

ORR COMPREHENSIVE LAND USE PLAN FOCUS GROUP MEETING NOTES

October 12, 2001

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 pm October 12, 2001.

Attendees

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

Members of the Facilitation team in attendance were Barry Lawson, Pat Parr, Marianne Heiskell, Leah Dever, Wayne Tolbert and Mike Deacon. Approximately 3 to 4 members of the public attended all or part of the meeting.

Action Items

- If possible, provide copy of the EA on the old CRBR site to the Focus Group
- Ultimately, DOE would like a report from the Focus Group documenting their recommendations.
- By next meeting assist the Focus Group in communicating differing sets of values to each other.
- The Facilitation team should provide some specific information on historic districts and what restrictions this designation and other designations may have on land use planning.
- DOE should provide information on what approaches the agency has adopted at other DOE sites for land use planning.

Welcome/Introductions

There were no changes to the Focus Group membership. The proposed meeting agenda was discussed, agreed upon, and followed. There was a suggestion from a member of the Focus Group that key points from previous meetings should be addressed early in the following meeting.

Notes from Previous Meeting

The meeting notes from the September 28 Focus Group meeting were briefly discussed. The notes had been transmitted to the Focus Group members prior to October 12. A couple of members had not received a copy either via email or by post. Copies were provided as needed.

A request was made that action items from the meetings appear in a bullet format at the front of the meeting notes.

Announcements

Marianne Heiskell announced that DOE would respond formally to any written communications. She also informed the Focus Group that dialog has been started with DOE Programs on mission needs. She clarified DOE Programs to mean programs such as Science, Environmental Management, Energy Research, NNSA, etc. DOE is expecting to have data from these Programs by December.

Roles and Procedures

Barry Lawson provided handouts of roles and procedures that reflected some very minor changes from the information presented and discussed during the September 28 meeting. He clarified some points about consensus (which he is defining as unanimous agreement—a compromise all parties, some with reservations, can agreed to). He wants consensus on procedures but not necessarily on all issues.

A portion of the Focus Group wanted to be sure that if things were agreed upon and thus were “off the table” that these items would not be re-opened for debate and discussion without good reason and Barry Lawson is to mediate any such proposed changes.

DOE responded to a question from the Focus Group about whether DOE expected/wanted a report from the Focus Group during or at the end of its work. DOE indicated that documentation from the Focus Group would be helpful and appreciated. The Facilitation team can assist the Focus Group with a report if desired.

Status Report/Presentations/Discussion of Main Topics

Presentation by Pat Parr

Pat Parr made a presentation addressing the planning process. A draft map showing (in pink) approximately 6,000 acres of underutilized or surplus land at and near the ETTP and the 80-acre Clark Center Park was distributed. The rationale for identifying land shown in pink on the draft map as underutilized or surplus was based on existing data since information on land required for DOE Program needs is currently being updated. Land shown in the ORNL Land and Facility Plan (2000) as having a current, continuing, or potential use for research, safety buffer, remediation, future facilities, or other DOE mission were included, for the most part, in the core area.

The need by the Focus Group for such as map and the rationale for land on it was a key point raised at the last Focus Group meeting. There was lots of discussion about the map including the definition of “core or core mission areas”. Also the possible need to address how lands in pink and yellow or other colors relate to one another in terms of compatible uses was discussed. DOE pointed out that some data-related uncertainties exist within the fenced area of ETTP regarding remediation status of specific parcels. The parties present discussed the likelihood that some land within fence of ETTP would become surplus but with land use/deed restrictions included with any transfer.

There was also discussion of TVA lands adjacent to the DOE surplus land, specifically questions on the status of the parcel where the Clinch River Breeder Reactor (CRBR) was once planned. TVA has no specific land uses but by default it is a wildlife area (though not specifically designated as a formal wildlife management area). TVA gets inquiries about the land but has no immediate plans. One Focus Group member commented that the land is listed on the Tennessee database as available for industrial development. The TVA parcel at the back of ETTP indicates an existing substation.

Focus Group Requests/Suggestions

There was a suggestion that the Focus Group should be provided with an EA done on the old CRBR site. There was a request for a presentation on the CROET land and some members wanted clarification on cultural resources and the potential restrictions that certain designations (like historical district) would place on land uses.

Mission Statement

A draft mission statement was provided by the Facilitation team (as requested by the Focus Group 9/28). It was discussed and a consensus was reached on wording. A handout of the final mission statement was provided by the end of the day.

Schedule

Barry Lawson discussed a proposed schedule that the Facilitation team had drafted. A handout of the schedule was provided to the Focus Group. There was concern expressed that the schedule was too short for adequate analyzes of site specific and cumulative impacts to be done. A question was raised of why 12 months—what is the driver? It was suggested that input from the Oak Ridge Planning Commission might be helpful. The opportunities for public involvement were outlined and the reasoning behind proposed dates was presented by Mr. Lawson.

Criteria for Analysis

Wayne Tolbert gave a short presentation of the types of analysis that is being planned for whatever alternatives were finally decided by DOE. One or more alternatives suggested/recommended by the Focus Group would be part of the analysis process. Analysis comparable to NEPA-level impacts analysis would be performed and typical NEPA subjects (land use, soils and geology, air and water resources, infrastructure, ecology, cultural resources, etc.) would be addressed. Some less typical analyzes of cost-benefit and identification of land use demand may also be included. Input is sought from the Focus Group on the scope and depth of the analysis. The status of NEPA to the overall planning process was discussed (another key point raised at the 9/28 meeting).

More Facilitation Group Presentation

Pat Parr used a series of map overlays to illustrate data pertinent to the surplus/underutilized land that the Focus Group is chartered to address. Pat also shared a large map provided by Paul Boyer of the Oak Ridge Planning Commission's proposed "plan" for these DOE lands and a map showing proposed zoning.

CROET Presentation

Lawrence Young made a presentation (in response to a request made earlier in the meeting) on the Horizon Center land. He indicated that much of the several thousand acres was not suitable for development and that considerable planning and effort had gone into protecting sensitive natural resources. He discussed the multiple protections that "protected areas" have—protected by lease agreements and the City has zoned same areas as Greenbelt. He indicated that CROET has 38 years left on its 40-year lease; the Horizon Center is an industrial park with an \$11 million investment made to date. There are tax implications of the land being leased by DOE to CROET—the land is not taxable but the improvements are.

Activities for the Focus Group

Barry Lawson suggested an exercise by the Focus Group. He suggested that the Focus Group use some of the time to begin formulation of one or more alternatives for the surplus land DOE has identified. The Focus Group did not feel it was ready to do that just yet. Instead, there were multiple expressions concerning the need to better understand each other's values. Members with a development background and/or interest felt they didn't really understand environmental values and issues sufficiently. Likewise, members with a conservation/environmental background and interest felt they did not appreciate or understand the values associated with land development. The members debated the relative merits of using the City Planning Commission map as a starting point for development of an alternative.

Future Planning Activities

See Key Points noted below. Also, it would be useful if DOE actions (re: surplus land) at other DOE sites were known.

Comments from the Public

There were no comments from the public.

Some Key Points Made by Focus Group

- Focus Group needs information of what restrictions various proposals and designations (such as historical districts, state natural areas, NERP, contaminated areas, etc.) mean
- to the planning process.
- The Focus Group needs to educate each other via presentations on economic development and environmental values.