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### 13. ACTION SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>&quot;Message!&quot; or Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fall Creek Falls watershed</td>
<td>OSM and its &quot;bosses&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Grant our petition! Abandon OSM's 'preferred' alternative!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>Pickett State Forest: added lands</td>
<td>Gov. Sundquist &amp; list</td>
<td>&quot;Don't delay in purchasing Cunningham tract!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B</td>
<td>Golf courses and resort parks</td>
<td>Gov. Sundquist &amp; legislators; Your state legislators</td>
<td>&quot;Revenue production is not primary mission of our parks!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B</td>
<td>Scott's Gulf gift</td>
<td>Bridgestone/Firestone</td>
<td>&quot;Thanks for gift and for promised protection of retained tract!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B</td>
<td>Container deposit legislation</td>
<td>Your state legislator</td>
<td>&quot;Support upcoming bill to study litter &amp; recycling problems!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B</td>
<td>Shoreline Management Initiative</td>
<td>Tere McDonough, TVA</td>
<td>Plan to attend public hearing on February 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8B</td>
<td>Melton Hill Land Mgmt Plan</td>
<td>Patri Reed, TVA</td>
<td>Plan to attend hearing on Dec. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9A</td>
<td>Anderson Cy. asphalt plant/quarry</td>
<td>Cy. Commissioners</td>
<td>Comment on proposed Blended Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11A</td>
<td>TCWP outing, Jan. 30</td>
<td>TCWP (Hal Smith)</td>
<td>&quot;We support Alternative B!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11B</td>
<td>TCWP committee meeting</td>
<td>TCWP (committee chair)</td>
<td>&quot;Oppose zoning; support filing appeal!&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senator John Doe</th>
<th>The Hon. John Doe</th>
<th>Pres. Bill Clinton</th>
<th>Governor Don Sundquist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States Senate</td>
<td>U.S. House of Representatives</td>
<td>The White House</td>
<td>State Capitol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC 20510</td>
<td>Washington, DC 20515</td>
<td>Washington, DC 20500</td>
<td>Nashville, TN 37243-9872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>202-456-1111; Fax 456-2461</td>
<td>615-741-2001; Fax 532-9711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:president@whitehouse.gov">president@whitehouse.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WHAT IS TCWP?**

TCWP (Tennessee Citizens for Wilderness Planning) is dedicated to achieving and perpetuating protection of natural lands and waters by means of public ownership, legislation, or cooperation of the private sector. While our first focus is on the Cumberland and Appalachian regions of East Tennessee, our efforts may extend to the rest of the state and the nation. TCWP's strength lies in researching information pertinent to an issue, informing and educating our membership and the public, interacting with groups having similar objectives, and working through the legislative, administrative, and judicial branches of government on the federal, state, and local levels.

**TCWP, 130 Tabor Rd., Oak Ridge, TN 37830.**

Exec Director, Mary Reed, 481-0623 or 481-0286.

Membership-Development Directors, Sandra Goss (522-3609) and Mary Reed (481-0623) or 481-0286

President, Jerry Freeman, 423-482-5980 (evening).

e-mail: TCWP@kornet.org On the web: http://www.korner.org/tcwp/
1. BIG SOUTH FORK -- GMP etc.

A. Your pre-draft input needed on General Management Plan (GMP)

The National Park Service is taking the unusual step of soliciting comments on preliminary ideas they have formulated concerning the alternatives to be proposed in the Draft GMP for the Big South Fork National River and Recreation Area (BSFNRA). Two of the tentatively proposed alternatives embody significant, harmful overdevelopments, and our input is therefore of the essence.

We had extremely short notice (10 days!) about 4 meetings held on the subject (Nov. 30 - Dec. 3) but tried to get word out to as many interested folks as possible. Therewere 16, 30, 30, and (?) people at the Jamestown, Oneida, Oak Ridge, and Whitley City meetings, respectively, and a lot of lively discussion. The meetings are now over, but your written comments will get equal weight to any oral ones (no firm deadline, but the sooner the better because the planners are already working on the draft). Please read the enclosed fact sheet and take action. As you will see (under "Your Comments") you are being asked to answer very simple questions and your responses can be very brief. For more information call us (423-482-2153), or check with NPS (423-569-9778).

B. Big South Fork has priority for Unified Watershed Assessment Funds

The Tennessee Dept. of Environment and Conservation has identified 35 Category-I watersheds (i.e., those with water-quality problems), out of which the state has selected 4 top priority watersheds. These are being submitted to EPA in application for Unified Watershed Assessment Funds (see §6A for a fuller description ofthis program). Among the priority rivers, South Fork Cumberland River is the first one named. Local watershed groups, organizations, officials and others will be contacted about a public meeting concerning the operation of the Unified Watershed Assessment Funds program.

2. OBED NEWS

A. Cumberland County Water Supply Study nearing completion

The Corps study. In the last Newsletter (NL224 §1A), we reported in some detail on a September meeting in which we received an update on the progress of the "technical feasibility" water-supply study that will have a major impact on current and future dam proposals in the Obed watershed (e.g., the Clear Creek Dam proposal).

At the preceding (June) meeting we had expressed serious concerns about a "Needs" analysis being part of this study, which -- being a feasibility and not a project study -- was not being conducted under NEPA, and thus without general public input (NL223 §3A). The Corps had responded by including 3 hypothetical scenarios of growth, which were presented for the September meeting.

We came away from that meeting concerned that the range of these scenarios was clearly on the high side. Even though there will be a more valid needs analysis once NEPA comes into play, a specific proposed federal project that would trigger NEPA will presumably be chosen on the basis of the current Corps study (the greater the perceived need, the more massive a project), and this choice will undoubtedly have a major political component.

We communicated this continuing concern to the Corps and they have now added another "low-growth" scenario, namely, 1.5% annually through Year 2025, then 1.25% annually through Year 2050. One may still ask why the low margin of the range is not a no-growth scenario. Another question we are trying to get answers to concerns the data supplied by the utility districts, on which the needs analyses are based. Specifically, we want to know whether the tallies of "new" water users include those households and businesses that newly connect to a water system, regardless of whether they might already have been water users (ground water) prior to connecting. Our concerns were communicated to the design team.

County Executive speaks: Brock Hill, Cumberland County Executive, spoke at the recent TCWP Annual Weekend (§11B, this NL), about the area's water-supply situation. Since Hill became Executive in 1994, the county has experienced 23% growth (partly from new retirement communities), straining the infrastructure. Of five rural water districts, all except Crab Orchard are served by Crossville, and the contracts are coming up for renewal. He succeeded in getting the utility districts to sign a joint request to the state to assist in obtaining a water supply; and the state, in turn, hopes to use the process as a model for other areas in Tennessee. Brock Hill is working to form a consortium on regional water supply to continue dealing with the state. Sen. Thompson and Rep. Van Hillery were approached to get watersupply funds for the Corps of Engineers.

B. Upper Obed polluted but not proposed for clean-up funds

Tennessee's long list of polluted water bodies, the "303(d)" list (§1B, this NL) includes the uppermost
27 miles of the Obed, “from the confluence of Little Obed to Lake Holiday.” This segment is listed as “not supporting” designated uses, with pollutant sources being urban runoff/storm sewers (medium magnitude) and upstream impoundment (high magnitude). There is “a significant loss of expected biological diversity below Lake Holiday. Sampling near Catossa WMA also indicated stress to biological community.” Although the Obed within the Wild and Scenic River (WSR) boundary does fully support designated uses, the significant upstream pollution, and the fact that developments in the watershed are growing, caused the WSR portion to be described as “threatened;” this means that “the Division believes that a continuation of land use or other trends will cause the stream to fail to support designated uses within the next two years.”

Despite this dire prognosis, and despite the significance of the “threatened” resource downstream, the upper Obed was not included in the recent priority list for Unified Watershed Assessment Funds. The state’s rationale for this omission is described in §1B. We are looking into ways to remedy this situation.

C. Obed Watershed Association formed

Because of growing pressures to develop and exploit the Obed watershed (see, e.g., NL224 §1), the Friends of the Obed/Cumberland County (where agood part of the watershed is located) decided to transform into a coalition, the Obed Watershed Association (OWA). An organizing meeting was held in Crossville on November 6. TCWP’s Executive Director, Marcy Reed addressed the group and stressed the need to include as many types of stakeholders as possible. Several organizations have already joined the coalition, and others are likely to affiliate over the next several months.

The purpose of the OWA is to be advocates for restoring, preserving, and appreciating the Obed River and its watershed. Committees are being formed to address the following issues: water quality and supply, forestry, mining, sustainable development, tourism and recreation, and valuing our watershed. The challenges to these committees were recently outlined in some detail by Don Clark. One committee has already met, and others are getting under way December 7. If you want further information, or can suggest groups that might be interested in joining the coalition contact Donor Jean Clark at 931-277-5467.

---

3. FALL CREEK FALLS “LUMP”
(Lands Unsuitable for Mining Petition)

A. More effort needed to have OSM get the message

[Contributed by Marcy Reed]

One might have thought OSM would have got the message. The June public hearing on the draft EIS for the Lands Unsuitable for Mining Petition (NL223 §1B) was attended by 350-400 people, virtually all in favor of declaring the watershed unsuitable for mining. Of almost 50 speakers (many of whom also submitted written comments), only one opposed the petition. Subsequently, OSM received 207 letters, again virtually all supporting the petition (see §13B, below, for letters requiring special mention).

There are, however, disturbing signs that OSM is not starting from scratch. Instead, they appear to be generating a supplemental EIS in which they are merely responding to each subject area raised by the comments but still denying the petition to declare the watershed unsuitable for mining. As you may recall (NL223 §1A), their “preferred alternative” was the requirement that a separate EIS be prepared for each individual permit application within the petition area.

It is important to keep the pressure on OSM and on OSM’s “bosses” within the Administration (see list in Action box, below). You can make the following points:

• OSM has failed to produce convincing evidence that Acid Mine Drainage produced by this area can be effectively predicted and treated.
• The preferred alternative does not take into account cumulative impacts of numerous individually permitted mines.
• The preferred alternative would shift the burden of permitting individual mines from the federal government to the state, creating an unfunded federal mandate.
• The EIS did not include a systematic inventory of the impact of mining on threatened and endangered species in the watershed of the park, as required by law.
• The EIS did not provide information on the economic impact of mining the watershed on state and local economies, especially tourism (in fact, the Park supports over 740 jobs locally and over 930 jobs statewide, and produces very large sums of income for local counties and the state).

WHAT YOU CAN DO: Write, call, or e-mail the following list of people, using one or more of the above points, and urge them to abandon the “preferred alternative” and grant the petition.
B. Some noteworthy comments on OSM's Draft EIS

In July, the State of Tennessee submitted a 12-page letter (covered in some detail in NL223 ¶ 1(I)) which concluded that "there is a very substantial likelihood that, upon further review, the Petition should be granted at least in part." Thus, the letter says, "there is convincing evidence that some lands, such as the watershed of Fall Creek and Cane Creek, must not be mined."

Similarly, the EPA (Environmental Protection Agency) in August recommended that the Preferred Alternative be #3c, under which selected watersheds within the petition area can be designated as unsuitable for surface mining. EPA stated that OSM "should designate the Cane Creek watershed and possibly the Meadow Creek and Fall Creek watersheds as off limits to mining," and that "each new mining application in the remainder of the petition area be required to have an individual mining plan EIS."

The US Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS) had earlier submitted to OSM their review of our (SOCM/TCWP’s) petition and stated we were "in general ... accurate relative to the description of fish and wildlife resources within the petition area," but that we had omitted two endangered species, the gray bat and the Virginia spiraea, which also are found there. "We strongly agree," said USFWS "that serious adverse impacts will occur to sensitive biological resources should mining be permitted to occur within the petition boundary ... even when conducted in strict compliance with applicable statutes and regulations."

Congressmen Gordon and Wamp, and Sen. Fris have expressed to us their support of the petition, though we don’t know whether they have directly interacted with OSM, and if so, what their approach has been.

Finally, it was interesting to read the opposite view in the Skyline Coal Company’s letter to OSM, which stated that “designation for the petition area as unsuitable for mining would likely have the effect of shutting Skyline down ... as continuing mining outside the petition area is significantly less economical than in the petition area ...” According to Skyline, not only the granting of the petition, but even the preferred alternative (which, they say, "in fact amounts to a partial granting of the petition") "would constitute a taking for which Skyline would seek compensation." It is undoubtedly the fear of a "takings" lawsuit that has kept OSM from granting the petition; they probably realize that their “preferred alternative” could not be construed to be a taking.

4. STATE LANDS AND OTHER CONCERNS

A. Support purchase of addition to Pickett State Park/Forest

[Contributed by Frank Hensley]

The Forestry Division (of the Tenn. Dept of Agriculture) is working to purchase 1,148 acres located in the headwaters of the Little South Fork of the Cumberland River adjacent to Pickett State Forest. This tract, (the old Arbuthnot land, now referred to as the Cunningham property), is bordered in the north by the Kentucky state line and Daniel Boone National Forest, and on the west and south by Pickett State Forest. It would constitute a very important addition to Pickett. However, the Forestry Division tells us that, while the acquisition has a high priority, there is at present no guarantee that it will take place in a timely fashion.

WHAT YOU CAN DO: To help assure that this tract is purchased by the state before a private developer acquires it, contact (a) Governor Sundquist (address p. 2), (b) Commissioner of Agriculture, Dan Wheeler, 615-837-5100, (c) State Forester, Ken Arney (Ellington Agric. Center, POB
private land conservancy (e.g., the Conservation Fund for the Pickett addition). At the forum, reform of the state's land acquisition process was determined to be a top priority. It will be handled as such among the Environmental Action Fund's legislative items for 1999.

C. Follow-up on Scott's Gulf Gift

The 4000 acres of land donated to the state of Tennessee by Bridgestone/Firestone (BF) on September 3 (NL224 #2A) will be administered by TWRA (Tenn. Wildlife Resource Agency). TWRA's Executive Director, Gary Myers, recently outlined (in the Friends of Scott's Gulf newsletter) some of the planned activities. They include "management of the agricultural fields to improve small game habitat; improve upland timber resources; protection of the forested riparian corridor of the Caney Fork River system; and establish public use programs that are low impact such as big game hunting, small game hunting, hunting dog field trials, and other outdoor activities such as hiking, horseback riding, bird watching, canoeing, kayaking, photography, and cave exploring consistent with the Conservation Easement" [note that BF's gift included a conservation easement that restricts development (including commercial tree cutting) on the property]. "Roads and parking areas to permit all-weather access will be constructed ... All other unimproved field and forest roads and forest trails will be closed to motorized traffic, including off-road vehicles such as ATVs, and horses."

There is a great deal of geographic and other information about the area on the Scott's Gulf website, which includes a great "virtual tour" of the area, at http://www.tntech.edu/wwwlife/ orgs/grotto/Gulf/gulf.html. TDEC also has a Scott's Gulf website at http://www.state.tn.us/environment/epo/bridgefire/index.html.

WHAT YOU CAN DO: If you haven't already done so, express your appreciation to Masatoshi Ono, Chairman, Bridgestone/Firestone Inc., 50 Century Blvd., P.O. Box 148900, Nashville, TN 37214-8900. You may wish to mention not only the land gift itself, but the commitment to develop a long-term
The Tennessee Dept. of Environment and Conservation’s Four-Year Strategic Plan will apply to all of TDEC’s areas: State Parks, Conservation (e.g., Natural Areas, rivers, trails) and Environment (e.g., air and water quality, solid waste). TCWP’s Wendy Lane, Frank Hensley and Marcy Reed attended a conference on the Plan on December 3 at UTK and voiced their opposition to the development of golf courses in state parks (see also ¶4B, above). To facilitate further public input, the state has made the draft available at the TDEC website (http://www.state.tn.us/environment/tdecplan.htm). You can also request hard copy by phoning the Planning Coordinator at 615-532-0072, but you may be told the deadline has passed (supposedly December 10).

Container-deposit legislation

[Based on a contribution by Mary Lynn Dobson]

The ten states that have container-deposit legislation (which requires a refundable deposit on beverage containers) recycled 30 million tons more containers in one year than did the 40 other states combined. Such recycling reduces consumption of natural resources needed to fabricate containers.

- Waste has been reduced by 5-8% in these states
- An EPA report shows that using a reusable that is filled just 10 times reduces both air and water pollution significantly.
- Other studies have documented that littered beverage containers cost farmers millions of $\$\$\$ in work delays, injured livestock, and ruined crops ($34 million a year in Pennsylvania alone).

WHAT YOU CAN DO: Ask your state legislators (see Political Guide) to support the upcoming bill to study litter and recycling problems. Communicate some of the above facts and tell them that over 70% of Americans support container-deposit legislation (GAO and Hart Research polls).

Toll-free reporting of environmental concerns

If you suspect an environmental crime (e.g., an illegal dump site, damage to a protected area), call the toll-free number 1-888-991-8332, which gets you in touch with the nearest TDEC office. Your call is confidential, but an ID number assigned to your inquiry allows TDEC to give you feedback on how your complaint is being resolved. From the same phone number, you can also get information on recycling, pollution prevention, and permits.

5. FORESTRY AND TIMBERING IN TENNESSEE

A. Further analysis of Forestry Panel’s recommendations

The recommendations of the 40-member Forest Management Advisory Panel (FMAP), which were summarized extensively in NL224 ¶3C, include a number of potentially harmful positions formulated by the majority of the panel (industry representatives, large land owners, opponents of regulations). Thus, BMPs (Best Management Practices) would remain voluntary; a statewide study of chip mills would not be supported; and land-owners would be compensated for government-imposed restrictions ("takings"). Possibly most insidious is the recommendation to pass a right-to-practice-forestry law. This type of law, which has been proposed in some other states, offers forestland owners varying degrees of "protection" from local or state ordinances that regulate forestry activities. (Strangely, even public-land forestry may be encompassed by this "protection," meaning that the citizens who own these public lands are prevented from promulgating -- through their elected representatives -- any regulation of activities on these lands.)

The FMAP report, which will be released in late December or January, is merely a set of recommendations. What actually happens (or fails to happen) in the legislature will, to a large extent, be the result of other pressures. In recognition of this fact, a new coalition has been formed (¶5B, below).

B. Friends of the Forest

[Contributed by Marcy Reed]

A new coalition, Friends of the Forest, has been formed to work for legislation to protect Tennessee forests. The organizational meeting, held in Nashville on November 15, was attended by representatives of TCWP (Marcy Reed), Save Our Cumberland Mountains, Sierra Club, Ogwood Alliance, Kauhau EFI, Memphis Audubon Society, TN Forest Defense Council, Environmental Action Fund, TN Environmental Council, and The Center.

Several of the individuals in attendance had been members of the Forest Management Advisory Panel (¶5A, above). Friends of the Forest plans to hold a public hearing to discuss the recommendations of the FMAP report. This is tentatively planned for February 2, 1999, 5:30 pm, in
the Legislative Plaza, Nashville. The hearing will include an in-depth critique of the FMAP process and the possible unveiling of a Comprehensive Forestry Act.

Members of Friends of the Forest are currently in the process of drafting legislation for several different bills they would like to see passed in the next year and over the next five years. One of these, a "bad actor" bill, is based on a recommendation from the FMAP; it would require timber companies to register their cuts and, if water quality violations occur, best management practices would become mandatory. Among other legislation being contemplated is a chip mill bill, and one requiring the current forest-inventory system to include ecological information rather than just a count of trees. As these various bills take more substantive form, we will provide more information in the TCWP Newsletter.

WHAT YOU CAN DO: Attend the public hearing now tentatively planned for February 2, 5:30 p.m. CST. Contact Marcy Reed (423-481-0623 or marcyreed@aol.com) for further info on date, time, and location, and for possible car-pooling arrangements.

6. STATE WATER-QUALITY ISSUES

A. Priority watersheds chosen for clean-up funds

Under a directive from President Clinton, the EPA and USDA (Dept. of Agriculture) have prepared the Clean Water Action Plan, released in February 1998 (see also ¶1B, this NL). The key element is a cooperative approach called the Unified Watershed Assessment and Restoration Plan, in which various levels of government and the public, (a) identify watersheds with the most critical water quality problems (Category I), and (b) identify specific projects in these critical watersheds to receive funding for restoring the impaired waters.

The Tennessee Dept. of Environment and Conservation (TDEC) has identified 35 Category-I watersheds. Using priority lists from TDEC, TDA (Tenn. Dept. of Agriculture) and NRCS (Natural Resources Conservation Service), Tennessee selected 4 top priority watersheds to submit to EPA for Unified Watershed Assessment Funds. South Fork Cumberland River is the first one named. Others are Red River, Upper Duck R., and Nolichucky R., with Ft. Loudon Lake/Little R. and Powell R./Upper Clinch R. being alternatives. Local watershed groups, organizations, officials and others from the proposed watersheds will be contacted about public meetings.

B. Proposed procedure for setting future priorities

How does the state propose to handle the 28 Category-I watersheds that have to date not been assigned a priority for funding (¶1A)? The answer is based on the 303(d) list, which Tennessee revised in September 1998.

Under the 303(d) program of the federal Clean Water Act (NL223 ¶5A), a state must list all waters that do not meet state water-quality standards even after point sources (e.g., factories, sewage plants) have installed the maximum required levels of pollution-control technologies. For such waters, the state must then establish a ranking of the order in which TMDLs will be developed (all TMDLs must be developed by Year 2011). A TMDL (Total Maximum Daily Load) is the pollution level above which the waterbody can no longer support its designated uses. Based on this level, cleanup plans must be developed. The value of the TMDL program lies in focusing on cumulative effects and nonpoint sources of pollution.

The Tenn. Dept. of Environment and Conservation has decided to give high priority to water bodies that, (a) are located within watersheds that begin their 5-year management cycle in 1996, 1997, or 1998, and (b) are impacted by a pollutant for which guidance for TMDL generation is available. If the pollutant is one for which EPA has not provided guidance, the affected waterbody is doomed to a low priority.

C. Getting the legislature educated on water issues

[Based on talk by Erin Kelly, EAF]

Speaking at TCWP's Annual Weekend, the Environmental Action Fund's lobbyist, Erin Kelly, discussed several approaches to interacting with the legislature on water issues.

- Paving the way by showing legislators where they need to get involved by bringing new bills. A major example is the burgeoning of large animal feed lots, which seriously pollute surface and ground water. The perception might be that these feed lots are farms, whereas they are, in fact, factories. The state is actually inviting them in, with no broad public involvement.

- Stopping bad bills by showing legislators the shakiness of the rationale behind them and the magnitude of the probable consequences.
example is this year's series of bills (NL220 ¶2; NL221 ¶4D) stimulated by one farmer, that would have resulted in toppling the whole ARAP (Aquatic Alterations Resources Permit) program. Another example is this year's bills that would have decreed that the Obed and Conasauga Rivers could never be designated Outstanding National Resource Water - bills that would have set the precedent for the legislature interfering with decisions of an independent Board created by past legislation.

Making legislators accountable. Tennesseans need to develop something analogous to the League of Conservation Voters' national environmental scorecard for Congress and campaign actions based on that (see ¶10B, this NL). EAF is hoping to develop the appropriate data base, but will need $10,000-20,000 for this purpose.

D. Source Water Assessment Program (SWAP) open for comments

The state is now soliciting public comments on the SWAP, which was established by a 1996 Amendment to the Safe Drinking Water Act (NL224 ¶4B). This program requires each state to analyze existing and potential threats to the quality of public drinking water supplies and to submit a plan to EPA by February 6, 1999. Among other things, the state plan must delineate source-water protection areas, a possible avenue for refinancing of TVA's debt. If approximately $3.2 billion of outstanding high-interest loans were refinanced, an estimated $100 million in annual savings could be used to pay for the non-power program. The refinancing would, however, have to be approved by the Treasury Department's Federal Financing Bank, which in the past has refused to allow TVA to pay off loans ahead of schedule. Possibly partial refinancing would be approved. In the meantime, activities such as the Shoreline Management Initiative and reservoir management plans - including that for Melton Hill -- are continuing (see stories below).

7. TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

A. Non-power program

Limping along on partial funding

TVA's resource (non-power) program was "zeroed" in the regular TVA appropriation (NL224 ¶6A), but is or may be, picking up crumbs here and there. As near as we can ascertain, $50 million was included in the FY 1999 water resources appropriations bill (which typically funds Corps of Engineers projects). It is also considered quite possible that additional money may come from a

B. Shoreline Management Initiative revised

In 1996, TVA offered its Shoreline Management Initiative (SMI) and Draft EIS for extensive public review. There was a great deal of disapproval of TVA's preferred alternative, and this disapproval went in two opposite directions with respect to resource conservation but addressed different aspects of the proposal. On the one side, there were many vocal owners of shoreland residences who didn't want TVA to curtail their right to clear vegetation ("briar patches," as they referred to it) in the Shoreline Management Zone (SMZ), and didn't want restrictions on the size and types of dock they could build, and objected to dock-related and other fees they would have to pay. On the other side, there were TCWP and other organizations, and numerous individuals, who objected to the proposed considerable increase in the percentage of shoreline that would be open to development.

Responding to this miscellaneous collection of concerns, TVA spent 2 years developing a new proposal, the "Blended Alternative," which was presented to the public at a series of 15 open houses held between Nov. 30 and Dec. 3. TCWP's Marcy Reed and Lee Russell attended one of these and recognized some other TCWP members among the people looking at exhibits and talking to TVA staff. Although the meetings are over, TVA still welcomes written comments (see Action Box, below).

The Blended Alternative responds to what had been our major concern, namely, by not allowing any increase in "Open Shoreline" beyond the existing 38% system-wide average (individual reservoirs vary greatly). Open Shoreline has two components: (a) private shoreline on which TVA has a flowage easement (i.e., the right to flood up to a certain level), and (b) TVA public lands where the adjoining private property owner has access rights across the land. The existing 38% of Open Shoreline is composed of 13% currently developed...
and 25% undeveloped; thus, the 38% represents an upper limit — and not a goal — within which development could occur.

The Blended Alternative contains a “maintain-and-gain” policy under which rights in one place could be exchanged for those in another place, provided this would result in neither net loss or in a gain of public shoreline, and in equal or greater public value of the land. Under the alternative, TVA would also promote donation of conservation easements from lands that continued to be privately owned (this was one recommendation in TCWP’s 1996 comments).

The greatest part of the remaining 62% of the shoreline “is currently available for resource management (wildlife, open space, cultural resources protection, visual protection, forestry, and related purposes).” These 62% are composed of 25% TVA-owned and -managed, and 37% that are TVA-owned but managed jointly with other entities (usually a government agency). TCWP would like to see TVA include a provision in their SMI to the effect that Small Wild Areas (such as the one on Whites Creek in which TCWP maintains a trail) would remain inviolate.

The Blended Alternative appeases those who did not want their rights to vegetation clearing and dock construction curtailed. A grandfather clause allows continuation of mowing of existing lawns and use of existing docks. Various fees proposed in the earlier draft are eliminated. The Shoreline Management Zone (SMZ), required for TVA land across which adjacent property owners have access, has been narrowed from the earlier proposed 100 ft. depth to 25 ft. (is that really enough to meet water-quality objectives, help control erosion, and benefit the aquatic habitat?). Within the TVA property inland from the 25-ft.-deep SMZ some selective thinning, pruning, and other vegetation management would be allowed on consultation with TVA.

TCWP likes the provisions of the Blended Alternative that address public-land protection (with regard to both quantity and value) and resource conservation. We would like to see an explicit statement that Small Wild Areas will remain inviolate. Further, we have some concerns about the adequacy of a 25-ft.-deep SMZ; the depth may need to be increased.

What You Can Do: By January 31, send your comments to Ms. Tere McDonough, SMI Project Leader, TVA, 17 Ridgeway Road, Norris, TN 37828; or call 1-800-TVA-LAND and leave your name and address along with your comments; or e-mail tcmcdonough@tva.gov

C. Melton Hill Plan

TVA held an Open House on November 30 to provide information and answer questions about the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Melton Hill Reservoir Land Management Plan (LMP). Early in 1997, TVA initiated a scoping process with a wide distribution of questionnaires. A large majority of returned comments were in support of scenic beauty, natural resource protection, and public land values, and in opposition to future developments.

Two alternatives were considered:
A. The no-action alternative, under which TVA would continue the reservoir-land forecast developed in 1966. Under that alternative, a land use proposed either by an external applicant or by TVA is evaluated for consistency with the forecast.
B. The LMP developed in the current Draft EA, which was based on public input, existing and newly collected field data, and technical knowledge of TVA, TWRA, DOE, and other agencies.

The land-use zones defined under Alternative B and the acreages allocated to them are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone No.</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>Non-TVA shoreland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>TVA project operations</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>Sensitive resource handling</td>
<td>1,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>Natural resource conservation</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>Industrial/commercial</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>Developed recreation</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>Residential access</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,578</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Sensitive Resource zone (#3) includes wetlands, habitat protection areas, Small Wild Areas, ecological study areas, significant scenic areas, and several other types. The Natural Resource zone (#4) may include wildlife and forest management areas, informal recreation areas, wildlife viewing areas, and others.

Comparison between the alternatives shows that of the 1,868 acres that are allocated to zones #3 and #4 under Alternative B, Alternative A would allow 592 acres for industrial development, 684 acres for public recreation, 96 acres for commercial landings, etc. Clearly, TCWP picks Alternative B as the better choice. Of special
interest to us is that Worthington Cemetery (near Elza), which TCWP, a few years ago, committed to maintaining as an environmental education area, is assigned to zone “industrial” in Alternative A.

WHAT YOU CAN DO: We recommend support for Alternative B. Written comments should be sent by January 31 to Patsy R Becker, TVA, Melton Hill Land Management Office. 2009 Grubb Rd., Lenoir City, TN 37771, or via e-mail at prbecker@tva.gov

D. Other management plans
A process similar to that described for Melton Hill Reservoir (†7C, above) is currently under way for four natural resource management units (including Davis Creek on Norris Res.) and the drafts will be available for public review within the next month. Development of plans for other units will start in the spring. For information call Ralph Jordan at 423-632-1604, or send e-mail to jrtjordan@tva.gov

8. SMOKIES BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES, etc.

A. Report of Smokies Network meeting
[Contributed by Patrice Cole]

The Smokies Network met in October at the GSMNP Headquarters to discuss issues of common interest to TCWP, the Smoky Mountain Hiking Club, Sierra Club, Izaak Walton League, and other local, regional, and national environmental and recreational groups. Patrice Cole will represent TCWP in setting up a steering committee and defining its functions. Articles and announcements were solicited for a Smokies list server which is soon to be developed.

Assistant Park Superintendent Phil Francis discussed the Discover America initiative to inventory all multi-cellular species in the GSMNP (NL221 ¶2D). The project is expected to take over 10 years, involving numerous partnerships with universities, etc. and should result in a list of roughly 100,000 species, compared to the 20,000 or so currently known to occur in the park. Twin Creeks is being considered as a location for a small “campus” to provide temporary living quarters for researchers and perhaps a “science center” for displaying the results of the survey. Alternatively, an off-park parcel of land might be donated for this purpose.

The LeConte Lodge reservation system, which has traditionally been “closed” in the sense that priority is given to those who have stayed there before, is being considered for revision so as to make it more open, recognizing that all Americans own the park, not just a small elite. TCWP’s Patrice Cole asked if there were plans to eventually eliminate this concession, which many park users consider to be inappropriate under any circumstances. Phil Francis replied that this would be considered only when the General Management Plan is revised, which will not occur in the foreseeable future.

A trail maintenance Environmental Assessment is currently underway at the NPS technical center in Denver. When issued, the EA will invite public comment on which trails should receive priority and on the best policy for accomplishing trail maintenance (e.g., speedy and economical versus quiet and less intrusive methods). More than one half of the Park’s 800 miles of trails are in poor condition; 23 trails are slated for major renovations during 1999.

There was a brief discussion regarding the cancellation of the red wolf re-introduction program in GSMNP (†8B, below). Finally, attendees were reminded to thank Senator Frist and Congressman Duncan for supporting legislation that can lead to restrictions on park overflights.

B. Red wolf reintroduction effort abandoned
On October 8, the US Fish & Wildlife Service and National Park Service jointly announced an end to the 8-year effort to restore a wild population of red wolves in the GSMNP. Of 28 pups known to have been born in the Park and not removed, none appears to have survived its first year. Biologists suspect that disease (e.g., parvovirus), predation (coyotes?), malnutrition, and parasites contributed to the high pup mortality. Adult wolves also strayed out of the Park, possibly because of a scarcity of prey.

The GSMNP has had considerable success in restoring populations of other wild species, such as the river otter and peregrine falcon. The red wolves that are still in the Park will be captured and relocated.

C. Insect and disease impacts on Park vegetation -- non-native invaders
Natural Resource Specialist Kris Johnson has recently summarized pest species currently present in the Park. They include the balsam woolly adelgid (an insect, which has devastated the Fraser fir stands), dogwood anthracnose (a fungus), butternut canker (a fungus), Chinese chestnut blight (which kills re-sprouted American chestnuts), Dutch elm disease, European mountain ash sawfly,
beech bark disease (an insect and a fungus), and southern pine beetle. Pest off future concern are the gypsy moth (which threatens old-growth oak stands) and the hemlock woolly adelgid (an insect). It is a gloomy picture that promises to get worse. The exact role of air pollutants is unknown, but it is possible that the non-native invaders would be less lethal if individual trees were not already stressed by acid deposition, ozone, or the large influx of nitrogen.

The threat from invasive alien species increase as Americans buy more goods from abroad. Many of the hitch-hiking pests are transported in ships’ ballast water, in cargo, and especially in packing material. A strategy of fumigating packing material with methyl bromide is now in place in China and elsewhere, but this gas is a Class-I depleter of the ozone layer, 50 times more depleting than are the chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs). The US Dept. of Agriculture is being urged to initiate regulations to require importers to utilize types of packing that would not be hospitable to pests.

D. Foothills Parkway

Upon passage of TEA-21 (NL224 §9D), the Park received $8.6 million to construct the 1.6 miles remaining in the 16-mile Walland-Wears Valley segment of the Foothills Parkway. Construction, started in the early 1980s, was halted because of engineering problems and major environmental damages.

9. LOCAL ISSUES: AN ENVIRONMENTAL THREAT TO ANDERSON COUNTY

A. Oppose large asphalt plant

A large asphalt plant and 30-acre quarry, projected to operate 40-60 years, threaten the Bethel community on the Norris side of the intersection of 1-75 and H’way 61. You can do something about it by calling County Commissioners and/or coming to a public hearing on Dec. 21 (see Action box below).

Rezoning of 106 acres would be required for these operations – to zone 1-2 for the quarry and to zone 1-3 for the asphalt plant. When the Anderson County Commission unanimously denied these rezoning requests by the Rogers Group, the company filed a $32 million takings suit. A Roane County Chancellor instructed the County to grant the 1-2 rezoning request to pay the company $5 million in lost revenues (the Rogers Group intends to keep pushing for the 1-3 rezoning also). County Commissioners agreed to appeal the chancellor’s decision. The problem now before us is that some of the Commissioners are wavering and want to find a compromise before the appeal is submitted. That’s what the Dec. 21 hearing is about.

This is what re-zoning would mean:
- environmental degradation of air and water, dangers of blasting, dust, noxious fumes, traffic, noise, odor
- loss of local control – allowing a prosperous corporation to undermine the public planning process with inappropriate development
- setting a precedent for industrial use along the highway which may attract other operations
- loss of a primary tourism gateway – the site is at the off-ramp to the Museum of Appalachia, Norris Lake, the County Visitors’ Center.

WHAT YOU CAN DO: County residents, and especially Oak Ridgers, should call their County Commissioners to oppose the re-zoning and supporting filing an appeal.

Commissioners from Oak Ridge are listed below. Their current probable leaning is indicated as follows: * = pro-County; x = pro-Rogers; ? = swing vote.

* James Vines, 482-4111
* Larry Dickens, 483-0289
* Harold Jernigan, 482-5079
* Jerry Creasy, 482-1171
x Jacqelin Holloway, 482-5077
x Myronlowski, 481-0526.
(If you want the names of the other 10 Commissioners, call Jean Creswell at 494-7002.)
The hearing is 12/21/98, 5:30 p.m., Room 312, County Courthouse, Clinton.

B. Knox Greenway progress

Completion of work on the Third Creek Greenway has resulted in a continuous greenway from U.T.'s Sutherland Ave. apartments to Loudon Lake, a total of ~3.3 miles. There is now a network of connecting greenways in the downtown, UT, Sequoya Hills, and Bearden areas, with a total mileage of well over 9 miles.

10. NATIONAL NEWS

A. Katie McGinty quits CEO

Kathleen (Katie) McGinty was not just the Chair of CEQ(Council on Environmental Quality, which has oversight over NEPA), she was the Clinton Administration’s principal environmental quality advisor for the past 6 years. Having
worked on environmental issues for Al Gore, Jr., when he was a senator, she was originally appointed to direct the White House Office on Environmental Policy, which later merged with CEQ. She is now moving to India, where she and her husband have accepted positions at an energy research institute.

McGinty “was behind some of the boldest and most controversial environmental initiatives of the Clinton presidency,” wrote the Washington Post, such as the creation of the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument (this alone should earn her undying gratitude - Ed.), stopping the planned gold mine just upstream from Yellowstone, and the Administration’s commitment to greenhouse-gas reduction (yet to be ratified by the Congress). Most recently, she played a critical role in getting over a dozen of the worst anti-environmental riders off the appropriations bills (NL224 ¶9A). If Gore is elected in 2000, Katie McGinty is likely to get a senior job in his administration.

On November 7, George T. Frampton was named by the President to succeed McGinty as head of CEQ (he has to be confirmed by the Senate). Frampton, former president of the Wilderness Society, served as Assistant Secretary of Interior for Fish Wildlife & Parks from 1993-1997. At an earlier time, he served as law clerk for Supreme Court Justice Harry Blackman.

B. Environmental gains in the Nov.3 election

The non-partisan League of Conservation Voters (LCV) issues periodic environmental scorecards for all Members of Congress, as well as rating challengers. For the Nov.3 election the LCV Action Fund targeted a “Baker’s Dirty Dozen” (i.e., 13) incumbents for defeat. Of these, 9 were defeated -- 5 running for the Senate and 4 for the House (including Sen. lunch Furchioth, NC, whose last score-card rating ranged from 4-14%). All 10 of LCV’s EarthList candidates (for whom contributions had been solicited) were elected, some against heavy odds (including one of the most active pro-environment senators, Barbara Boxer). Of-90 endorsed candidates, 90% won.

In addition, there are several newcomers in the House who are truly pro-environment, such as the Udall cousins (sons of Stewart and Morris Udall, respectively) and Rush Holt; and there is a great new voice in the Senate, former Rep. Chuck Schumer (last three ratings ranging 83-100%) who defeated Alfonse D’Amato (range 3-29%). A poll commissioned by LCV immediately before the election demonstrated the importance that environmental issues had for the electorate. Among 7 races in which the poll was conducted, the environment ranked at the top of all issues tested in two, and was among the top three issues in two others. The poll also found that environmental concerns have grown in the heartland, the south and the southwest. LCV can be reached at 202-785-8683; or visit their website at http://www.lcv.org

C. Government sued for opening Petroleum Reserve

In August, the US Dept. of Interior’s Bureau of Land Management (BLM) announced that over 4 million acres of the National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska (NPRA) (an area the size of Indiana) would be opened to oil exploration and drilling. A group of organizations has now brought a lawsuit, contending that the decision of the final EIS violated NEPA.

The NRPA was designated in 1923, with the requirement that it be tapped only if the nation’s energy needs warrant it. Currently, the nation is awash with cheap oil. The EIS actually conceded that not only is there no national energy policy (and thus no need within any articulated time frame), but no guarantee that the oil from the Reserve would even be marketed in the USA.

The plaintiffs also charge that the environmental review in the EIS was totally inadequate for as fragile and pristine an area as Alaska’s Arctic. For example, the EIS relied on outdated and incomplete data with respect to migratory birds, which are such a major component of the region’s biota. Even though the EIS makes a couple of specific areas unavailable for leasing (Colville River and the shorelines of Teshekpuk Lake), it allows other industrial activities in these areas.

There has been no lease sale in the NPRA since 1984. Now, BLM is preparing for the first sale under the EIS’ “preferred alternative.” The agency will determine “what portion, if not all [italics ours], of the area ... will be offered in the first lease”.

D. Federal water rights

[Based on talk by Don Barger]

Unlike the West, which has water laws governing its limited supplies, the Eastern United States is comparatively water rich. Its riparian water law, which deals with how to use and return water, essentially assumes that there is enough for everyone. But we are closer to the edge than most of
us assume. Few people realize that we reuse water over and over again (e.g., the Tennessee River at Chattanooga would be dry if water were not returned repeatedly). Thus, water quantity is a water quality issue, though there is little preparation for this in law.

In the West, when federal lands are "reserved" (i.e., set aside) for a public purpose, water, too, is reserved. This was established by a precedent-setting case in Death Valley, when water withdrawal from outside the park threatened to extinguish a unique species of fish. Many eastern federal lands do not protect their headwaters, and units such as Mammoth Cave and New River have already experienced the problem of incremental water losses (as have we, in Tennessee, in the case of the Clear Creek dam and earlier water withdrawal proposals -- ¶2A, this NL). There is a pressing need to establish clear public property rights for eastern waters (i.e., federal reserved waterrights) in order to prevent incremental water depletion from destroying the very purpose for which an area was set aside. We must speak out: protecting water quantity is the issue, and there must be limits to growth.

E. Forestry capsules

• According to Common Cause, the American Forest and Paper Association spent $2.7 million in soft money on Congressional campaigns between 1991 and 1997. Members of Congress who had voted with the timber industry received, on average, 4 times as much as those who had voted against the industry.

• Worldwide, at least 8,750 tree species (1 in 10 species) may be threatened with extinction. The United States ranks 12th in the world, with 259 species at grave risk. Overall, key threats are logging, fuel collecting, agriculture, development, forest fires, and alien species. The World List of Threatened Trees can be accessed free at www.wcnc.org.uk/trees

• Approximately 351 million acres, 72% of the productive forest land in the USA, is privately held. Of that, 19% is owned by the forest products industry and 81% is individually held as non-industrial forest land. On public forest lands, the average annual cut increased from 2 billion board feet to 10 billion between 1955 and 1990.

• Certification, usually indicated by a physical trademark stamped on the wood product, is designed to assure the consumer that the product was harvested according to measurable standards that assure a defined level of environmental, social and economic sustainability. The whole meaning of certification is discussed in a brochure by the Natural Resources Law Center of the Univ. of Colorado (see ¶12, this NL). Should wood from federally-managed forest lands be certified? One cogent argument against this (among others) is that certification might well become a political device to justify increasing the harvesting levels on federal lands.

11. TCWP NEWS

A. TCWP outing, January 30

In the first of a series of outings planned for 1999, we'll hike along Clear Fork, one of the two main stems of the Big South Fork in the BSFNRA. Starting in Rugby, the trail takes us down to an area of the river that, during the days of the Rugby Colony, was called The Gentleman's Swimming Hole, downstream along beautifully figured sandstone bluffs and house-sized boulders, to the confluence of Clear Fork with White Oak Creek, which we may follow a short distance upstream (water-level permitting). The total trip is 3-4 miles of moderately easy walking. After the hike, you may wish to visit Rugby and/or have tea at the Harrow Road Cafe.

For car pooling in Oak Ridge, meet Saturday, January 30 at 9 a.m., EST, in the Winn-Dixie parking lot (Illinois Avenue near corner of Turnpike). Those going individually will meet car poolers in Rugby, Harrow Road Cafe, at 10:15 a.m., EST. Route: Hwy 62 to Warburg, then US 27 to Elgin, then Hwy 52 to Rugby. The Harrow Road Cafe is on the left, setback slightly from the road.

Bring lunch and a beverage, wear sturdy shoes, and come prepared for cold weather and/or rain. For more info (or for decisions concerning whether to go/postpone in case of inclement weather), call trip leader Hal Smith (483-5731).

B. Report on Annual Weekend

Despite the delay in date (which cut down our attendance to 30+), our Annual Weekend was a great one -- weather clear (but cold), talks wonderful (see below), outings varied and beautiful, camaraderie great, slideshows artistic and informative. The Saturday morning talks are summarized elsewhere in this NL: Don Barger's on public water rights (¶10D), Erin Kelly's on interacting with the legislature on water issues (¶5G), and Brock Hill's on the Cumberland County water supply (¶2A). There was also a non-scheduled evening talk by Mary Lynn Dotson on container-deposit legislation (¶4E). In addition to a Saturday outing to Fiery Gizzard (led by Charlie Klabunde) and a Sunday one (led by Chuck Estes),
several smaller groups set out on outings of their own. All in all, a most successful weekend.

C. Report from the New Committees

Three new committees have held their inaugural meetings summarized below. If you are interested in joining one of these committees, call the chair persons listed, or call Sandra Goff (522-3809) or Marcy Reed (481-0623).

Service Committee, Eric Hirst, Chair

[Contributed by Eric Hirst]

The inaugural meeting of this committee was held on November 17, with the following 7 people joining Eric at his house: Don Davis, Miriam Kertesz, Marion Burger, Hal Smith, Janet & Bob Lowrie, and Marcy Reed. A number of ideas were discussed for attracting new members, such as increasing media coverage for TCWP issues and activities, including local TV (channels 2 and 12), preparing stories for TV, radio (especially WUOT), and local newspapers (including Metropulse), working on March for Parks, designing display boards and staffing booths at community events and fairs. Also discussed was the importance of having regular activities, such as hikes, lectures, and other programs. The first test of our ability to organize such an event successfully will be a hike led by Hal Smith on January 30 in the BSFNRRRA near Rugby (see §11A).

A phone tree is planned that will be used only when the time is too tight to use other means of communication. Marion Burger and Janet & Bob Lowrie will call people who would comprise the first line of the "tree."

The next meeting is January 7, 7:00 p.m., at Eric's house (106 Capital Circle, Oak Ridge), and it is hoped that additional people will join this important committee that has already outlined many large tasks to be accomplished, with others yet to be discussed (e.g., our service jobs, such as trails maintenance and stewardship activities).

State Parks Committee, Jenny Freeman, Chair

[Contributed by Jenny Freeman]

Five enthusiastic people joined Jenny for the first meeting, Dec. 2: Joni Lovgrove, Frank Hensley, Wendy Lane, Marcy Reed, and Sandra Goss (functioning as organizer). The committee agreed on these priorities (in order of importance):
- the land acquisition process
- inappropriate development of our state parks
- ways to educate Tennesseans about the Sundquist administration's proposal (§4B, this NL) for 4 more golf courses and 2 resort parks for East Tennessee (one idea: hold a "March for State Parks Awareness")
- ways to revitalize the push for reforms to the state parks system that TCWP initiated 2 years ago.

The next meeting is January 6, 7:00 p.m., at Jenny's house (371 East Drive, Oak Ridge), and we hope additional people will join the committee. The "inherent values" of state parks that the 1937 enabling legislation seeks to protect must have champions. Our committee joins the army of others across the state who have a vision of our parks as places to restore the soul and rest the mind.

Water Issues Committee, Chuck Estes, Chair

Meeting with Chuck at his house on December 3 were Jason Darby, Melissa Mundell, Lee Russell, and Sandra Goss (functioning as organizer). The committee will initially focus on the Cumberland Plateau water-supply study (§12A, this NL) and water-quality issues being addressed by the state through the TMDL process (§16A&B, this NL) and through watershed studies. First priority will be given to the Obed watershed and the Obed Wild & Scenic River, e.g., the Water Resource Management Plan that is currently being generated, and the Park Service's efforts in documenting baseline hydrological data that might figure in water rights issues.

Specific near-term activities:
- The Obed superintendent, Don Forester, will be invited to meet with the group in mid-January (check with Chuck or Lee for exact date).
- Chuck will lead a hike in the Nemo segment of the Cumberland Trail, within the Obed WSR, to acquaint people with the resource.
- An existing list of contacts for river and water issues will be updated and enlarged.

This committee has major and urgent ongoing tasks to tackle and would greatly welcome additional members. The next meeting will be January 14, 7 p.m., at Chuck's house, 114 Baypath Drive, Oak Ridge.

D. " Kroger Cares" Certificates: An Easy Way to Raise Money for TCWP

Just another reminder that we provide Kroger certificates as a TCWP fund raiser. You can use these certificates just like cash (or like a personal check) at the check-out counter of any Kroger store. For every $100 of certificates you buy from TCWP, we make $4. You may contact Marcy Reed with your order at 481-0623, or e-mail her at marcyreed@aol.com. She can arrange for mailing or delivery of coupons to you on a regular basis, if you wish.
12. ACTIVITIES, READING MATTER, RESOURCES

**Deadlines and events calendar**

- As soon as possible: comments on Big South Fork Master Plan (§1A and special page)
- December 21, 5:30 p.m., hearing on Anderson Cy. rezoning for quarry/asphalt plant, Clinton Courthouse (§9A)
- December 31, 1 p.m., hearing on Source Water Assessment Program, Knoxville (§10D)
- January 6, TCWP Parks Committee, 371 East Drive, Oak Ridge (§11C)
- January 7, TCWP Service Committee, 106 Capitol Circle, Oak Ridge (§11C)
- January 14, TCWP Water Committee, 114 Baypath Drive, Oak Ridge (§11C)
- January 30, TCWP hike to Gentlemen’s Swimming Hole (§11A)
- January 31, deadline for receipt of comments on TVA’s Shoreline Initiative (§7B)
- January 31, deadline for receipt of comments on Melton Hill Plan (§7C)
- February 2, 5:30 CST, Nashville, public hearing on state forestry issues (§5B)
- April 12-14, “Going to the Source – Protecting Tennessee’s Drinking Water,” organized by Tenn. Section of the American Water Resources Assoc. (contact Michael W. Bradley, Nashville, 615-837-4703)

**Resources**

- The Waste Xchange, operated by the Knoxville Recycling Coalition, has stationery, office supplies, and some office furniture. Open on first Saturday of each month, 9-10:30 a.m., at City of Knoxville Transfer Station (take Webster Ave exit from I-275 and follow signs). Available items, with photographs, are listed on http://www.komet.org/recycle/
- The Southeast Watershed Forum – an information clearinghouse serving 9 states -- is aimed at helping community groups find financial and technical assistance and to access watershed information. The Forum’s newsletter is a free publication featuring news about state and local watershed programs. To get on the mailing list, call TVA at 632-751-7328.
- “Innovations in Forestry: Sustainable Forestry and Certification” is one of several pamphlets published by the Natural Resources Law Center, Univ. of Colorado School of Law (Phone 303-492-1288, e-mail nrlc@spot.colorado.edu).
- The 1999 Conservation Directory lists more than 3000 organizations, agencies, colleges, etc., and has an extensive keyword subject index ($51 from National Wildlife Federation, 410-516-6583).

• The 1998 Mining Conservation Directory lists grassroots organizations as well as information on how to organize, how to network, etc. (free from Mineral Policy Center, Washington, DC; call 202-887-1872, or e-mail to mpc-us@msn.com).
• “Earth Day Countdown Teacher Day,” Feb. 23, is among several courses offered by the Smoky Mtns. Inst. at Tremont (call 423-448-6709, or e-mail gsmith@smokieshna.org).
• “Advanced Wilderness First Aid,” Feb. 11-14, is among several courses offered by the Nantahala Outdoor Center, Bryson City, NC (call 888-662-1662 x355).
• The Smoky Mountain Field School offers numerous classes, most of them outdoors, lasting from one day to one week. (To order a catalog, call 423-974-0150, or e-mail FieldSchool@gateway.ee.utk.edu).
• “Landscaping with Native Plants” is a highly informative pamphlet published by the TN-EPPC (Tenn. Exotic Pest Council, Nashville, 615-532-0436).
• “The Dark Side of the American Dream: The Costs and Consequences of Suburban Sprawl” (free, 202-675-7907, or at www.sierraclub.org/transporation).
• Many varieties of native plants are available from two East Tenn. nurseries: (a) Native Gardens, Greenback, TN 37742, and (b) sunshine Gardens, Andersonville, TN 37705.

HAPPY HOLIDAYS!!!