

**The "Preliminary Recommendations" Phase  
of the Common Ground Process:  
A Synthesis of External Stakeholder Views**

**Technical Appendix**

Kathy Conley McKown  
Senior Research Assistant, Energy, Environment, and Resources Center

Mary R. English  
Associate Director, Energy, Environment, and Resources Center

Traci R. Yavas  
Graduate Research Assistant, Energy, Environment, and Resources Center

Donna L. Creech  
Director of Environmental Community Relations, SSA, Inc.

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

August 1995

Questions concerning this report should be directed to Dr. Mary R. English, University of Tennessee, 600 Henley St., Suite 311, Knoxville, TN 37996-4134. Phone: 615-974-4251.

The Common Ground Process is being undertaken by the U.S. Department of Energy's Oak Ridge Operations Office and its contractor, Lockheed Martin Energy Systems, Inc., with the assistance of the University of Tennessee's Energy, Environment, and Resources Center, as well as other subcontractors. This report has been prepared under a Cooperative Arrangement between the U.S. Department of Energy and the University of Tennessee (Instrument No. DE-FC05-92OR22056). The support of the U.S. Department of Energy is gratefully acknowledged. Any opinions, findings, conclusions, or recommendations contained in this report do not necessarily represent the views of the U.S. Department of Energy or the University of Tennessee. The authors take responsibility for the accuracy of its contents.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>I.</b>	<b>BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE</b>	
<b>II.</b>	<b>QUESTIONNAIRE</b>	
	Overview .....	5
	Questionnaire: Open-ended Comments .....	7
	Questionnaire: Instrument.....	71
<b>III.</b>	<b>FORUMS</b>	
	Overview .....	81
	Forums: Interactive Discussion Sessions .....	83
	Pellissippi State Technical Community College Public Forum .....	83
	Harriman Public Forum .....	85
	Clinton Public Forum .....	87
	Oak Ridge Public Forum (Afternoon Session) .....	91
	Oak Ridge Public Forum (Evening Session).....	95



**I. BACKGROUND  
AND  
PURPOSE**



## BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

The Common Ground Process was begun in early 1994, to develop stakeholder-preferred future use options for the Oak Ridge Reservation in Oak Ridge, Tennessee. It is being conducted by the U.S. Department of Energy's Oak Ridge Operations Office (DOE-ORO) and its contractor, Lockheed Martin Energy Systems, Inc. (LMES), with the support of the University of Tennessee's Energy, Environment, and Resources Center and other subcontractors.

This technical appendix supplements *The "Preliminary Recommendations" Phase of the Common Ground Process: A Synthesis of External Stakeholder Views* (August 1995), which synthesizes external stakeholder views gathered in Phase II of the Common Ground Process during June of 1995. Phase II was an effort to obtain reactions to the preliminary recommendations for future uses for the Oak Ridge Reservation, developed through stakeholder input during Phase I (the "visioning" phase) and through consideration of DOE missions and technical, economic, and environmental factors.

The Phase II vehicles for obtaining external stakeholder opinions were a questionnaire and five public forums. (See page 71 for a copy of the questionnaire.) While *The "Preliminary Recommendations" Phase of the Common Ground Process: A Synthesis of External Stakeholder Views* synthesizes these views, this technical appendix documents in their entirety the open-ended comments made on completed questionnaires and summarizes comments made during each of the five public forums. Correspondingly, these comments are divided into 2 sections: those submitted on questionnaires, and those captured at the public forums. There has been considerable effort to restate open-ended stakeholder input exactly as received. Any changes made were done only for clarity.



## II. QUESTIONNAIRE

**Overview:** The questionnaire provided the opportunity to indicate agreement or disagreement with the preliminary recommendations and to make open-ended comments on the recommendations. (Please see page 71 for a copy of the questionnaire.) Questionnaires were mailed to Phase I participants in June 1995. In addition, they were available at the public forums, at the DOE Information Resource Center, and by request to Lockheed Martin Community Relations. A total of 104 respondents completed and returned the questionnaire. In addition, two completed questionnaires were received well after the June 30 deadline after the data had been processed; consequently, their comments are not included here.

In this section, each preliminary recommendation is listed separately, followed by open-ended comments made on it.



## QUESTIONNAIRE: OPEN-ENDED COMMENTS

**Background:** Below are the open-ended comments made on the questionnaire in response to the preliminary recommendations. Comments are sorted by preliminary recommendation and by the respondent's identification number (e.g., 0004). If a respondent indicated that a comment applied to more than one recommendation, it is correspondingly repeated below.

**1a. Future uses of ORR should build on past and current technologies, labor skills, technical and scientific expertise, and physical facilities available at ORR and in the region.**

- 0004 This should not preclude introduction of new technologies that might come along.
- 0010 In this questionable economic time, focus should be placed on using strengths we have into moving ahead to new more needed activities.
- 0014 This should be considered, but not an overriding factor.
- 0015 I don't believe that the technology and science developed for warfare purposes should be propagated and exploited just to keep jobs in Oak Ridge other developments and technologies should be exploited.
- 0016 "Current and Future" technologies, skills, not "past and current."
- 0019 The short term uses need immediate fast implementation because the reality of the economy will filter down to DOE and future funding will be on a radical decline!
- 0022 Factor in highest and best use of prime real estate. Should we consider future residential needs for additional employees or need for city of Oak Ridge growth? Consider benefits to ALL stakeholders as well.
- 0023 Re-use of existing infrastructure provides new opportunities for federal and private investment.
- 0025 The goals and participation of the Oak Ridge Summit should be noted.
- 0028 Only to the extent indicated below: [comment below is as follows: Environmental and non-intrusive recreational (e.g., historical) should be emphasized; economic should be de-emphasized.]
- 0031 The ORR with its pool of expertise is a definite asset to the region.
- 0044 These, 1a. and 1b. are not incompatible.

**1a. (Continued) Future uses of ORR should build on past and current technologies, labor skills, technical and scientific expertise, and physical facilities available at ORR and in the region.**

- 0049 The word “region” bothers me. The ORR is federal property. It’s use should not be limited to the region.
- 0052 Hiking-biking-nature study and hunting activities as well as a center for leisure study.
- 0053 Future uses . . . should build on future or emerging technologies, etc.
- 0055 I’m not sure I know what it means . . . How about an example? I can’t answer this . . .
- 0057 The technologies, skills and expertise should be used to improve the economic and labor needs of the area. Physical facilities use should be maximized and reuse instead of building new emphasized.
- 0060 We should lean heavily on present existing labor skills to support all projects now and in the future no matter what comes into the ORR.
- 0063 Current technologies researching energy efficiency & “clean” technologies should be ongoing.
- 0064 Strongly urge focus on advances in science, the core of Oak Ridge’s success in the past.
- 0073 But limit the use of such industrial lands to that shown on map, or less.
- 0082 An emphasis should be placed on utilizing existing facilities as much as possible to minimize the need for the development of undeveloped portions of the ORR.
- 0085 Emphasis should be placed on commercialization of ORNL technology.
- 0088 This is no picnic. You don’t offer a real choice, i.e., radioactive waste incineration versus high tech park, etc.
- 0090 ORNL is valuable resource for region as well as country we need to be sure it is not lost.
- 0099 Development and research in non-defense missions such as medical and energy should be of paramount importance and receive increased funding.
- 0103 Only to the extent that remaining undeveloped lands can be preserved intact and protected from all future industrial, office, residential, and highway development.

**1b. Future uses of ORR should optimize economic, environmental, and recreational opportunities that promote the region's well-being.**

Economic and environmental opportunities may be contradictory, i.e., they might be mutually exclusive.

One question what are you defining as the “region?”

Not only the region’s well-being but also the nation’s well-being.

0008 Sizable natural lands will become rarer as Tennessee grows economically and in population. ORR will become a very valuable entity in this regard in the future.

I agree but this should be secondary to the prior.

However, there should be a balance between the three and no one aspect should dominate.

This is a “motherhood” and apple pie statement. Who could disagree with it? So, what is its purpose?

The value of ORR to the nation should also be considered.

0022 Same as 1a. [1a. is as follows: Factor in highest and best use of prime real estate. Should we consider future residential needs for additional employees or need for city of Oak Ridge growth? Consider benefits to ALL stakeholders as well.]

0025 This is most important economic is preferred for well-being.

Only to the extent that 1a. is not compromised. Emphasize ideas that need a large site in the S. East.

0028 Environmental and non-intrusive recreational (e.g., historical) should be emphasized; economic should be de-emphasized.

0039 The notion that these 3 factors can be optimized on the ORR is wrong. The regional context must be considered. There is little land in the region suited for the environmental research and conservation currently carried out on the ORR.

0046 Should optimize economic opportunities, not the others. Jobs and tax base are needed not more land conservancy.

0054 In general, I agree, but I’m afraid of the word “optimize,” as it often means (in practice) “economic interests should be controlling,” and I disagree with that notion.

**1b. (Continued) Future uses of ORR should optimize economic, environmental, and recreational opportunities that promote the region's well-being.**

0055 Sounds like a “have your cake and eat it too” phrase. You cannot maximize these sometimes conflicting goals, though I would like to.

0056 To optimize future economic uses for the region’s well-being, sell industrial and residential land to local governments so that the land and development of the land can be taxable to produce revenue to broaden the tax base and decrease the burden costs to citizens and local governments for services provided to the developments. For example, about 20-25 years ago, AEC stopped patrolling and providing police, fire, and medical response to public roads through the ORR. The City of Oak Ridge was given the responsibility to respond to all accidents, etc., on these open-to-the-public ORR roads without any financial assistance per year to offset the city’s cost and taxpayers cost to expand its police and fire departments to respond to ORR accidents. An early unfunded mandate borne by the city! Sale of land to local governments for development and sale to private sector will reduce the costs of operating ORR by the federal government.

0057 As stated above, economic needs should be optimized but not at the expense of environmental and recreational needs. What’s left of the environment needs to be preserved at current levels. Past failure to do so has already had negative impacts on recreational opportunities in the region.

0058 I don’t believe that you can have it both ways, that this is an either/or proposition. If this is so, I don’t believe that much of the area can be cleaned up sufficiently for recreational opportunities (whatever those are). I don’t believe anyone will pay for it, either.

Optimize uses that preserve natural area & close off contaminated areas. Parks would be ideal.

0065 This question is difficult to respond to because you combine 3 issues into one question I’m not sure what is meant by an “environmental opportunity.” I think future uses should seek to balance economic and environmental concerns.

0067 “Well-being” will mean widely different things to different people. Some people will focus on environmental without a corresponding look at economic impacts.

Environmental and recreational should not be compromised for the sake of economics.

0074 As more and more open land becomes developed and privatized, the demand for

open green areas will intensify. Hopefully, Oak Ridge can preserve undeveloped land for the future.

**1b. (Continued) Future uses of ORR should optimize economic, environmental, and recreational opportunities that promote the region's well-being.**

0079 ORR land and resources should not be developed for general industrial or commercial purposes, since the government will likely be unable to obtain such a large undeveloped tract in the Eastern U.S. in the future.

0082 I believe that a large portion of undeveloped ORR lands should be managed by TWRA for increased recreational opportunities including managed hunting of both small and big game species.

0086 What does “the region’s well-being” mean?

0091 And be protective of the environment and human resources.

0094 However, proper, current baseline environmental assessments for radiological and other hazardous pollutants (e.g., heavy metals) should be thoroughly characterized before a region is “disturbed” (i.e., where surface dirt/soil is moved or where surface water may be affected).

0095 Such uses should not include nuclear-weapons production capabilities.

0097 Should be kept “as is.” We don’t need more trails, more recreational areas with what’s already around (Big South Fork, Frozen Head, etc.).

0099 Economic opportunities and environmental restoration are top priorities. The region already has abundant recreation opportunities available.

0103 Focus should be on preserving environmental values of ORR the entire remaining tracts of relatively unspoiled, rural, and semi-wilderness lands, not just a few postage-stamp plots hidden among industrial facilities, offices, and residences. Passive recreational opportunities are fine, but not destructive recreational facilities such as golf courses and ball fields. Rather than emphasizing “promoting the region’s well-being,” focus on preservation of the nation’s natural resources for the benefit of all Americans (all

of who share ownership in the ORR).

0087 [1c was written in by respondent with following comment]: Future uses of ORR should emphasize strongly use of all parts of ORR for unusual or unique national missions. The ORR was collected at a large cost. It should not be fragmented to meet not-very-important development objectives.

**2a. Over the short term (0 to 25 years), ORR land uses should accommodate scientific and technological research.**

0009 ORR should be a major node that terminates the Oak Ridge/Knoxville technology corridor along the Pellissippi Parkway.

As long as they stay within the parameters of the National Academy of Sciences.

0019 See 2b. [2b. is as follows: For public support clean up of waste must be top priority even over new research.]

Only through scientific research can anything be done for the short term.

0029 See 2 b. [2b. is as follows: Those developed sites (X-10; Y-12; K-25) should be first to be used as the weapons production and research is phased out.]

0041 I am not comfortable with the current political and executive management in place to blindly give approval to their interpretation of “scientific and technological research.”

0051 Scale down any weapons related activities not compatible economically viable for future with probable weapons complex consolidation in western state(s).

0057 Scientific and technological research is the economic backbone of the region and must be encouraged for not only regional needs but also for national and defense needs.

0060 These are lands that our fore-fathers had taken for the future uses by the government. They were for national security reasons to have the plants built. We need to keep the plants functioning to keep America alive and thriving. We need to utilize the existing plants to plan and work for the future. Without jobs, all the recreational uses and forestry is nothing. We need jobs so we all can survive.

0067 Over the short-term we should also focus on non-DOE uses if we maintain a short-term focus on activities related to DOE or ORR activities we will be too short-sighted. Need to expand our economic base beyond DOE is NOW!

0077 General comment: Any of these uses may be appropriate and/or desirable for ORR. The implementation of these uses should be accomplished through a strategic and comprehensive planning process (see question # 7).

0094 You must characterize these areas to make sure no anomalies with regard to radiological or hazardous waste pollutants (i.e., above typical background, such as plutonium from fallout) are present. Even if this means systematic sampling of grid areas where you do not suspect any pollutants.

Once the land has been used we have lost a unique “virgin” land study area.

**2a. (Continued) Over the short term (0 to 25 years), ORR land uses should accommodate scientific and technological research.**

0098 Energy capital/expo of the world! Research heavily into: removal, how to degrade, decontaminate, materially break down or neutralize contaminated material. Developing ways to accelerate half-lives, manipulating particles, de-energizing, as well as protecting/securing contaminated areas.

Oak Ridge should become known as the energy research leader for the free world.

0103 To the extent compatible with the preservation of existing undeveloped lands (and rural lands that may have incurred some limited development).

**2b. Over the short term (0 to 25 years), ORR land uses should accommodate specialized industrial uses (including waste management and cleanup activities) that are compatible with and contribute to ongoing and anticipated DOE missions.**

This would be an excellent opportunity to use existing landfill areas to perform research.

Any 'specialized industrial use' approval should be filtered through a Citizens Advisory Board.

For public support clean up of waste must be top priority even over new research.

0022 Some cleanup activities requiring heavy industry of environmentally unsuitable [sic] should **NOT** be allowed in conservation transition (C.T.) areas or Conservation Use (C.A.) areas.

This is ongoing.

0029 Those developed sites (X-10; Y-12; K-25) should be first to be used as the weapons production and research is phased out.

0039 Industrial uses should be around the periphery of the ORR near K-25 and Y-12, not scattered throughout the National Environmental Research Park.

0044 Care must be taken of environmental consequences, temporary storage that becomes permanent is not acceptable.

0047 I support those activities addressing ORR issues but not those supporting DOE-wide activities (e.g., bringing Hanford waste to ORR).

0051 Waste management and clean-up of ORR contamination and wastes. Any activity to bring in waste from other DOE sites to be discouraged strongly (must be part of DOE-wide plan).

0057 I agree that cleanup activities are to be supported and encouraged, but waste management activities must be carefully controlled. Oak Ridge does not need to become a national waste dump.

0065 I think waste treatment and waste disposal need special consideration in your questionnaire. I want cleanup activities to continue, but don't want DOE to get the impression that stakeholders support waste disposal at ORR, or large scale importation of waste for treatment.

0067 Over the short-term we should also focus on non-DOE uses if we maintain a short-term focus on activities related to DOE or ORR activities we will be too short-sighted. Need to expand our economic base beyond DOE is **NOW!**

**2b. (Continued) Over the short term (0 to 25 years), ORR land uses should accommodate specialized industrial uses (including waste management and cleanup activities) that are compatible with and contribute to ongoing and anticipated DOE missions.**

0084 Need to be careful with this one I agree that Oak Ridge should be considered for the MRS but this may preclude some other uses. The other proposed uses all seem to be compatible.

0086 Aren't waste management and clean-up the ongoing missions (not just compatible with and contributing to, as stated in the question)?

0087 Difficult to anticipate even 25 years ahead.

0094 You must characterize these areas to make sure no anomalies with regard to radiological or hazardous waste pollutants (i.e., above typical background, such as plutonium from fallout) are present. Even if this means systematic sampling of grid areas where you do not suspect any pollutants.

Such uses should not include incineration of waste either DOE incinerators or private ones.

Once the land has been used we have lost a unique "virgin" land study area.

0098 Where safe and appropriate. Since I-40 and I-75 intersect here and are major connecting arteries to probably 1/3 of U.S. population within 500 mile drive; special consideration needs to be given toward transportation of hazardous materials.

0099 Residents in close proximity to reservation must be assured that such activities will not jeopardize their health/safety.

OK, as long as remaining undeveloped and relatively undeveloped lands are wholly protected.

**2c. Over the short term (0 to 25 years), ORR land uses should accommodate office and business uses that support other activities on the ORR.**

0006 There is too much opportunity for litigation (adverse) should these activities involve inadvertent exposure to hazardous wastes/contaminants associated with the ORR.

0015 However, I don't expect the ORR to be turned into a country club atmosphere no million dollar health facilities like the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA).

Encourage new business ventures.

0022 Evaluate areas for office business but do not place in areas of prime environ., residential, conservation, etc., such as C.T. area S. or Y-12 are located in.

0027 Offices don't require chopping up the site. A reuse option.

0029 See 2b. [2b. is as follows: Those developed sites (X-10; Y-12; K-25) should be first to be used as the weapons production and research is phased out.]

Any office or business uses should be limited to areas already developed.

0039 Existing space and office buildings at the plants could be used more efficiently to provide for future needs.

0051 Maintain ORR for national regional needs as single unit. Don't sell off to private industry piecemeal without long-term strategic plan. [Respondent circled both numbers 2 and 3, indicating a neutral response.]

0056 Whenever feasible, allow these structures to be located on land that can be sold to local governments; local government sells to private sector developers; and taxable income is produced, such as property and sales tax, to offset burdens and broaden tax base and reduce federal operating costs.

0057 Here my concern is development of areas best tuned to environmental or recreational uses. There is already enough land that can be used for this by reuse of existing facilities.

0067 Over the short-term we should also focus on non-DOE uses if we maintain a short-term focus on activities related to DOE or ORR activities we will be too short-

sighted. Need to expand our economic base beyond DOE is **NOW!**

0072 Non-DOE businesses should be in facilities that pay local taxes.

0086 I agree via a narrow interpretation. General office and business uses that are copies of the office parks found anywhere else should not be sited on the ORR.

**2c. (Continued) Over the short term (0 to 25 years), ORR land uses should accommodate office and business uses that support other activities on the ORR.**

0087 Low priority should not “get in the way” of major future use.

0094 You must characterize these areas to make sure no anomalies with regard to radiological or hazardous waste pollutants (i.e., above typical background, such as plutonium from fallout) are present. Even if this means systematic sampling of grid areas where you do not suspect any pollutants.

Once the land has been used we have lost a unique “virgin” land study area.

0098 Where safe and appropriate, and necessary security can be maintained.

0103 Could be located off the reservation (ORR) altogether, or perhaps sited within already highly industrialized sites.

**2d. Over the short term (0 to 25 years), ORR land uses should accommodate institutional uses (primarily educational) that are related to other ORR activities.**

I am not sure I understand this item it is not clear.

0006 There is too much opportunity for litigation (adverse) should these activities involve inadvertent exposure to hazardous wastes/contaminants associated with the ORR.

0022 Excellent recommendation.

0025 Education is the only answer for the future.

0027 Prime.

0033 Actually, my numerical answer is between 2 and 3 2.5, I don't feel strongly in support of this but I am not against it either.

0051 Maintain Freels Bend Cabin as environmental study center for all ages. Revive Ecology Explorer (Scouts) post under Environmental Sciences Division at ORNL.

0057 To be strongly encouraged for obvious reasons.

0058 What is this?

0065 Again, the word "institutional" is usually associated with controls; if you mean educational, why not use that word?

0067 Over the short-term we should also focus on non-DOE uses if we maintain a short-term focus on activities related to DOE or ORR activities we will be too short-sighted. Need to expand our economic base beyond DOE is **NOW!**

0087 OK, if temporary.

0094 You must characterize these areas to make sure no anomalies with regard to radiological or hazardous waste pollutants (i.e., above typical background, such as plutonium from fallout) are present. Even if this means systematic sampling of grid areas where you do not suspect any pollutants.

Once the land has been used we have lost a unique "virgin" land study area.

Where safe and appropriate.

Internet will bring opportunities to advance scientific/educational expertise available on ORR.  
As consistent with preservation of all existing semi and undeveloped lands.

**2e. Over the short term (0 to 25 years), ORR land uses should accommodate recreational uses that are generally passive in nature (e.g., trails, wildlife observation, and general open space uses) and are located in specified areas that do not interfere with ongoing activities.**

0006 There is too much opportunity for litigation (adverse) should these activities involve inadvertent exposure to hazardous wastes/contaminants associated with the ORR.

0008 Consumptive uses by the public of natural resources, namely hunting and forest products, that are renewable is a legitimate resource use and must be integrated into ORR plan.

0019 Attracting recreational uses will produce an improved public relation attitude of the area citizens. Restrict present activities which presently interfere with recreational uses.

0022 Recreational uses to support local and regional populations should be considered in prime areas along riverfront areas on Melton Hill Lake (C.T. Area).

0025 Federal (Smokies National Forest) State-parks and U.T. Arboretum already lead the way. ORR should support what we already have.

Some areas, but do not compromise f) and g).

0028 Trails and wildlife observation should be throughout not only “located in specific areas that do not interfere with ongoing activities.” They can be co-located and not interfere.

0029 Hunting should be a part of this plan to keep a healthy wildlife population, keep down traffic accidents, and to protect the area from overbrowsing.

0030 Deer hunting and other compatible sport hunting activities should be continued as an integrated part of a wildlife management effort/plan.

0033 See 2d. [2d. is as follows: Actually, my numerical answer is between 2 and 3 2.5, I don't feel strongly in support of this but I am not against it either.]

0038 Maybe “other uses of the ORR” should be compatible with recreational and

specialized forestry and agricultural research uses instead.

With the contamination that exists, how could any significant portion of ORR be considered?

Residential uses of ORR should be considered at locations far from industrial or contaminated areas.

0051 Greenways, hiking biking trails, wildlife observation. Maybe designate canoe trails to observe waterblinds. Some camping sites.

**2e. (Continued) Over the short term (0 to 25 years), ORR land uses should accommodate recreational uses that are generally passive in nature (e.g., trails, wildlife observation, and general open space uses) and are located in specified areas that do not interfere with ongoing activities.**

0054 Greenways corridors (including bike trails) should be established on existing road corridors throughout the ORR.

0057 YES!

0067 Over the short-term we should also focus on non-DOE uses if we maintain a short-term focus on activities related to DOE or ORR activities we will be too short-sighted. Need to expand our economic base beyond DOE is **NOW!**

0082 I assume hunting falls somewhere in “passive recreation.” If not, I disagree that recreational uses should be limited to only passive recreation. Increased hunting should be allowed.

0087 OK, since surely temporary.

Reservation property provides unique, natural environment for many native plants and animals.

0091 Picnic areas and relatively primitive camping (tents not RVs) should also be included in conservation transition areas; also provide access for canoes.

0094 You must characterize these areas to make sure no anomalies with regard to radiological or hazardous waste pollutants (i.e., above typical background, such as plutonium from fallout) are present. Even if this means systematic sampling of grid areas where you do not suspect any pollutants.

Once the land has been used we have lost a unique “virgin” land study area.

0098 Where safe and appropriate. Special care needed to control/expand perimeters for the “wanderer.” Old waste lagoon; out in the woods unknown “dumps” could easily be stumbled upon by cavers, fishermen, hikers, campers, etc.

Many of contaminated areas are still to be identified recreation must be in totally safe environment.

As consistent with preservation of all existing semi and undeveloped lands.

**2f. Over the short term (0 to 25 years), ORR land uses should accommodate specialized forestry and agricultural research uses that are compatible with other uses of the ORR.**

Might be able to expand the existing U.T. arboretum facility if parts of the ORR can be utilized.

0008 Do not overlook a viable natural resources management program that includes conservation, public use (consumptive and non-consumptive), and research.

0015 These areas are already sufficiently covered by USDA and USFS. If ORR cooperates and I truly mean cooperates with the other federal agencies responsible for these areas this activity could then be pursued.

Undertake a positive forest management program to eradicate the devastating pine beetle infestations especially along route 58.

0022 Should be environmentally consistent with adjacent areas no undesirable projects which impact adjacent areas being used for C.T. or residential (city).

0025 Same as 2e. [2e. is as follows: Federal (Smokies National Forest) State-parks and UT Arboretum already lead the way. ORR should support what we already have.]

Maybe silvaculture should avoid feeding pine bark beetle.

Don't forget production of agricultural commodities and sensible timber harvest (selective cutting).

0030 Forest resources should be managed for long term commodity production, as well as used for research purposes. A specific forest resources management/conservation plan is needed.

0033 See 2d. [2d. is as follows: Actually, my numerical answer is between 2 and 3 2.5, I don't feel strongly in support of this but I am not against it either.]

0035 I don't believe forestry research should include timber harvest for sale.

0038 Maybe "other uses of the ORR" should be compatible with recreational and specialized forestry and agricultural research uses instead.

We need more environmental related research rather than nuclear related.

Question ability to accomplish this considering recent Pine Beetle problems and poor forestry

practices.

**2f. (Continued) Over the short term (0 to 25 years), ORR land uses should accommodate specialized forestry and agricultural research uses that are compatible with other uses of the ORR.**

No repeats of early experiments that involved radioactive contamination of environment.

0054 I very much support ecological and agricultural/forestry research use, BUT I am opposed to continuation or expansion of the ill-managed forestry production program that has been conducted in the past.

0057 YES!!

0064 Seem to be trivial aspects.

0067 Over the short-term we should also focus on non-DOE uses if we maintain a short-term focus on activities related to DOE or ORR activities we will be too short-sighted. Need to expand our economic base beyond DOE is **NOW!**

0087 OK, since surely temporary.

0094 You must characterize these areas to make sure no anomalies with regard to radiological or hazardous waste pollutants (i.e., above typical background, such as plutonium from fallout) are present. Even if this means systematic sampling of grid areas where you do not suspect any pollutants.

Once the land has been used we have lost a unique “virgin” land study area.

0098 Where safe and appropriate.

0099 These could be major areas for research that could benefit mankind agriculture, genetic engineering, prevention/protection of forests from disease, acid rain, etc.

0103 Same as 2d. [2d. is as follows: As consistent with preservation of all existing semi and undeveloped lands.]

**2g. Over the short term (0 to 25 years), ORR land uses should accommodate conservation uses, including environmental research and the protection of special habitats.**

0006 Same as 2b. above. [2b. is as follows: This would be an excellent opportunity to use existing landfill areas to perform research.]

Draw on existing findings. Undertake positive actions. Don't "study" do it!!!

In consideration of above.

Avoid softwood conversions.

0033 See 2d. [2d. is as follows: Actually, my numerical answer is between 2 and 3 2.5, I don't feel strongly in support of this but I am not against it either.]

0051 Yes.

0054 The ORR is uniquely suited to research on, and protection of, the Southern Appalachian hardwood forest ecosystem, and constitutes valuable wildlife habitat for birds and animals that are not thriving elsewhere in the region.

Special habitats use common sense. Do not let a habitat or an endangered species, such as the snail darter, unnecessarily delay or defeat a project or use of land. Speedy decisions will reduce federal costs.

0057 YES!!!

0058 Like the effect of radiation on the deer population?

0064 Seem to be trivial aspects.

0067 Over the short-term we should also focus on non-DOE uses if we maintain a short-term focus on activities related to DOE or ORR activities we will be too short-sighted. Need to expand our economic base beyond DOE is NOW!

Conservation uses and protection of special habitats can be performed in the Smoky Mountains.

0083 ORR is an ecological island in a developing area. Its value as such will grow over time and it should be recognized and protected.

0087 OK, since surely temporary.



**2g. (Continued) Over the short term (0 to 25 years), ORR land uses should accommodate conservation uses, including environmental research and the protection of special habitats.**

0094 You ~~must characterize~~ these areas to make sure no anomalies with regard to radiological or hazardous waste pollutants (i.e., above typical background, such as plutonium from fallout) are present. Even if this means systematic sampling of grid areas where you do not suspect any pollutants.

Once the land has been used we have lost a unique “virgin” land study area.

Where safe and appropriate. ORR should be a model of environmental stewardship.

0099 Same as above. [Above comment is as follows: These could be major areas for research that could benefit mankind agriculture, genetic engineering, prevention/protection of forests from disease, acid rain, etc.]

**3a. Over the long term (26 to 100 years), ORR land uses should build on specialized mixed industrial and other activities that take place during the short-term period.**

I question the ability to accurately predict the 26-100 year horizon.

0015 Only if DOE and its contractors are open and forthright with the public about such activities and uses. I DISAGREE that such mixed uses can be done under a veil of secrecy.

0016 “And other activities that take place” does not sound like a plan.

There is no other option unless a totally new direction will be called for in the short term.

0022 Short term use should not impact future use (Long Term).

0027 Not much choice!

0028 The population will continue to increase. This “go with flow as needed” approach of 3a. and 3b. will severely damage the ability to maintain this jewel of a natural area in the Eastern U.S. The ORR should NOT respond and evolve with markets and needs or it will be changed forever and the trust in which it is held forever changed.

0035 Development of industry should be limited to fringe (outer) areas and particularly to areas already developed, such as the large area at K-25 so little used.

0036 This makes good sense, but . . .

0039 The ORR is a unique environmental resource and should not be destroyed for short-sighted industrial development.

0047 Depends upon which of the seven short term uses selected. I would strongly support some but strongly disagree with others.

0051 Environmental restoration and uses become more important over long term. [Respondent circled both numbers 2 and 3, indicating a neutral response.]

0053 Not sure I know what “specialized mixed industrial” is referring to.

**3a. (Continued) Over the long term (26 to 100 years), ORR land uses should build on specialized mixed industrial and other activities that take place during the short-term period.**

See 1(b) and 2(c). [1b. and 2c. are as follows: To optimize future economic uses for the region's well-being, sell industrial and residential land to local governments so that the land and development of the land can be taxable to produce revenue to broaden the tax base and decrease the burden costs to citizens and local governments for services provided to the developments. For example, about 20-25 years ago, AEC stopped patrolling and providing police, fire, and medical response to public roads through the ORR. The City of Oak Ridge was given the responsibility to respond to all accidents, etc. on these open-to-the-public ORR roads without any financial assistance per year to offset the city's cost and taxpayers cost to expand its police and fire departments to respond to ORR accidents. An early unfunded mandate borne by the city! Sale of land to local governments for development and sale to private sector will reduce the costs of operating ORR by the federal government. Whenever feasible, allow these structures to be located on land that can be sold to local governments; local government sells to private sector developers; and taxable income is produced, such as property and sales tax, to offset burdens and broaden tax base and reduce federal operating costs.]

0057 I don't see the terms environmental, recreational or conservation mentioned at all in this statement. I agree that industrial use, in some cases, needs to be encouraged, but not at the expense of the above listed concerns.

0058 I don't believe anyone has a crystal ball good enough to anticipate anything in this time frame. If a similar exercise had been attempted in 1900, one of the anticipated uses would likely have been "grazing land for horses."

0059 I don't see a contradiction between these two uses [3a. and 3b.].

0060 The U.S. is in a state of depression. We can't trust the foreign countries. We need to keep the plants ready to open full speed ahead at all times. We need to continue to work toward better scientific goals and other needs.

Although I strongly agree, it's not apparent what consequences of this view may occur.

0067 It depends 3b is the right answer (which may or may not include 3a activities). [Respondent circled the area between numbers 2 and 3.]

0080 Any architecture should maximize energy-efficient technologies. Consider a zero-emissions industrial park where the waste from one industry can be the fuel for another, closing the loop.

0082 Industrial development should generally be limited to the areas surrounding existing facilities on the ORR.

**3a. (Continued) Over the long term (26 to 100 years), ORR land uses should build on specialized mixed industrial and other activities that take place during the short-term period.**

0084 These two are really saying the same thing. We can build on specialized needs that come about because of evolving national missions.

0086 And make use of land previously developed.

0098 Where it continues to be safe and appropriate.

**3b. Over the long term (26 to 100 years), ORR land uses should respond to evolving national missions, market conditions, and regional needs.**

0007 This ORR land is national land. I want emphasis on national use or preservation for national use not regional use.

0010 Committees (which are already established) could publish a public newsletter on a quarterly basis outlining future possibilities. This would allow the subcontractors and workers to anticipate future needs and begin adapting before the need arrives.

ORR shouldn't jump out in front of the headlights on just any national mission that comes along.

0016 "Conservation Area Uses" should also include "significant historic and archaeological sites" (to be preserved).

0018 I realize that 3b. will most likely occur, but this area has a unique set of talents and skills, and they should be cultivated to maximize the potential of its use rather than bringing it to a halt and then developing similar places elsewhere from zero again.

0019 Congress will have a lot to say about this!

0021 This unique large piece of land should be reserved for some future use.

0022 If consistent with final plan for ORR.

0027 Not much choice!

0028 The population will continue to increase. This "go with flow as needed" approach of 3a. and 3b. will severely damage the ability to maintain this jewel of a natural area in the Eastern U.S. The ORR should NOT respond and evolve with markets and needs or it will be changed forever and the trust in which it is held forever changed.

You have to remain aware of how the world changes and how you fit in.

0039 National missions are the key priority. Regional needs and market conditions are impossible to determine objectively. The regional development commission and chamber of commerce present highly biased recommendations.

You can't respond to national missions, market conditions and regional needs fairly.

0047 Same comment as above. [Above comment is as follows: Depends upon which of

the seven short term uses selected. I would strongly support some but strongly disagree with others.]

**3b. (Continued) Over the long term (26 to 100 years), ORR land uses should respond to evolving national missions, market conditions, and regional needs.**

0051 See 3(a) above. [3a. is as follows: Environmental restoration and uses become more important over long term.]

0055 [This question is] too general [to answer]. [Over the long term (26-100 years), ORR land uses should] be used to research ways to integrate resource use and biological sustainability on public and private lands nationwide.

See 1(b) and 2(c). [1b. and 2c. are as follows: To optimize future economic uses for the region's well-being, sell industrial and residential land to local governments so that the land and development of the land can be taxable to produce revenue to broaden the tax base and decrease the burden costs to citizens and local governments for services provided to the developments. For example, about 20-25 years ago, AEC stopped patrolling and providing police, fire, and medical response to public roads through the ORR. The City of Oak Ridge was given the responsibility to respond to all accidents, etc. on these open-to-the-public ORR roads without any financial assistance per year to offset the city's cost and taxpayers cost to expand its police and fire departments to respond to ORR accidents. An early unfunded mandate borne by the city! Sale of land to local governments for development and sale to private sector will reduce the costs of operating ORR by the federal government. Whenever feasible, allow these structures to be located on land that can be sold to local governments; local government sells to private sector developers; and taxable income is produced, such as property and sales tax, to offset burdens and broaden tax base and reduce federal operating costs.]

0057 Change to meet evolving needs is of course desirable but it must be balanced. Change for the sake of change is poor policy. Especially if change to satisfy immediate needs leads to major problems down the road. A good example is the legacy waste problem that the ORR already has.

0058 I don't believe anyone has a crystal ball good enough to anticipate anything in this time frame. If a similar exercise had been attempted in 1900, one of the anticipated uses would likely have been "grazing land for horses."

0059 I don't see a contradiction between these two uses [3a. and 3b.].

Although I strongly agree, it's not apparent what consequences of this view may occur.

Stick to original 'game plan' as regards protection of the recreational & environmental lands.

0074 We need to be careful about responses to short-term conditions & needs and build a strongly diversified and high quality area which will sustain the community over the long-term.

**3b. (Continued) Over the long term (26 to 100 years), ORR land uses should respond to evolving national missions, market conditions, and regional needs.**

0079 Same comment as 1b. [1b. is as follows: ORR land and resources should not be developed for general industrial or commercial purposes, since the government will likely be unable to obtain such a large undeveloped tract in the Eastern U.S. in the future.]

0086 This implies the land will be returned by DOE. Is that a reasonable assumption? Market condition drivers should be documentable (if that is the right word) market responses driven by fear or politics are not appropriate factors to base land use decisions upon.

0087 Too broad, combines disparate factors.

0088 Have a specific vision.

0091 This may include housing in transition areas.

National missions and market conditions are dangerously vague and ambiguous.

Take out market conditions and regional needs. I strongly agree to evolving national missions.

0096 “Respond to . . .” is not the phrase I would choose. Especially for “national missions,” ORR should play an active role in propelling the United States into the 21st century with research and development on renewable energy, the environment, cures for diseases, etc.

0098 Where it continues to be safe and appropriate.

0099 National missions cannot always be openly debated; local environmental/health concerns must be one of top priorities before embarking on any missions.

**In general, future uses of ORR should be as shown on the enclosed map.**

The land use plan is generally OK, but there was no mention of transportation corridor needs.

0003 Substantial residential development is in place and continues to occur along the north boundary of the ORR in the “Yellow-Green cross hatched” area. Future use of this area should be compatible with the residential nature of that north boundary. I am concerned about development in the proximity of Whippoorwill Drive and Hartland Estates.

0004 There is absolutely no rationale given for these choices it is difficult to agree if you don’t understand. This requires an act of faith.

0007 I don’t know what you mean by “Industrial Area Use.” If you mean national industry such as Y-12 weapons work or the past K-25 enrichment work OK. If you mean regional industry for some local entrepreneur to make money on at the nation’s expense NO!

0008 How can this be determined at this point?

0009 The three major (primary) industrial areas should be linked together through secondary or conservation transition areas. If not, the three sites will tend to remain isolated as they are now.

0015 Flexibility and adaptability are critical to the on-going success of this planning. However, the over-arching guiding principles used to formulate the recommendations must be kept in the forefront of any pressure to change the recommendations.

0016 With an “iterative” (repeated) process.

0019 The enclosed map is quite cluttered. It would be more pertinent to develop individual maps for specific uses, i.e., waste improvement areas; office complex areas; disposal sites; trails and picnic areas; wildlife habitat areas; forest management sites; river or reservoir access points.

0021 Need a clearer definition of the conservation/transition land use. What is the current use of these areas? Is this to or from the conservation use?

0022 I agree with majority of future uses as listed except for C.T. Area along Melton Hill Lake. This prime property should NOT BE CONSIDERED for light industry, and office, business and institutional. It should be held for passive recreation, forestry and

agricultural research, conservation, environmental protection and some future city growth (residential) use.

**(Continued) In general, future uses of ORR should be as shown on the enclosed map.**

0025 More use of growing national lab more research. More role in defense and education for world energy growth and needs. Less recreation.

0027 a) There is no designation for the dark brown portions. b) The categories aren't well defined (for us). c) The "conservation transition" modifier is unclear.

0029 The conservation transition area on the southeast Melton Hill lake boundary (Freels Bend) should be included in the conservation area because of the geology and topography. Numerous sinkholes are indicative of underground caverns that would connect them.

0035 Enclosed is the map you have supplied. I have circled three areas of concern. The areas circled just east of Hwy 95 [the 2 areas between the K-25 Site and the City of Oak Ridge and the one area above Bear Creek Road which are all labeled Primary Potential Industrial Use Areas/Conservation Transition Use Areas] have existing populations of the Tennessee dace or adjoin areas having this fish, which is deemed in need of management by the state of Tennessee these areas should be changed to Conservation Area Uses. The [Conservation Area Uses] area circled between Y-12 and ORNL is near Walker Branch Watershed. This site has international and national importance as an ecological/environmental research site. Encroachment of this area should be minimized to avoid altering its "natural" setting and thus, its value as a research site.

0038 Need legend on map!

0039 This map is a travesty! Long narrow conservation areas are virtually worthless for conservation. Conservation value is destroyed by including islands of development as in the preliminary map. This map shows total ignorance of conservation and land use planning. Who made this map? [Information gathered from the map indicated that the respondent would prefer to develop the Conservation Area Uses area above the K-25 Site, and not to develop the Secondary Potential Industrial Area Uses/Conservation Transition Area Uses area that is below Y-12 and above the Clinch River, the Primary Potential Industrial Area Uses area left of Highway 95 near ORNL, nor any of the Conservation Transition Area Uses, Secondary Potential Industrial Area Uses, nor the Primary Potential Industrial Area Uses areas between the K-25 Site and the City of Oak Ridge, and below the K-25 Site.]

0040 In Conservation Transition Area Uses I can't see the first 3 items interacting with remaining suggestions. I feel we need to reserve a carbon sink and natural environmental [sic].

**(Continued) In general, future uses of ORR should be as shown on the enclosed map.**

0042 Retain an undeveloped scenic buffer along Melton Hill and Watts Bar Reservoirs to protect water quality, etc. Give particular attention to maintaining protection of water quality and the shoreline where backlying industrial development may be considered. The allowable type of industry, potential emissions, wastes, etc. needs to be carefully scrutinized.

0044 Give attention to long term consequences.

0045 Looks like a lot of development occurring within the reservation. This is a unique area ecologically and should be preserved as such.

0046 There should be a limited amount of land near the current “off-reservation” portion of Oak Ridge for future residential areas.

0047 It is unclear from the map what uses are being proposed (color reproduction/legend problems) for what uses. Why are areas outside the ORR boundary color coded? I can not agree with anything that I do not understand.

[Respondent circled both numbers 2 and 3, indicating a neutral response to this question.]

Area west of Wisconsin Ave. and north of Oak Ridge Turnpike should be reserved for residential uses.

0051 Be wary of industrial use of any land along lakefront or creeks, wetlands.  
[Respondent circled both numbers 3 and 4.]

0053 All of the land along the Clinch River should be conserved as much as possible for recreational space. For example: a 100 foot buffer.

0054 Environmental protection will not be well-served by protecting only narrow corridors, surrounded by industrial uses. I am also concerned about the proximity of industrial uses (in the striped transition areas) in close proximity to existing off-reservation residential uses, e.g., in Country Club Estates and Westwood subdivision, both in Oak Ridge. I oppose the notion of “attracting industrial prospects” to “Primary Potential Industrial Areas” as a near-term emphasis. When we have single-story office buildings in an industrial park (Commerce Park) and empty and under-utilized space and buildings at K-25 and Y-12, we don’t need to be chasing “prospects” to “develop” yet more land. Let’s emphasize re-use and more efficient use of what has been developed. I approve of concentrating new development near existing areas, but there is too much fragmentation on the proposed map.



**(Continued) In general, future uses of ORR should be as shown on the enclosed map.**

0055 All Conservation 'transition' areas should be managed as Conservation and Research use areas. No light industrial. No light office and business. No institutional [sic] in these areas. Primary and Potential Industrial areas should shrink 25%. That is still plenty of development potential.

0056 1) Primary Potential Industrial Area Uses All are accessible to public roads. Local governments desperately need industrial park land to broaden tax base, hence, sell these areas to local governments that will develop and sell land to private developers and industries. 2) Secondary Potential Industrial Area Uses Add "Residential" as a potential use. These lakefront parcels are very marketable by the city/private sector and broaden the tax base. Most TVA lakefrontage in 50-mile radius of ORR has been sold to private sector. 3) By selling land to local governments for private development, costs of operating ORR by the federal government will reduce federal expenses of operating the entire ORR as defined in the 5-31-95 map.

0057 I found the map to be somewhat confusing. Several areas seem to be marked as having more than one use. In many cases the projected uses would seem to be incompatible, i.e., conservation versus industrial. Is this meant to show one use during the short-term and another use in the long-term? If so, what and when? This is not made clear. I personally would like to see much more green on the map.

0058 The area south of ORNL is a long way from being cleaned up enough for unrestricted use. They won't let their own employees in without a week training course or an escort. I think the map is unduly optimistic.

0063 Conservation sites should be mainly for public use trails, natural areas, sanctuaries. Emphasis on Environmental Protection.

0065 I don't think the enclosed map defines industrial uses (or potential uses) well. I don't want decision makers to get the impression that OR stakeholders support long-term disposal, for example, by agreeing generally with this map without additional information. What is the difference between "industrial" and "medium-to-light" industrial as compared to "light industrial and research." Perhaps these terms should be defined on the map. How were these boundaries defined? Perhaps the legend should include a definition of the dark gray/brown areas is that supposed to be privately owned land?

**(Continued) In general, future uses of ORR should be as shown on the enclosed map.**

0067 To the best of my knowledge, the future uses recommended seem appropriate. However, more details and “case by case” decisions will be necessary. For example, some areas are probably appropriate for residential development (should the economy actually expand under this plan!). I like the large amount of conservation area and the recognition of each of the central plant areas as primary industrial use.

0073 The random pattern of small parcels of industrial lands might enhance compromise of Recreation and Environmental lands at some future time.

0077 The map represents a good starting point for continuing planning.

This question doesn't make sense. The enclosed map already shows future land use.

0083 I need more information/data about (1) current DOE use related to future use (e.g., land use percentages), (2) regional land use planning (current and future), and (3) City of Oak Ridge projected needs.

This goes without saying. Land use of surrounding areas should also be included on map.

0086 Some areas with biological significance are included in areas for industrial use at a broad scale. These areas shouldn't be treated as islands, but better integrated into the overall use in the larger (broad scale) use area. Can this be achieved? How?

0087 This is silly (and an apparent waste of time and money). Conditions of contamination have been ignored in preparing the map. Reality must intrude in the process of planning future use, due to the very large cost of cleanup. Methods of cleanup may not be available at any cost (which is remotely feasible) for a few areas.

0088 Say what??? Haven't been enough a part of the process to know if the map makes sense. The legend is incomplete, i.e., dark gray? Brown with green slash lines? Where's the map of the toxic contaminant??? That's the only real important one!!! Quite a snow job here.

0089 The potential land-use needs for a definitely needed northwest bypass should be incorporated in the planning scheme. This bypass certainly will be planned within the next 25 years and the ORR would be in the path of the probable best route. Ignoring this need makes your present plan incomplete.



**(Continued) In general, future uses of ORR should be as shown on the enclosed map.**

0091 Indicate current residential areas with another color. Conservation transition areas should only be with secondary potential industrial and limited potential residential. Recolor areas (labeled on enclosed map) as follows: [Change all Conservation Transition Area Uses/Primary Potential Industrial Area Uses areas between the K-25 site and the Oak Ridge city boundary to] green/light tan striping. [Change the Conservation Transition Area Uses/Primary Industrial Area Uses area immediately on and to the left of the ORNL site to] green/light tan striping. [Change the Secondary Potential Industrial Area Uses area above Melton Hill Lake to] green/light tan striping. [Change the Conservation Transition Area Uses/Primary Industrial Area uses area on the Y-12 Site to] medium brown or dark brown no striping.

0092 [Reserve the Conservation Area Uses area and the Conservation Transition Area Uses/Secondary Potential Industrial Area Uses area north of the two meander bends above the Clinch River and below the Y-12 Site for a State Park (information taken from map).]

0094 Because: I totally disagree with the proposed delineation as shown on map. The categories generally overlap in their uses!! There are too many subcategories. These subcategories appear to be “splitting hairs” of potential applicable uses. Use only 2. (1) Primary Industrial Area Uses and (2) Conservation Area Uses.

0095 Too much industrial usage planned. Some of the area slated for industrial use should stay conservation transition areas or conservation use areas.

0097 What’s wrong with leaving the land like it is commercialized? This is government (people) land Smokies for “future” use. what says the land has to be who’s to say we have a map of the

0102 While I agree, it is not obvious how these areas were determined i.e., how were the criteria applied (weights?) and what were the specific criteria, and were other criteria considered e.g., geography, transportation, current land use, etc.? Also, the 25-100 year planning horizon is extremely tenuous and hard to believe what about considering 5 year and 25 year horizons as more realistic?

0103 Conservation Area Uses should be greatly expanded; industrial area uses should be

limited to those areas already highly developed. It would be really tragic to see Freels Bend and surrounding areas peppered with industries, offices, and roads.

**5a. For cleanup purposes, all of the ORR should be designated a "Specialized Industrial Use."** ("Specialized Industrial Use" is a category that focuses on current and projected industrial and research uses but includes other compatible uses as well. Specific cleanup strategies would vary, and would be determined partly by future use plans for the areas to be cleaned up.)

0003 Many areas of the ORR have not been impacted in the past. These areas should not be arbitrarily declared as cleanup areas.

0004 Please explain whose category this is. Is it a commonly accepted definition? Also, what are the other options?

I feel any "special use" needs to be judged on a case-by-case basis and not arbitrarily granted.

0007 Only clean up those ORR contaminants that (1) we can afford to clean up and (2) that may seriously contaminate off-site land. Hold the nation's ORR land for other potentially contaminating uses. Do not attempt a general clean up of the ORR.

0010 Those areas designated recreational or otherwise open for public use must be evaluated more stringently if contaminated. While residential criteria are most likely over conservative for the problem, industrial are definitely on the liberal side. Designation as specialized industrial is fine as long as public access is restricted.

0013 Probably up to 50% (half) of the ORR could be exempted from this designation without any hardship on the cleanup process. There is sufficient information available to permit planners to designate only what is needed for this classification.

0014 I would rather see all areas 'cleaned' rather than specific areas left 'dirty' because 'dirty' uses were projected.

0015 Until the Feds get smart and begin to work closely with the public translate that to taxpayer or boss of the state and Feds clean up strategies will continue to be debated. A specialized industrial use designation is a step albeit a small one in the right direction.

0017 Concern about unrealistic standards for clean up. "How dirty is dirty?" Or how bad is bad? [Respondent circled both numbers 2 and 3, indicating a neutral response for this question.]

I hope some of these industrial uses capitalize on the core of skills present in the area and focus on long-term rather than short-term development.

0019 Is it necessary to include the entire area for clean up?? If so, maybe the public will not be inclined to want to participate in day activities. Certainly use can be safely allowed over a great deal of the ORR.

**5a. (Continued) For cleanup purposes, all of the ORR should be designated a "Specialized Industrial Use."**

Yes future use with restrictions because of incomplete cleanup is acceptable.

0022 Many factors need to be considered for this land use. The cure could be worse than the problem for example, impact of mercury cleanup of Poplar Creek. Each specific strategy should be reviewed for impact on future use and also present use of adjacent areas and the city of Oak Ridge and its residents.

Must include assurance that "off-site" groundwater quality meets federal drinking water standards.

0025 We already have Smokies and other land to use for recreation without the tremendous expenditures necessary for pristine recreational use. Preserve that we now have rather than spend needlessly!

0026 I'm not sure the entire ORR should receive this designation. Maybe only the areas designated as primary industrial. The conservation areas may need another cleanup standard since it is a different land use. I don't feel there are enough questions relating to this topic. Note: Is the average stakeholder aware of the full implications of this question? In that their response will be used to determine clean-up standards? This is an extremely complex and difficult subject and to have only one question seems to be a little too simple.

0027 The concept is very unclear to me. Does it mean that any uncontaminated land will be dirtied? This part needs work.

0028 See comments on 3(a-b). [3a. and 3b. are as follows: The population will continue to increase. This "go with flow as needed" approach of 3a. and 3b. will severely damage the ability to maintain this jewel of a natural area in the Eastern U.S. The ORR should NOT respond and evolve with markets and needs or it will be changed forever and the trust in which it is held forever changed.]

0029 “Hot spots” and other hazardous sites should be made as safe as economically and technologically possible. Each site should be mapped and marked as to the problem material and treatment. These areas should be equipped for monitoring as part of cleanup and not after the fact.

0031 Investment in clean up can be reduced.

0039 Connotations of “Specialized Industrialized Use” preclude research, conservation and recreation uses.

**5a. (Continued) For cleanup purposes, all of the ORR should be designated a "Specialized Industrial Use."**

0041 Not if the “Specialized Industrial Use” designation means business as usual with no accountability to the local population.

Cleanup should be the standard that will allow it productive, private use. It must also be bankable.

The statement addresses cleanup. However, the leap to land use is made apparently tying cleanup levels to projected land use(s) although this is not entirely clear. If the question is “should cleanup levels be tied to projected land use,” then I would agree that is an appropriate response.

0050 Some remote portions of ORR near existing residential areas should be considered for future residential use.

0051 What are the other “categories” and what cleanup strategies and future uses would they have as other options?! The other “categories” if such exist are not well known as options provide information to the public and stakeholders and initiate discussion!

0055 Even after this description, I still don’t understand the implications of this designation. I cannot respond to this one until more information is provided.

0056 Yes, the federal government should maintain ownership until areas for private sector uses are cleaned up, paid for by federal government. After cleanup, most “Primary Potential Industrial Area Uses” and “Secondary Potential Industrial Area Uses” identified on the 5/31/95 map should be considered as areas to be sold to local governments that will sell them to private sector developers to broaden the tax base and reduce the burden on taxpayers and on the federal government.

0057 This statement seems to preclude any possible use of ORR land for conservation or recreational use. It would seem to be a ploy by Department of Energy to escape the requirement to clean up the ORR to acceptable environmental levels. While not all areas of the ORR need to be cleaned up to “green field” levels, there are some areas that should be. Also, areas that are currently unspoiled need to be preserved at “green field” levels.

0058 I don't understand this.

0060 Clean-up should be done regardless of what use. We need to keep our plants in A-1 condition at all times ready to meet any needs of the government and the people.

0063 “Other compatible uses” not clear. Would like more specific description of how and what industrial uses are conducted.

**5a. (Continued) For cleanup purposes, all of the ORR should be designated a "Specialized Industrial Use."**

I'm not at all convinced that big “cleanup” operations win on a cost/benefit analysis.

0065 This designation could be used to relieve DOE of its responsibility to clean up parcels for potential other uses. I'm strongly opposed to this classification, and again, am unsure what is meant by “other compatible uses.” Does this include disposal?

0067 There needs to be a balance between the contamination levels present before cleanup, ease of cleanup to various standards and projected future use, i.e., if I can clean up to specialized, industrial use for \$10.00, and the same area can be cleaned to unrestricted residential use for \$10.50, then of course I would recommend cleanup to more stringent levels. Conversely, if it will cost me twice as much, and the area is unlikely to be utilized for residential, I would strongly oppose spending the additional money.

0072 Money should not be wasted by trying to remediate contaminated areas to a pristine state. The level of clean up should be coordinated with future uses of the areas to minimize costs and at the same time protect human health and the environment.

0073 Should not apply to lands slated for conservation and recreation uses except for pre-existing contamination.

Does the designation mean only industrial or does it include open land and recreation land?

0077 It is not clear what value is added by the designation of “Specialized Industrial Use.” It is stated that “for cleanup purposes, all of the ORR should be designated . . .,” yet the definition indicates that specific cleanup strategies would vary, and would be determined partly by future use plans for the areas to be cleaned up. It is recommended that for cleanup purposes, use designations such as industrial, recreational, conservation, etc.

0083 I believe the term “Specialized Industrial Use” (particularly as applied to all of the ORR) is very misleading and very confusing to the public. Surely there is a better way to describe the concept/strategy.

0084 Cleanup goals need to be set according to each individual land use. Some of this area will be under pressure for residential development.

0085 This will greatly simplify risk assessment for cleanup projects.

0086 This strategy is logical and easily understood.

**5a. (Continued) For cleanup purposes, all of the ORR should be designated a "Specialized Industrial Use."**

0087 Meaningless, see 4a. [4a. is as follows: This is silly (and an apparent waste of time and money). Conditions of contamination have been ignored in preparing the map. Reality must intrude in the process of planning future use, due to the very large cost of cleanup. Methods of cleanup may not be available at any cost (which is remotely feasible) for a few areas.]

0091 See 6(a) suggestion. [6a. is as follows: Conservation and transition areas should be managed by an environmental consortium and local government. Areas critical to the DOE mission that require special security should be managed by the DOE. The balance should be managed by a consortium which includes industry, employees and unions, local government and educational institutions]. At least two, preferably three (based on 6(a) management type) or five (based on map categories). After all, this was one of the reasons given to go through the Common Ground Process. With funding tight, it is important to indicate areas needing greater care; we can't afford everything "pristine."

0092 The Conservation Areas and Conservation Transition Areas should be maintained in a clean condition. (Green and Green/White areas on the map). Any contamination in those areas should be cleaned up to a level for passive recreational use.

Specialized industrial use may not be applicable in recreational areas; is leading and ambiguous.

0096 "Risk assessment" and "future use plans" are helpful only insofar as they help prioritize cleanup projects. If they do not look beyond 100 years, they are short-sighted especially for long-lived contaminants.

0097 1,000 acres for an industrial park, why do we need more?

0098 However, it concerns me deeply when I read comments like: "We've determined that no one uses the groundwater for either domestic or commercial purposes, therefore there is no risk to human health from the groundwater contamination." [Respondent's footnote: Quoted from DOE's Environmental Restoration Program Manager, Sherry Lankford, when discussing the elevated levels of 4 industrial solvents in the groundwater ½ mile from Y-12 in the Union Valley area. Environmental Update, Spring, 1995.] We must not forget the "Food Cycle" of nature. Also, just because you don't think anyone is using it today does not mean that in 10 or 20 years it won't be and then knowledge/memory/records kept lackadaisically can fade. "Oh, that area is OK, it was

evaluated years ago and deemed ‘no risk;’ or ‘It’s been like that for a long time, I’m sure if it were contaminated or unsafe they would have cleaned it up or cordoned it off, so let’s go ahead and use it for \_\_\_\_.’

0099 Difficult for me to assess do we “know” where everything is buried so it can be remediated? Is this practical for all areas?

**6a. Generally, the ORR should be held, managed, and used as a single property. If land is released, it should be done so only as part of a comprehensive, long-term strategy that would achieve national missions as well as regional economic and environmental goals.**

0002 Land not needed for federal purposes should be released or sold as appropriate to private, state, local and non-profit organizations.

0010 It should be noted that if this is to say we are trying to discourage land release, I disagree with it totally. I would like to see the suggestion altered to promote land release for the purpose of regional economics by using it as a carrot for industry, so long as such industry supports DOE missions and goals. This would greatly help OR become less addicted to DOE funds.

0013 Long term leasing is a good method for accomplishing this goal. Conditions can be incorporated into the lease agreement to limit/restrict yet permit lending institutions and businesses to invest and recover their capital outlay.

0014 I believe that there is too much opportunity for trouble that could be caused by a breakup of the property; physically or managerially.

0015 No land should be released if the city wants it, or the county let them pay fair market value when such is proposed they will back down. This land was bought confiscated really by the Feds. The taxpayer has put billions into the ORR over the years the Feds were at best poor stewards why should I believe the city or county could be better stewards.

0016 Specifics: If I were the City of Oak Ridge represented by ETEC/Joe Lenhard, I would develop a strategy of asking for a segment of the reservation not quite adjacent existing developed corporate city limits, then later request other land to “join” or “link” the property to existing city property in a contiguous way. The property described in Katy Kates 5-31-95 letter to Bill Tear, chair of the Lockheed Martin Energy Systems, RMO,

may therefore be a real test of the Common Ground direction in 6a. above, since this lease may eventually “predicate” a band of leased land.

0019 ORR is historically significant and must NOT be reduced or destroyed.

0021 Fragmenting the management would be the worst scenario.

**6a. (Continued) Generally, the ORR should be held, managed, and used as a single property. If land is released, it should be done so only as part of a comprehensive, long-term strategy that would achieve national missions as well as regional economic and environmental goals.**

0022 Future city (local) needs to be an item of consideration. Additional lands should be held for future city growth to support the increased population growth to support ORR projects, etc. C.T. land south of Y-12 and bordering on Melton Hill Lake should be held for future growth and not committed to business, industry. Prime land for passive recreation, forestry and agriculture, conservation and environmental protection as well as residential should have 1st consideration.

0025 I do not feel that any more of the ORR should be released. Where will we get more land for the future? Keep what we have and manage and use for regional and national missions.

Strongly agree with 1st sentence. Strongly disagree with second sentence. It should NOT be released.

0029 My family was forced to move from a farm in the Freels Bend area and I strongly oppose any private citizen or privately held business from profiting from this property. The taking of this property was contested in court and my parents and others were never adequately compensated for their property and relocation expenses.

0031 Because of the nature of the reservation and the diversity of planned use makes it essential a single manager be responsible for the property as a whole.

0036 I agree with the underlined part [respondent underlined from the provided statement in question 6a.: “. . . land is released . . . as part of a comprehensive, long-term strategy”] even more than the beginning; why not release portions in accordance with the “Plan”?

Again, you can't satisfy all the missions and goals of such a broad nature. The national mission is not the same as the regional or local goals if it involves destruction and dangerous conditions to the local population. The way much of the DOE operates is a joke.

0045 Land use planning is critical and local governments do it poorly.

0046 Land released must recognize the City of Oak Ridge's right to acquire identified, specific parcels. Thus local economic goals must be given great weight.

0049 Partial releases may be desirable unless there is positive information indicating such releases would detract from over-all utilization.

**6a. (Continued) Generally, the ORR should be held, managed, and used as a single property. If land is released, it should be done so only as part of a comprehensive, long-term strategy that would achieve national missions as well as regional economic and environmental goals.**

The length of time necessary for releasing land should not be unreasonable.

0051 ORR is a national and regional resource. Selling off piecemeal is extremely near-sighted and harmful to best interests of the nation and the region.

0054 I am concerned about the effect of piecemeal land transfer negotiations between DOE and the East Tennessee Economic Council and similar groups. Neither land sales nor leases should be enacted on an unplanned piecemeal basis, unless there is no land development involved in a lease action. Reuse of existing sites should, on the other hand, be marketed aggressively.

0056 See 1(b), 2(c), 4(a), 5 (a). [1b., 2c., 4a., and 5a. are as follows: To optimize future economic uses for the region's well-being, sell industrial and residential land to local governments so that the land and development of the land can be taxable to produce revenue to broaden the tax base and decrease the burden costs to citizens and local governments for services provided to the developments. For example, about 20-25 years ago, AEC stopped patrolling and providing police, fire, and medical response to public roads through the ORR. The City of Oak Ridge was given the responsibility to respond to all accidents, etc. on these open-to-the-public ORR roads without any financial assistance per year to offset the city's cost and taxpayers cost to expand its police and fire departments to respond to ORR accidents. An early unfunded mandate borne by the city! Sale of land to local governments for development and sale to private sector will reduce the costs of operating ORR by the federal government. Whenever feasible, allow these structures to be located on land that can be sold to local governments; local government sells to private sector developers; and taxable income is produced, such as property and sales tax, to offset burdens and broaden tax base and reduce federal operating costs. 1) Primary Potential Industrial Area Uses All are accessible to public roads. Local governments desperately need industrial park land to broaden tax base, hence, sell these areas to local governments that will develop and sell land to private developers and industries. 2) Secondary Potential Industrial Area Uses Add "Residential" as a potential use. These lakefront parcels are very marketable by the city/private sector and broaden the tax base. Most TVA lakefrontage in 50-mile radius of ORR has been sold to

private sector. 3) By selling land to local governments for private development, costs of operating ORR by the federal government will reduce federal expenses of operating the entire ORR as defined in the 5-31-95 map. Yes, the federal government should maintain ownership until areas for private sector uses are cleaned up, paid for by federal government. After cleanup, most “Primary Potential Industrial Area Uses” and “Secondary Potential Industrial Area Uses” identified on the 5/31/95 map should be considered as areas to be sold to local governments that will sell them to private sector developers to broaden the tax base and reduce the burden on taxpayers and on the federal

**6a. (Continued) Generally, the ORR should be held, managed, and used as a single property. If land is released, it should be done so only as part of a comprehensive, long-term strategy that would achieve national missions as well as regional economic and environmental goals.**

government.] Release of ORR “clean” land to local governments for development and sale to the private sector will reduce federal operating expenses. Consider value and marketability of lakefront property to homeowners (residential usage).

0057 Single property management of the ORR is the only form of management that makes sense in this case. The ORR is after all the sum of its parts. Many areas that need to be addressed cut across facility lines. For example, it makes little sense to cleanup one area, when the contamination source is in another area and not addressed.

This sounds good, but what does it really mean? Released to whom? The city of Oak Ridge?  
Industry?

0060 If the land is released, let’s look at the previous ancestors and their families who had to move out and give up their land. The ancestors should have first rights if the land is released.

0062 As of the end of June, 1000 acres are being released for industrial development under a long term lease. Where’s the strategy?

0063 The public living in the area Roane, Knox Co., Anderson not just those employed by ORNL, should be able to have input when and if land is released. Land should never go private.

0065 Your question has too many issues I think the ORR should officially be divided into three separate properties in all practicality, it is already treated as such. Land control for parcels not currently identified for current national missions (and near-term 10 years.) should be turned over to an organization such as a trust that would be made up

of local governments and citizens to manage for the long-term. Decisions about future use should be made locally to the extent possible, not in Washington. A long term strategy is difficult given the local situation, the lack of knowledge about future missions, and the future of DOE is in question.

0067 There is no need for the ORR to remain a single property in perpetuity however, as land is released for commercial or public use, especially large tracts of land, I would like to know that it does make sense in terms of the bigger picture. [Respondent strongly disagreed with the first sentence, and circled the area between numbers 2 and 3 to indicate level of agreement with the second sentence.]

Do not compromise lands slated for conservation and environmental protection.

**6a. (Continued) Generally, the ORR should be held, managed, and used as a single property. If land is released, it should be done so only as part of a comprehensive, long-term strategy that would achieve national missions as well as regional economic and environmental goals.**

0074 Absolutely.

0077 DOE should pursue creative ways to allow non-DOE entities to use the ORR to maximize beneficial use and offset landlord costs. This should be accomplished through implementation of a strategic planning effort (see survey question # 7).

0079 Same comment as 1b. [1b. is as follows: ORR land and resources should not be developed for general industrial or commercial purposes, since the government will likely be unable to obtain such a large undeveloped tract in the Eastern U.S. in the future.]

0082 The land should not be turned over to the City of Oak Ridge or private developers. Some arrangement should be implemented to allow TWRA to more actively manage undeveloped lands for wildlife. DOE should not be making the wildlife management decisions for the most part.

0083 As a resource, the ORR is too valuable to scatter to the winds (whose direction will shift over time). An initial effort to maintain its integrity is a step in the right direction.

0085 Consideration also should be given to selling parcels such as has been done on Bear Creek Road with SEG and IT Corp.

0086 And one that considers land use changes as a whole via a comprehensive site wide environmental impact statement.

0087 No clear way to interpret [as well as regional economic and environmental goals.] Put this up front where it belongs!

0091 Conservation and transition areas should be managed by an environmental consortium and local government. Areas critical to the DOE mission that require special security should be managed by DOE. The balance should be managed by a consortium which includes industry, employees and unions, local government and educational institutions.

0092 I strongly believe that (after contamination cleanup) the Freels Bend area and the peninsula downstream of Freels Bend should be transferred to the Tennessee State Park System (see enclosed map).

0093 Define national missions and regional economic goals.

**6a. (Continued) Generally, the ORR should be held, managed, and used as a single property. If land is released, it should be done so only as part of a comprehensive, long-term strategy that would achieve national missions as well as regional economic and environmental goals.**

0094 I agree with the first sentence regarding single property categorization. I strongly disagree that this land should be “Released.” Does release imply release of ownership or release for unrestricted use. Please specify what you really mean.

0098 ORR is a world renowned, historically significant, and yet potentially dangerous property. It is easier to control an area that was already once highly secure.

0099 Comprehensive planning is a must! Adjacent local government assures acceptance of and support for the long-term plan.

0102 It is doubtful that a long term (> 25 year) national strategy can be expected. Oak Ridge should develop its own vision of where to go and plan property use based on that strategy.

0103 Agree with first sentence but not with second. The land should never be released to development. The major emphasis should be on preservation of existing environmental values (and enhancement by returning no-longer-needed developed areas to a natural or semi-natural state).

0104 It should be released as part of a short term strategy (2-10 years) as part of a comprehensive strategy to strengthen the economic well being of this region.

**7a. The U.S. Department of Energy should begin immediately to develop a top-level, integrated, and comprehensive strategy for the use of ORR land and facilities, with implementation plans for facility reuse and future development.**

0003 DOE should include their opinions regarding a Regional Freeway Bypass in this planning process. Knowing DOE's preferences now will make TN-DOT's planning process more streamlined.

0004 Suggest waiting to see what future role of DOE is.

0015 Duh!

That's what this study is all about should have been started 10 years ago!!

0022 This is very critical item.

0051 But with continued "grassroots" input and for DOE to "listen."

0056 See 6a. [6a. is as follows: See 1(b), 2(c), 4(a), 5 (a). [1b., 2c., 4a., and 5a. are as follows: To optimize future economic uses for the region's well-being, sell industrial and residential land to local governments so that the land and development of the land can be taxable to produce revenue to broaden the tax base and decrease the burden costs to citizens and local governments for services provided to the developments. For example, about 20-25 years ago, AEC stopped patrolling and providing police, fire, and medical response to public roads through the ORR. The City of Oak Ridge was given the responsibility to respond to all accidents, etc. on these open-to-the-public ORR roads without any financial assistance per year to offset the city's cost and taxpayers cost to expand its police and fire departments to respond to ORR accidents. An early unfunded mandate borne by the city! Sale of land to local governments for development and sale to private sector will reduce the costs of operating ORR by the federal government. Whenever feasible, allow these structures to be located on land that can be sold to local governments; local government sells to private sector developers; and taxable income is produced, such as property and sales tax, to offset burdens and broaden tax base and reduce federal operating costs. 1) Primary Potential Industrial Area Uses All are accessible to public roads. Local governments desperately need industrial park land to broaden tax base, hence, sell these areas to local governments that will develop and sell land to private developers and industries. 2) Secondary Potential Industrial Area Uses Add "Residential" as a potential use. These lakefront parcels are very marketable by the city/private sector and broaden the tax base. Most TVA lakefrontage in 50-mile radius of ORR has been sold to private sector. 3) By selling land to local governments for private development, costs of operating ORR by the federal government will reduce federal expenses of operating the entire ORR as defined in the 5-31-95 map. Yes, the federal government should maintain ownership until areas for private sector uses are cleaned up,

paid for by federal government. After cleanup, most “Primary Potential Industrial Area Uses” and “Secondary Potential Industrial Area Uses” identified on the 5/31/95 map

**7a. (Continued) The U.S. Department of Energy should begin immediately to develop a top-level, integrated, and comprehensive strategy for the use of ORR land and facilities, with implementation plans for facility reuse and future development.**

should be considered as areas to be sold to local governments that will sell them to private sector developers to broaden the tax base and reduce the burden on taxpayers and

on the federal government.] Release of ORR “clean” land to local governments for development and sale to the private sector will reduce federal operating expenses. Consider value and marketability of lakefront property to homeowners (residential usage).]

0057 I agree, especially with the facility reuse idea. DOE has had too much of a tendency in the past to build new instead of reusing existing facilities. Many of those old facilities have become liabilities.

Top level, integrated and comprehensive are all good buzz words, but when they say that duck.

0060 Sometimes, too many people get involved and water down a process. I look at the ORR as a national security area and should be kept as such. Sure, everyone would want a piece of a pie.

0065 All these questions assume one agrees with 7 (a).

With the threat of the dissolution of the DOE, decisions on future use should begin immediately.

It would be wonderful if DOE could integrate its various activities but I won't hold my breath!

0086 This process is called an environmental impact statement.

0091 DOE should lead to start; leadership role should be transitioned as in 6(a) suggestion [6a. is as follows: Conservation and transition areas should be managed by an environmental consortium and local government. Areas critical to the DOE mission that require special security should be managed by the DOE. The balance should be managed by a consortium which includes industry, employees and unions, local government and educational institutions].

You must first define specifically the difference between ownership and release of property.

Preservation of all remaining natural and semi-natural areas should be the primary goal.



**In the strategic planning effort, strong consideration should be given to co-development of ORR property with the private sector through partnerships, financial incentives, and mutually acceptable property use agreements.**

This is the nation's land. Local businesses and political organizations should have minimal say.

0019 Providing only that such "agreements" retain the integrity of the ORR and that it not revert into another "Gatlinburg/Dollywood, etc."

Private co-development could lead to fragmented development/management.

0022 Private sector partners' goals and objectives are not always consistent with goals best suited for ORR. Project motive is overriding.

0051 "Strong" consideration is only warranted for private sector treatment of wastes onsite for ORR material. Do not extend such facilities for waste treatment of non-ORR material unless some ORR waste goes to other DOE sites for similar [sic]. [Respondent circled both numbers 1 and 2.]

0054 Private sector development initiatives should be concentrated in, or largely restricted to, reuse of previously developed sites and facilities.

0056 See 6a. [6a. is as follows: See 1(b), 2(c), 4(a), 5 (a). [1b., 2c., 4a., and 5a. are as follows: To optimize future economic uses for the region's well-being, sell industrial and residential land to local governments so that the land and development of the land can be taxable to produce revenue to broaden the tax base and decrease the burden costs to citizens and local governments for services provided to the developments. For example, about 20-25 years ago, AEC stopped patrolling and providing police, fire, and medical response to public roads through the ORR. The City of Oak Ridge was given the responsibility to respond to all accidents, etc. on these open-to-the-public ORR roads without any financial assistance per year to offset the city's cost and taxpayers cost to expand its police and fire departments to respond to ORR accidents. An early unfunded mandate borne by the city! Sale of land to local governments for development and sale to private sector will reduce the costs of operating ORR by the federal government. Whenever feasible, allow these structures to be located on land that can be sold to local governments; local government sells to private sector developers; and taxable income is produced, such as property and sales tax, to offset burdens and broaden tax base and reduce federal operating costs. 1) Primary Potential Industrial Area Uses All are accessible to public roads. Local governments desperately need industrial park land to broaden tax base, hence, sell these areas to local governments that will develop and sell land to private developers and industries. 2) Secondary Potential Industrial Area Uses Add "Residential" as a potential use. These lakefront parcels are very marketable by the

city/private sector and broaden the tax base. Most TVA lakefrontage in 50-mile radius of ORR has been sold to private sector. 3) By selling land to local governments for private

**7b. (Continued) In the strategic planning effort, strong consideration should be given to co-development of ORR property with the private sector through partnerships, financial incentives, and mutually acceptable property use agreements.**

development, costs of operating ORR by the federal government will reduce federal expenses of operating the entire ORR as defined in the 5-31-95 map. Yes, the federal government should maintain ownership until areas for private sector uses are cleaned up, paid for by federal government. After cleanup, most "Primary Potential Industrial Area Uses" and "Secondary Potential Industrial Area Uses" identified on the 5/31/95 map should be considered as areas to be sold to local governments that will sell them to private sector developers to broaden the tax base and reduce the burden on taxpayers and on the federal government.] Release of ORR "clean" land to local governments for development and sale to the private sector will reduce federal operating expenses. Consider value and marketability of lakefront property to homeowners (residential usage).]

0057 I disagree simply because there seems to be no provision in this statement for conservation and recreational use. The local OR land barons don't need any more land for shopping malls!

0063 Depends on agreements. Leary [sic] of "co-development" term. Oak Ridge needs a state-run (federal assistance) park & DOE energy efficiency research area. ORNL is prime territory for these uses.

0065 [Respondent agrees with comment as modified: If a strategic planning effort were initiated, strong consideration should be given to co-development of ORR property with the private sector through partnerships, financial incentives, and mutually acceptable property use agreements.]

If private sector involved, only United States companies, universities, etc., should be considered.

0073 As long as lands slated for conservation and environmental usage are not compromised. Lands slated for industrial use should not expand beyond that shown on Recommendations Map.

0074 Except that consideration must go to educational institutions and other agencies that may not have a lot of money. Don't let the deals be made only with developers.

0080 This option would ease the pressure felt by DOE to create a solution by transferring the pressure to private industry.

0082 Co-development of existing facilities would be acceptable, but not the development of undeveloped lands.

**7b. (Continued) In the strategic planning effort, strong consideration should be given to co-development of ORR property with the private sector through partnerships, financial incentives, and mutually acceptable property use agreements.**

0083 Important for broadening the economic base.

0093 Define financial incentives.

0094 What happened to DOE??

**7c. The strategic planning effort should include the short term (0-25 years) and the long term (26-100 years).**

0004 Repeat my concern of planning anything in this time frame.

0010 One may also wish to consider very short term (0-10 years). Also, these plans should be reviewed and updated annually and determination made of what goals have been met.

0019 Emphasize the short term see how successful it will be. The long term should be generalities only.

0021 Don't know if enough "vision" exists to plan 26-100 years?? Current planning should avoid permanently excluding future options.

Assure short term use does not destroy specific, ORR areas for best long term use.

0049 Technological advances may well make any "long-term" plan obsolete. Emphasis should be on short term 0-25 years.

0055 The long term plan should define 'boundaries' and drive the short term planning process. This is important.

I agree as long as it is realized that both long and short term can have impacts on each other. Planning efforts in phases is OK as long as they don't become separate, exclusive issues.

0083 Sounds good but with each change of administration, DOE gets a new set of "marching orders" someone needs to figure out how to institutionalize strategic planning.

0093 Long term should be more thoroughly defined.

0094 Note: It could take 20 years to just get something built.

26-100 years is not a reasonable planning horizon it is too long to expect reliable plans.

**7d. The strategic planning effort should address the ORR as a whole and should be continually updated.**

0015 With stakeholder input.

0017 [Respondent emphasized that the ORR as a whole should be addressed, and circled both numbers 2 and 3, indicating a neutral response for this question.]

0019 That is the only way you can have “strategic planning!”

0031 Circumstances surrounding usage can always change.

0049 Continuous updating of a 25 year plan will meet long term needs.

0056 See 6a. [6a. is as follows: See 1(b), 2(c), 4(a), 5 (a). [1b., 2c., 4a., and 5a. are as follows: To optimize future economic uses for the region’s well-being, sell industrial and residential land to local governments so that the land and development of the land can be taxable to produce revenue to broaden the tax base and decrease the burden costs to citizens and local governments for services provided to the developments. For example, about 20-25 years ago, AEC stopped patrolling and providing police, fire, and medical response to public roads through the ORR. The City of Oak Ridge was given the responsibility to respond to all accidents, etc. on these open-to-the-public ORR roads without any financial assistance per year to offset the city’s cost and taxpayers cost to expand its police and fire departments to respond to ORR accidents. An early unfunded mandate borne by the city! Sale of land to local governments for development and sale to private sector will reduce the costs of operating ORR by the federal government. Whenever feasible, allow these structures to be located on land that can be sold to local governments; local government sells to private sector developers; and taxable income is produced, such as property and sales tax, to offset burdens and broaden tax base and reduce federal operating costs. 1) Primary Potential Industrial Area Uses All are accessible to public roads. Local governments desperately need industrial park land to broaden tax base, hence, sell these areas to local governments that will develop and sell land to private developers and industries. 2) Secondary Potential Industrial Area Uses Add “Residential” as a potential use. These lakefront parcels are very marketable by the city/private sector and broaden the tax base. Most TVA lakefrontage in 50-mile radius of ORR has been sold to private sector. 3) By selling land to local governments for private development, costs of operating ORR by the federal government will reduce federal expenses of operating the entire ORR as defined in the 5-31-95 map. Yes, the federal government should maintain ownership until areas for private sector uses are cleaned up, paid for by federal government. After cleanup, most “Primary Potential Industrial Area Uses” and “Secondary Potential Industrial Area Uses” identified on the 5/31/95 map should be considered as areas to be sold to local governments that will sell them to private sector developers to broaden the tax base and reduce the burden on taxpayers and on the federal government.] Release of ORR “clean” land to local governments for development and sale to the private sector will reduce federal operating expenses. Consider value and marketability of lakefront property to homeowners (residential usage).]

**7d. (Continued) The strategic planning effort should address the ORR as a whole and should be continually updated.**

0057 Totally agree.

0080 This option should go beyond and be incorporated into option 7(e).

Update periodically by the responsible management consortium or a coalition thereof.

0094 No clear delineation has been made with regard to TVA powerline right-of-way and state highway or roads (r-o-w).

**7e. The strategic planning effort should be conducted in consultation with the State of Tennessee, the City of Oak Ridge, Anderson and Roane counties, and other nearby counties most affected by activities on the ORR.**

0006 I feel the “near-by counties” needs to be better defined. Otherwise, counties not directly involved in this area might see a desire to exert influence in the area and “muddy the waters.”

0014 And citizen involvement. Citizen involvement!

But not at the expense of the taxpayer not having opportunities for input.

0016 And Knox County since expansion is to the west.

To be successful you MUST involve all adjacent land use governments.

This should be a prime consideration. Common Cause reinforces this particular item. Excellent process.

0036 And cities.

0039 Consultation for information, not a vote on land use.

0042 Would also suggest TVA’s involvement. Due to potential impacts on Melton Hill and Watts Bar reservoirs and shorelines, coordination with TVA is recommended.

0043 EPA, FWS, Interior.

Also with continued citizen input, not just government officials of cities and counties.

0054 Regional governments that lack jurisdiction over ORR lands, such as Knox County, may be consulted, but do not deserve an important voice.

0056 See 6a. [6a. is as follows: See 1(b), 2(c), 4(a), 5 (a). [1b., 2c., 4a., and 5a. are as follows: To optimize future economic uses for the region’s well-being, sell industrial and residential land to local governments so that the land and development of the land can be taxable to produce revenue to broaden the tax base and decrease the burden costs to citizens and local governments for services provided to the developments. For example, about 20-25 years ago, AEC stopped patrolling and providing police, fire, and medical response to public roads through the ORR. The City of Oak Ridge was given the responsibility to respond to all accidents, etc. on these open-to-the-public ORR roads without any financial assistance per year to offset the city’s cost and taxpayers cost to expand its police and fire departments to respond to ORR accidents. An early unfunded

mandate borne by the city! Sale of land to local governments for development and sale to private sector will reduce the costs of operating ORR by the federal government. Whenever feasible, allow these structures to be located on land that can be sold to local governments; local government sells to private sector developers; and taxable income is

**7e. (Continued) The strategic planning effort should be conducted in consultation with the State of Tennessee, the City of Oak Ridge, Anderson and Roane counties, and other nearby counties most affected by activities on the ORR.**

produced, such as property and sales tax, to offset burdens and broaden tax base and reduce federal operating costs. 1) Primary Potential Industrial Area Uses All are accessible to public roads. Local governments desperately need industrial park land to broaden tax base, hence, sell these areas to local governments that will develop and sell land to private developers and industries. 2) Secondary Potential Industrial Area Uses Add "Residential" as a potential use. These lakefront parcels are very marketable by the city/private sector and broaden the tax base. Most TVA lakefrontage in 50-mile radius of ORR has been sold to private sector. 3) By selling land to local governments for private development, costs of operating ORR by the federal government will reduce federal expenses of operating the entire ORR as defined in the 5-31-95 map. Yes, the federal government should maintain ownership until areas for private sector uses are cleaned up, paid for by federal government. After cleanup, most "Primary Potential Industrial Area Uses" and "Secondary Potential Industrial Area Uses" identified on the 5/31/95 map should be considered as areas to be sold to local governments that will sell them to private sector developers to broaden the tax base and reduce the burden on taxpayers and on the federal government.] Release of ORR "clean" land to local governments for development and sale to the private sector will reduce federal operating expenses. Consider value and marketability of lakefront property to homeowners (residential usage).]

0057 Again, totally agree.

0065 I think the state and local governments need to work better together to develop plans themselves. Strategic planning should be handled by state and local planners with public consultation and input. Primary consideration should be given to "host" communities.

0083 Goes without saying but such consultation increases the time it takes to develop a plan. Need to figure out how to get and effectively use the input.

0086 In consultation, not in 100% bend-over backwards accommodation.

0095 Oak Ridge City Council does not seem to care what the citizens want.

For national missions, stakeholders beyond the ones mentioned should be included.

0098 Including Knox and Loudon.

**7f. A primary goal of the strategic planning effort should be to maximize the benefits of ORR for the region.**

0005 And for the nation.

0006 What is the “region?”

No, this land is the nation’s land, and should not be misappropriated for local benefit.

0014 It may be that activities at ORR highly benefit some other region that’s OK.  
ORR will benefit this region, regardless, due to proximity.

0015 What are these specifically?

0019 That is the goal!

0021 Benefits for region and nation.

0022 See 7e. [7e. is as follows: This should be a prime consideration. Common Cause reinforces this particular item. Excellent process.] Agree strongly. ORR should be an asset to local, regional and nations stakeholders.

0024 And drive the CERCLA process.

0025 Don’t forget national and world missions.

0037 Good planning does not necessarily involve maximization, but rather often results in the best compromise.

0039 Goals should be national benefit.

0042 National-scope needs and focus should also be integrated.

0049 The national welfare should override local benefits.

0051 Balanced against national resource status of ORR.

What does THIS mean? Benefits to whom? What kinds of benefits? This is political speak.

**7f. (Continued) A primary goal of the strategic planning effort should be to maximize the benefits of ORR for the region.**

0056 See 6a. [6a. is as follows: See 1(b), 2(c), 4(a), 5 (a). [1b., 2c., 4a., and 5a. are as follows: To optimize future economic uses for the region's well-being, sell industrial and residential land to local governments so that the land and development of the land can be taxable to produce revenue to broaden the tax base and decrease the burden costs to citizens and local governments for services provided to the developments. For example, about 20-25 years ago, AEC stopped patrolling and providing police, fire, and medical response to public roads through the ORR. The City of Oak Ridge was given the responsibility to respond to all accidents, etc. on these open-to-the-public ORR roads without any financial assistance per year to offset the city's cost and taxpayers cost to expand its police and fire departments to respond to ORR accidents. An early unfunded mandate borne by the city! Sale of land to local governments for development and sale to private sector will reduce the costs of operating ORR by the federal government. Whenever feasible, allow these structures to be located on land that can be sold to local governments; local government sells to private sector developers; and taxable income is produced, such as property and sales tax, to offset burdens and broaden tax base and reduce federal operating costs. 1) Primary Potential Industrial Area Uses -- All are accessible to public roads. Local governments desperately need industrial park land to broaden tax base, hence, sell these areas to local governments that will develop and sell land to private developers and industries. 2) Secondary Potential Industrial Area Uses Add "Residential" as a potential use. These lakefront parcels are very marketable by the city/private sector and broaden the tax base. Most TVA lakefrontage in 50-mile radius of ORR has been sold to private sector. 3) By selling land to local governments for private development, costs of operating ORR by the federal government will reduce federal expenses of operating the entire ORR as defined in the 5-31-95 map. Yes, the federal government should maintain ownership until areas for private sector uses are cleaned up, paid for by federal government. After cleanup, most "Primary Potential Industrial Area Uses" and "Secondary Potential Industrial Area Uses" identified on the 5/31/95 map should be considered as areas to be sold to local governments that will sell them to private sector developers to broaden the tax base and reduce the burden on taxpayers and on the federal government.] Release of ORR "clean" land to local governments for development and sale to the private sector will reduce federal operating expenses. Consider value and marketability of lakefront property to homeowners (residential usage).]

0057 Of course. Isn't that what all of this is about aside from saving DOE clean-up costs by allowing them to say that certain areas don't need to be cleaned up?

0065 Yes, but I think primary consideration should be given to individuals living closest (less than or equal to 10 miles) to the ORR.

0079 The primary goal of the strategic planning effort should be to maximize the

benefits of ORR for the nation.

0080 Maximize the benefits of the region.

**7f. (Continued) A primary goal of the strategic planning effort should be to maximize the benefits of ORR for the region.**

0082 If this means large amounts of development in undeveloped lands, I disagree. Existing facilities should be utilized if at all possible.

0088 Another dumb question.

0091 This sounds too much like economic only.

0103 Maximize benefits for the entire nation by preserving (perhaps as a nature preserve of park) all remaining undeveloped and rural lands in their natural state.

**7g. The strategic planning effort should first identify and accommodate DOE uses for the land, while at the same time seeking to accommodate the needs and preferences of other stakeholders.**

0005 DOE and other federal government needs.

0009 As long as DOE is a player. If they abandon their mission in Oak Ridge, the plan needs to accommodate that.

0014 Highest and best use as determined by a broad spectrum committee.

0015 I only strongly agree with the last part of this statement [respondent underlined this part of the statement, which follows: while at the same time seeking to accommodate the needs and preferences of other stakeholders.]

0019 If you don't do that you don't have strategic planning and you'll be doomed to failure. Hard times are coming for all government agencies DOE can expect to take a shot too I commend this effort to look to the future!

0021 Or other federal/state government needs.

0022 Keep in mind past DOE uses and negative impact on local, region, and nation. DOE's uses should never again impact stakeholders as it has done in the past. Other stakeholders should be a prime consideration for any use of DOE land in the future. [In a footnote, respondent added: Responder is a 51 year resident of Oak Ridge.]

The nation and world needs outweigh stakeholders dreams and demands.

0029 Let's hope that DOE has all the land it needs for weapons production.

0038 This should be a cooperative, "Common Ground" process not a DOE first and merely "accommodate" the needs and preferences of other stakeholders.

0041 The best thing long term for this area is for the DOE to downsize substantially and concentrate on cleaning up the area and turning over R & D to the private sector completely.

0051 DOE budget (cuts)! DOE existence as a department may be in question. Balance is key. [Respondent circled both numbers 2 and 3.]

0056 See 6a. [6a. is as follows: See 1(b), 2(c), 4(a), 5 (a). [1b., 2c., 4a., and 5a. are as

follows: To optimize future economic uses for the region's well-being, sell industrial and residential land to local governments so that the land and development of the land can be taxable to produce revenue to broaden the tax base and decrease the burden costs to citizens and local governments for services provided to the developments. For example, about 20-25 years ago, AEC stopped patrolling and providing police, fire, and medical response to public roads through the ORR. The City of Oak Ridge was given the

**7g. (Continued) The strategic planning effort should first identify and accommodate DOE uses for the land, while at the same time seeking to accommodate the needs and preferences of other stakeholders.**

responsibility to respond to all accidents, etc. on these open-to-the-public ORR roads without any financial assistance per year to offset the city's cost and taxpayers cost to expand its police and fire departments to respond to ORR accidents. An early unfunded mandate borne by the city! Sale of land to local governments for development and sale to private sector will reduce the costs of operating ORR by the federal government. Whenever feasible, allow these structures to be located on land that can be sold to local governments; local government sells to private sector developers; and taxable income is produced, such as property and sales tax, to offset burdens and broaden tax base and reduce federal operating costs. 1) Primary Potential Industrial Area Uses All are accessible to public roads. Local governments desperately need industrial park land to broaden tax base, hence, sell these areas to local governments that will develop and sell land to private developers and industries. 2) Secondary Potential Industrial Area Uses Add "Residential" as a potential use. These lakefront parcels are very marketable by the city/private sector and broaden the tax base. Most TVA lakefrontage in 50-mile radius of ORR has been sold to private sector. 3) By selling land to local governments for private development, costs of operating ORR by the federal government will reduce federal expenses of operating the entire ORR as defined in the 5-31-95 map. Yes, the federal government should maintain ownership until areas for private sector uses are cleaned up, paid for by federal government. After cleanup, most "Primary Potential Industrial Area Uses" and "Secondary Potential Industrial Area Uses" identified on the 5/31/95 map should be considered as areas to be sold to local governments that will sell them to private sector developers to broaden the tax base and reduce the burden on taxpayers and on the federal government.] Release of ORR "clean" land to local governments for development and sale to the private sector will reduce federal operating expenses. Consider value and marketability of lakefront property to homeowners (residential usage).]

0057 Let's not bring back the good ol' AEC days! This could lead to a big step backwards where DOE does what it wants based on their alleged needs and to hell with everyone else. DOE needs do take priority IF AND ONLY IF THOSE NEEDS ARE DIRECTLY DEFENSE RELATED!

0058 Stakeholders can think of a lot of things they would like to do with the land. Particularly if someone else pays. This sounds politically correct, however.

While there are clearly DOE needs, the agency doesn't seem to be able to make and follow thru with decisions. The local communities need to develop a vision for their futures, and work with other stakeholders (including DOE) to realize their vision.

DOE will be dissolved soon start looking for non-DOE uses and users.

0085 Given the instability of DOE emphasis should be on other uses.

**7g. (Continued) The strategic planning effort should first identify and accommodate DOE uses for the land, while at the same time seeking to accommodate the needs and preferences of other stakeholders.**

0088 DOE is maybe not going to be around long so only are they a given!

0093 Who are other stakeholders and what are their interests?

0097 Everyone wants his own little piece of land. Why not keep it intact? In 10-20 years after I am sure would like to see it kept as today not asphalted over into one 35,000 acre parking lot!

**Part IV gives you an opportunity to comment on the Common Ground Process.**

0001 I am very impressed with this entire effort.

0005 The statements of this questionnaire are general and in the form of “motherhood” positions. Hence all have been answered in the positive. When specific industrial or governmental uses are to be considered, the answers may be different. Detailed comments were given earlier to Dr. Robin White.

0013 This has been an excellent process and implemented to perfection to date. DOE and Lockheed Martin Energy Systems senior managers should support and follow through with these recommendations. The process should continue for as long as the land is held and managed.

0016 Excellent effort by the Common Ground Process Team. I hope for unified and cross programmatic “turf” support by the Lockheed Martin Energy Systems sites and especially by the various DOE “turfs” [LM/ER, Environmental Management (including Waste Management and Decontamination & Decommissioning, as well as Environmental Restoration), and Defense Programs]. Funding for future updates or reiterations of the public input component of the Future Use Program will be a major test after 1995 (‘96, ‘97, etc.). Cross-programmatic, multi-site, ORR-wide Environmental Impact Statement under National Environmental Policy Act, requiring the integrating of all potential programmatic uses of all parcels of the ORR will be the ultimate test of integration of Common Ground with local and national missions, local stakeholder involvement, ecological protection and preservation, and economic development (jobs and tax base). We’re in a challenging time.

0018 Thanks for keeping stakeholders involved!

0019 Thank you for letting me comment . . . The preponderance of recommendations are going to originate with the high proportion of “super educated” (and I don’t mean that in a derogatory manner at all) professional “planners.” Sometimes they can’t see the forest for the trees. Fiscal reality needs to be in the forefront of all “short term” and especially in “long term” activities. Keep up the good work. Protect the integrity of ORR!

0025 Thanks for this opportunity; I only hope our views could be shared and will really make a difference. Thanks.

0028 People all over the U.S. donate millions of dollars every year to purchase land from private owners and give it to the government to hold in trust for future generations to be able to enjoy nature as we now know it. The ORR is already held in trust by the government. We must not release it to private owners or the opportunity to preserve it

will be changed forever.

**7 (Continued) gives you an opportunity to comment on the Common Ground Process**

0029 This is a one-time opportunity. Do it right. After having to move from Freels Bend in March of 1943, I have a difficult idea with the notion that someone other than my family members should profit from property my parents struggled to pay for and were not adequately compensated for. Our eviction notice said the property was being taken “for the establishment of the Kingston demolition range.” Was the property taken under false pretense; a ruse? Yes; but those were terrible war years and little was said in protest. Thanks to the Almighty it helped win that war!

0031 The process has all the earmarks of a town hall process where all segments of the community have an opportunity to make inputs to a decision making process that will have a significant impact on the region in the future. It is not all too often this type of opportunity happens.

0038 Appears to be an excellent, open, participatory process. Caution needs to be taken to preclude to the extent possible a DOE first, “accommodate” others secondly attitude that seems to come through in the written word. To do otherwise would violate the public trust that this is truly a consensual, cooperative “Common Ground” process.

0039 The Map and Summary give the impression that all needs of all stakeholders can be met to some degree. This raises false expectations. The ORR is a national resource and should not be “nickel and dimed” to death by cutting off pieces at the whim of the City of Oak Ridge and the regional development commission. It is a unique block of land that preserves a natural environment that has been destroyed almost everywhere else in the Valley and Ridge area of East Tennessee.

0041 DOE has zero credibility as far as I am concerned.

0044 This has been well done!

0054 · DOE’s initiation of the Common Ground Process seems to have given many regional groups the idea that it is now “open season” on ORR land. For example, Knox County groups have decided that DOE might be receptive to transferring land for an interstate bypass, and have built regional support for this concept. There will be significant political pressure on DOE to give in to this and other plans, and the existence of the Common Ground process will be used by some groups as rationale for calling DOE the bad guy when the agency says “No.” Please make every effort to clarify that this process does not represent a commitment by DOE to start large-scale transfers of land.  
· The Common Ground future use map will cause some local development groups to salivate over the prospect of “getting” Freels Bend for industrial use. Please reclassify this area; its historical value, proximity to the lake, and past waste management use do not make it a good candidate for transfer (or clarify the meaning of “Transition Area” uses).

- DOE and regional needs would be well-served by creatively exploring options for creating a functional bicycle-pedestrian transportation network on the ORR, and connecting ORR facilities to Oak Ridge and surrounding communities.

## 7 (Continued) gives you an opportunity to comment on the Common Ground Process

This is a poorly designed survey. Wording was **BIG** and vague. Choices were limited. Ideas that can be conflicting were together in the same choice, so the respondent has to choose all or none. Very badly done. It is a shame that such an important issue has become mired in mud like this. I recommend trying again with this questionnaire.

0056 I hope that the Common Ground Process (CGP) is much more than an effort to give concerned citizens an opportunity to express their thoughts and dreams for the future. If implemented as a consistent, ongoing process of evaluation and implementation, CGP has high potential to be a great service to the ORR region.

The main question that comes to mind, and has already been expressed at public meetings, is; "Is this effort worth anything?" One can easily get the impression that this is no more than an attempt by DOE to get public approval of a plan to limit environmental clean-up requirements with endorsements of land give aways and financial promises. Promises which DOE may not feel obligated to keep. It is good that DOE is attempting to get stakeholder opinions on this issue. I truly hope that this effort will be worth the time, effort and money spent. I realize and agree that national and defense needs should come first. If this is the attitude that DOE will maintain through all aspects of its land management, then why bother with this effort? After all, if in the end DOE raises the banner of national needs and marches off to its own drum, of what use is all of this? Perhaps the only real advantage to come from this will be getting DOE to manage its land resources better. That alone may make the effort worth the cost.

0058 I have attended a couple of meetings on this matter. More recently I read the summary sheet and the questionnaire. I still do not know where this program is coming from or where it is going. The verbiage sounds good, but what does it mean? A lot of people at the meeting I attended had visions of traipsing through a carefully maintained semi-wilderness and admiring various endangered species in a carefully maintained habitat (this was an actual suggestion). No apparent thought was given to the cost of maintenance the assumption was that here was a free goody. Overall comment #1: Who will pay? Overall comment #2: Who is astute enough to see even dimly 25 years down the road? Even 10 years ago most of this program would have been dismissed as arrant nonsense. The long term projections are an exercise in hubris.

0059 I have only one major suggestion. Although the Monitored Retrieval Storage facility (MRS) was rejected some 8 years ago, ORR remains an ideal spot for MRS. I believe MRS in ORR should not be given up as a lost cause, even though the outlook today is very dim. Twenty years from now attitudes may change! My major, indeed only real suggestion, is given on p. 1 [shown above] that the ORR eventually become the

site for the Monitored Retrievable Storage facility. Should this happen, say within 10 years, the immortality and viability of OR would be assured.

**7 (Continued) gives you an opportunity to comment on the Common Ground Process**

0060 I love my job and our community along with our country. I think the ORR should stay (basically) as is so if needed, immediately, we would have it. Everyone wants a piece of the pie. Many people have given their whole life to the ORR. I want our children to share in the past, present, and future. I want good unionized jobs for the ORR.

0062 Most of this is pretty obvious. A questionnaire should be able to offer a diversity of reasonable opinions, to determine where honest differences occur. This is phrased as if to support a predetermined position.

0063 I appreciate the Common Ground Process opportunity to voice my opinions/concerns about the Oak Ridge Reservation's future. I commend Mary English & her assistants for doing a professional job in gathering a wide variety of "panelists" views. I hope this process results in documentation that will actually be used carefully & seriously as DOE/officials plan the Reservation's future.

0064 The questionnaire makes it easy to agree strongly with the seeming goals of its originators. It's not at all obvious to me that such support might result in any actions. I will be most interested in the follow [sic] effects of the Process. Thanks for the opportunity to respond.

0065 I think that reports and other information submitted to DOE HQ about "stakeholder preferences" should be carefully explained in terms of numbers and categories of respondents. It seems that many people support more "reasonable" cleanup levels and costs, but this should not be interpreted to mean that a majority of individuals support institutional controls on a long-term basis. There are costs associated with the latter, and we're only beginning to identify some of them. These costs will have a very long-term impact on ORR communities. Good luck!

0071 My primary objective is: all use should benefit the region's population. Educate, create jobs, a safe environment. In other words, help the people that need the help.

0073 The lands in question belong to all Americans, not to special interest groups. We should remain focused while deciding the fate of these public lands. I believe we must concentrate on conservation, recreational, etc. and not necessarily treat this parcel as another industrial park. Develop a master plan and stick to it.

I enjoy the interactive-process and the quick results. These results are very well summarized.

0081 I have only been to one meeting they meet the same night the Anderson County Commission meets. From the report here it looks like a lot of work and study has been so far [sic]. Thanks for letting me be part of this program.

**is you an opportunity to comment on the Common Ground Process**

0082 During this process, an effort should be made to get input from as many “average citizens” as possible. By “average citizen,” I mean residents of the surrounding counties who do not have a direct financial interest in future development of the ORR. Forums, such as these meetings, tend to attract a substantial number of developers, chamber of commerce members, etc. who favor development of all develop able areas. “Common Ground” should be advertised more extensively to attract more citizens to participate.

0083 The Common Ground ~~process~~ appears to be a success. The next challenge is the implementation of the plan/recommendations at DOE HQ and the Operations Office. As a result of the OR Summit, we have the attention of the decision makers the plan/recommendations should be an integral part of all efforts to “sell” ORR. Common Ground will need advocates here and in Washington to effectively influence government and business leaders. I hope their efforts don’t disappear into the black hole in D.C.

0084 Many of the questions are worded such that they may bias the results it’s hard to disagree with many of them. This appears to simply serve as confirmation of accepted results from earlier input.

0085 I am pleased with accomplishments of the Common Ground Process. With a little tweaking a good plan will be developed.

0086 The City of Oak Ridge is a stakeholder but their views, i.e., transfer of property to the city, should not unduly influence the future use map, or even more so, the future uses themselves. Public trust would be lost if there was “evidence” (or to some, maybe even a hint of evidence) that the city, not DOE, controlled the land use decisions. DOE acting as an agent or voice of Oak Ridge is also deceptive to the public. DOE has an additional mission stewardship and it shouldn’t get lost in the shuffle. It is also not the same mission as environmental restoration and waste management. Common Ground is entirely conducive/useful as a NEPA process in itself let’s not miss the opportunity to use it for that purpose.

0087 1. Recognize reality. Some areas will not be “cleaned up” in 100 years. 2. Concentrate planning on large (possibly unique) national programs. Planning for unknown missions cannot be easy but must emphasize flexibility and costs that meet tests of reasonability.

0088 I'm very disappointed. Not much specificity at all as to what is really the scenario on the reservation. So much money spent on this and so little substantive dialogue!!!

0091 I consider it a worthwhile activity of potential benefit.

**7 (Continued) gives you an opportunity to comment on the Common Ground Process**

0093 ORR, on the surface, consists of 35,000 acres of land that should be maintained for natural beauty and recreation, research, conservation and environmental study. Industrialization can only enhance the greed factor and can be equally promoted in more suitable industrial areas.

0094 This is a very good process, but is more complicated than it may seem. I do, however, support the process I just think we have to be very careful. Thanks again.

0098 Thank you for actively soliciting public input. I appreciate the opportunity to be involved. We are lucky to have such a beautiful area in which to live, work, and play. My concern for great care in this decision making process is predicated primarily on the general health and well-being of our community. I remember seeing and reading information on how safe the nuclear (and other industrial processes, by-products, etc.) industry was once thought to be; but now we realize the many hazards associated with it. I would hope we would remember that and plan accordingly to be good land/environment stewards, and not allow greed or our own gain to cloud the issues. Decisions made today will affect us and our legacy for many generations to come.

0099 I am hopeful that input from stakeholders will be utilized by DOE and applaud the Department's efforts to involve the general public in the decision making process. The recommendations resulting from the process should serve as guidelines and advice to those seeking solutions.

0103 I cannot help but wonder how useful this process is when DOE continues to lease or sell large tracts of the reservation to developers even as this Common Ground exercise continues. I do believe neither the decision-makers nor most of the public realize what a remarkable and rare national resource the ORR is. Large-scale tracts of largely undeveloped land become so much more rare and thereby more valuable as natural areas with each passing day. Let's save it for our children and their children too.

0104 This process or plan should address the need to maintain the area's economy and standard of living. As government participation in this area decreases, efforts should be made by the government to leave the area in the same manner (economic and living conditions) as when government was here. This can be achieved by providing technical

and financial assistance to the local governments to build an economy based on private developments. As budgets DOE are cut back [sic], portions of the budgets need to be devoted to such an effort in a phased manner.



# III. FORUMS

---

**Overview:** Five public forums were held to present more in-depth information about the Oak Ridge Reservation, the preliminary future use recommendations, and the Common Ground Process, and to obtain external stakeholders' views about the recommendations. The forums were held at the Pellissippi State Technical Community College in west Knox County, the Harriman Holiday Inn, the Clinton Recreation Center, and the Pollard Auditorium in Oak Ridge. Two forums were held at the Oak Ridge location. Each Phase I Common Ground Process participant received notification of the forums, which were also widely advertised in regional newspapers. There were also direct mailings by LMES Community Relations. In all, 69 people attended the forums.

Each forum consisted of 2 sessions. The first was an "open house" session in which posters, maps, technical documents, and Common Ground Process team members were available to answer questions. The second was an interactive discussion session in which participants were given an opportunity to ask questions and voice their views; key points were captured on flipcharts, and more detailed notes were taken by a notetaker. Participants were also encouraged to submit or post written questions or comments.

For each forum, the following provides (1) a summary of participants' questions and Common Ground Process team member responses; (2) key points captured on flipcharts (listed as "Flipchart Comments"); and (3) questions and comments submitted in writing to the Common Ground team (listed as "Written Comments").



## FORUMS: INTERACTIVE DISCUSSION SESSIONS

**Background:** Following is a summary of the questions and comments expressed by participants during the interactive discussion sessions of the five public forums, with the responses provided by Common Ground Process team members. Material for this section was supplied by SSA, Inc., under a subcontract with LMES Community Relations.

### Pellissippi State Technical Community College Public Forum Saturday, June 10, 1995

· When you got input from the surrounding community, did they specify should it be greenfield or should it be industrial space? How did the stakeholders give us this information?  
Response: *Everybody didn't agree, but what we looked for is widespread agreement.*

*Three-fourths of the participants in public workshops and interviews said commercial uses and industry were a high priority (showed chart and explained percentages for high, medium, and low support).*

· I have been confused by definitions. "DOE Missions" is one. When you say, "industrial," is this an exclusive or inclusive term?  
Response: *"Industrial" is a land use that would include current operations at DOE.*

· Recreation. How far have we taken recreational use? It's unlikely we would have a state park here. How do you see it happening?

Response: *"Active" recreation is something like a team that needs a specific facility. "Passive" recreation can occur where open land is.*

How does active recreation apply to the Reservation without creating a disruption?

Response: *It would probably be for employees.*

For "passive" [recreation] we do not need to clean up to the same standards as for "active," right?

Response: *Correct. The map I'm showing you is a land use map as opposed to a more specific site-use map.*

## ppi State Public Forum (Continued)

- In understanding or "voting" for options I found it difficult to "vote" where I did not understand how it would be used. Are you implying the land might be sold or leased for heavy industry, for example?

Response: *We purposely left it open. We did not get specific. The proposed recommendations are still general enough to accommodate a lot of different uses.*

- As you arrive at potential uses I wish you would go back and revisit each type of use. Opinions could be more focused as plans develop. Perhaps annually go back to people for a "vote." I appreciate DOE asking community opinions about land uses.

What is the game plan?

Response: *Process was explained.*

DOE ORR will transmit these recommendations to whom?

Response: *To Secretary Hazel O'Leary*

- How do you envision implementation? Who will govern or administer the Reservation's recommendations?

Response: *Recommendations will be evaluated by Headquarters, and Headquarters will make plans. I can't honestly say what will be done at Headquarters, but they asked for stakeholders' recommendations.*

Response: *Locally, this information is already being used. Environmental Restoration is using them to determine when and what sites should be done first. Facility Re-Use is using them, too, to interface with the private sector that might be interested in doing things here.*

What is the estimated economic value of ORR's natural resources, excluding facilities?

Response: *It's not really known.*

Response: *It's really a hard thing to do.*

## Flipchart Comments

Add definitions to future information documents.

Revisit methods of transferring land as site definitions and specificity increase.

Better explain how DOE (HQ) will use the study.

- I encourage you to push harder on this to let us know how DOE intends to use this. We would like to know specifically. They should say: This is our plan for implementation.

Response: *We will probably to be forced to do that.*

**Harriman  
Public Forum  
Monday, June 12, 1995**

· In the leaflet that came in the mail we said that the ORR parcel would be maintained as a whole and it would not be sold off. How can this land use be done with a consortium of "everyone in the world."

*Response: There are several assumptions. In the next 100 years DOE would have less intense interest and presence. I identified brown areas (top 2) where DOE will be intensively involved for 0-25 years (cleanup and operations activities). Another assumption is that as DOE moves out, the city of Oak Ridge might be a partner in future uses.*

Lease it? Sell it?

*Response: It has been left open. We thought it better to suggest alternatives and that the process should be allowed to evolve. It should respond to market forces. We have this idea that the parcel should be managed as one unit by a consortium of stakeholders.*

Did the Nature Conservancy say there's lots of land and big tracts to be covered?

*Response: The map incorporates the Nature Conservancy's recommendations. In response to NC's recommendations, we proposed that the reservation be allowed to operate as a large eco system.*

· I would think that people would respond to keeping it as one unit. 30,000 acres have been sold in the last 30 years. Some has been "chewed" away," which may not have any scheme to it. It may be that conservation is the best use of it. I'm afraid it will be frittered away. I recommend that a picture be developed. We're at risk that things may be developed too much. Maintain some semblance of planning. You should not be too shy to talk about ways it could be done. The public has no idea of how to do it. Describe ways, develop schemes so that we can maintain integrity of ORR. It should be a part of the process itself. Present one, two, or three ways. How do we bring this off? My mind is a blank.

Response: *You're saying we should identify some possible roles and responsibilities*

*Response: To accomplish this plan, you need to have some method to accomplish it. The "who" and "how" are so closely related to "what" and "where."*

Did anybody question what would happen here if DOE is eradicated?

*Response: When we started the process this had not come up. There have been discussions. If there's no DOE, some federal agency*

*would accomplish its missions. DOE functions can't be abolished.*

## 1an Public Forum (Continued)

- Someone would have to be in charge. But the level of activity **might** change. In the writeup you talked about a consortium operating the site you talked about industrial and several other categories. Is there a precedent for this many "zones" working out?

Response: *That is why we see the City of Oak Ridge as a major player. They are the ones that do the "zonings." If ownership does change zoning **might** help keep things from being confused. What we're recommending has been done at other places like base closures.*

Is there the assumption that cleanup levels determine land use?

Response: *That's how all this started.*

- It's common now to talk about industrial areas that won't have to be cleaned up to the same level as for residential uses or for schools. The community and the courts have to accept cleanup levels. I question how it will play out. That's why years ago we thought we had to clean up to the highest level. Even if the community agrees, have we gotten banks and real estate developers to agree? What if they won't touch it? History shows that not everyone is reasonable. I think we may have to go to more stringent cleanups levels elsewhere (other than East Fork Popular Creek). It may not be more acceptable. We need to get bankers and developers involved in this process.

Response: *The economic consultants made several suggestions about how to get these people involved. Those sorts of issues will be addressed. Some ideas: loan guarantees. These will be fleshed out with the first tenant. You're right there has to be some "practice." Nothing might work unless property is considered totally harmless.*

Response: *With brownfields and industrial development, state and federal government have to deal with liability issues concerning past contamination and future contamination.*

Response: *At the Oak Ridge Summit, the City of Oak Ridge person had an old industrial site with contamination, trying to figure out how to bring it back into use.*

Response: *Portsmouth and Paducah are leasing property from DOE. That might be something to look at. The government may have to assume liability.*

## Flipchart Comments

- Come up with schemes to maintain the integrity of ORR. Describe ways to maintain it.

This should be part of the Common Ground process.  
Need to address future liability issues.  
Bankers and developers need to be involved in the process.

**Clinton  
Public Forum  
Monday, June 19, 1995**

Define "passive recreation".

*Response: "Active" is something like spectator sports with teams on a field needing a built facility, like a swimming pool. Employee recreation could be active. I would have special employee activities listed as "active" with jogging tracks, pools, fields. "Passive" recreation is less structured, not team oriented: walking, jogging, bicycle trails. No built facilities.*

- How does this relate to guidelines for cleanup procedures? Are you considering cleaner areas in the conservation areas (making it pristine)? How does agricultural research fit in?

*Response: We are working on how that would be done. We're putting together plans on how to use it (our recommendations won't be ready in time for cleanup reports). We're looking at a schedule seeing now if changes need to be made. By August we will have an internal draft for the public forum.*

Does that document go to headquarters in D.C.?

*Response: Yes, to the assistant secretary for environmental management, Thomas Grumbly.*

- That major green area is it a primary area for environmental protection? It's too big for a green area. If we're going to be industrial, let's be industrial. It would also require too stringent cleanup standards. That's 24-hour use for animals. If the prime use is conservation area it's too broad.

*Response: We have a fairly good idea where the plumes are.*

*Response: Much of that region has ridges and valleys. The central green area is a ridge around Melton Hill. It's fairly steep (and also a visual buffer). It so happens that areas not built on have become fairly important environmental areas.*

You should evaluate the percentage of green vs. brown areas.

*Response: Information about stakeholder preferences for uses was shared.*

- Even within the conservation areas—it would be good to see how much would be eliminated due to ridges, flood plains, etc.

Did planners take into account the major interstate that's proposed to run through the area?

Response: *Yes. We discussed impacts of something like that. We also talked about making major improvements to 95 and about connecting through the Clinch River Breeder Reactor site. We looked at long-range transportation issues.*

Will the final recommendations address that?

Response: *We can't. At that point it becomes a regional planning document. We can only go so far.*

## **Public Forum (Continued)**

- A major interstate exchange would greatly affect this plan. If it goes through the top valley Dutch Valley/Marlow, it would have to go through thousands of landowners The State wants to go through Oak Ridge Reservation so they won't have to deal with all those property owners.
- You should identify major transportation routes and how they might impact things. It would make land more desirable as industrial land than it is presently.
- Would it be possible for planners to look at the recommendations and suggest the best places for major throughways?

Response: *We're already looking at that in terms of how it might impact Lab work, etc. But we have not looked at it from an engineering or conservation standpoint. We would have to look at a comparison of the corridors. I don't know if Lab comments have been documented and sent as some kind of report. One reason we looked at 8 and 18-county areas is because of regional things going on.*

- Is the reservation going to remain a reservation under government control? Would a major manufacturer get some portion, if it were thought important?

Response: *We're looking at options now to see if we could lease or transfer property.*

Response: *Until recently, DOE could only turn over property to Oak Ridge. Now we have the mechanism (in the last 2-3 months) that allows us to lease property.*

Response: *The recommendation is to manage it under one form of control. We do not specify who. There are advantages to the region if the Reservation is maintained intact and managed under one control.*

Has DOE determined if land is leased what would be the status of taxes?

Response: *I'm not sure the answer has been determined. It would depend on how the four entities work out (DOE, City of Oak Ridge, State, Anderson and Roane counties) It could be a consortium of private concerns that work with federal, county, state, and city. It's not defined. It could be unique.*

Our facility is located near water. Are other DOE facilities located near water?

Response: *Most are, but not Los Alamos. The driving force around most DOE sites was the location of water for industrial purposes.*

You suggest maintaining the buffers. Have you looked at the width of buffers?

Response: *There are areas of protection of different types major issues are health and safety. But we have not looked at them specifically. That gets into planning. There could be other reasons.*

## 1 Public Forum (Continued)

- TVA has a new shoreline management plan that will be concerned with buffer zones. The size (width) of buffers would be an issue.

Response: *As Melton Hill gets more use—buffer zones could get more use.*

It would be nice to know what rights DOE will retain or release.

Response: *Those uses considered compatible with both industry and conservation uses. If it becomes managed by a consortium those rights should be taken care of.*

Is there a mechanism to say "no" to industry that might want to come in?

Response: *Throughout the document, we use the word "compatible." At some point that would need to be defined. We would need to add to existing uses that enhance or support DOE missions and operations.*

You could also have deed restrictions to control the situation.

Zoning could play a role.

### Flipchart Comments

Green areas are too large. Clean up to the level to support manufacturing, etc.

Determine the percentage uses of land area for the different uses, especially:

- industrial uses
- conservation uses

- Within conservation areas, determine the percentage of land not suitable for development because of slope, topography, etc.
- Identify/document regional and area land use and transportation changes which are currently being investigated by others.

Maintain buffer zones, especially for TVA's shoreline management. Don't decrease width of those zones.

Before land is turned over, determine which rights will be retained especially along the shoreline.

**Oak Ridge  
Public Forum  
Tuesday, June 27, 1995    Afternoon Session**

- The terms "specialized industrial uses" and "institutional uses" need definitions. It would affect how I respond.

*Response: The concept "specialized industrial uses" was developed after we had a week-long workshop with consultants and site programmatic people. We came up with the concept of "specialized industrial uses" unique for this area. We proposed that the land would support multiple uses. We hope it will be a model for East Tennessee and the nation.*

"Institutional" use    can it be churches, hospitals, etc? "Institutional uses" can mean "controlled" like a prison. They would have a fence around it    like "institutional control." You need to be clearer.

- For cleanup purposes    (Question 5 on the questionnaire) the amount of cleanup needs to be different for different uses.

Does this mean a more or less stringent cleanup?

*Response: You're asking how the recommendations would affect cleanup of specific sites. The cleanup people are looking at these    waiting on them.*

You have gone to the trouble to identify different uses. What do they mean?

*Response: If it's called an industrial zone    it wouldn't be cleaned up to residential standards level. Revisit the White Oak Lake area designation.*

Discuss Parcel 1.

*Response: It's a 1,000-acre site identified for industrial development.*

- How does the Secretary's decision affect Common Ground? Can the Common Ground process alter DOE's decision?

*Response: What is the goal of Common Ground? To forward recommendations to the Secretary. The idea goes back to NEPA    which includes stakeholder input.*

Could it affect the decision?

Response: *HQ has not told us how it will use these recommendations.*

What kind of NEPA planning is going on?

Response: *Common Ground is not doing NEPA. That will be left up to the property people.*

What NEPA (EA or EIS) is planned for parcel 2?

## **1 Afternoon Session (Continued)**

What will happen with Common Ground after December 1995?

Response: *Every five years it will be revisited. The land use policy signed three months ago will include stakeholder opinions. Common Ground "kicked off" this process.*

Response: *There is an ongoing future use planning process that has public involvement included. I might speculate that there will be periodic review.*

You need to describe how it all fits together. Put a copy of the "Land Use Policy" in the report.

Is the land use policy general in nature?

Response: *Yes. It allows us to mold it to suit our needs. Those are the guidelines we're operating under now.*

Is it under review now?

Response: *Yes*

· "I am retired from MMES and now under contract with Barge Waggoner. While I was with MMES, I helped draft the policy statement at DOE HQ (one of several involved nationwide). I am extremely pleased by the public's participation and openness, especially considering that DOE is coming out of an environment of classification and secrecy. I'm excited by the policy."

· There's no residential. I understand that 63% of the stakeholders placed a low priority on residential use. I have not flip-flopped on this yet. I think there are areas that could be residential. Would it not conflict with DOE missions?

Response: *"Institutional" uses might include temporary housing, like for training academies (dorms, training facilities, temporary housing for those working with people on site).*

Response: *In the conservation transition zone (north and southeast), we began to see the lake front property is very valuable, including the northern zones. We thought those areas could support low-density uses (because they are not contaminated).*

Explain "passive" recreation.

Response: *The difference: "active" generally means team sports that require paving, facilities, etc. "Passive" the most development would be a trail. Tent camping is considered an "active" use.*

## 1 Afternoon Session (Continued)

Is it possible to get an indication of residential land use on other side of river?

Response: *On residential issues We might look at those as a time issue.*

- Cleanup issues do impact long-term uses. Just to maintain and protect land from existing contamination each decision today is made on a case-by-case basis to determine cleanup levels. Common Ground will help determine up-front potential uses.

- If you are talking about the year 2050, it is possible that attitudes will be very different then. Does this preclude having a monitored retrievable storage (MRS) area?

Response: *No. It would probably been in a "primary industrial area use."*

The proposed connector between I-75 and I-40. Will Common Ground be giving input to DOE on this?

Response: *In the follow up planning process yes. The information from the Metropolitan Planning Group will be included as an appendix.*

Several science projects at DOE are not reflected on the map.

Response: *The area of ITER and the Accelerator are considered in the Common Ground process. Future uses like that will be recommended to fall into brown and tan areas (on map).*

Could specific possible uses be identified on this map?

Response: *We could probably make it a part of the process.*

Would you also include in the report some of the maps that are in the open house?

Response: *What you've seen will be included in the supporting documents section of the report. (These would be in ring-binder volumes.) We*

*wouldn't provide a lot of copies of this part. They would be at information centers and libraries.*

- You've got passive recreation within environmental use areas. Does that include hunting on the Oak Ridge Reservation?

*Response: That's a detail that has not been brought up. Turning land over to TWRA that has not come up. TWRA manages hunts now, but DOE is the one that gives approval for the hunt.*

- As times goes by, people may have a need for areas for gardening. (Public gardening areas give people an opportunity without land to garden.)
- At the June 27th meeting it became clear that residential areas had been extensively discussed for the "conservation transition use areas," yet it doesn't show up as a potential activity for this land use type. I believe that this is an appropriate omission.

## **1 Afternoon Session (Continued)**

### **Flipchart Comments**

It would be helpful to show the current and proposed uses at DOE-ORR.

Include in the report the charts, etc., that you have displayed in the open house.

Open ORR to hunting.

Enclose the land use policy as an appendix to the report.

There are some peripheral areas of ORR that could be used for residential.

A definition of "passive" recreation is needed.

There's a need for camping (i.e. tent) areas.

Note: Refer to the "visioning report" for residential uses (37% call for some).

"Institutional" confusing term.

The amount of clean-up needs to be different for different uses.

Revisit the White Oak Lake area designation.

You need an explanation in the report to explain how the land uses policy fits.

"S-16A Map." Provide it with the recommendations as an overlay and with labels or grids.

- If it is determined that an "EA" will be done relative to the 1,000 acre parcel, the public should have an opportunity for input.

A definition is needed for "specialized industrial uses" and "institutional uses."

A description of DOE land use policy is needed.

- City of Oak Ridge boundaries are not accurately reflected on the map. It doesn't show high-density areas.

Not showing existing residential areas on north boundary outside of ORR creates concern.

Residential uses have mixed support.

Determine how clean-up activities can be handled for time-related uses.

- Show the relationship between environmentally sensitive areas and the "green" areas on the map in the Common Ground document.

Show possible "garden " areas on the recommendations map.

**Oak Ridge**  
**Public Forum**  
**Tuesday, June 27, 1995    Evening Session**

Do the dark green areas mean we (people) should not be a part of it?

Response: The dark green has environments that we shouldn't encroach upon. The striped green areas mean we should be careful about development there.

- I don't understand why the dark green areas are an exclusion for recreation areas. It seems that places where research and industrial areas are should be in green areas.

Response: *When you look at those sites, you find that there are areas within brown areas that are not contaminated. Brown areas also allow us to control contamination.*

Is it not better to bring new businesses into uncontaminated areas?

Response: *Green areas have become developed environmentally and ecologically. They are important research sites. Also, many undeveloped areas have steep ridges and other topography unsuitable for development.*

I'm curious about the accessibility of the dark green areas. Are they are for low      earmarked for low-impact recreational use or to exclude people totally?

Response: *There are areas in the green area that might be "darker green." The Nature Conservancy helped us to determine which areas are most sensitive. They have recommended some that should be untouched. These are very small areas.*

- This area has the potential to be the best mountain biking areas. It could be converted to a prime recreational area. I prefer a multiple-use area as opposed to "National Park."

Response: *Nature Conservancy spent a week with us. They sat at the same table as the economic development people. They helped intensively with the recommendations.*

The old Clinch River Breeder Reactor Site      what's to become of it?

Response: *That's outside our area of consideration. It belongs to TVA.*

- That brings up the issue of the possible dissolution of DOE. What might happen? How will it affect the options that we're developing?

Response: *That's hard to answer. We're going on what we're seeing in process now, which affects the ongoing planning process. Common Ground is going on concurrently with the regular planning process. It will be blended into the long-term. One recommendation that Common Ground is making is that a consortium of Oak Ridge, Oak Ridge Reservation, and DOE get involved in long term strategic planning that could serve as a check to what we're talking about.*

## **dge Public Forum Evening Session (Continued)**

- Even if DOE goes away, the function of existing sites would not go away. Someone will have to manage these sites.

Response: *Just for cleanup activities alone they're looking at about a 20-to-50 year timetable.*

Are there forecasted plans for utilization of Y-12, K-25, and ORNL?

Response: *In the process, we've documented everything we can get our hands on that has projections for the area: DOE, regional interests. We've tried to identify everything in the entire process. There is also an economic development group "Facility Re-Use Committee" at K-25. They are looking at what DOE needs to go through to determine how one might affect others' plans.*

Can you weigh economic development over environmental development?

Response: *We can go through the NEPA process. We had economic folks sit down with the Nature Conservancy this map is a reflection of that idea. In five years when we re-look at this it may change.*

- Could you show us what areas might be available for lease under this map? No corporation is going to look at a 10 year lease with 10 years renewable. Why not consider leases for 100 years if the time frame for this report is 100 years?

Response: *Send that to us as a recommendation. The City of Oak Ridge, in addition to the 1,000 acre lease, has identified areas they would like excessed. This is all part of the "self-sufficiency" plan. This current land lease is under this agreement with the city of Oak Ridge.*

Are there plans for transfer of property to anyone else?

Response: *Right now, there are only lease agreements, not transfer of property.*

Isn't one of the recommendations that there should not be a transfer of land?

Response: *Yes. But this self-sufficiency agreement is many years old.*

*Common Ground was not set up to stop that agreement but to provide longer term planning. We have been asked to comment on the land lease. We did comment that we should respond in longer term ways.*

What will happen after this report goes to DOE?

*Response: It's up to Headquarters to determine how it will be used. The Site Management Plan is incorporating Common Ground recommendations into their planning process.*

**Public Forum Evening Session (Continued)**

I notice there is no residential use recommended. That's probably good, considering the cleanup.

*Response: It was considered, but the majority of stakeholders did not place a high priority on this type of use. That's not to say that over a long period of time that may not change. We're proposing something fairly unique to this area. We want the recommendations to be flexible enough to respond to government and local needs.*

- If all green areas remain under consideration, given the green connectors between passive recreation areas and natural conservation areas, will these remain?

*Response: Yes. You will see that some areas like a flood plain would be a corridor.*

Does Common Ground also imply common water? How does water fit into the picture and to access?

*Response: That's not addressed specifically yet. TVA has right-of-way on many impoundments. That may take care of it.*

*Response: We cannot restrict waterway access. There are fishermen now in the middle of K-25 on the Clinch River all the time.*

If we promote industrializing the area, we should allow use of the waterway.

Is it possible to violate TVA waterway?

*Response: Yes. TVA is responsible for navigation and flood control on the Tennessee River System. TVA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers cooperate to determine the advisability of docks and terminals along the waterway. Such facilities are built only after TVA and the Army Corps of Engineers have gone through a public permitting process.*

Will Common Ground make any recommendations about ground and rail transportation issues?

*Response: We're much more general. We have not made specific activity recommendations. We are leaving it to Planning to decide what should follow the recommendations.*

- In thinking about cutting off the "green areas," they may not be as cut off as it appears. In the northwest and central locations I'm concerned not just for animals but for passive recreation. There's a potential for recreation there.

*Response: We're trying to conserve important ecological areas as well as the "view shed." This area will become more and more important. These*

*"viewsheds" tend to encompass sensitive ecological areas.*

Flipchart Comments

- R&D and offices should be located in the "green" areas instead of in the plant sites because it will take longer to cleanup the plant sites.

Use the potential industrial impact on waterways as a way to promote the area. Give thought to a greenway area to connect the green areas for passive recreation, i.e. [east of X-10].

Written Comments

What about small game hunts?

- Would you discuss Parcel 1? How does the Secretary's decision affect the Common Ground Process? Can the Common Ground Process alter the DOE decision? If so, how?

With regard to the 1,000 acres that DOE will release for industry:

- Where is it located?
  - Was the "Common Ground" comprehensive, long-term strategy a part of the decision making process?
- Will an EA or EIS (NEPA requirement) be prepared?
- If an EA, will the public be involved in the process?

· Does our tc  
als  
o  
out  
sid  
e  
wo  
rld  
(m  
ean  
s  
we  
nee  
d  
to  
edu  
cat  
e  
our  
kid  
s  
and

oth  
ers)

.  
Fin  
ally

this  
is  
the  
yea  
r  
200  
0,  
mo  
st  
of  
us  
nee  
d  
to  
upd  
ate.