

**APPENDIX A-3 COMMENTS WITH TVA RESPONSES AND
OFFICIAL LETTERS**

Comment	Name/Organization	Comment and TVA Response
+1	John R. Johnson, Mayor, City of Morristown	<p>COMMENT: Ms. Susan Fuhr was kind to meet with me Monday and bring copies of your draft Environmental Assessment on the Cherokee Reservoir Land Management Plan. She indicated some of the summarized information that was included. Afterwards I did review a major portion of the material and I most wholeheartedly commend those who put together Alternative B because it is a great improvement over our current situation, Alternative A. Alternative B is an outstanding proposal and I certainly hope that it will be adopted and implemented.</p> <p>The idea of shifting the future planned usage away from development and toward management and usage in the natural state is the direction that our reservoir needs. Although there are many points in Alternative B that I appreciate, there are three that I would specifically like to point out: 1) the allocation of usage for the entire 8,187 acres; 2) the reduced allocation of land subject to development to 19%; and 3) that no land will be allocated to Zone 5, Industrial/Commercial Development.</p> <p>Please record my position as being in full support of your proposal.</p> <hr/> <p>TVA RESPONSE: Comments noted.</p>
+2	Tom Love, Environmental Planning and Permits Division, TDOT	<p>COMMENT: We reviewed the EA. As you mentioned in your response to us on the SR31 Hawkins and Hancock project, TDOT's project would impact the management plan in the Poor Valley Creek. Your EA said that Alternative B was the preferred plan. Under Alternative A the SR31 project would affect land that you would designate for recreation while under the Alternative B, SR31 would affect land designated as Natural Resource Conservation. If your Alternative B, Natural Resource Conservation is less restrictive, that is the plan we would prefer. Of course we are making TVA a cooperating agency on the SR31 project and will be sending you a prelim EA in the near future for your review and comment. I hope these comments were helpful.</p> <hr/> <p>TVA RESPONSE: TVA has the background information on the SR 31 Project and the US 11W (SR 1) Project (see Comment #3 below). Based on the outcome of additional environmental reviews, TVA will consider accommodating these beneficial public works projects under either plan alternative.</p>
+3	Tom Love, Environmental Planning and Permits Division, TDOT	<p>COMMENT: I e mailed you yesterday on the EA and said the management plan could impact TDOT's SR31 Project. I neglected to mention our improvement to US11W (SR1) project from Rutledge to Bean Station. This project is the widening of the existing rout and could impact sections of the Cherokee Reservoir Plan along US 11W.</p> <hr/> <p>TVA RESPONSE: See response to Comment #2 above.</p>

Comment	Name/Organization	Comment and TVA Response
+4	Robert Holmes	<p>COMMENT: I thank you for sending me the DEA Plan. I reviewed it and would like to cast a vote for Alternative B. I think it is the better of the two. Thanks again.</p> <hr/> <p>TVA RESPONSE: Comments noted.</p>
+5	Dave Cooper	<p>COMMENT: Please look at Island extreme west # 29. This is a hatchery for blue herons - no access should be allowed - not even camping.</p> <hr/> <p>TVA RESPONSE: TVA is aware of the new heron rookery on Parcel 29. Consistent with management of all land in Zone 4, TVA will monitor the impacts of informal recreation on the resources present. Because populations have increased substantially since the late 1970s, great blue herons are no longer protected by state law. Zone 4 land is available for informal use, including camping.</p>
+6	Alan Hartman, City of Morristown	<p>COMMENT: I am hopeful that TVA will consider a green belt along the reservoir in their future land use plans. The City of Morristown is actively planning a greenway/trail system that could connect downtown to Cherokee Lake and other points of interest and scenic beauty. I will be happy to discuss the City's greenway plans with TVA representatives at your convenience. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input.</p> <hr/> <p>TVA RESPONSE: For land in Zones 3, 4, and 6, TVA would consider accommodating a greenway/trail system if sensitive resources on these lands can be protected. Based upon receipt of plans for the Morristown greenway, TVA will consider the use of its land for this purpose.</p>
+7	Max R. Hime, First Realty	<p>COMMENT: Very Good Plan. Hope it can be adopted. TVA lakes are a great attraction to out of state people. We have a lot of inquiries about lake property as a Realtor. We hear from a number of people, especially ones wanting to retire to the area.</p> <hr/> <p>TVA RESPONSE: Comments noted.</p>
+8	Tina Allen, First Realty	<p>COMMENT: Most helpful in Real Estate. The more info, makes job easier. Enjoyed the additional information. Thanks for being such a great reflection on the name TVA! Thanks.</p> <hr/> <p>TVA RESPONSE: Comments noted. TVA thanks you for the compliment.</p>
+9	Mr. and Mrs. Ben Pausus	<p>COMMENT: Keep up the good work.</p> <hr/> <p>TVA RESPONSE: Comment noted. TVA thanks you for the compliment.</p>

Comment	Name/Organization	Comment and TVA Response
+10	Mrs. Donna Jarnagin (Residential Owner)	<p>COMMENT: We support Alternative B to control and put stricter regulations for Lake Use and areas.</p> <hr/> <p>TVA RESPONSE: Comment noted. Alternative B provides greater protection for land containing sensitive resources, but does not propose new regulations.</p>
+11	Mr. Ted Jarnagin (Lake Resident)	<p>COMMENT: I wholeheartedly want to support the adoption of Alternative "B". The key to the future of our lakes is the controlled growth and preservation of natural resources.</p> <hr/> <p>TVA RESPONSE: Comments noted.</p>
+12	Blain Potter	<p>COMMENT: As I'm sure you have a great deal, my main comment is that, as a lake user, I'd love to see a discontinuation of the "pull down" of Cherokee Lake each year. At least align the late summer pull down with the beginning of Fall.</p> <hr/> <p>TVA RESPONSE: As indicated in Section 1.2, Purpose and Need, this plan examines alternative land allocations. TVA decisions related to lake (i.e., reservoir) levels and the timing of draw-down are made based on potential system-wide affects and, therefore, are subject to a separate review process.</p>
+13	Donavon B. Davis	<p>COMMENT: Reference is made to the above plan. I reside in Morristown but also have ten acres of Cherokee Lake frontage property in Hawkins County just down stream from the Lakemont Area approximate mile mark 89 (Quarry Hill). Consequently our comments voice are limited but important concern comparing Panel 3 of "Alternative A" vs. "Alternative B" Plan.</p> <p>Our primary concern relates to (1) Reservoir Aesthetics and Visual Resources, (2) Water Quality, and (3) Industrial/Commercial Development</p> <p>(1) In our geographic area the mountains are adjacent to the lake and is obviously a very beautiful section of Cherokee Lake. I am very much interested in the aesthetics of this particular area to remain status quo although am concerned to see the area north of the Sequoyah Boy Scouts is primary source of water for our community and we are down stream from the Kingsport Industrial area. Our water quality has been extremely poor for many years.</p> <p>(2) Water quality is of major concern since Cherokee Lake is the primary source of water for our community and we are down stream from the Kingsport Industrial area. Our water quality has been extremely poor for many years.</p>

Comment	Name/Organization	Comment and TVA Response
		<p>(3) Industrial/Commercial Development must remain with 0% for the future of our area. Industrial development must remain within controlled boundaries away from our water source to insure the future of all mankind.</p> <p>The Alternative "B" is the plan to address these concerns for the future of our lake area. THANKS for giving consideration to our comments.</p> <hr/> <p>TVA RESPONSE: Comments noted. The land allocation in the upper part of Cherokee Reservoir are mostly Zones 3 and 4 which would enhance water quality. No parcels are allocated for industrial development under the preferred alternative, i.e., Alternative B.</p>
+14	Carol and Doug Killian	<p>COMMENT: Thank you for sending me the package with the two plans and corresponding maps. I and my husband, Doug, have spent considerable [time reading] them and thinking about what was presented.</p> <p>Our response to the choices is really very easy. Please note that we would like for you to continue with the Alternate B plan. This alternative covers all the areas what we consider to be very important for the preservation of this very unique environment for ourselves and future generations.</p> <p>There is an old saying "not every silence has to be filled with words." A parallel is 'not every foot of land has to be filled with a plan.' The beauty of this watershed is the natural diversity that is there, and Doug and I would like to see this protected. Once development begins it never reverts back to what it was. We know the pressure is great to release it to the public at large, but there is so much to lose!</p> <p>Please keep us informed as to the developments in this plan. We are very interested in the outcome, not only for our own personal comfort but for the preservation and conservation of our wonderful heritage. I would be glad to help anyway I can to assist you in this great endeavor. Just let me know how.</p> <hr/> <p>TVA RESPONSE: Comments noted.</p>
+15	R. Michael Wiseman M.D. (and 58 other petitioners)	<p>COMMENT: We, the undersigned residents of counties in proximity to the Cherokee Reservoir, enthusiastically endorse alternative "B" for the Cherokee Reservoir Land Management Plan. We realize that industrial and commercial development of the lake should be controlled, we however, have an obligation to preserve the beauty of the Ecosystem, and reduce the pollutants and carcinogens. This is for our benefit, we well as providing a legacy of conservation for our descendants.</p> <p>[This petition was presented to the Cherokee/Douglas Watershed Team at the April 24th Open House with 59 signatures].</p> <hr/>

Comment	Name/Organization	Comment and TVA Response
		TVA RESPONSE: Comments noted.
+16	Richard Sheppard, WA-NI Village Resort	<p>COMMENT:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) How could TVA Directors possibly consider <u>not</u> implementing a plan that is 30 years more current and responsive to current public concerns and the environment? What am I missing or what was not discussed in the draft public summary? 2) Why is there not a predetermined review period for each or the major TVA policies, i.e., Reservoir Land Management for one - or is every 30 years (i.e., every generation and a half) considered often enough? If there is not a predetermined review the tendency is to say "Things are good enough, let's not review." 3) Nothing that I could find addressed the lake levels and impact either Alternative A or Alternative B would have - I know this is strictly Land Management and nobody at TVA wants to address lake levels until years after deregulation - How Typical! 4) Consider getting a new proof reader - I found too many errors in a 30 minute review of the "draft." 5) How can we influence the Board to adopt this and other needed changes? <hr/> <p>TVA RESPONSE: TVA seeks to review and update its land allocation plans about every 10 years. However, reservoirs vary in their purpose and land use and, therefore, the frequency of review of the plans is based on trends in development pressures, and the need to revise allocations such that public concerns are addressed. In regards to lake levels, see response to comment #12. In regards to your query about ways to influence the TVA Board, continued participation in this and other TVA environmental reviews of land actions will ensure that your views are known to TVA decisions-makers.</p>
+17	Mr. and Mrs. Wayne Hansard	<p>COMMENT: We would be in favor of alternative B.</p> <hr/> <p>TVA RESPONSE: Comments noted.</p>
+18	Joe Harrell	<p>COMMENT: After reviewing the maps and attending the 4/24 meeting I would request that TVA consider looking at parcel # 11 currently designated as public recreation and consider leaving this parcel as recreation under the new proposal. I think this area has value as a potential campground/recreational area in the future due to the proximity to Jefferson City and the nearby Black Oak Dock. Thanks for your consideration on this matter.</p> <hr/>

Comment	Name/Organization	Comment and TVA Response
		<p>TVA RESPONSE: During TVA's planning process, Parcel 11 only ranked medium based on criteria for Recreation (Zone 6) suitability. Although a portion of the site is suitable for commercial recreation development, the shoreline is steep and it would be difficult to get from any land-based development to the water. The land-base on this parcel, that could potentially be developed, does not appear to be large enough to recoup the cost of development. The site currently receives high informal recreational use from diverse groups and inclusion in Zone 4, as proposed, would allow such use to continue.</p>
+19	<p>Louis Buck Deputy Commissioner Tennessee Department of Agriculture, Ellington Agricultural Center</p>	<p>COMMENT: The Department appreciates the opportunity to comment on the above-referenced document. This EA demonstrates TVA's commitment to wise management of the land and water of Tennessee and we support your efforts to minimize the impact of polluted runoff and excessive soil erosion into Cherokee Reservoir.</p> <hr/> <p>The Department has no formal comments to offer relative to this document.</p> <hr/> <p>TVA RESPONSE: Comments noted.</p>
+20	<p>Mr. H. Joe Cathey, C.F.P., Department of the Army, Nashville District Corps of Engineers</p>	<p>COMMENT: This is in response to your April 16, 2001, letter requesting our review of the subject Land Management Plan.</p> <p>We have reviewed the plan and found it to be well written and very thorough. The plan accurately explains the relationship between the Corps and TVA on wetland protection and development affecting Waters of the United States.</p> <p>We appreciate your awareness of our Regulatory Program and wish you success in the execution of this plan and support Alternative B as the best course for resource protection while allowing reasonable and managed development.</p> <p>If you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact me at the above address, or telephone (615) 369-7520.</p> <hr/> <p>TVA RESPONSE: Comments noted.</p>
+21	<p>Lee A. Barclay, PH.D. Field Supervisor US Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service</p>	<p>COMMENT: Thank you for your correspondence of April 16, 2001, regarding the Tennessee Valley Authority's (TVA) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Cherokee Reservoir Land Management Plan in Grainger, Hawkins, Hamblen and Jefferson counties, Tennessee. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) personnel have review the document and we offer the following comments.</p>

Comment	Name/Organization	Comment and TVA Response
		<p>The EA adequately describes the resources within the project area and the proposed actions' impact on these resources. The Service recommends the Preferred Alternative (Alternative B) for TVA's involvement in the land management plan, and believes it will benefit fish and wildlife of the area and provide adequate recreational opportunities.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposes action. If you have any questions regarding the information which we have provided, please contact Wally Brines of my staff at 931/528-6481, extension 222.</p> <hr/> <p>TVA RESPONSE: Comments noted.</p>
+22	Toye Heape Executive Director Tennessee Commission for Indian Affairs	<p>COMMENT: I would like to offer the following comments on the Draft Environmental Assessment for the Cherokee Reservoir Land Management plan.</p> <p>The main concern of the Tennessee Commission of Indian Affairs (TCIA) regarding the plan is the protection and preservation of Native American cultural resources around Cherokee Reservoir. For the most part, the provision of Alternative B seem to offer a reasonable plan for protection of sensitive cultural resources.</p> <p>However, there is one aspect of Alternative B that requires more consideration or clarification. If the first paragraph on page 20, the Draft EA states that "areas identified as having sensitive resources would also be regarded as committed and would be placed in Zone 3, Sensitive Resource Management. However, if parcels with existing commitments (leases, licenses, contracts, etc.) contain sensitive resources, that parcel would remain zoned with the committed use."</p> <p>Any leases, licenses, contracts or other commitments that will expire in the future should be reviewed before they are renewed in compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act. Any such commitments should not be renewed if they result in activities that impact Native American cultural resources. Affected land parcels should then be placed in Zone 3.</p> <p>I appreciate having the opportunity to make these comments. Please let me know if you have any questions.</p> <hr/> <p>TVA RESPONSE: When TVA renews leases, licenses, contracts, or responds to other land-use request, it evaluates the proposed action for potential adverse affects on historic properties including resources of particular importance to Native Americans. TVA complies with the provisions of NHPA on all reviews, whether new requests or renewals of previous approvals. Depending on the reviews of individual undertakings, appropriate protection measures would be incorporated in the land use instrument. See Commitment #2 in Section 3.17 of the FEA.</p>

Comment	Name/Organization	Comment and TVA Response
+23	Herbert L. Harper Executive Director and Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer Tennessee Historical Commission, Department of Environment and Conservation	<p>COMMENT: The above-referenced Draft Environmental Assessment has been reviewed with regard to National Historic Preservation Act compliance by the participating federal agency or its designated representative. Procedures for implementing Section 106 of the Act are codified at 36 CFR 800 (64 FR 27044, May 18, 1999).</p> <p>We concur with your office that phased identification and evaluation is an appropriate strategy for Section 106 compliance for both Alternative A and B of the proposed management plan. As stated in the document, portions of the project's Area of Potential Effect (APE) have not yet been systematically surveyed for the presence of historic properties. All portions of the APE must be systematically surveyed and evaluated prior to the beginning of any ground-disturbing activities.</p> <p>Upon receipt of the survey reports, we will complete our review of this undertaking as expeditiously as possible. Until such time as this office has rendered a final comment on this project, your Section 106 obligation under federal law has not been met. Please inform this office if this project is canceled or not funded by the federal agency. Questions and comments may be directed to Jennifer M. Bartlett (615) 741-1588, ext. 17.</p> <p>Your cooperation if appreciated.</p> <hr/> <p>TVA RESPONSE: Comments noted. As indicated in Commitment #2 in Section 3.17 of the FEA, TVA will comply with its obligations under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act for future land-disturbing activities undertaken on Cherokee Reservoir.</p>
+24	Mike Butler, Director of Conservation, Tennessee Conservation League	<p>COMMENT: The following are the comments of the Tennessee Conservation League (TCL) regarding the draft EA for the Cherokee Reservoir Land Plan. Should you or any of your staff have any questions regarding any of the comments contained within, please feel free to contact our offices at your convenience.</p> <p>Shoreline Assessment and Proposal</p> <p>The Cherokee Reservoir contains 336 acres [miles] of shoreline, of which 297 miles are TVA owned and managed. As stated in the EA, 99 miles are privately owned.</p> <p>Of the 297 miles owned and managed by TVA, 128 miles or 43% are considered "Residential Access Shoreline".</p> <p>Comment #1 – Table 2.2-1 shows a total mileage of RAS to be 143.6 miles. We ask this figure to be reviewed, as it may be in error. Forty-three percent of 297 miles of TVA owned and managed shoreline is 128 miles.</p> <p>Comment #2 – Of the total shoreline (336 miles), 68% (227 miles) has ownership patterns that will allow for shoreline impacts. TVA documents several miles of shoreline that contain unknown archaeological, sensitive species and wetland shoreline resources, but in its end analysis offers no shoreline miles to be included in the</p>

Comment	Name/Organization	Comment and TVA Response
		<p>“Shoreline Protection” category. Taking into account that TVA has no ability to alter the 99 miles of privately owned shoreline miles, and that 128 miles of TVA shoreline has the potential to be impacted; we ask that TVA reconsider its allocation of “Existing Residential Shoreline Categorization.”</p> <p>Comment #3 – On page 12 of the EA, TVA admits that “adjustments to shoreline categories” may be necessary in the future, and that future identified areas containing valuable shoreline resources could garner “shoreline protection” status (page 11). For these reasons, we implore TVA to take the time and effort necessary to determine the value of existing shoreline resources and plan for their protection and conservation accordingly, utilizing the NEPA guided land management process already in place.</p> <p>By delaying such an effort, TVA is setting the stage for future conflicts that, history has shown, arise as development of reservoir shorelines increase. By going through an iterative process that identifies the value of shoreline resources now, and provides a strategy for their conservation, future developers and landowners will be better served when approaching TVA about developing RAS, and the public better served through the protection of these public natural resources.</p> <p>Comment #4 – The discussion of archaeological, sensitive and wetland shoreline resources on page 11 is confusing. It is not clear the juxtaposition of these shoreline resources with respect to their value (i.e., archaeological, sensitive or wetland). Are the miles of archaeological, sensitive and wetlands resources additive, thus providing that 120 of the 128 miles of RAS contain valuable shoreline resources, or are they cumulative, or a combination of both? It is not possible to determine the answer to this and other questions using the current discussion on page 11.</p> <p>Alternative B</p> <p>TVA has done an excellent job in its map presentations of the two alternatives. In this light, the League commonly advises public agencies to cluster public lands and natural resources to lessen or avoid habitat fragmentation. At first glance, it appears that the Cherokee Reservoir EA attempts to accommodate this thought.</p> <p>While Alternative B is agreeable to the League, we would like to ask for some clarification and justification for the acres allocated to the “recreation” zone of management.</p> <p>First, we would like to understand what types of activities would be permitted under a recreational designation. For example, would this designation of these properties allow for private vendors to provide services on public lands?</p> <p>Secondly, in examining the maps for Alternative B, it is unclear which areas in red have existing recreational services and what those particular services are. Because of this, and the absence of any analysis that might justify the need for additional recreational acres, it is impossible to determine if the proposed recreation acres are needed.</p>

Comment	Name/Organization	Comment and TVA Response
		<p>Specifically, parcels 63, 64, 82, and 83 appear to be located away from services and appear to be undeveloped. We would appreciate further examination of these parcels and their need to be formally designated as recreational acres. We understand that upon learning the more detailed definition of “recreational acres”, we may agree to the proposed designation.</p> <p>Closing Comments</p> <p>The Cherokee Reservoir Land Management Plan & EA is a wonderful start to the sound stewardship of the public resources held by TVA. For this reason, we offer the final two thoughts on how this document might be strengthened.</p> <p>First, TVA has identified several areas that have existing agricultural licenses, and states on page 9 that “a substantial amount of the planned public land on Cherokee Reservoir” has outstanding agricultural land use rights. We were unable to find any indication on the maps or in the EA that show where these outstanding agricultural rights exist. A revision of the maps showing these areas would be helpful.</p> <p>We would propose that these areas be examined as to their usefulness in promoting best management practices for agriculture, as well as wildlife management for informal recreational purposes. Further, on pasture areas we would support the conversion of some acres of fescue to native warm season grasses to promote native grasses for forage production. Native grasses have consistently shown great weight gains in cattle, and also provide excellent forage for horses, as well as critical habitat for bobwhite quail and ground nesting songbirds.</p> <p>Secondly, because 227 of the 336 miles of shoreline have the potential to be impacted by development, we would suggest that TVA include in the EA a strategy that better protect shoreline resources on Cherokee. Some of our ideas are presented above, but more thought should be given to what the future holds for the Cherokee Reservoir, if TVA is to “maintain and gain” public shoreline miles and natural resource values.</p> <p>Again, thank you for this opportunity to comment on this EA, and we look forward to following up with you and your staff in the near future.</p> <hr/> <p>TVA RESPONSE: TCL Comment #1 - TVA has verified its mainland residential shoreline miles calculation and found it to be accurate. Cherokee Reservoir has a total of 396 miles of shoreline. After excluding the shoreline on islands, the total shoreline on the mainland is 336 miles. Thus, 43 percent of 336 miles amounts to 143.6 miles of residential access shoreline (RAS). The RAS includes 45 miles of TVA public shoreline and 99 miles of non-TVA (privately-owned) shoreline.</p> <p>TCL Comment #2 and #3 - This plan is based on conditions as presently known. Depending on the vulnerability and national significance of these resources, the shoreline segments were placed in either the Managed Residential,</p>

Comment	Name/Organization	Comment and TVA Response
		<p>Residential Mitigation, or Shoreline Protection Categories. Although a large percentage of the RAS presently has sensitive resources, none was placed in the "Shoreline Protection" category because no listed or eligible historic properties, federally-listed plants or animals, or high value wetland areas are known to occur there. Potential changes to these dynamic resources resulting from discovery of a rare species, new listing of threatened or endangered species, evolution to higher value wetlands, or determination of an eligible historic property, would guide TVA to adjust the shoreline categorization as new data and other relevant circumstances warrant. New information will become available from TVA's ongoing management and stewardship of its land or through reviews of land actions and other requests in the future.</p> <p>Shoreline containing sensitive resources has been placed in the Residential Mitigation Category. Although development is not prohibited in this category, any request for a water-use facility in this stretch of the shoreline would be closely scrutinized to ensure that the sensitive resources are protected.</p> <p>TCL Comment #4 - The miles of shoreline where sensitive resources (i.e., historic, rare species, or wetland) occur overlap and they are not mutually exclusive on a site. On Cherokee Reservoir, all the RAS was categorized and included in Residential Mitigation on Managed Residential categories. Shoreline categorized as Managed Residential has no known sensitive resources present. Some shoreline categorized as Residential Mitigation may have only one sensitive resource present while others may have more than one sensitive resource present.</p> <p>In regards to TCL's comments on Alternative B, see Table 2.2.2-1, Planned Land Use Zone Definitions, for the definition of Recreation (Zone 6). It describes the type of permissible recreation activities that TVA would review for possible approval on land in planning zone. Parcels 63, 64, and 82 were licensed for "Recreation Purposes" under the Forecast System and were also committed to this use under Alternative B. Parcel 63 has been licensed to the Sequoyah Boy Scout Council for its use so that potentially conflicting uses could be avoided. The license allows the public to also use the land for compatible recreation purposes. The parcel is undeveloped and there are no plans for development at this time. Parcels 64, Malinda Ferry Bridge Access, and 82 (a currently undeveloped site that provide public access) are licensed to Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency (TWRA). Parcel 83 is not allocated for recreation, but is included in Zone 2, Project Operations (Mooresburg Substation site).</p> <p>There are thirteen active agricultural licenses on 217 acres of TVA public land included in six parcels (i.e., Parcels 1, 52, 80, 89, 91, and 145). These 5-year licenses allow private farmers to jointly managed this land largely for pasture and hay production subject to certain conditions for environmental protection. In addition to lands for which agricultural licenses have been issued, there are lands with outstanding agricultural rights. See Section 2.2 Alternatives, for a discussion of these agricultural rights. These lands with outstanding agricultural rights were not mapped because they are tract- and deed-specific and their boundaries are not the same as the currently allocated parcels boundaries. Furthermore, mapping the location of the land encumbered with these agricultural land rights would add little value to the land planning process. As indicated in Section 1.1 Background, the amount of land encumbered with outstanding agricultural rights is 4,785 acres.</p>

Comment	Name/Organization	Comment and TVA Response
		<p>For demonstration purposes, on some of its land licensed for agricultural use, TVA is converting fescue sod to native warm season grasses. This work is being done cooperatively with local farmers, TWRA and other private conservation groups to enhance habitat for various beneficial and valued species. This work is most often implemented through resource management unit plans developed by TVA. See Section 3.4, Terrestrial Ecology and Significant Managed Areas.</p>
+25	Tim Nicely, Fishing Committee Chairman, Cherokee Lake User's Association	<p>COMMENT: After reviewing the 1998 "Aquatic Ecological Health Determinations for TVA Reservoir" it is evident that Cherokee Lake is in critical ecological condition. The 1998 study by Dycus, Minert, and Baker identifies many of the problems facing Cherokee Lake, which clearly points toward ecological disaster for the lake (Figure 7). TWRA studies consistently show similar findings that support TVA. The poor health of Cherokee Lake is showing up in the size and abundance of fish in the lake. The average size of largemouth bass, crappie, and bluegill have declined steadily over the past ten years (Figure 8). Fisheries evidence shows that ecologically Cherokee Lake is unable to produce enough food and oxygen to promote normal fish growth. Fish are reproducing adequately, but are not putting on enough weight to survive the winters (Figure 9 & 10). A one or two inch fish in October can not make it through a stressful four months. The Ohio Department of Natural Resources documented this pattern in 1991 (Figure 11). It is obvious that our ecological food chain is being devoured by an overabundance of shad (figure 12). If we are to measure them by weight in comparison to whales Cherokee Lake would have an adult population of 7,500 whales to feed annually. Eating only zooplankton and phytoplankton they could starve smaller species into desperate circumstances.</p> <p>Cherokee Lake is truly in a desperate situation, but with TVA's available land resources it is possible to halt the damage. We are asking that TVA establish a buffer zone for aquatic preservation like it has for shoreline habitat. Aquatic ecosystems are fragile and must be handled with care. The fertile soils that have not been eroded away can be utilized to benefit Cherokee's aquatic life. With today's fisheries technology a minimal amount of land set aside as a buffer (fish nursery) can produce astonishing results. Out of Cherokee's 30,000 acres fisheries specialist need only .33 of one percent to raise millions of bass, crappie, and hybrid bass annually. The proposed Shields Creek nursery is a step in the right direction, but in reality it is too small to affect the entire fishery. One optimal size nursery in the correct location is needed to impact the entire reservoir. That location is the 200 acres above the 1050 MSL north of highway 31 bridge in Hawkins County (Figure 13 TVA map). In plan (A) this property is allocated for public recreation. In plan (B) it is used for Natural Resource Conservation. In the end it will be you that decides if we can grow millions upon millions of largemouth bass, crappie, and hybrid bass over the next fifteen years or if we get to sit back and watch the cockleburs grow each fall.</p> <p>Thank you for letting us comment.</p> <p>Teamwork: Coming together is a beginning. Keeping together is progress. Working together is success</p> <p>Henry Ford</p>

Comment	Name/Organization	Comment and TVA Response
		<p>TVA RESPONSE: Comments noted. TVA agrees that proper planning for the future use of its reservoir land, as well as working to improve water resource conditions in the Holston River watershed, would enhance water quality and provide for the establishment of a diversity of aquatic life.</p> <p>We are considering the establishment of a trial buffer zone for the preservation of aquatic life and fishery resources. TVA currently has under review a request from TWRA and CLUA for construction of a fish rearing facility at Shields Creek in the German Creek embayment. Recognizing the benefits of such projects to the area and the local economy, any future proposals, such as the 200-acre area in Hawkins County you mentioned, would be reviewed by TVA on a case by case basis.</p>
+26	Joyce H. Hoyle, CLP Director, Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation	<p>COMMENT: Thank you for allowing Tennessee the opportunity to comment on the DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA) - CHEROKEE RESERVOIR LAND MANAGEMENT PLAN, GRAINGER, HAWKINS, HAMBLEN, AND JEFFERSON COUNTIES, TENNESSEE prepared by you and your staff. The Department of Environment and Conservation takes seriously the significance of the TVA lakes and reservoir systems to our statewide recreation and conservation opportunities.</p> <p>As you know, Tennessee is fortunate to have many lakes and reservoirs available for recreation. Primarily the Corps of Engineers and the Tennessee Valley Authority, with some of our lakes jointly managed through the Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency manage Tennessee's lakes.</p> <p>Our lakes are a public resource that needs to be preserved to meet future recreation demands. I encourage changes to management that would minimize negative impacts to areas requiring sensitive resource management and natural resource conservation while maximizing socio-economic opportunities from increased recreation use. Of the two alternatives outlined in the EA, we encourage the adoption of Alternative B because it furthers the aforementioned with the least amount of impact.</p> <p>If our division can be of any assistance to you , please contact Kay Vance at (615) 532-0755.</p> <hr/> <p>TVA RESPONSE: Comments noted.</p>
+27	Dan Sherry, Fish and Wildlife Environmentalist, Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency	<p>The Draft Environmental Assessment for the Cherokee Reservoir Land Management Plan has been reviewed by this agency's Region 4 staff. We concur with the TVA preferred Alternative B (Allocation Alternative).</p> <p>Thank you for coordinating with us.</p> <hr/>

Comment	Name/Organization	Comment and TVA Response
		<p>TVA RESPONSE: Comments noted.</p>
+28	Bruce and Emma Anderson	<p>We strongly disagree with your new Plan B for land use on Cherokee Lake.</p> <p>You have apparently decided that there is to be no further or future commercial development on Cherokee Lake.</p> <p>Under the original Plan A that has been in effect for many years there are commercial recreation areas designated.</p> <p>Your Plan B removes all commercial recreation areas, even though you acknowledge that boat registration exceeds the increased population growth in that area.</p> <p>Our Consulting Business requires travel, we were out of state and not aware of your only meeting for the public this year. We would like to arrange a meeting with you to discuss our concerns on this issue prior to the Board approved of your plan.</p> <hr/> <p>TVA RESPONSE: Of the 133.3 acres of land designated for Commercial Recreation under Alternative A, 132 acres were allocated to Natural Resource Conservation (Zone 4) under Alternative B. Most of this land, including the 79.1-acre Parcel 18 of interest to Mr. Anderson, has no public access and has limited development potential because of steep topography. Therefore, TVA staff experts rated Parcel 18 low in recreation development potential and support its allocation to resource conservation.</p> <p>There is no newly allocated recreation land under Alternative B. However, under this alternative, parcels totaling 760 acres in Zone 6 (Recreation), are already in approved recreation use or committed to this type of future use under an active license, easement or other agreement. Expansion of existing and new developed recreation opportunities can be accommodated on this land. Other recreation development can occur on adjoining private land. Marinas and other water-dependent development on private land can be accommodated with plans approved under Section 26a of the TVA Act.</p>



TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Dan Wheeler
Commissioner

Don Sundquist
Governor

April 20, 2001

Mr. Jon M. Loney, Manager
NEPA Administration
Environmental Policy and Planning
Tennessee Valley Authority
400 West Summit Hill Drive
Knoxville, TN 37902-1499

Re: Environmental Assessment (EA) for Cherokee Reservoir Land Management Plan
Comments

Dear Mr. Loney:

The Department appreciates the opportunity to comment on the above-referenced document. This EA demonstrates TVA's commitment to wise management of the land and water of Tennessee, and we support your efforts to minimize the impact of polluted runoff and excessive soil erosion into Cherokee Reservoir.

The Department has no formal comments to offer relative to this document.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Louis Buck".

Louis Buck
Deputy Commissioner

Ellington Agricultural Center, Box 40627, Nashville, TN 37204
Telephone (615) 837-5103 • Fax (615) 837-5333
E-Mail: dwheeler@mail.state.tn.us



TENNESSEE HISTORICAL COMMISSION
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND CONSERVATION
2941 LEBANON ROAD
NASHVILLE, TN 37243-0442
(615) 532-1550

April 30, 2001

Mr. Jon Loney
Tennessee Valley Authority
400 West Summit Hill Drive
Knoxville, Tennessee 37902-1499

RE: TVA, CHEROKEE RESERVOIR LAND MANAGEMENT PLAN,
UNINCORPORATED, MULTI COUNTY

Dear Mr. Loney:

The above-referenced Draft Environmental Assessment has been reviewed with regard to National Historic Preservation Act compliance by the participating federal agency or its designated representative. Procedures for implementing Section 106 of the Act are codified at 36 CFR 800 (64 FR 27044, May 18, 1999).

We concur with your office that phased identification and evaluation is an appropriate strategy for Section 106 compliance for both Alternatives A and B of the proposed management plan. As stated in the document, portions of the project's Area of Potential Effect (APE) have not yet been systematically surveyed for the presence of historic properties. All portions of the APE must be systematically surveyed and evaluated prior to the beginning of any ground-disturbing activities.

Upon receipt of the survey reports, we will complete our review of this undertaking as expeditiously as possible. Until such time as this office has rendered a final comment on this project, your Section 106 obligation under federal law has not been met. Please inform this office if this project is canceled or not funded by the federal agency. Questions and comments may be directed to Jennifer M. Bartlett (615) 741-1588, ext. 17.

Your cooperation is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Herbert L. Harper
Executive Director and
Deputy State Historic
Preservation Officer

HLH/jmb



June 4, 2001

Ms. Jennifer Bartlett
Tennessee Historical Commission
Department of Environment and Conservation
2941 Lebanon Road
Nashville, Tennessee 37243-0442

Dear Ms. Bartlett:

TVA, CHEROKEE RESERVOIR LAND MANAGEMENT PLAN,
UNINCORPORATED, MULTI COUNTY

The Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) is in receipt of the April 30, 2001 letter from Herbert L. Harper, Executive Director and Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer, regarding the Tennessee Historical Commission's review of the above-referenced draft Cherokee Land Management Plan (LMP) for compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA).

TVA understands that your office concurs that phased identification and evaluation is an appropriate strategy for Section 106 compliance for both Alternatives A and B of the proposed Cherokee LMP. Accordingly, we understand that no further review by your office of the Cherokee LMP will be necessary prior to finalizing the plan. Future ground-disturbing activities proposed to be undertaken at the Cherokee Reservoir in implementing the finalized Cherokee LMP will be coordinated with your office to meet the requirements of Section 106 of the NHPA.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact Pat Bernard Ezzell at (423) 632-1582 or fax at (423) 632-1795.

Sincerely,

J. Bennett Graham
Senior Archaeologist



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
NASHVILLE DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
3701 Bell Road
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE 37214

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

May 2, 2001

Regulatory Branch

SUBJECT: Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) -Cherokee Reservoir Land Management Plan, Grainger, Hawkins, Hamblen, and Jefferson Counties, Tennessee

Mr. Jon Loney, Manager
Environmental Policy and Planning
Tennessee Valley Authority
400 West Summit Hill Drive
Knoxville, Tennessee 37901-1499

Dear Mr. Loney:

This is in response to your April 16, 2001, letter requesting our review of the subject Land Management Plan.

We have reviewed the plan and found it to be well written and very thorough. The plan accurately explains the relationship between the Corps and TVA on wetland protection and development affecting Waters of the United States.

We appreciate your awareness of our Regulatory Program and wish you success in the execution of this plan and support Alternative B as the best course for resource protection while allowing reasonable and managed development.

If you have any question regarding this matter, please contact me at the above address, or telephone (615) 369-7520.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "H. Joe Cathey", written over a horizontal line.

H. Joe Cathey, C.F.P.
Operations Division



United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

446 Neal Street
Cookeville, TN 38501

May 15, 2001

Mr. Jon M. Loney
Manager, NEPA Administration
Environmental Policy & Planning
Tennessee Valley Authority
400 West Summit Hill Drive
Knoxville, Tennessee 37902-1499

Dear Mr. Loney:

Thank you for your correspondence of April 16, 2001, regarding the Tennessee Valley Authority's (TVA) Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Cherokee Reservoir Land Management Plan in Grainger Hawkins, Hamblen, and Jefferson counties, Tennessee. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) personnel have reviewed the document and we offer the following comments.

The EA adequately describes the resources within the project area and the proposed actions' impact on these resources. The Service recommends the Preferred Alternative (Alternative B) for TVA's involvement in the land management plan, and believes it will benefit fish and wildlife of the area and provide adequate recreational opportunities.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposed action. If you have any questions regarding the information which we have provided, please contact Wally Brines of my staff at 931/528-6481, extension 222.

Sincerely,


Lee A. Barclay Ph.D.
Field Supervisor



TENNESSEE COMMISSION OF INDIAN AFFAIRS
7th Floor, L & C Annex, 401 Church Street
Nashville, Tennessee 37243-0459
(615) 532-0745

Cubert Bell, Sr.

Clayton W. Prast

May 21, 2001

Harold M. Draper
Tennessee Valley Authority
400 West Summit Hill Drive
Knoxville, TN 37902-1499

Re: Draft Environmental Assessment – Cherokee Reservoir Land Management Plan

Dear Mr. Draper:

I would like to offer the following comments on the Draft Environmental Assessment for the Cherokee Reservoir Land Management plan.

The main concern of the Tennessee Commission of Indian Affairs (TCIA) regarding the plan is the protection and preservation of Native American cultural resources around Cherokee Reservoir. For the most part, the provisions of Alternative B seem to offer a reasonable plan for protection of sensitive cultural resources.

However, there is one aspect of Alternative B that requires more consideration or clarification. In the first paragraph on page 20, the Draft EA states that "areas identified as having sensitive resources would also be regarded as committed and would be placed in Zone 3, Sensitive Resource Management. However, if parcels with existing commitments (leases, licenses, contracts, etc.) contain sensitive resources, that parcel would remain zoned with the committed use."

Any leases, licenses, contracts or other commitments that will expire in the future should be reviewed before they are renewed in compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act. Any such commitments should not be renewed if they result in activities that impact Native American cultural resources. Affected land parcels should then be placed in Zone 3.

I appreciate having the opportunity to make these comments. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Toye Heape".

Toye Heape
Executive Director



STATE OF TENNESSEE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND CONSERVATION

May 22, 2001

Mr. Jon M. Loney
NEPA Administration
Environmental Policy & Planning
Tennessee Valley Authority
400 West Summit Hill Drive
Knoxville, TN 37902-1499

Mr. Loney:

Thank you for allowing Tennessee the opportunity to comment on the DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA) – CHEROKEE RESERVOIR LAND MANAGEMENT PLAN, GRAINGER, HAWKINS, HAMBLLEN, AND JEFFERSON COUNTIES, TENNESSEE prepared by you and your staff. The Department of Environment and Conservation takes seriously the significance of the TVA lakes and reservoir systems to our statewide recreation and conservation opportunities.

As you know, Tennessee is fortunate to have many lakes and reservoirs available for recreation. Primarily the Corps of Engineers and the Tennessee Valley Authority, with some of our lakes jointly managed through the Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency, manage Tennessee's lakes.

Our lakes are a public resource that needs to be preserved to meet future recreation demands. I encourage changes to management that would minimize negative impacts to areas requiring sensitive resource management and natural resource conservation while maximizing socio-economic opportunities from increased recreation use. Of the two alternatives outlined in the EA, we encourage the adoption of Alternative B because it furthers the aforementioned with the least amount of impact.

If our division can be of any assistance to you, please contact Kay Vance at (615) 532-0755.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Joyce H. Hoyle".

Joyce H. Hoyle, CLP
Director

cc: Kay Vance



TENNESSEE WILDLIFE RESOURCES AGENCY

ELLINGTON AGRICULTURAL CENTER
P. O. BOX 40747
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE 37204

June 4, 2001

Mr. Stanford E. Davis, Planner
Tennessee Valley Authority
Cherokee-Douglas Watershed Team
2611 W. Andrew Johnson Highway
Morristown, TN 37814-3295

re: Draft Environmental Assessment, Cherokee Reservoir Land Management Plan,
Tennessee Valley Authority

Dear Stan:

The Draft Environmental Assessment for the Cherokee Reservoir Land Management Plan has been reviewed by this agency's Region 4 staff. We concur with the TVA preferred Alternative B (Allocation Alternative).

Thank you for coordinating with us.

Sincerely,

Dan Sherry
Fish & Wildlife Environmentalist

DS/bjs
cc: Bob Ripley

The State of Tennessee

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER