8. Environmental Resources Inventory of the Metropolitan Region of Nashville, Tennessee, and the Mid-Cumberland Development District (June 1976)

Seattle District updated and edited the provisional Washington State inventory with the support of the Institute for Environmental Studies of the University of Washington. Then it was published by the Government Printing Office in January 1975 as the *Washington Environmental Atlas.* This handsome publication received wide acclaim. One item which distinguished it was the mention of Sasquatch, or "Big Foot," who, if not mythical, was certainly an endangered species.

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) became the focus of an agitated discussion at the seventh meeting of the EAB. General Koisch complained that minor issues seemed to stop many projects. A procedure was needed, he suggested, to throw out "nonsense items." Furthermore, the financial burden for project delays should rest on the plaintiff in the form of a reasonably high bond.

Clement was not sympathetic. He thought that the Corps' environmental impact statements were inadequate. Guidance sent to the field contained only procedural material and nothing of substance. If the Corps "did a proper job on the 102 statement [EIS] they would not be subject to injunctions. . . . the suits we have gotten seem to be because of poor or non-existent statements." The reaction to Clement's assertion was intense. Several Corps employees objected; and, although discussion was long, nothing was resolved. Clement offered however to assist the Corps in obtaining more explicit guidance from the Council on Environmental Quality.[29] Shortly after the meeting, Clement acknowledged to Clarke that he "may sometimes appear to be ungrateful for the progress all of you are making." Nevertheless, on the question of environmental impact statements he was adamant: "You must not let OCE staff assure you that present 102s are as yet adequate. . . . the challenge is to make these 102s truly helpful assessments of the trade-offs and alternatives so that the public will *know* that the Corps is willing to expose the options to public scrutiny rather than going along with the silence that can favor only special interests."[30]

Environmental impact statements remained the center of attention at the May EAB meeting. General Clarke summarized the legal challenges to these statements; and a copy of a speech by E. Manning Seltzer, OCE General Counsel, was distributed which analyzed ways in which environmental groups attempted to force the cessation or modification of Corps projects. At the time sixteen projects had been stopped through suits or court action.[31]

The EIS discussion focused on ER 1150-2-507, "Planning: Preparation and Coordination of Environmental Statements." This regulation, published on 3 January 1972, delineated the procedures and necessary interagency coordination which field offices were to follow in the preparation of impact statements. Clement reiterated his conviction that the new regulation required