



Environmental Management Site Specific Advisory Board
Idaho National Engineering Laboratory

**IDAHO NATIONAL ENGINEERING LABORATORY
DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE FACILITY AND LAND USE PLAN
(DOE-ID 10514)**

INTRODUCTION

The Environmental Management Site Specific Advisory Board - Idaho National Engineering Laboratory (EM SSAB-INEL) met on November 14-15, 1995 in Idaho Falls. After discussion with Department of Energy-Idaho Operations Office (DOE-ID) and Lockheed Martin Idaho Technologies (LMIT) personnel regarding the document, and after having discussed the issue and previous Board meetings, the Board participated in a facilitated, consensus-building process through which the following recommendation was developed and unanimously adopted.

RECOMMENDATION

The Environmental Management Site Specific Advisory Board to the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory (EM SSAB-INEL) determined that there is a major imbalance in the weight given the land use section and the facilities section of the Draft Comprehensive Facility and Land Use Plan (CFLUP). Twenty-nine (29) pages generally "outline" the resources that exist on the site while the rest of the 241-page document focuses primarily on the existing facilities and infrastructure. The EM SSAB-INEL strongly recommends:

1. That the Comprehensive Facility and Land Use Plan (CFLUP) address and better define the rationale for preserving the unique, contiguous and isolated 892-square miles of federally-controlled land for future programs. This definition should clearly state the need for continuity of its boundaries to provide site integrity to lessen the possibility of contaminant migration.
2. Define a preferred core area to determine exactly what land is needed for facilities development and what it will be used for. This includes recognizing (or at least not precluding) the possibility of nuclear energy research as a component of a larger research mission. The plan should also address the need for future waste disposal sites.
3. The plan identifies many of the resource values and constraints found on the INEL site but does not go into any detail on planning for their future use and management. Grazing, wildlife, cultural, archaeological, minerals, endangered species, recreation, hydrology, and others are mentioned, but the plan is silent on whether to use and manage the resources or to preserve them.
4. The INEL should continue to coordinate its planning activities with those of adjoining entities.
5. Address in more detail those policies, treaties, regulations, statutes, and physical characteristics which affect land usage in areas of the INEL. Provide references where land use is impacted (for example, 100-year flood plain). Areas where significant data gaps exist which impact land use (for example, seismology and levels of contamination) should be described.

6. Expand the “Land Description” and “History of Land Acquisition, Terms, and Agreements” to reflect the historical and current Native American presence as legitimized by the Fort Bridger Treaty of 1868 between the United States and Shoshone-Bannock Tribes, DOE Order 1230.2 (“DOE-ID Native American Policy”), the subsequent “working agreement,” and Memoranda of Agreement with the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes. They should be fully described in the Land Use Chapter 1 as they impose restrictions on future land use development (for example, cultural and historic preservation sites).
7. A section should be devoted to detailing the Public Land Orders that removed the land from the public domain and put it under the jurisdiction of the Department of Energy (DOE). The constraints and implications of each Order should be outlined. In addition, any MOUs or MOAs pertaining to land management (for example, fire protection and rehabilitation) should be addressed.
8. The Plan should be a living document that incorporates land use planning implications of other related INEL documents as well as planning based on system integration principles across program lines.
9. The Plan should include proposals for creative uses of the available land, such as development of an INEL Interpretive Center in conjunction with the EBR-1 facility. This could be an Interagency Visitor Center to explain the various missions of INEL and describe the ongoing projects and research. The facility would help remove the cloak of secrecy that surrounds the site and inform the public that it is a “world class” nuclear research facility. Also, from an interagency standpoint, the surrounding federal lands and their resources could be interpreted. This could be a privately-run center or a cost-shared federal facility.
10. The Board made a recommendation at the May meeting that basically supported the 15 assumptions on which the land use plan was being based, and the Board added two additional assumptions and a footnote related to concerns of the Tribes. In the August meeting DOE responded to a query to the effect that all the Board’s recommendation had been incorporated in the draft land use plan. To the contrary, the draft document did not reflect the Board’s recommendation.

Editorial Comments:

- Include document sources in the text, using original references, not just DOE documents.
- Include a more detailed index.
- Correct maps and labels (for example, include Clark County on the map on page 10 and provide a clearer indication of what the floodplain map is).