

Name: John Carlton Templeton
Phone: 981-5409
Address: 1601 Brahman Lane, Seymour, TN 37865
E-mail: mtjet2@charter.net
Website: under development

3. Office?

Blount County Commission, District 8, Seat A

4. Professional background and current occupation?

High School Teacher (2 years)
Insurance Brokerage—various companies: Marsh & McLennan, AIG, Bankers Life

5. High School and College?

EMTHS Indianapolis, Indiana
Indiana University, BA Spanish and Latin American Studies, 1968
Indiana University, MBA, International Business, 1970

6. Professional, governmental, community service

Twice president of Knoxville Association of Health underwriters 2005, 2006
Concerned Voters of East Blount County, *ad hoc*, 2008-2010

7. Background and skills assist as officeholder?

H.S. teacher—insight into problems of education, youth issues and society
Insurance broker—understanding of healthcare issues, finance and the needs of small businesses

8. Raven Society Mission?

Yes, I do support the Raven Society mission both as an active member and in terms of general philosophy. I believe that the people of Blount County are gaining an increasing and urgent awareness of the precious resources we have here and the need to preserve and nurture them. Along with the many organizations and the many studies that relate to these same issues, the Raven Society has done an outstanding job of analyzing, communicating and advocating possible solutions.

9. Three most critical issues?

1. Community preservation and protection of our natural beauty through long-range planning.
2. Education—one of our most valuable legacies to future generations.
3. Transportation because of its potential impact on the natural assets of the county. All of this within a context of careful and creative local government financial planning.

10. Guiding Principles:

1. Operate county government in a conservative and forward-looking manner.
2. You never hurt yourself by raising your standards.
3. Make use of lessons learned elsewhere and in other times.

11. Support the Pellissippi Parkway Extension?

No. In a general sense, I am opposed to the PPE because I have seen, as anyone can see, what the results of the construction of a major interstate through a rural area are. Those results are demonstrable and invariable: visual degradation, water and air pollution, increased traffic, destruction of community cohesion and unwanted and unneeded commercial development, among others.

Blount County finds itself, like many other communities throughout America, presented with a questionable agenda when it comes to transportation and highways. New highways are repeatedly sold as “transportation projects” when, in fact, they are “developmental” projects. The building of the road is simply a means to an end, where the goal is not to eliminate or reduce the number of cars or the number of trips in cars but rather to open up new areas for the building of new service stations, motels, shopping centers and tract housing.

To further illustrate this problem, take a look at the text of the preliminary injunction granted by Judge Todd Campbell against the PPE. It first, enumerates the many ways in which TDOT skirted or ignored the niceties of federal law to push the project forward. He then states, “Defendants did not take the ‘hard look’ required by federal regulation at the need for the Pellissippi Parkway Extension, INDUCED GROWTH, and potential inconsistencies with local planning, air pollution and ozone impacts on the GSMNP, and impacts on those whose livelihoods depend on working farms . . .” Induced growth means growth that would not otherwise have taken place, growth whose primary purpose is to pad the tax coffers of the county.

As far as proponents of the Parkway are concerned, it seems that the only statistic that counts is that they want the PPE done. During the public meeting held by TDOT in October 2007, TDOT studies which were presented confirmed that the PPE will not alleviate traffic congestion. When Blount County has an extensive network of streets, roads and highways in dire need of upgrading, why spend \$50,000,000 on a project that will put increased pressure on existing roads, not lessen it?

12. If the PPE is eventually built . . . ?

Since the basic issue here is roads, I think it is essential that we continue at every level to push for an allocation and use of highway tax funds which balances the needs of local areas with those of regional and national scope. If tax money is drained out of Blount County, ostensibly for roads and transportation, it should not be returned to us with mandates that we submit to huge, destructive and polluting projects that do not serve either our short- or long-term goals. As for schools, I believe that smaller, more numerous, local schools would go far to reduce pollution by reducing the need for students to drive to school, reduce the number of school buses and bus trips, and reduce school closings due to weather. We need to insist that the BC Planning Commission take its role in ensuring quality growth seriously by, among other things, not approving subdivisions in areas where adequate infrastructure does not exist. We need to take a closer, more realistic look at light rail and monorail projects. And, we need to look at any

available studies on the nature and sources of air and water pollution and try to eliminate them at the source.

13. Recommend proposals for raising fund to purchase and preserve green space in rural parts of the county?

I must be frank in saying that I have seen and read the list of funding options developed by GMAC and I do not fully understand all their possible effects. However, I can say that my support for some or all of them would be predicated to some extent on the financial condition of the county and the competing uses that might exist at a given time. For example, I would oppose any method that involved a tax increase until a rigorous evaluation of the current sources and uses of tax revenues revealed that all available resources are being allocated wisely and economically. “Windfall Revenue” is another mysterious term that could have different meanings to various people. Restricting a property owner’s right to profit fully from the sale of his/her property is just as objectionable to me as taking property by eminent domain for the economic benefit of commercial interest. I am definitely open to learning more about these proposals from those familiar with them in the Raven Society or elsewhere.

14. Incorporate Five Guiding Policies . . . ?

What appears to be lacking generally in Blount County government at this point is a true and heartfelt commitment to these policies. Officials express or imply allegiance to the ideal of “preserving the rural character” of the community, but go on to approve landing strip developments in an area of farms and rural homes. They say “government actions should be guided by regulations specific to the health, safety and welfare objectives and then move to allow helicopter concession flights over farm fields and homes. They support “improvement and maintenance of county roads” but want to pour millions into a new interstate. Somehow, we need to work together to move these guiding policies into the realm of consistent and concrete action. How about a billboard on a major highway listing them and asking, “What have you done”.

15. My vision for Blount County in 20 years?

I have two visions of Blount County in 20 years. The first is a landscape overrun with crisscrossing and isolating highways; congested intersections choked with cars and blighted by chain motels and restaurants; farm fields converted to vast auto junkyards; visibility limited by smoke and pollutions and health problems generated by air and water pollution.

However, my ideal vision for Blount County is as the spiritual gateway to the Smokies as opposed to the commercial gateway to the Smokies already claimed by Sevier County. What do I mean by “the spiritual gateway”? I see the potential for Blount County to identify itself as an extension of the beauty and serenity the nation’s most beloved national park. An area that will welcome visitors from all over the world attracted by our esteem for cleanliness, order, nature, and love for our mountain homeland. I can see a community united not by our views on international trade or comparative advantage but by a commitment to preserve and share our good fortune and, yes, to profit by its uniqueness. Which one is more likely? I think I see the

early stages of agreement developing now—agreement that can lead us to avoid the mistakes made elsewhere and in the past and to work out our own solutions to the challenges we face.