Economic development — includes the things measured under economic growth plus things that are harder to measure and important, such as quality of life. Also consider negative consequences of growth, such as congestion, increased wage rates, environmental impacts.
- c. Jobs today are following people and going where there is a strong quality of life.

### 2. The dynamic aspect of regional economic development

- a. Local economy is part of an interconnected regional economy.
- b. Workers come from a multi-county area.
- c. The tax base need not correspond to the location of businesses or residents — economic activity "leaks" from one community to another.

### **3. The current source of economic growth**

- a. Traditional view emphasized "exporting" goods and services to other regions.
- b. ORNL and other DOD facilities have other, "supply-side" advantages that can attract businesses — quality workforce, infrastructure, buildings, other capital improvements.
- c. Time and effort spent on maintaining this quality capital will pay off

### **4. Impact analysis**

- a. Should consider both benefits and costs.
- b. Consider both direct effects (company purchases, payroll) and indirect effects (nonpayroll spending, multiplier effects).
- c. "Bottom line" impacts can be hard to estimate because they depend on many factors.

### **5. Fiscal impact analysis**

- a. Incentives and subsidies should be carefully balanced against expected tax revenues.
- b. Incentives may sometimes be justified for companies that pay greater than average wages and invest lots of capital per worker (this is what generates tax revenues).
- c. "Low end" companies unlikely to generate enough revenue to justify incentives.

### **6. Summary —**

- a. Balance competing objectives.
- b. Look at both benefits and costs.
- c. Remember that we are part of a regional economy with economic flows in both directions (into and out of our community).

In response to questions from the Focus Group, Dr. Murray did not have any short-term solutions to Oak Ridge's fiscal problems but he emphasized that Oak Ridge had some major assets and should continue to invest in those assets (such as strong schools, high quality of life, etc.). He expressed strong optimism for Oak Ridge's long-term future.

### Ray Evans

Mr. Evans discussed the projected needs of the City of Oak Ridge for land. Citing the Fluor study's identification of shortcomings the city needs to diversify its types of industrial properties. He discussed Parcel 8, a modified Parcel ED-3, Parcel 4, and Parcel D (east end of Black Oak Ridge) within the study ("pink") area. He also discussed some parcels outside the study area and pointed out that the total package of lands need to be taken together. If the City cannot get the identified lands outside the study area, then this would increase the land needed within the study area. Lorene Sigal asked if the acreage in Parcel ED-1, the Roane Regional Business and Technology Park, Pine Ridge development, and the former Boeing property had been taken into consideration in the Fluor study. Ray indicated they had and the City's needs were in addition to those properties. He also mentioned Commerce Park spearheaded by Martin-Marietta, the Rarity Ridge residential development (instead of industrial use as proposed by Boeing), the former Breeder Reactor site, which TVA is marketing as a large single-industry site, and transfer of the water plant by DOE to the City.

Jim Kopotic (DOE, Environmental Management Program)

Mr. Kopotic discussed DOE's plans to cleanup Zones 1 and 2 at the ETTP site, starting with the Zone 1 area, which has been addressed in a CERCLA Proposed Plan issued to the public for comment. The administrative footprint of ETTP is 5000 acres, with Zone 1, located outside the main plant fence occupying approximately 1400 acres and Zone 2, inside the fence, about 800 acres. Since the area outside of Zone 1 has been addressed under DOE's footprint reduction effort, it is assumed to be uncontaminated. The cleanup goal for land is unrestricted industrial development down to 10 feet. He discussed several known contaminated sites, including the K-770 scrap yard, Blair quarry, powerhouse soils and K-895 Cylinder Destruct Facility among others. The idea is to excavate soil to 10 feet. During the Q & A session with the Focus Group, Mr. Kopotic noted that cleanup has been delayed because of the lack of funding, and was taking longer than originally planned. However, an attempt can be made to prioritize and expedite cleanup if there is an industrial customer wanting the site.

Brian Bowen (TDEC - Division of Natural Heritage)

Mr. Bowen discussed a brief history of TDEC heritage program relationship with DOE-ORO, noting that in 1995 eight sites on the ORR were registered. Since then TDEC has moved more toward an ecosystem protection approach versus a species based protection approach. After the Nature Conservancy study, the Natural Heritage division spent 2.5 years ground-truthing identified natural areas, resulting in a proposal by TDEC to have 5 designated natural areas on the ORR. Mr. Bowen explained the considerable difference in legal protection for areas that are **designated** versus **registered**. A registered site is totally voluntary and is more of a tool for TDEC working with landowners. A designated site is protected by law and must go through a legislative process. A designated site has very limited uses (some public access and passive recreation); development would not be allowed nor would any DOE mission that involved development.

### **Technical Analysis Updates**

Both Sharon Bell and Diane McDaniel provided technical analysis updates. Sharon had taken many of the suggestions from the last Focus Group meeting and re-ran some numbers for the full development scenario. She discussed some of the uncertainties and value judgments involved in the analysis. Ms. McDaniel briefed the Focus Group on acreage updates and interior forest parcels within the study area and some initial parcel identified on the ORR but outside the study area (for cumulative impact considerations).

Tolbert told the Focus Group that based on feedback from the Focus Group and the public the next area of impact analysis would be water quality and air quality. This prompted a discussion in which the Focus Group members indicated that the Facilitation Team was possibly misinterpreting the results of the survey. Air and water quality were high values because one could not be against good air and water quality; this did not mean they necessarily required heavy analytical focus. Based on this input a presentation to be given by Alauddin Khan was cancelled (handouts of his talk were handed out) and the Facilitation Team will reconsider the technical approach to be used.

## **Future Planning Activities**

### Scenarios

We discussed possible scenarios involving the "agreement" map produced by the Focus Group and the public, Ray Evans city needs map which identified parcels within the study area, and some other possible ones involving little/no development south of Highway 58 (per Lorene Sigal suggestion). Full development/full conservation, while helpful in generating more refined scenarios, would likely not be presented to DOE as reasonable scenarios since there was no consensus of them.

Lawrence Young and Dev Joslin mentioned the possibility of DOE giving land to another entity for perpetual preservation similar to DOE giving land to private or other entities for development purposes.

### Other

The next Focus Group meeting is March 15 back at the City Services building. There may or may not be an April meeting, depending on several factors. Time may be better spent doing analysis and there is a desire not to burden the Focus Group with unnecessary meetings. Field trips can be discussed with Pat Parr via phone and email.

## **Comments from the Public**

There were no additional public comments.

# ATTACHMENT

## Summary on Focus Group 'Values' and Broad Comparison to Public's 'Values' from Survey Distributed at January 30, 2002 Public Meeting

The tables below portray, in summary, the results of the value survey completed by the Focus Group members in January. In order to draw conclusions from the data collected, an analysis was conducted to categorize the various values by their relative importance to the Focus Group members. For analytical purposes, the Focus Group respondents were placed in two subgroups — those that identified themselves as having more of an environmental, or economic, perspective. From this one can see that some values (i.e., those in Tables 1 and 2 specifically) are important to both perspectives.

The values in boldface are those that would fall into either a comparable Table 1 or Table 2 (i.e., both environmental and economic subgroups averaged >3.0) for non-Focus Group members of the public who attended the public meeting on January 30. This high degree of "agreement" between these two 'populations' further confirms these values' significance in developing land use plan scenarios.

Table 1. Values that both economic and environmental perspectives ranked very important (> 3.50)

VALUE	Overall	(Eco,Env)
#24 Protected Threatened/Endangered Species	4.26	(3.56, 4.90)
#32 Concern for Water Quality	4.22	(3.67, 4.78)
#8 Increase Oak Ridge Tax Base	4.21	(4.89, 3.60)
#16 Concentrate Any New Industry	4.06	(3.78, 4.33)
#5 Increase Number of Jobs in Oak Ridge	4.00	(4.22, 3.80)

Table 2. Values that both economic and environmental perspectives ranked important (3 < 3.50)

VALUE	Overall	(Eco,Env)
#19 Minimize Land Fragmentation	4.00	(3.33, 4.60)
#17 Clean Up CERCLA Sites Quickly	3.89	(4.63, 3.30)
#18 Conserve Natural Resource/Wildlife	3.84	(3.33, 4.30)
#21 Protect Natural Resources for 15-Year Research	3.79	(3.22, 4.30)
#10 Increase Commercial Development in Oak Ridge	3.79	(4.44, 3.20)
#27 Conserve Forest Resources	3.61	(3.11, 4.11)
#31 Concern for Air Quality	3.61	(3.44, 3.78)
#20 Public Access to Natural Resources	3.58	(3.33, 3.80)
#23 Preserve Historical/Cultural Resources	3.58	(3.00, 4.10)
#25 Protect Existing Wildlife	3.58	(3.22, 3.90)

Table 3. Values that only one perspective ranked important (> 3.00)

VALUE	Overall	(Eco,Env)
#24 Save Wetlands	3.68	(2.89, 4.40)
#22 Protect Natural Resources for 50-Year Research	3.53	(2.89, 4.10)
#6 Increase Oak Ridge Region Jobs	3.21	(3.78, 2.70)
#9 Increase Oak Ridge Region's Tax Base	3.21	(3.67, 2.80)
#3 Increase Oak Ridge Population	3.11	(4.11, 2.20)
#14 Improve Infrastructure in Area to be Opened	3.00	(4.00, 2.10)
#7 Increase Oak Ridge Reservation Jobs	2.95	(3.56, 2.40)
#11 Increase Oak Ridge Regional Commercial Development	2.89	(3.67, 2.20)
#28 Have DOE See Land in Area to be Opened	2.68	(4.78, 0.80)
#30 Have DOE Retain Ownership	2.56	(1.38, 3.61)
#4 Increase Oak Ridge Regional Population	2.53	(3.00, 2.10)
#15 Have Large Number of Industrial Sites in Area	2.37	(3.89, 1.00)
#12 Include Residential Development in Area to be Opened	2.16	(3.89, 0.60)
#29 Have DOE Lease Land in Area for Long-Term	2.16	(3.33, 1.10)
#13 Have Considerable Residential Development in Area	1.53	(3.11, 0.10)