

**Appendix F – Public Comments and Responses**

Page intentionally blank

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**  
Received by TVA on the  
Watts Bar Reservoir Land Management Plan and  
Amended Draft Environmental Impact Statement  
August 2007

**Introduction**

The amended draft environmental impact statement (DEIS) for the Watts Bar Reservoir Land Management Plan was distributed in August 2007). TVA received 152 comments by letters, electronic mail and oral statements during the comment period on the amended DEIS from August 10 to September 24, 2007. Following release of the amended DEIS, TVA held an information meeting at Harriman, Tennessee on August 21, 2007 where 102 people attended. The written and oral comments were received from 91 individuals, including 5 organizations, 2 local governments, and 10 interested agencies. TVA has reviewed all of the comments.

The comments and TVA responses to them appear below. In some cases the EIS was changed because of the information or issues presented in the comments. Due to their volume and frequent similarity, many of the comments were summarized to save space and provide joint responses. The names of those individuals and organizations providing comments appear after the comment text. Because the comments were summarized the precise wording could not always be used. However, TVA tried to retain all important issues and differences among similar comments. Also, commentors names may appear in more than one comment if they identified more than one issue. All original comments and letters are available from TVA upon request. Letters from agencies and some organizations providing more information appear in Appendix D (Document and Letters).

Comments were organized into logical topics and themes, their order of appearance has no bearing on their importance as all comments were reviewed and considered.

The largest grouping of the public responses to the amended DEIS focused on the types of use allocation for specific parcels of TVA managed land, in particular the former Clinch River Breeder Reactor site and Lowe Branch area. There were also many comments about the NEPA process and alternative selection, and stewardship of public lands. And there was interest in how TVA's land policy is applied and the management of various types of recreation on public lands.

The remainder of comments on the DEIS raised questions and provided comments on the identified environmental issues. Of these the issue of greatest concern was water quality, especially about waste water discharges. Other issues mentioned with concerns about impacts to the environment were; socioeconomic and environmental justice, terrestrial ecology, threatened and endangered species, forestry, aquatic ecology, and cultural resources.

### **Aquatic Ecology**

1. **[At]** Clinch River mile 21.5 Roane and Loudon County, left bank. Plants are growing in River Bottom very thin plants every 12" -36" apart. (William J. Johnson)

Response: Comment noted. Most TVA reservoirs and tailwater areas have some aquatic vegetation. During low flow/drought years, such as 2007, aquatic plant growth can be expected in some more shallow, slack water areas including some portions of the Clinch River arm of Watts Bar Reservoir.

### **Cultural Resources**

2. We are unaware of any specific historic properties or traditional cultural, religious and/or sacred sites at this time. However, in the event of inadvertent discoveries, we expect all construction activities to cease and we be notified according to all applicable state and federal laws. (Jefferson Keel, Lt. Governor, Chickasaw Nation)

Response: Comment noted.

3. As TVA is committed to following the stipulations in the PA [*programmatic agreement regarding reservoir land management plans in Tennessee*], we have no further comments. (Jennifer Barnett, Tennessee State Historic Preservation Office)

Response: Comment noted. In earlier consultation (2004), the Tennessee State Historic Preservation Office and TVA developed a programmatic agreement regarding reservoir land management plans in Tennessee (PA) to address potential adverse effects. TVA will follow the stipulations in the PA. See Section 4.20, Summary of Proposed Mitigation Measures, in the final environmental impact statement (FEIS).

### **Floodplains**

4. Is there a new flood plain map for Watts Bar? (Bob Ott)

Response: Yes, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) is in the process of updating the Flood Insurance Rate Maps for all of the counties in the state of Tennessee, along with the rest of the United States. To determine if Roane County has been updated, you may visit the FEMA Map Service Center Web site at:

<http://msc.fema.gov/webapp/wcs/stores/servlet/FemaWelcomeView?storeId=10001&catalogId=10001&langId=-1> or you may contact the Tennessee Local Planning Office in Knoxville at 865-994-6666. In order to learn more about the FEMA Map Modernization Program, please access the following FEMA Web site: [http://www.fema.gov/plan/prevent/fhm/mm\\_main.shtm](http://www.fema.gov/plan/prevent/fhm/mm_main.shtm)

### **Forest and Land Management**

5. Although Zone 4 is named "Natural Resource Conservation", we note that timber management would be allowed there, as well as hunting. How will these activities be held to sustainable levels and will clearcutting still be allowed like in the 1988 Plan (pg. 21, Allocation #12)? In order to be a true conservation zone, we recommend that harvesting be limited to forest fuel thinning without clearcutting, and that hunting primarily also be for thinning growing populations for their benefit based on consultation with FWS and their state counterparts. In essence we recommend that harvesting and hunting be allowed to promote healthy forests and wildlife populations rather than for

silvicultural or high-yield purposes. (Heinz J. Mueller, Environmental Protection Agency [EPA])

Response: Timber harvests, including small clear-cuts (20 acres or less), would be utilized on Zone 4 properties to maintain healthy forests, create needed biodiversity and forest-age structure, and enhance wildlife habitats and populations. Timber harvests would not be conducted for revenue production from a high-yield perspective. Hunting on TVA-retained properties is allowed following rules and regulations established by individual state wildlife resource agencies, which, following guidance from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) for migratory species, are established to promote healthy and sustainable wildlife populations.

6. The DEIS would have been improved if the proposed Natural Resource Management Strategy that is to replace the IRM [*Integrated Resource Management*] was already prepared and presented as a draft or final strategy in an appendix. (Heinz J. Mueller, EPA)

Response: Comment noted.

**Section 26a Approval**

7. I'm a property owner on Watts Bar. Will the plan affect my access rights? (Vivian Crump)

Response: Access rights are determined by your deed and will not change as a result of the Watts Bar Reservoir Land Management Plan.

8. Will the land plan have any affect on my ability to expand my dock. (Janelle Douglas)

Response: Expanding your existing water use facility will require Section 26a approval from TVA. The Watts Bar Reservoir Land Management Plan will not affect that decision.

9. I also encourage you to enforce the rules for all new development around the water, minimizing the destruction of habitat. (Rhonda Bogard)

Response: TVA strives to complete its environmental commitments in agreements with developers. Please report any potential violations on TVA property to the Watts Bar-Clinch Watershed Team at Lenoir City, Tennessee.

10. My next comment is that TVA has no plan to fund enforcement and oversight of areas outlined in the land management plan that are allocated as informal dispersed land based opportunities. While TVA police have been responsive, the Watts Bar Reservoir is not adequately covered. TVA has failed to oversee current development. Examples are the cove of Apollo Shores developer [*where he*] was allowed to scalp the shoreline without the appropriate approvals by TVA. There's also some question on Terrace Views Marina docks, there not being adequate oversight for that. There is no funding outlined in the draft EIS on how additional oversight will be accomplished. (Gail Okulczyk)

Response: The land plan is programmatic and pertains to TVA's designating the use of public land under TVA management and not the enforcement of agreements. However, TVA does fund inspection and compliance activities through its watershed teams. These teams monitor the contract agreements and permits of individuals or organizations using public lands and any associated special or environmental commitments. TVA uses a variety of inspection and compliance actions. The most common methods are the annual shoreline inspections and random compliance inspections. The shoreline inspection process is designed to methodically look at the entire length of shoreline for every reservoir in the TVA system. The random compliance inspection process is performed to ensure compliance with conditions of each permit inspected. In addition, specific projects may receive additional inspection during construction to ensure compliance with existing agreements. TVA invites the public to report any suspected permit violations to the Watts Bar-Clinch Watershed Team.

### Land Policy and Use

11. How can a TVA lease of public land to Rockwood allow private development? (David Baker)

Response: According to the 2006 TVA Land Policy, residential development will not be considered on TVA land. Any proposal for use of TVA land from Rockwood (or from any applicant) would have to comply with this policy (see Appendix A of the FEIS). Accordingly, TVA does lease land to private concerns for some types of specific development in the interest of the public. For example, TVA land is often leased to private marinas or campgrounds for public use. No decision has been made by TVA on the Rockwood proposal (as of August 2007).

12. There appears to be several descriptions regarding Parcel 240 provided in the DEIS and displayed at the public meeting. Some maps/documents list it as unplanned, unallocated, allocated, committed, uncommitted, etc. From Appendix B of the revised draft, the Parcel is uncommitted but allocated. (Gail Okulczyk)

Response: The terms planned, committed, and uncommitted are defined by definition or use in Section 2.1.2, The Planning Process for Action Alternatives. In summary, planned land is land included in the planning process completed in 1988, unplanned land is inferred as land not included in the 1988 Plan. Committed land includes those parcels where TVA currently has licenses, easements, project operations, identified sensitive resources, or with water access rights. Uncommitted lands are those parcels with none of the above agreements, uses, resources, or rights.

Parcel 240 was planned in the 1988 Plan and allocated as commercial recreation (interpreted currently as Zone 6). This allocation was made in order to allow for potential expansion of recreation facilities on adjacent private land. It is considered uncommitted because there are no existing licenses, easements, TVA project operations, sensitive resources, or water access permits. TVA proposed to allocate Parcel 240 to Zone 6 - Developed Recreation under Alternatives B and C in the 2007 DEIS. However, because of the lack of interest and occurrence of other developed

recreation in the area, TVA proposes to allocate Parcel 240 to Zone 4 - Natural Resource Conservation.

13. If the parcel was re-evaluated from the former land plan by the means described on page 29 AND comments used from the scoping process as stated in your revised draft, then TVA has to be aware of the roosting of the bald eagles, turkeys, pileated woodpeckers, and the vultures, along with all the other wildlife observed by those that signed our petition opposing the turnover of Parcel 240 to Arrowhead Resort. (Gail Okulczyk)

Response: Yes, TVA is aware that these species could occur on Parcel 240. These species observed on this parcel either are occasional users or there is currently other habitat available for the species on Watts Bar Reservoir. Therefore, the parcel does not meet the criteria for allocation as Zone 3 - Sensitive Resource Management. However, TVA is proposing to allocate Parcel 240 as Zone 4 - Natural Resource Conservation. See response to Comment 12.

14. If TVA has allocated Parcel 240, does this mean Arrowhead Resort has the option to purchase or is the land given? During discussion at the Roane State meeting, I was told that Subdivisions such as Apollo Shores cannot be "given" the parcel. How does TVA allocate properties? By purchase or a transfer of deed with no cost? What is the process for an interested party, such as Apollo Shores or private citizen, to obtain an allocated status? Can a private citizen purchase or lease Parcel 240? (Gail Okulczyk)

Response: According to the 2006 TVA Land Policy, if TVA were to allocate Parcel 240 as Zone 6 - Developed Recreation, then TVA can either lease or grant a limited easement to the developer, which could be a private or public entity. The developer must meet certain criteria to demonstrate their ability to develop, manage, and operate the property for the use allocated. If TVA were to allocate the parcel as Zone 4 - Natural Resource Conservation, then it could not be sold or transferred and would remain as a Zone 4 until the next land plan or the TVA Board of Directors changed the land policy. Currently, TVA is only authorized to sell reservoir lands for economic development purposes (Zone 5) or where land has been identified as fragmented reservoir property (no longer connected to the reservoir). More information on the TVA Land Policy may be found on TVA's Web site: [http://www.tva.com/river/landandshore/land\\_policy.htm](http://www.tva.com/river/landandshore/land_policy.htm).

15. You mentioned that Arrowhead Resort had not indicated an interest in Parcel 240. Is this because they are under assumption that since TVA has "allocated" that they are required no further action and they will obtain the parcel? (Gail Okulczyk)

Response: TVA has no agreement with Arrowhead Marina for Parcel 240. We understand they have no current interest in the parcel to expand their facility.

16. I find it interesting that Parcel 239, listed in Appendix B as Unplanned but Committed. A developer purchased an acreage totaling 161 lots in Apollo Shores where this parcel affronts and has significantly modified the shoreline, well below the 750 elevation. Was this parcel provided to or purchased by the developer (The Cove at Apollo Shores)? (Gail Okulczyk)

Response: Parcel 239 is public land managed by TVA over which the back-lying owners have access rights and may apply for water use facilities. It is allocated as Zone 7 in Alternatives B and C and continues to be unplanned in Alternative A. Please see Section 2.1.2 of the FEIS for a description of Marginal Strip Land. In any of the Alternatives Parcel 239 would remain in public ownership although it may contain private water use facilities.

17. I am a retired TVA employee who owns a Lake House on Watts Bar Lake. Following my wife's retirement recently, we find ourselves spending the majority of our time at the Lake House on what is now a beautiful Watts Bar Lake. We have been upset to hear about TVA's plans to possibly allow the construction of a Barge Terminal on the Slue where our Lake house is located. This is Zone 5. All of our neighbors are very upset. We feel the best option for the site should be Natural Resource Conservation. Many homes would be impacted by the loss of the natural view, and the potential impacts on the environment. Please consider our views. We are also contacting our congressional friends for their assistance. (James W. McCarter)

Response: As a part of TVA's broad regional resource development mission, TVA reservoir properties are managed to provide multiple public benefits, including recreation, conservation, and industrial development. In reservoir land management plans, TVA allocates parcels for industrial development and conservation. TVA recognizes the importance of striking a balance among the competing demands placed on the land and water resources.

Parcel 298 was considered for industrial development in the 1988 Plan. It meets the land policy criteria of being suitable for industrial use to support a water-based industry and is a potential site for a supporting barge terminal. The parcel is allocated for Zone 5 (Industrial) under Alternative B; however, under the conservation alternative (Alternative C), it is proposed for allocation to Zone 4 (Natural Resource Conservation).

18. I think the TVA board should reconsider the residential development as I believe many people did not understand exactly what options were being considered. There had been a lot of publicity about the purposed residential development. I think that is why there were more comments on that particular part. I don't think that the industrial possibilities had really been explained and many will be surprised by this type of development. I think TVA is responsible by not having enough public meetings in Rhea County, Meigs and Roane Counties so that more people are informed. Personally, I would rather see more residential than industrial along with public and commercial recreation. Please reconsider including residential development and pass these comments on to the new TVA board. (Shelly Beasley)

Response: TVA believes it has provided ample information about the Watts Bar Land Plan to the public and provided adequate opportunity for the public to make comments. See Sections 1.6 and 1.7 of the 2007 DEIS, which include the results of three public comment periods with public meetings, along with information meetings with stakeholders. Both residential and industrial uses were reduced in the 2007 Plan. As described in Section 1.3, residential development will no longer be permitted on TVA land. Furthermore, industrial allocations were reduced by 45 percent. In addition, see Sections 3.8.1 and 4.8.1 for anticipated land use around Watts Bar Reservoir.

19. What can I do to keep people from crossing my land to get to TVA property? Can I put up a fence at the TVA property line? (Beth Bowelle)

Response: Under most circumstances private property owners have the right to prevent unwanted trespassing on their property. Please contact the Watts Bar-Clinch Watershed Team if the situation involves TVA managed public land.

20. We note that since the completion of Watts Bar Reservoir, TVA has sold or transferred over 9,000 acres (35 percent of the original TVA land base) to private, state, or federal ownership. Of the 721 miles of shoreline, 340 miles (47 percent) is available for Shoreline Access, which includes current development. By your own calculations, TVA land comprises only about 11 percent of the land within 0.25 mile of Watts Bar Reservoir. There are over 17,000 acres of platted residential property adjacent to public land on the reservoir; approximately half of the platted area has already been converted to residential housing. Additionally, there are 67 developed recreation areas on Watts Bar Reservoir, and over 50 paved boat ramps on the reservoir, 3,600 permitted docks, and marina facilities with about 1,500 boat docking slips (with an additional 200 plus out-of-water storage slips). It seems obvious to us that more than sufficient Watts Bar Reservoir marginal lands have already been made available for residential, commercial, and industrial development. (Axel C. Ringe - Sierra Club)

Response: Comment noted. None of the alternatives under consideration would make more public land available for residential development. The alternatives allocate varying amounts of land for commercial recreational and industrial development.

### **Land Use Designation**

#### ***Parcels 256 and 257 - Godsey Hollow***

21. We wish to express our concern, already too much development has occurred on Watts Bar Lake and that the remaining land be devoted to natural resource conservation as possible. Under the amended Watts Bar Reservoir Land Management Plan Allocation A, Panel 1, Parcel 257 Godsey Hollow is recommended under all three alternatives to continue in Zone [4] Natural Resource Conservation. However on page 219 of the draft, it also states that "...this parcel is being requested for use with the adjoining property (Parcel 256) for a potential marina development. Please don't let this happen. The cove is a wonderful haven for wildlife, and numerous Wood ducks, Owls, Blue herons. Bald eagles and Osprey nesting nearby which we enjoy very much. Converting this from Zone 4 to a different classification that would allow a Marina or boat docks would destroy one of the few remaining coves, and a beautiful natural resource would be lost forever. We would like to encourage TVA to reject any request to change its classification. (Ed and Judy Staten)

Response: The sentence on page 219 of the 2007 DEIS requesting the use of Parcel 257 for a potential marina development is in error and has been corrected in the FEIS. TVA is unaware of any current proposal for use of this parcel or for the adjacent Parcel 256.

In the 2005 DEIS, TVA considered allocating Parcel 257 for Developed Recreation (Zone 6) at the request of the adjacent landowner. This allocation would have allowed for the development of commercial recreation. TVA since reexamined the need for a commercial recreation facility in this

area and determined this parcel was best suited for Zone 4 (Natural Resource Conservation). This recommendation was based on the recent recreation assessment that showed a high density of water use facilities and marinas in the vicinity (see Appendix E). TVA now proposes to allocate Parcel 257 as Zone 4 (Natural Resource Conservation) under the Action Alternatives B and C.

22. I have particular concern for any marina development in Godsey Hollow. The report appears to be in conflict as to continuing the Zone 4 or allowing this marina. I would like to say that I am not in favor of such a development. We are all familiar with the elements from a marina that can pollute and damage or destroy the environment. There are very few natural coves remaining that offer such natural beauty. Please allow that to remain for the future generations to enjoy. (Linda Spencer)

Response: See response to Comment 21.

23. Parcel #257 is currently under natural resource conservation. It should remain such in perpetuity and should under no circumstances be developed. It is noted that a marina development is proposed. My family and I are in absolute opposition as this would destroy a beautiful natural resource. (Alexander Solomon)

Response: See response to Comment 21.

24. Allocation A Panel 1, designates Parcel 257 (Godsey Hollow) as zone 4 "Natural Resource Conservation" a developer owning adjacent property (Parcel 256) is requesting a change to allow for a potential marina development. We believe this would be detrimental to the wildlife on the lake. This cove contains numerous wildlife, waterfowl, and birds (Bats, Osprey, Geese, Ducks, Kingfishers, Blue Heron and Eagles). TVA should allow this cove [to] remain a Natural Resource Conservation area and not reclassify to allow a marina. (Paul Bartizal, Tim Gultrie, Jim Baldin, and William E. Barber)

Response: See response to Comment 21.

***Parcel 297 and 298 - Lowe Branch***

25. Parcel 297 at Lowe Branch should be allocated to Zone 4, rather than to Zone 5. Creating an industrial park on this large parcel would render that land forever unusable by the public. (Dave Reichle)

Response: As a part of TVA's broad regional resource development mission, TVA reservoir properties are managed to provide multiple public benefits, including recreation, conservation, and industrial development. In reservoir land management plans, TVA allocates parcels for industrial development and conservation. TVA recognizes the importance of striking a balance among the competing demands placed on the land and water resources.

26. Parcels 297 and 298 are all I can see from my lake home. We bought here because of the natural beauty and wild life from our home. The land needs to stay zoned Natural Resource Conservation. The last thing Watts Bar Lake needs is another water polluting industrial site on the lake. The Lowe branch area is a well known nesting area for the Great Blue Heron an industrial site here would destroy their habitat. It is common to see

Bald Eagles and Osprey soaring over the branch looking for food. Industrial development in this area would destroy all of this. Recreation would be hurt with added pollution. (Ted Hitchens)

Response: See response to Comment 25.

27. The proposed Barge Depot near the dam is opposed by every resident I know, and accepted only by residents that do not own or live on property on the lake. (Charles McCrosson)

Response: See response to Comment 25.

28. I am a resident of the Lowe's Branch area. Parcels 297 and 298 should not be changed to commercial and industrial but remain as natural resource conservation. This is a beautiful area and industry would just mess it up and we do not need the industry in the area. (Bran Hickman)

Response: See response to Comment 25.

29. I live at Saber Hill. There on that Parcel 297 and 298 that they've got zoned commercial and possibly making a barge terminal there, if they make barges and everything there, we live in that little area that when we look across the lake then the barges are all we're going to be able to see. That's our main exit going out to the river and to the dam there at Lowe's Branch. ....But that was our concern because now when the barges go up and down the river, evidently they'll spill a lot of diesel fuel or oil or something and then they back the water up and it just comes all around our dock, just greasy stuff floating on top of the water. I came in the other night, and quick as I lifted my boat up out of the water, I had to wash it because it just had a greasy film on it. We live at the end of the slue and when they back it up, there's no other way for the water to go out except going back to the dam. That's our concern, is if they put in a barge *[terminal]* over there and everything, it's going to ruin our property on account of the small area that it's in and maybe block the area -- I don't want to see them do it. I've lived there for ten years. It's been natural wood area and all that in there ever since I've been there and I hate to see them put industry and all that and a barge *[terminal]* and everything right where we have to go by them every time we go out to the river. I just don't want to see them do it. I think it will ruin that area. I think below the dam where there are not so many houses they could probably put a *[terminal]* instead of putting it right there where there's a lot of houses in that small area and everyone is going to have to go in and out past the barges every time they go to the river. (Wayne McNeese)

Response: See response to Comment 25.

30. I have waterfront property along with about 30 or 40 other families. I respectfully have my concerns about these two parcels, number 297 and number 298. We do not want a barge facility in this zone. My family and 30 or more other families live on waterfront homes that look directly at these two zones. Further, using these two zones as a barge facility would be an injustice to the tax-paying families *[who]* would be affected by TVA's endeavors. We do not want increased amounts of oil slicks washing into our docks. We do not want the fears that our children cannot swim in the area due to poor water quality. We do not want the integrity of God's creation taken from us as to have to look at barges from our houses and docks as we go about our daily life. (Wendell L. Phillips)

Response: See response to Comment 25.

31. Parcel 297 at Lowe Branch should be allocated to Zone 4, rather than to Zone 5. Creating an industrial park on this large parcel would render that land forever unusable by the public. (Carol A. Grametbauer, Chance Finegan - The Campus Greens, Ruth K. Young, Dave Reichle, Barbara A. Walton, Natalie Pheasant, Ken Shepard and Mary Collins-Shepard, Sandra K. Goss - Tennessee Citizens for Wilderness Planning (TCWP), and Frank Hensley)

Response: Comment noted.

32. I support the request from TWRA for transfer of parcels 295, 297, 298, and 299 for inclusion in the WMA (Wildlife Management Area) program as a contiguous tract of land. (Jerry Poe)

Response: Comment noted.

33. Please do not let parcels 295 to 299 be used for industrial/commercial use. This is an area across from over 70 homes in a compact area of Lowe Branch (ours is one of these). All four Parcels 295, 297, 298, 299 should be kept as natural conservation and informal recreation areas. We urge you to consider a less populated area for commercial/industrial use. (Joe Ferguson)

Response: Comment noted.

34. There is adequate land for a barge facility in Parcel 298 and an access road could be built on the edge of Parcel 297 to Route 68. (Sandra K. Goss - TCWP)

Response: Comment noted.

35. We note that 92 acres of existing industrial sites (Zone 5) would still be part of Modified C. Barge terminals and marinas should be properly sited to protect the reservoir resource function. (Heinz J. Mueller - EPA)

Response: Comment noted.

***Parcel 240 - Arrowhead***

36. We oppose the allocation of Parcel 240 (Arrow Head Resort) to Zone 6 Recreation. (Regina Batuk, Tom Okulczyk, and Daniel R. Funk)

Response: Comment noted. Parcel 240 was planned in the 1988 Plan and allocated as commercial recreation. This was done in order to allow for potential expansion of recreation facilities on the adjacent private land. In the 2005 DEIS, TVA proposed to allocate Parcel 240 to Zone 6 - Developed Recreation under Alternatives B and C to support the expansion of Arrowhead Marina. However, because of the lack of interest by Arrowhead Marina, public comments, and occurrence of other developed recreation in the area, TVA now proposes to allocate Parcel 240 to Zone 4 - Natural Resource Conservation.

37. The Parcel [*Parcel 240*] appears to be a migratory "stopping point" for at least 2 varieties of vultures. During the Fall I've seen hundreds of vultures perched in the trees and browsing on the shoreline. (Tom Okulczyk)

Response: Black and turkey vultures are common in the Watts Bar Reservoir area and often gather in large flocks, especially in the fall and spring of the year.

38. The shoreline [*Parcel 240*] has many fallen trees that bass fishermen love to fish - nearly 9 month of the year. During the spring months the crappie fishing is outstanding. (Tom Okulczyk)

Response: Comment noted.

39. Ducks nest on that property [*Parcel 240*] and are in the cove year around. I've seen wood ducks on the shore of the property but haven't seen nests. (Tom Okulczyk)

Response: Wood ducks typically nest in tree cavities or artificial nesting boxes with a minimum 4-inch-diameter hole opening and use many shoreline areas on Watts Bar Reservoir for brood-rearing habitat.

40. I've seen Bald Eagles perched in trees on the property [*Parcel 240*]. (Tom Okulczyk)

Response: Bald eagles currently have several nests in the Watts Bar Reservoir area and forage or roost in many places along the shoreline.

41. A campground will destroy this sensitive area [*Parcel 240*] and significant[ly] impact adjacent property owners. (Tom Okulczyk)

Response: Further environmental review would take place for any future activity proposed on Parcel 240.

42. Arrowhead Resort was allowed to use this property [*Parcel 240*] as a campground over 20 years ago and it was a disaster for surrounding landowners. Most weekends there were very loud intoxicated campers keeping everyone else up. My parents did not allow us to stay outside because of foul language echoing across the water. This also caused increased boat traffic in the cove the property is located on making it more dangerous for swimmers. TVA managed campgrounds have no alcohol policies and make sure that campers keep the sound levels low at night. That is not the case with a commercial campground. I now have children and do not want them to be endangered or subjected to the environment that was present in the past when Arrowhead controlled Parcel 240. (Daniel R. Funk)

Response: Comment noted.

43. I'm also opposed to the allocation of parcel 240 to Arrowhead Resort for the following reasons. The area is a haven for wildlife. I have observed deer, bald eagles, vultures, piliated woodpeckers and turtles. The waters in the area attract fishermen for crappies and bass. (Gail Okulczyk)

Response: Comment noted.

44. Arrowhead is a good neighbor, but the development of a campground by them in that area would eliminate the noise buffer that Parcel 240 provides. Development of a campground would devalue my property due to increased water traffic, litter, and noise. I'm requesting that TVA reallocate parcel 240 as a natural, undeveloped area. (Gail Okulczyk)

Response: Comment noted. Further environmental review would take place for any activity proposed on Parcel 240.

45. Residents of Apollo Shores have signed a petition in opposition of Watts Bar Parcel 240 turnover to Arrowhead Resort and I'll be submitting that with this revised draft EIS. (Gail Okulczyk)

Response: In September 2006, TVA received a petition from a total of 122 residents of Apollo Shores opposing the turnover of Parcel 240 to Arrowhead Marina for commercial recreation use.

***Spring City Boat Dock***

46. I live close to the Spring City Boat Dock and I have been very upset by the way that the Spring City Commissioners have allowed unauthorized development there. I have lived in Rhea Co most of my life and my family and I have fished and boated on Watts Bar Lake for years. My dad is now 75 years old and in declining health. He is no longer able to boat, but dearly loves bank fishing. Once the land has been turned over to private developers, there is no turning back. (Belinda McCampbell)

Response: TVA is working with Spring City officials to resolve issues that have been identified by concerned citizens. There is a Tennessee Wildlife Resource Agency (TWRA) fishing pier on site that may be used by, and will remain open to, the public.

***Parcel 219 - Rockwood***

47. The City of Rockwood is requesting TVA approval of a lease for a marina and restaurant on city owned parcel 219 zoned for developed recreation use. The city will also request similar approval for adjoining parcel 218 (same zone 6) approval is vital for the future of Rockwood and the Southwest portion of Roane County. (Concerned Citizen)

Response: Comment noted. The city does not own Parcel 219; however, it has a license to use the parcel for public recreation. The city does own the adjoining back-lying property.

48. Although a formal proposal for development of the Rockwood City property has not been presented as of this date. I have a few comments in the event a formal proposal is received by TVA. The cove adjacent to "Tom Fuller Park" is inhabited by Homeowners who for the most part have been residents and good stewards of the land for over 25 years. The land is kept pristine and the neighborhood is tranquil. I support the development, however I have two concerns: (1) a walking path "through the back yards would destroy the integrity of the neighborhood. No one wants a public thorough fare off their back porch. (2) If a marina is constructed on very close proximity - the homeowner should be allowed boat docks also. (Ron Higgs)

Response: Comment noted.

**Thief Neck and Goat Island**

49. Leave Thief Neck and Goat Island as they are - Sensitive Resource Management and a natural resource. (James McNabb and Debra Liafsha)

Response: Comment noted. Under both Action Alternatives B and C, Thief Neck Island is allocated for Zone 3 (Sensitive Resource Management) and Goat Island as Zone 4 (Natural Resource Management).

**Parcels 142-146 - Former Clinch River Breeder Reactor Site**

50. The previously disturbed site on parcel 145, along with 133 contiguous acres from parcel 142 for a total of 378 acres provide an excellent industrial site and should be allocated to Zone 5. The two mile riparian area from the road to the river (100 acres of parcel 145) should be Zone 3 so important wildlife habitat can be preserved as well as water quality. There are 350 acres, the remainder of parcel 142 and all of parcel 143, which should be Zone 4. This will provide habitat for wildlife including turkeys and deer and deep forest habitat for migratory birds. It also provides deer and turkey hunting opportunities. These parcels are contiguous with a forest on the DOE reservation as well as the Grassy Creek habitat protection area (parcel 146) and the 2.2 mile riparian area of parcel 144, thus extending protected habitat from the deep forest to the water's edge. This also provides a buffer for the DOE security training range located near the DOE/Breeder Site Boundary. The 265 acre Grassy Creek habitat protection area (parcel 146) should be a natural area as TVA has proposed. In addition, approximately 30 acres (less a narrow strip for access to industrial property) of parcel 145 should be added to the west end of parcel 146 since this is a very steep slope and would not be desirable for any type of industry. Parcel 144 is proposed as Zone 3 as it should be. This is a 2.2 mile riparian area that is very important for wildlife, as well as water quality. Another consideration that should be given to the allocation of breeder site land is the fact that if a nuclear type facility is located here, large buffer zones are very important. The allocations described above would surround any new facility by a buffer zone. (Carol A. Grametbauer, Chance Finegan - The Campus Greens, Ruth K. Young, Dave Reichle, Barbara A. Walton, Natalie Pheasant, Ken Shepard and Mary Collins-Shepard, Sandra K. Goss - TCWP, Axel C. Ringe - Sierra Club, and Frank Hensley)

Response: TVA has reviewed the proposed land use allocation strategy submitted by the Tennessee Citizens for Wilderness Planning. TVA agrees that buffers are an important aspect in resource management and proposes to add an additional Zone 3 (Sensitive Resource Management) buffer area adjacent to Parcel 145 along the shoreline in Alternative B. This buffer would incorporate wetlands, cultural resources, and floodplains. TVA would, however, consider allowing potential development on Parcel 145 to access the water through a future corridor through the buffer, in compliance with the TVA Land Policy supporting industrial development with a preference for water-based access. This water access for future industry would be determined during the subsequent environmental review process that would occur should an industry request the use of this property.

In Alternative A, TVA continues to support the allocation of Parcels 142, 143, and 145 for industrial development. In Alternative B, these parcels are proposed for allocation to Zone 2 (Project Operations) to support future TVA projects and facilities.

Alternatives B and C would add over 100 acres to the Grassy Creek Habitat Protection Area. The corridor from Bear Creek Road is the only access to the former Clinch River Breeder Reactor site and needs to be wide enough for future transportation facilities' proposals to support the use of the site. The buffer described in the response to Comment 50 would include some of the 30 acres mentioned for inclusion with Parcel 146.

51. I encourage TVA to designate most of parcels 145, 142, and 143 as zone 4 to provide for wildlife habitat, water quality, and maintain a natural area for future generations. It seems sensible to have the parcels 142 and 143 between the Grassy Creek Habitat Protection Area and the river designated as zone 4. The disturbed breeder reactor site and some of the surrounding area totaling 378 acres could still be suitable for industrial development. It is very important to maintain the riparian areas for wildlife as zone 3. (Joan Nelson)

Response: Comment noted. See response to Comment 50.

#### **Other Parcels**

52. We commend TVA for the following allocations:
- Zone 3 allocations, under both Alternatives B and C, for Parcel 238, the Whites Creek Small Wild Area (SWA), and for Parcel 237, listed as "Proposed addition to Whites Creek SWA to support trail expansion."
  - The new Habitat Protection Area designation for the Whites Creek Alluvial Deposit Forest, at the upper end of Parcel 233.
  - Zone 4 allocations for Parcels 224 and 226 and Zone 3 for Parcel 223.
  - Zone 6 allocation for the Meigs County Park (Parcel 5).

(Carol A. Grametbauer, Chance Finegan - The Campus Greens, Ruth K. Young, Dave Reichle, Barbara A. Walton, Natalie Pheasant, Ken Shepard and Mary Collins-Shepard, Sandra K. Goss - TCWP, and Frank Hensley)

Response: Comment noted.

#### **Managed Areas**

53. *[In the 2007 DEIS] Page 58, Section 3.4.6 Oak Ridge Reservation, line 3 - The current size of the Department of Energy (DOE) Oak Ridge Reservation (ORR) is approximately 33,718 acres. [In the 2007 DEIS] Page 73, Section 3.8.1, third paragraph, line 7 - The acreage cited for the DOE ORR property adjacent to TVA public lands is not accurate. The current size of the ORR is approximately 33,718 acres. (Gary Hartman - DOE)*

Response: The Oak Ridge Reservation acreages given in Sections 3.4.6 and 3.8.1 of the 2007 DEIS were rounded up to 34,000 acres. The actual acreage of 33,718 acres is used in the FEIS.

#### **Boating Safety**

54. There are enough safety issues on the lake now--I can't tell you how many reckless incidents we see from our dock on a weekly basis. Please do not release land for further

development. If you want to push an agenda, back TWRA in mandatory boating safety courses in order to operate a boat. Only after TWRA is given the legislation they need to increase boating safety would I back a move to release land for development and substantially increase the traffic on the lake--particularly around Watt's Bar. (Mrs. Dale D. Powers - Diocese of Knoxville)

Response: Recreational boating safety requirements, responsibilities, and legislation are a responsibility of the states. TVA does cooperate with state agencies and has an agreement with the fish and wildlife agencies in Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, and Kentucky to share law enforcement responsibilities for recreational boating on the Tennessee River Waterway and tributaries. At the federal level, TVA and the U.S. Coast Guard both share enforcement responsibilities on the Tennessee River for commercial safety.

In Tennessee, legislation was passed a few years ago that requires individuals born after January 1, 1987, to take a mandatory boating safety course before they can legally operate some recreational boats, and there are similar laws in several other Valley states. Violators of these laws can be prosecuted.

Because the TWRA and the TVA Police cannot be in all locations all the time, TVA would urge you to report unsafe boating activity when you observe it to local law enforcement, TWRA, or the TVA Police.

### **NEPA and Alternatives**

55. TVA should have had copies of the DEIS available at the [public] meeting, or at least extra copies of the maps for folks to take with them. (Iris D. Shelton)

Response: Copies of the DEIS and maps were available on request at the meeting.

56. This is a very well written document and I appreciate the information provided in it. Please mail me the final EIS and ROD when complete. (Iris D. Shelton)

Response: Comment noted.

57. The meeting for public comment is a good thing, everyone was helpful. (Debra Liafsha)

Response: Comment noted.

58. I think TVA has done a remarkable job on this project and kept everyone informed about what is happening with the land policy. (Anonymous)

Response: Comment noted.

59. Do we need to go to the public meeting to make a comment on the alternatives? (William J. Johnson)

Response: Mr. Johnson was informed that there were several ways to make a comment on any part of the DEIS and Land Plan.

60. It is therefore unclear why Table 2.2-1 (pg. 34) depicting allocations for the modified alternatives shows more land (92 ac) in Zone 5 for Modified C than Table 2.1-1 (pg. 18) depicting the original Alternative C shows (52 ac). Although not significantly different, the final EIS (FEIS) should discuss this. (Heinz J. Mueller - EPA)

Response: The increase in acreage for Zone 5 was from the correction of an error in the original 2005 DEIS and was included as part of the discussion of changes to the 2005 Plan in Section 1.3.3. It will also appear in the FEIS.

61. EPA and other resource agencies previously provided NEPA comments on the TVA EIS for the 2005 Plan. In addition to EPA, page 14 indicates that U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency (TWRA) and Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation (TDEC) all favored Alternative C. EPA also recommended a hybrid or blended alternative between the development (B) and conservation (C) extremes, which was acknowledged in the present EIS (pg. 14). Despite the resource agencies' position on the original 2005 Land Plan and acknowledgement that Modified C is the "environmentally preferred" alternative (pg. 38), we note that TVA continues to prefer Modified B similar to its selection of Alternative B in the 2005 EIS. However, we appreciate the present modification toward increased allocation of lands for conservation in Modified B and assume that in part it was made in response to the agency selection of Alternative C. We are also aware of TVA's mandate to balance the environment with industrial and economic development in the Valley (pg. 1), which would favor Modified B over C. (Heinz J. Mueller - EPA)

Response: Comment noted.

62. We rate this DEIS as "EC-1" (Environmental Concerns, some additional information requested). While we find that both Modified B and C have areas of environmental improvement over the original 2005 Land Plan, we prefer Modified C. This alternative would provide an important public land buffer for ongoing private land development around the Watts Bar Reservoir for wildlife habitat and reservoir water quality benefit. (Heinz J. Mueller - EPA)

Response: Comment noted.

63. The present EIS is said to "amend" the 2005 EIS. Editorially, the NEPA term that is used in such instances is to "supplement" the original EIS, i.e., a "Supplemental EIS" rather than an "Amended EIS" is produced. Also relating to NEPA, it is unclear why the No Action Alternative would still use the 1988 Land Plan if selected as opposed to the 2005 Land Plan since that plan has recently undergone the NEPA process (even though it is being amended by the present EIS). (Heinz J. Mueller - EPA)

Response: Comment noted. The 2005 Land Plan was not completed or formally adopted, and thus the 1988 Land Plan remains the No Action Alternative.

### **Alternative C**

64. We support the Modified Alternative C which has the most TVA land allocated for natural resource conservation and the least land allocated for economic development. (Gail Okulczyk, David Reister - Conservation Chair of the Harvey Broome Group of the Sierra Club, Axel C. Ringe - Sierra Club, William Johnson, Rhonda Bogard, Iris D. Shelton, and two Anonymous Commenters)

Response: Comment noted.

65. We find that both Modified B and C alternatives are environmentally more attractive than the original B and C, with Modified C still providing the most overall protection for the environment. Modified C's correlation with less development reduces impacts to wetlands, aquatics, shorelines, riparian vegetation, terrestrial areas and other natural habitat as well as minimizing air and noise emissions. Sensitive habitat areas that would be protected include the former Clinch River Breeder Reactor site in Zones 3 or 4 (pg. 108) as a wildlife corridor. Accordingly, EPA continues to prefer the benefits of Alternative C and now Modified C. (Heinz J. Mueller - EPA)

Response: Comment noted.

66. The Tennessee Wildlife Resource Agency recommends and supports Modified Alternative C - Modified Conservation and Recreation. It is our opinion that the public and the natural resources of the state would benefit the most if this alternative were chosen. Outdoor recreational opportunities would be expanded under this alternative, impacts on prime farmlands would be no greater than with either of the other alternatives, the greatest benefit to rare aquatic and terrestrial species would likely occur under Modified Alternative C, water quality would be maintained under this alternative, and potential impacts to archaeological resources would be insignificant under Modified Alternative C. (Robert M. Todd -TWRA)

Response: Comment noted.

67. I believe we need to appropriately manage our resources for generations to come and Alternative C does the best job of protecting land and providing recreational activity to the public. (Rhonda Bogard)

Response: Comment noted.

68. To me if you don't develop the area like in Plan C, you can always develop it later if you need to. If you go with one of the other plans and you overdevelop it now, then we won't ever go back and reclaim from houses or run down factories. So to me it's better to lock it up and in years to come redo another impact study and develop it then if we need it. If you don't it, let it lay. (William Johnson)

Response: Comment noted.

69. We believe this Alternative C to be most consistent with the TVA Board's Land Management Policy, which responded to the overwhelming public call for no sales of TVA public land for private development. (Axel C. Ringe - Sierra Club)

Response: Comment noted.

***Blend of Alternatives B and C***

70. The Clinch River Breeder Reactor site should be an amalgam of Alternatives B and C. (Natalie Pheasant, Dave Reichle, Ken Shepard and Mary Collins-Shepard, Ruth K. Young, Chance Finegan - The Campus Green, Carol A. Grametbauer, Sandra K. Goss-TCWP, and Barbara A. Walton)

Response: Please see the response to Comment 50 where additional buffers are proposed for Parcel 145 in Alternative B. Note: the map and description the proposal provided by these commenters appears in Appendix D of the FEIS.

71. If Modified C in association with Section 26a permitting would not adequately satisfy the TVA mandate, we alternatively suggest consideration of a hybrid or blended alternative that would allocate more lands for industrial development (Zone 5) than in Modified C but less than in Modified B (i.e., more than 92 ac but notably less than 1,253 ac). We further suggest that such development be limited to light industry that depends on water access and has some environmental benefit such as barge terminals. (Heinz J. Mueller - EPA)

Response: Comment noted.

**Alternative B**

72. I support Alternative B, which has a more balanced plan. (Michael Atchison, Jim/Judy Callen, David Peterson, and Mark Tummons - TDED)

Response: Comment noted.

73. The Oak Ridge Chamber of Commerce and Oak Ridge Economic Partnership recommend serious consideration be given to adopting the Modified Development and Recreation Plan (Modified Alternative B.) The plan would provide for continued industrial development in the areas currently designated for industrial development, permitting TVA to continue its mission to encourage economic development in the Tennessee Valley. (Greta Stoutt Ownby - ORCC and Kim K. Denton - OREP)

Response: Comment noted.

74. I am in favor of restricting TVA property to be used mainly as public property, some industrial, and no residential development. (Belinda McCampbell)

Response: Comment noted.

**Other Comments**

75. I have previously written to your Athens Office but get no reply. Throughout the year - Spring to present -- military helicopter exercises have been landing on Long Island in Watts Bar. Is TWRA aware that this occurred during nesting season for water fowl? And it continues through hunting season. Who has given them permission for this and why? (Dave Reichle)

Response: Comment noted. TVA has no knowledge of military exercises taking place on Long Island. We have informed TWRA who manages the property for waterfowl.

76. Look into the impact on Rhea County schools in regards to Watts Bar Nuclear Plant Unit II. They are already stretch[ed] way too thin! (Jim/Judy Callen)

Response: This has been addressed in the FEIS issued by TVA in 2007 for the completion of Watts Bar Nuclear Plant Unit 2.

77. The Department of the Interior has reviewed the Amended Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Watts Bar Reservoir Land Management Plan and has no comments to provide for your consideration. (Gregory Hogue - U.S. Department of the Interior)

Response: Comment noted.

78. In Appendix C, comments were incorrectly attributed and we ask that the attributions be corrected as follows: TCWP commented on the Fingers Area, page 277. (Sandra K. Goss -TCWP)

Response: Appendix C has been corrected in the FEIS.

#### Lake Levels

79. I have yet to understand why Watts Bar Lake is sacrificed for other areas. An example is the lake levels. Other lake levels have been dropped an average of 1 to 5 inches but Watts Bar Lake is dropped 15 to 18 inches. So far that many of us have not been able to use our boats most of this summer season, we can't get them away from the dock! Can this be explained to us? (Charles McCrosson)

Response: See the operating guide at [http://www.tva.com/river/lakeinfo/op\\_guides/wattsbar.htm](http://www.tva.com/river/lakeinfo/op_guides/wattsbar.htm) for information about TVA's river operations and lake levels. Watts Bar Reservoir has been within its summer operating range of 740-741 feet above sea level for most of the summer of 2007.

80. In my prior correspondence I mentioned "Lake Levels" as an example. You responded that the levels had been kept as originally stated between 740 and 741 feet above sea level. Unfortunately you have been misled. Given poor information! The levels have fluctuated drastically during every 24 hours. At night levels are raised, readings are taken during the night and/or early morning, during the day the levels are dropped. On August 30, 2007 the reported "Watts Bar Lake Level" was 739.7. That is below the 741 and 740 stated but it drops much further during the day, as much as 7 to 12 inches and then brought back!! If support to these facts is necessary I have many persons that will verify my statements. Those persons providing you necessary information that you might respond to property owners correspondence and concerned others need to provide you with real facts that your statements are accurate. Failure to offer real facts puts a possible "Taint" on any future issue or statement! I am sure you as a professional realize the merit in this statement. I would appreciate a notification of any future open meetings on these issues that I might try to attend, now that you have my e-mail address. I would appreciate your looking into my claim with regard to lake levels and respond to my statements. It would do a lot for your credibility and that of TVA. I will share your words with others of similar concern. (Charles McCrosson)

Response: Please see the response to Comment 82. The reported Watts Bar Lake Level was 739.7 on August 30, 2007, which was slightly below the operating level of 740. This could have occurred for several reasons. Because Watts Bar is a very large reservoir, it is normal for minor fluctuations to occur along the reservoir, as with any large body of moving water. A variance of several inches at any point on a reservoir would not be uncommon as water moves through the system from multiple sources. There can be minor fluctuations in water levels to maintain minimum flows on other reservoirs, which are

required on the Tennessee River system to ensure sensitive aquatic habitats, public and industrial water supplies, and navigation. Furthermore, the Tennessee Valley region has experienced a severe drought, and there have been some further fluctuations and lower levels in the tributary reservoirs to ensure the minimum flows.

81. Since I live 2 miles below Melton Hill Dam, I have trouble with the water rising so much. When they had me riprap my place -- from the elevation, they had me riprap it to elevation 743 and now when they're using two generators, it gets to about 744 elevation. It's a foot above my riprap. I wondered if there are any plans in the future to not bring it up so high. Five years ago, it didn't run that high and now it does. (William Johnson)

Response: There are no plans at this time to alter the way Melton Hill Dam is operated. Typically, TVA staff permits riprap to extend 2 feet above normal summer pool elevation. On Watts Bar Reservoir, the normal summer pool is the 741-foot-contour elevation. Please feel free to contact the Watts Bar-Clinch Watershed Team to discuss your situation.

82. I know we went to the line meeting when they was going to change the level of the water, filling it up in March -- I mean instead of April 15 having if full, they went to May 15 and they had a meeting there in Spring City. TVA wanted to hear everything everybody had to say and all the ones that -- Arrowhead and all of them that owned the fishing camps and everything down there was against it, but they had their mind made up before we got there because they told us what they was going to do. They didn't want to hear [our] side of it. We didn't even get to speak. (Wayne McNeese)

Response: Comment noted.

83. Why can't TVA consider keeping the water level higher for fall, just by weeks would help out marina's, and people who live in the many coves near Watts Bar Lake? (Charles Romeo)

Response: This issue was addressed in the Reservoir Operations Study (see TVA's Web site [http://www.tva.gov/environment/reports/ros\\_eis/](http://www.tva.gov/environment/reports/ros_eis/).) As a result of the study, TVA did not change the time of the winter drawdown on Watts Bar Reservoir, which begins on November 1 and is typically at its winter operating zone by November 30. However, the spring fill was adjusted. Weather permitting, the reservoir will fill halfway during the first week of April. The remaining half will fill over a five-week period by May 15.

### **Public Lands and Stewardship**

84. The lake should be accessible to the people. (Belinda McCampbell)

Response: Comment noted.

85. Please do not allow further commercial development along the lakefront. Single family homes are ok. Do not allow campgrounds to expand into TVA land. Boy Scout camps, girl scouts should be an exception. (John Kueck)

Response: TVA has no control over the commercial or residential development of private property. TVA does have control over the development of its own

property. The TVA Board of Directors has adopted the TVA Land Policy, which describes the types of uses permissible on TVA land; see the discussion in Section 1.2 and the TVA Land Policy in Appendix A of the FEIS.

86. I was unable to travel to Harriman for the meeting at Roane State, but would be greatly concerned about further blocks of land being released by TVA for development. (Mrs. Dale D. Powers, Diocese of Knoxville)

Response: Comment noted.

87. No industrial development on Watts Bar please. (Eugene F. Corcoran, Jr.)

Response: Comment noted.

88. I would like to see that TVA did not allow any development in the Zone 6 - Developed Recreation areas, where there can be a spill like a marina, where there can be a fire like a marina, where there could be a spill like light industrial, or parking lots where you can have runoff into the water unless it's in an area that can be contained like a bay. I don't want to see them build any marinas or light industrial on the main channel of the Tennessee River or Watts Bar Lake. If it's in a cove, it's fine because it can be contained, any problems can contained. (William Wright)

Response: Zone 6 parcels are allocated for commercial or public recreation use in the land planning process. A majority (1,407 of the 1,621 acres being considered for Zone 6 in the preferred alternative) of the land designated for Zone 6 on Watts Bar is already committed for use with an existing land agreement. That is, the majority of the Zone 6 lands (1,407 acres) will not change from the current use.

89. I appreciate your information and am very aware that TVA is seeking input for their future plans with regard to lake usage. I must again state that industrial usage of the Watts Bar Lake area is not in the best interest of the property owners around this lake. I can only hope that our concerns will be considered prior to any final decision on lake usage. We, owners of property along the lake, sportsmen, frequent visitors and users of Watts Bar Lake are totally against industrial usage of Watts Bar Lake. I don't think I can put it any simpler nor clearer! We love our lake. We fear that the pollution, safety hazards, our views from our properties, values, all *[will]* be harmed and with little concern of those responsible for the industry nor by those who manage the lake operations. (Charles McCrosson)

Response: Comment noted.

90. The beauty and wildlife has been encroached upon by land development enough already. Further development *[will]* only detract from this resource! (Anonymous)

Response: Comment noted.

91. Do not allow Watts Bar *[to]* be overdeveloped like Tellico has become. The main beauty of Watts Bar is the natural shores. (Anonymous)

Response: Comment noted.

92. Do not sell anymore TVA lake frontage! The more undeveloped land on Watts Bar Lake the better. (Debra Liafsha)

Response: Comment noted.

93. Thanks to the board for freezing the areas for natural use. (Anonymous)

Response: Comment noted.

94. TVA couldn't be more wrong. Citizens of the State of Tennessee do want more access to home building sites on the unused shores of lakes managed by the Tennessee Valley Authority. Lake front home ownership is a dream of many Tennesseans and TVA needs to open much more property up to private home ownership and enjoyment. TVA took these lands from Tennesseans for development and now TVA wants to deny development opportunities to homeowners? I owned a home on Boone Lake in Washington County, and I know well the joys of lake front living. However, when I moved to Chattanooga in 1998, my wife and I quickly found that we could not approach affording a similar residence on Chickamauga Lake. Lake front living is celebrated in other parts of this country. TVA should not be putting a stop to further residential development on TVA lakes, especially when it says it wants to substitute residential development with industrial development. (Stan Boyd)

Response: The TVA Land Policy does not support the use of TVA land for residential development. Approximately 47 percent of the shoreline along Watts Bar Reservoir is zoned for Shoreline Access to support back-lying residential development. TVA estimates that only 20 percent of shoreline on Watts Bar currently has back-lying residential or is platted for future residential development. This leaves approximately 27 percent of shoreline open for access in the future.

95. I know that a great deal of work on TVA's part has been done in looking at the best for the properties around Watts Bar Lake. I am a native of the area and can see that over the course of TVA managing these properties, it has become a natural habitat to much wildlife. Development has a way of destroying that. (Linda Spencer)

Response: Comment noted.

96. Regardless of a preference for Modified B or C, it is unclear why TVA public lands should be offered for private sale (other than revenue) in either alternative since considerable private shorelands are already in private ownership along the Watts Bar Reservoir (Figure 1.1-1). Moreover, the DEIS indicates that such private lands are rapidly being developed, that the local growth rate is growing faster than that of the state and nation (pg. S-5), and that only 3.7 % of the land in the State of Tennessee is public (pg. 100) and only about 11 % of the lands along the reservoir shoreline are TVA public lands (pg. S-4). TVA public lands along Watts Bar Reservoir, which primarily have a conservation and recreation use, serve to buffer the reservoir from ongoing private development in the watershed. Moreover, TVA could continue to encourage its mandate for economic development by regulating private shoreline development along the Watts Bar Reservoir through its Section 26a permitting process. That is, TVA could allocate

more lands to conservation (Modified C) and still promote economic development at sustainable levels through its Section 26a permitting process for shoreline construction of private lands. (Heinz J. Mueller - EPA)

Response: According to the 2006 TVA Land Policy, only a limited amount of land would be designated for potential industrial use through private ownership. Land made available for future recreation uses would have easements or license agreements for that specific purpose.

97. It is time to strike that balance between economic development and environmental protection that is always paid lip service to by government and industry and make a decision that is in the best interests of the land, the water, and the affected communities for the long term rather than the quick economic gain for the short term. (Axel C. Ringe - Sierra Club)

Response: Comment noted.

98. It would be a real tragedy to allow more development in this and surrounding areas. It would add more activity, noise and stress to the now quiet community of land owners along TVA's Watts Bar Lake area. It would also make more boat traffic making the lake less safe. There are too many developments now! Bigger is not better. We bought our land for solitude, not to become apart of a village by the sea. Please respect our input and do not open up this land. There are already many parks and boating places that visitors can enjoy because of our TVA public land. Please continue to allow this, rather than sell out and make it commercialized. That will detract from what we have come to love about this area of East TN. Please refer back to the survey of the East Tennessee people that were overwhelmingly opposed to selling TVA land to developers. They are motivated by greed rather than what's best for the land owners. And please do not give into them or politicians, who should remember that elected politicians are suppose to represent the wishes of the people that elected them, not to be motivated by money or bend to special interest groups. (Nancy Powers Stutts, Barry, Dustin, and Misty Stutts)

Response: In November 2006, TVA finalized a new land policy governing planning, disposal, and retention of lands owned and managed by the agency. This policy was written with much public input and was designed to help TVA manage its lands to protect the integrated operation of the TVA reservoir and power systems, to provide for appropriate public use and recreation of the reservoir system, and to provide for continuing economic growth in the Valley. TVA will no longer dispose of public land for private residential development. Under certain conditions, TVA will continue to support the economy through the disposal of land for industrial development when there is a public benefit.

99. It has come to my attention that TVA is being approached by counties in the Watts Bar Lake area trying to get land for developing. As a land owner in the Lake Wood Village community I am adamantly opposed. The joy of having the property on the lake is to get away from the crowded busy life of the city, and enjoy the solitude of the country, wildlife and water activities. It has always been a place of refuge for me and my family, ever since I was a child. And now my children, and 4th generations in our family are enjoying the inner peace and sense of renewal obtained from even a weekend spent at Watts Bar Lake. We've even spent many family vacations and reunions there, instead of traveling

to the beach and spending our money out of state. (Nancy Powers Stutts, Barry, Dustin, and Misty Stutts)

Response: See the response to Comment 98.

100. PLEASE do not release land for further development. (Mrs. Dale D. Powers - Diocese of Knoxville)

Response: Comment noted.

### Recreation

101. Very concerned about the sewage in the Blue Springs area from the large boats. (Diane Bowman)

Response: Water quality in Watts Bar Reservoir is described in Sections 3.5 and 4.5 of the FEIS. TVA monitors reservoir health through a variety of indicators including fish tissue and bacterial levels. There were 20 bacteriological monitoring sites on Watts Bar during 2006. Many of these sites were located at highly used recreational areas. The Blue Springs area was not one of the specific sites sampled in 2006. TDEC has authority to issue bodily contact advisories. Currently, there are no state advisories against swimming in Watts Bar Reservoir. Please visit [www.tva.gov](http://www.tva.gov) for additional information on reservoir health ratings for Watts Bar.

Specifically for sewage, reservoirs in Tennessee are designated by TDEC as either a 'discharge' reservoir (where vessels may discharge properly treated sewage overboard), or a 'no-discharge' reservoir (where no sewage, treated or untreated, may be discharged overboard). Watts Bar is a 'discharge' reservoir. Therefore, discharge into public waters is restricted to wastes treated by a Type I or II U.S. Coast Guard-approved marine sanitation device.

TWRA and TVA Police have enforcement rights over boating vessels with regard to sewage discharge. Both agencies perform patrols of reservoir areas. If you suspect illegal sewage discharges, please report them to TWRA at 1-800-332-0900. Please record the boat registration number and report vessels suspected to be dumping sewage or solid waste.

TVA and TWRA along with the Coast Guard Auxiliary also conduct an annual clean boating campaign outreach to boaters. During this campaign, vessel safety checks are completed, and information and supplies to support clean boating are distributed. In addition, TVA set up the Tennessee Valley Clean Marina Initiative to help protect water quality in relation to boating activities. This program addresses activities such as sewage management, oil and gas control, marina siting, and erosion prevention. For more information on clean boating, visit [www.tva.com/environment/water/boating.htm](http://www.tva.com/environment/water/boating.htm).

102. I would encourage you to work with local parks and recreation agencies throughout the area to implement the plan. One point of concern might lie in the number of recreation user days per year. The Draft EIS points out that Watts Bar Reservoir receives an

estimated 1.9 million recreation user days per year, while your Reservoir Operations Study (ROS) - Final Programmatic EIS, 4.24-5 states that there are “4.0 million recreation user days across ALL 25 ROS projects.” This means that Watts Bar Reservoirs in the study utilize the other 50% of the recreation user days per year and the other 34 Reservoirs in the study utilizes the other 50%. This may not be a significant point, but it might skew the number results enough to consider other recreation endeavors, such as number of boat ramps, marinas, picnic areas, etc. (Mark Tummons - TDEC)

Response: As a part of TVA’s recreation strategy, we do work with a variety of partners (including local parks and recreation agencies) to achieve our goal of increasing diverse recreation opportunities along the reservoirs we manage. In the Reservoir Operations Study (ROS), three types of access to account for the overall recreation user days (public, private, and commercial) were identified. The figure of 4 million user days across all ROS reservoirs was specifically for the “public” measure. The 1.9 million user days for Watts Bar reported in the Plan were for public, private, and commercial measures combined. The total recreation user day estimates, for all ROS reservoirs, across all three measures were 21.8 million. Therefore, Watts Bar Reservoir receives approximately 9 percent of the total recreation user days across all three measures.

103. Do not allow docks to be built within 100 feet of launch ramp areas. Exception would be the dock that serves the launch ramp. Launch ramp areas in subdivisions are becoming too crowded, congested. (John Kueck)

Response: Comment noted. TVA takes into account the safety of the users at public ramps and typically does not permit docks and other structures in close proximity to these. While developing public ramp access, TVA takes into consideration the adjoining landrights. TVA does not manage use on private access ramps that are not available to the general public.

104. If Modified Alternative B were chosen additional impacts to informal recreation could occur, as stated on page 101 of the DEIS: "Specifically selection of this alternative would eliminate future stakeholder partnership opportunities and activities on Parcels 297 and 298 at Lowe Branch as well as eliminate from consideration a request from TWRA for the transfer of Parcels 295, 297, 298, and 299 from TVA for inclusion in its WMA program as a contiguous tract of land. Additionally, this alternative would eliminate, over time, the WMA hunting regulation agreement with TWRA for the former Clinch River Breeder Reactor Site area, which includes Parcels 142, 143, 144, 145, and 146." (Robert M. Todd - TWRA)

Response: Comment noted..

105. This letter is to inform you of the City of Rockwood’s interest in pursuing commercial recreation development opportunities on Parcel 218 as described in the proposed Watts Bar Reservoir Land Management Plan. This parcel, along with our public recreation property (Parcel 219) can provide the appropriate lake-oriented recreational opportunities that the City so desperately needs for future economic prosperity. We envision the use of Parcel 218 to provide recreational facilities typical of those found at Tennessee State parks. We will be submitting plans for potential uses of Parcel 218

once the TVA Board adopts the new Reservoir Land Management Plan. We look forward to working with TVA to secure the recreational and economic benefits that King Creek can provide to the City of Rockwood and Roane County. (Mike Miller - City of Rockwood)

Response: Comment noted. This parcel would be available for Developed Recreation if TVA selects Alternative B.

106. Modified Alternative C would expand informal recreational pursuits, such as wildlife and nature observation and hunting. As stated on page 102 of the DEIS, Modified Alternative C would: "Specifically, the selection of this alternative would maintain current stakeholder partnership opportunities and activities on Parcels 297 and 299 at Lowe Branch and keep open consideration of TWRA's request for the transfer of Parcels 295, 297, 298, and 299 for inclusion in its WMA." (Robert M. Todd - TWRA)

Response: Comment noted.

### ***Caney Creek Campsites***

107. We are concerned about an ongoing problem with TVA land that is located in front of our homes, however. We have the following list of complaints: 1 - campers are discharging human feces into Watts Bar Lake from the holding tanks of their motor homes and trailers. 2 - campers are using buckets as toilets, then dumping them in the lake. 3 - human feces and toilet tissue is left all over camping area. 4 - 14 days trash accumulation is scattered all over the ground. 5 - campers have loud drunken parties, drug use. 6 - vagrants are living in tents for months at a time. 7 - campers are building huge campfires, leaving them burning when they leave. 8 - numerous vehicles are parked on these small sites, destroying the vegetation. 9 - campers are using these small sites to launch their boats, further destroying the shoreline. We have listed just a "few" of the problems, our report is on record. We thank TVA for its efforts to try and curb the problems we brought to your attention, namely by posting signs, asking campers to use the porta-john's located 1 mile away at the public boat launching site, and warning campers to pick up trash, etc. Unfortunately, campers are ignoring the signs and all of the above problems, are still occurring on a daily basis, including dumping on these sites. They are an eyesore for this neighborhood. Also, we are just across the lake from Caney Creek Park, (a four minute drive) which offers every amenity people could want, including restrooms and trash cans. We are also distressed and baffled, because our neighbors down the street, who shared the same problems with campers, were given permission by TVA to chain off their parking areas, and by doing so, it discouraged campers from using the waterfront land in front of their homes. Our neighbors have cleaned up their TVA waterfront area, planted grass and made the sites very attractive to this community. We are asking for your permission to clean up the waterfront areas in front of our homes and to replant vegetation, etc., and in order to keep the waterfront clean, we respectfully request that you stop all camping. We observed that guardrail posts were being installed on the three lots we refer to. It appears that this solution would finally prevent campers from parking their vehicles in areas that already have their vegetation and shoreline destroyed. (Loren and Judith Nelson)

Response: Comments noted. TVA monitors reservoir health and reservoir properties through a variety of indicators including bacteriological monitoring and informal recreation area assessments. TDEC has authority to issue bodily

contact advisories for water bodies in Tennessee. The Caney Creek informal swim site was one of the sampling locations during 2006. While it did exceed the single sample maximum on 1 of 10 sampling events, there are currently no bodily contact advisories on Watts Bar per TDEC.

TVA has assessed the potential for informal recreation for this site. Based on the results of this assessment and input from the public, TVA has taken management actions including improved sanitary facilities, signage, and increased TVA Police patrols. The public has the right to use public land in a sustainable manner, and TVA will continue to monitor and manage the land as appropriate to address the environmental and social conditions in the Caney Creek area while allowing public access to public lands.

TVA welcomes assistance in litter cleanup on public lands. However, the planting of vegetation may require a permit and review. Please feel free to contact our field office at 865-632-1320 with specific questions about this process.

108. If TVA wants to provide free camping, it needs to find one area to make it possible. Allowing camping in residential areas is causing considerable distress for homeowners. (Anonymous)

Response: In general, TVA allows informal camping on lands designated as Zone 4. The demand for informal camping is increasing, and TVA supports the sustainable use of public land for informal recreation. In some instances, a conflict occurs between nearby landowners and the recreating public. TVA has established protocols for measuring environmental and social damage caused by this type of use. TVA attempts to take a holistic look, through these methods and responding to landowner concerns, to achieve an equitable solution in areas where conflict occurs.

***Rhea Springs and Jackson Island***

109. I'd like for the Jackson Island area to stay open, stay like it is. I'd like the Rhea Springs area and March Cemetery tract opened up for primitive camping. The Holloway Branch area and Jackson Island 125, 135 acres be opened up for primitive camping. I think now they worry about the four-wheel drives tearing up the property, but cell phones will take care of that from the campers. You can report them before they get out of the area. Of course, Holloway Branch, let it stay open also with Jackson Island. (Wilker Hassler - Friends of Watts Bar Lake)

Response: There are no land allocation changes proposed for the Jackson Island or Holloway Branch areas. Therefore, informal camping will remain an appropriate use for these areas.

Rhea Springs Campground has been closed for several years. The infrastructure is dilapidated to the point where it creates a safety hazard for the user and, therefore, cannot be opened at this time. TVA is in the process of looking at this area and developing a management strategy for its future use. Due to the condition of this area, a management strategy may take some time to develop.

110. We would like Rhea Springs Recreation Area opened back up for primitive camping or day use. We wouldn't mind to pay to use it. We would like to keep Jackson Island open for primitive camping. We would also like the Marsh Cemetery Tract added to Jackson Island camping. (Steven Hassler - Friends of Watts Bar Lake, Eugene F. Corcoran, Jr., Doris Hassler, and Frances Hassler)

Response: See response to Comment 109.

**Sensitive (Endangered and Threatened) Species**

111. Page S-3 and Table 3.3-2 (pg. 48) still lists the bald eagle as a federally-threatened species. We understand it has now been delisted, but recommend verification with the FWS before prospective development. (Heinz J. Mueller - EPA)

Response: The bald eagle was officially removed from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) list of threatened animals in 2007 while the DEIS was in preparation. Its status has been updated in the FEIS. In agreement with the USFWS, TVA continues to monitor bald eagle populations throughout the Tennessee River Valley. TVA has coordinated with the USFWS and will comply with guidelines outlined in the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act to minimize disturbance to nesting bald eagles on or adjacent to TVA-retained properties.

112. If either Modified Alternative A or Modified Alternative B were chosen, rather than Modified Alternative C, approximately 279.4 acres of habitat for the State Endangered Bachman's sparrow could be impacted due to the allocation of parcels 297 and 298 near Watts Bar Dam. As stated on page 49 of the DEIS, "Suitable habitat for Bachman's sparrows is limited and scattered throughout Watts Bar Reservoir lands. The species may be found in Parcels 3, 295, 297, 298, and 299 near Watts Bar Dam." Loss of habitat for the Bachman's sparrow is one of the greatest threats for the continued existence of this species. (Robert M. Todd - TWRA)

Response: Comment noted. State-listed Bachman's sparrows have not been recorded on the Watts Bar Reservation land parcels where habitat occurs. In addition, Bachman's sparrows have not been recorded from the area since 1987, and the habitat for them on TVA lands is marginal. TVA would review potential effects on all animal and plant species associated with any future industrial development proposals on Parcels 297 and 298.

113. I believe the rationale may have been that any adverse effects **[on threatened and endangered species]** would be addressed during site/project specific review and consultation at a later date. If there is no other rationale to support the determination, we may have a procedural issue that precludes us from being able to concur.

Consultation on the Land Management Plan is programmatic in nature. Just as the Land Management Plan sets direction and serves as an umbrella for the specific actions that will take place on the Consultation on the Land Management Plan is programmatic in nature. Just as the Land Management Plan sets direction and serves as an umbrella for the specific actions that will take place on the landscape, this consultation will serve as an umbrella for the site-specific consultations that occur later and tier back to the umbrella (programmatic) consultation. As such, the umbrella determination should encompass all likely determinations that will follow at the site specific level. Therefore, if

any specific action taking place under the Watts Bar Land Management Plan is likely to have an adverse effect on a listed species, the determination for the Land Management Plan (the umbrella) should also be "likely to adversely affect" and initiation of formal consultation on the Land Management Plan should be requested. Conversely, if no specific action is anticipated to result in an adverse effect to a listed species, then a determination of "not likely to adversely affect" is appropriate for the Land Management Plan. Often this "not likely to adversely affect" determination at the Land Management Plan (umbrella) level is supported by an agency's nondiscretionary commitment to adequately minimize the effects of specific actions so that the action is wholly beneficial, insignificant, or discountable. If a specific project could not be modified in a manner or to an extent that removes the adverse effect, it would not be implemented. The agency's commitment to minimize the effects of specific actions could be made in the Land Management Plan or in associated NEPA/decision documents. In such a case, we would provide concurrence with "not likely to adversely affect" for the plan, and we would review each specific action to ensure the effects have been minimized adequately and, if so, provide a project-specific letter of concurrence.

If you can explain the rationale for the "not likely to adversely affect" determination for the Watts Bar Land Management Plan in a little more detail, I will be able to evaluate how we should proceed on this concurrence request. Let me know if the determination was reached based on the fact that all future projects under this plan are likely to have effects to the listed species that are either wholly beneficial, insignificant, or discountable. If that determination is based on a commitment made in the plan or its NEPA documents, I'd appreciate it if you could let me know where to look (document and page). However, if you anticipate that some specific projects implemented in the future under this Land Management Plan will likely result in a determination of "likely to adversely affect" a listed species, we should discuss the need for initiation of formal consultation. If formal consultation is needed, we will attempt to expedite the consultation as much as possible. (Mary Jennings - USFWS, Cookeville Field Office)

Response: Formal consultation was initiated and a Biological Assessment prepared February 29, 2008 for review by the USFWS. USFWS provided a Biological Opinion on May 2, 2008, which said "You (TVA) have determined that there would be no effect on the Virginia spirea, Cumberland rosemary, fanshell, rough pigtoe, shiny pigtoe, orangefoot pimpleback, snail darter, spotfin chub, and the gray bat. Additionally, you (TVA) determined that this project would have no effect on designated critical habitat for the spotfin chub in the Obed or Emory rivers. You (TVA) have determined the proposed Land Plan is not likely to adversely affect the pink mucket, based on implementation of specific measures if TVA were to develop industrial facilities at the former Clinch River Breeder Reactor site. With implementation of these conditions and appropriate Best Management Practices, you have determined that only relatively minor impacts to federally listed mussels in the Clinch River are expected to occur. Typically, the Fish and Wildlife Services does not concur with a "not likely to adversely affect determination" at the programmatic consultation level when such determination is based on a commitment to consult on specific projects in the future when details become known. If there is a potential for a "likely to adversely affect" determination to be made during site-specific consultation in the future, the Service advises that "likely to adversely affect" is the appropriate determination at the programmatic consultation level also. However, after numerous discussions with your staff

and a thorough review of this project and associated conservation measures, we believe the likelihood of reaching a determination of “likely to adversely affect” at the site-specific consultation level in the future is discountable. Therefore, we concur with your conclusion that the proposed Land Plan is not likely to adversely affect the pink mucket. In view of this, we believe that the requirements of section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (Act), as they apply to this programmatic review, have been fulfilled.”

### **Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice**

114. Property values have been generally good but industrial use of the lake will have a dramatic effect on these values which we have spent many dollars, in some cases our entire savings to create. To say that this will not happen, that TVA will police any industrial pollution activity, is not accurate based on your current track record. (Charles McCrosson)

Response: Under TVA's preferred alternative, Alternative B, 1,253 acres would be allocated for industrial use. This consists largely of five tracts that are part of the former Clinch River Breeder Reactor site in Roane County (957.4 acres) and two tracts in Rhea County in the area known as “The Pines” (279.4 acres). In addition, three small tracts in Roane County, with total acreage of 16.2 acres, are allocated for industrial use because of their possible suitability for industrial or barge terminal development. This is less than 8 percent of the land that TVA owns and manages on the Watts Bar Reservoir. Pollution control is under the jurisdiction of the designated federal and state agencies; any industrial development on these tracts would be subject to the restrictions and control of these agencies and the appropriate laws.

The former Clinch River Breeder Reactor site is bounded largely by the Clinch River and by the Department of Energy, Oak Ridge Reservation. The remaining portion runs generally along the southeastern side of Bear Creek Road. Due to this location, any negative impacts to surrounding property including property values would, at worst, be small except for possible temporary impacts during any construction that might occur. Depending on the nature of the development, property values could increase as a result.

The Rhea County site is bounded by the Tennessee River and by TVA-owned land designated largely for Natural Resource Conservation, with a smaller portion designated for Project Operations. Due to the location, development is unlikely to have noticeable negative impacts on property values.

The remaining sites are small tracts that could be used only to provide water access for barge use by back-lying industries that would be located on non-TVA properties. Use for Industrial or barge terminal access is compatible with current uses of adjacent property. Therefore, no noticeable impacts to property values are likely.

115. There is plenty of land in Rhea County for industrial development; leave the lake alone! (Ted Hitchens)

Response: Under TVA's preferred alternative, Alternative B, 1,253 acres would be allocated for industrial use. The only site allocated for industrial use in Rhea County are two adjacent tracts in the area known as "The Pines" (279.4 acres). This area is bounded by the Tennessee River and by TVA-owned land designated largely for Natural Resource Conservation, with a smaller portion designated for Project Operations. Preference for this site will be given for businesses that require water access. The availability of water access could provide opportunities not easily available elsewhere in the Rhea County area. Industrial use would affect only a very small portion of the reservoir shoreline and would not be likely to interfere with other uses or enjoyment of the reservoir.

116. Environmental Justice need not be an issue for this proposed project since minorities account for only 5.7 % of the population (compared to 22.1 % for the State of Tennessee). However, the reduction in commercial residential and industrial growth by all alternatives due to the proposed modification could reduce job opportunities in the area (pg. 140). We note that unemployment (5.3 %) in the area is already higher than the state and national average (pg. S-5). (Heinz J. Mueller - EPA)

Response: TVA acknowledges the possibility that the proposed land use modifications could reduce job opportunities in the area. However, there are potential privately owned sites that are adjacent to narrow strips of TVA-owned shoreline. TVA will consider changing land use designations to provide water-access for industrial or commercial recreation uses on privately owned back-lying land. In addition, most industrial opportunities would not require direct water access, and there are many potential private sites in the area that might be used for these. For these reasons, impacts on job opportunities are unlikely. Maintaining a good quality of life in the area is important to the economy of the area. Maintaining the quality of the environment and public views of and access to the water is a significant factor in maintaining that quality of life.

117. The East Tennessee Development District has completed its review of the above-mentioned proposal, in its role as a regional clearing house to review state and federally-assisted programs. ETDD review of this proposal has found no conflicts with the plans or programs of the District or other agencies in the region. However, ETDD or other reviewing agencies may wish to comment further at a later time. We appreciate the opportunity to work with you in coordinating projects in the region. (Terrence J. Bobrowsk - ETDD)

Response: Comment noted. If and when specific proposals are initiated they will have specific environmental reviews and be available for further study and comments.

118. We will need quality jobs in the Watts Bar Lake area after the work at *[Watts Bar Nuclear Plant]* Unit 2 is completed and all of those workers have moved on or we will have an economic vacuum. Encouraging development of new manufacturing facilities in Meigs and Rhea counties is essential. (David Peterson)

Response: See the response for Comment 116. In addition, Parcels 297 and 298 are zoned for Industrial, with preference given for businesses requiring water access.

119. Limiting waterfront residential development and encouraging off water residential development will result in more affordable homes. (David Peterson)

Response: New waterfront homes tend to be expensive because of the value of the water view and the proximity to the water. These attributes are scarce and therefore allow waterfront residential development to be restricted to a limited high-value market. However, this market would purchase expensive homes elsewhere if waterfront sites were not available. It seems unlikely that there would be a noticeable difference in the overall housing mix within the general area. However, it could affect the choice of location by retirees and persons buying second homes.

### **Terrestrial Ecology**

120. Please patrol and cut down mature invasive species, Mimosa, etc., growing on your property along lake front. Mimosa is getting to a critical mess where it is going to be **[hard]** to get under control. (John Kueck)

Response: TVA recognizes that there are numerous issues with a number of invasive plant species on Watts Bar Reservoir properties. Currently, TVA places emphasis on the management and control of these invasive species on parcels where there are recognized sensitive resources such as rare plants and uncommon natural or native plant habitats. TVA natural resource management personnel are also willing to work with adjoining property owners to partner in an effort to control such invasive plants and to replace these with plantings of endemic native plant species on a case-by-case basis.

121. Impacts to terrestrial ecological resources where habitat alteration occurs under Modified Alternative A or Modified Alternative B would be greater than Modified Alternative C , as stated on page 101 of the DEIS, which would include "...the loss of some interior forest bird habitat, more habitat fragmentation and loss of biodiversity, and a concurrent increase in invasive plants and animals." (Robert M. Todd - TWRA)

Response: Comment noted.

122. This reallocation would maintain the area's current ecological state and allow TWRA to continue its interim management agreement. Specifically, this alternative would allow for continued management of natural resources on Parcels 295, 297, 298, and 299 with the possibility of designating a portion of this area as an Important Bird Area in conjunction with TWRA and the incorporation of prescribed burning regimes to better manage groups of wildlife species in conjunction with the Tennessee Division of Forestry. (Robert M. Todd - TWRA)

Response: Comment noted.

**Water Quality and Shoreline Conditions**

123. We have water front family property on Watts Bar between Loudon and Ft. Loudoun Dam. The waves from the traffic on the river are badly eroding our property. TVA should have a program or provide assistance for rip rap of the bank, especially where the river is narrow and more susceptible to erosion. (George Peeler)

Response: TVA provides information and advice about erosion-control methods to landowners who are experiencing shoreline erosion. In addition, TVA provides these landowners with contact information of contractors who perform stabilization work. TVA can provide advice about how to apply for the necessary permits and may waive the standard fee. Please contact the Watts Bar-Clinch Watershed Team for information.

124. Do not allow discharge of treated sewage into Watts Bar. No one checks to see if it is really treated. Tug boats and actual commercial vessels should be exceptions. Boats should be randomly checked to see if their heads do discharge directly into the lake. - Large fine if they do. (John Kueck)

Response: It is illegal to discharge untreated waste, oil, or trash into any federally controlled or Tennessee State waters for a variety of reasons:

Specifically for sewage, reservoirs in Tennessee are designated by TDEC as either a 'discharge' reservoir (where vessels may discharge properly treated sewage overboard), or a 'no-discharge' reservoir (where no sewage, treated or untreated, may be discharged overboard). Watts Bar is a 'discharge' reservoir. Therefore, discharge into public waters is restricted to wastes treated by a Type I or II U.S. Coast Guard-approved marine sanitation device.

TWRA and the TVA Police have enforcement rights over sewage discharge from boats. Both agencies perform patrols of reservoir areas. TWRA also monitors Marine Station 17. If you suspect illegal sewage discharges, please report them to TWRA at 1-800-332-0900. Please record the boat registration number and report vessels suspected to be dumping sewage or solid waste.

TVA and TWRA along with the Coast Guard Auxiliary also conduct an annual clean boating campaign. During this campaign, boat safety checks are completed, and information and supplies to support clean boating are distributed. In addition, TVA established the Tennessee Valley Clean Marina Initiative to help protect water quality in relation to boating activities. This program addresses activities such as sewage management, oil and gas control, marina siting, and erosion prevention. For more information on clean boating, visit [www.tva.com/environment/water/boating.htm](http://www.tva.com/environment/water/boating.htm).

125. We have noticed in Indian Shadows sub-division that at times we have solid matter (foaming) floating down the lake and at our boat dock. It looks like sewage. Who do you contact to check this out? It makes a mess on our boat docks and boats. (Anonymous)

Response: If you believe the source of the sewage is untreated wastes from boating vessels, please record the boat registration number and report suspect

vessels to TWRA at 1-800-332-0900. If you believe the source of the sewage is from specific failing septic tanks or specific failing sewage treatment plants, you may report this condition to the Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation at 1-888-891-TDEC (8332).

126. I am very concerned about the sewage in the Blue Springs area from the large boats. Does TVA test for it or monitor it in any way? (Diane Bowman)

Response: TVA monitors reservoir health through a variety of indicators including fish tissue and bacterial levels. There were 20 bacteriological monitoring sites on Watts Bar during 2006. Many of these sites were located at highly used recreational areas. The Blue Springs area was not one of the specific sites sampled in 2006 but possibly could be added as a future sampling regime. TDEC has authority to issue bodily contact advisories. Currently, there are no state advisories against swimming in Watts Bar Reservoir. Please see Sections 3.5 and 4.5 of the FEIS for additional information on reservoir health ratings for Watts Bar.

127. The TVA signs guiding campers to sanitary facilities at Caney Creek are a costly failure!!! Children are swimming in water that is contaminated with feces. The Health Department will be notified! The public will be notified. TVA is unresponsive to homeowners' complaints! (Anonymous)

Response: TVA monitors reservoir health and reservoir properties through a variety of indicators including bacteriological monitoring and informal recreation area assessments. TDEC has authority to issue bodily contact advisories for water bodies in Tennessee. The Caney Creek informal swim site was one of the sampling locations during 2006. While it did exceed the single sample maximum on 1 of 10 sampling events, TDEC has issued no bodily contact advisories on Watts Bar.

This area has also been assessed by TVA using informal recreation site protocol. Based on site assessment and input from the public, TVA has taken management actions including improved sanitary facilities, signage, and increased TVA Police patrols. The public has the right to use public land in a sustainable manner, and TVA will continue to monitor and manage the land as appropriate to address the environmental and social conditions in the Caney Creek area.

128. We recommend compliance with TVA's clean marina initiative and related programs (see TVA website), specifically pertaining to proper marina siting and selection of designs with adequate flushing to maintain water quality. (Heinz J. Mueller - EPA)

Response: Comment noted. There are currently over 75 marinas throughout the TVA reservoir system that are certified Clean Marinas. In addition, new marina proposals are reviewed for a variety of criteria including potential impacts to the environment.

129. I noted with interest the changes required to TVA operations during the recent peak cooling season combined with drought conditions. I urge caution on new industrial

zones that could increase water usage at such times. It is really important to this area to preserve water quality. (Barbara A. Walton)

Response: Comment noted. The potential impact to water resources and reservoir operations from water intakes and discharges associated with future industrial development will be considered as part of the approval process.

130. Do not allow any industry (to include marinas, factories or any other facility that could cause pollutants to be expelled into the waterway) to build on the main channel of the Tennessee River. They should be built in bays at inlets where if a spill, fire, or other accident happened, it could be contained. They would also be susceptible to accidents from barges and power boating. (Germaine Smith)

Response: Comment noted. Project location is one of the many attributes for which a proposed project is reviewed. During the approval process, potential impacts to resources such as water quantity, navigation, and potential for pollutant discharge are reviewed and considered in the decision-making process.

### **Wetlands**

131. At this time we have no comments regarding environmental resources or possible environmental issues. We appreciate your awareness of our Regulatory Program and inclusion of language referencing the need for approvals in accordance with Section 404 of the Clean Water Act for disturbance to waters of the United States, including wetlands. Upon reaching a final decision, should there be development-related impacts subject to Section 404 and/or Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, please contact this office for necessary permits and approvals. (Kim Franklin - U.S. Army Corps of Engineers)

Response: Comment noted.

132. In addition to the Watts Bar Reservoir watershed being generally forested, forested wetlands is the most common wetland type (pg. 69). Selection of Modified C would likely protect these wetlands from development more than Modified B or A. Avoidance of wetlands (listed as a sensitive resource in Zone 3: pg. 24) through land allocation is preferable and generally more protective than wetland mitigation for filling wetlands due to development. (Heinz J. Mueller - EPA)

Response: Comment noted..