

Muscle Shoals Reservation Comprehensive Master Plan Public Comments Received Sept. 16, 2014 – Oct. 16, 2014

Comments received from the public have been produced verbatim. In some instances, TVA has divided up a commenter's submission into several sub-comments in order to provide responses to individual issues raised.

1. **Name:** Larry Gautney

Comment: The Master Plan describes, in considerable detail, corridors of green space that are anticipated to be an integral part of the redevelopment. This is commendable. At the same time, TVA has stated that they will not be involved in the details of development after the transfer of ownership. Based on observation of previous developments in the Shoals area, the only way to ensure that green space, as described in the master plan, will be incorporated into any development is to make the green space a part of the agreements that will be developed prior to transfer of ownership. Even better, TVA should consider maintaining ownership of the land that is expected to be green space.

Response: As stated in Section 4 of the CMP, TVA has taken care to ensure green space and preservation in certain areas either by deed restriction or by zoning mechanisms. For instance, over 200 acres of surplus property within areas 3A and 3B have been set aside for preservation.

2. **Name:** Bonita McCay

Comment: I was concerned about the cemetery sites on the property to be purchased. They should receive the same restrictions as the Historical zoned sites to protect their historical and cultural integrity. State laws are insufficient to protect these areas, and I believe that since this property was bought by the Corps of Engineers through eminent domain, that there is an obligation to the families that this land was purchased from to maintain due diligence to these grounds. I also believe that there is significant historical value in these cemeteries as these are the last resting places of important, historical figures who founded Southport as well as were a significant part of the growth and development of the region.

Response: TVA determined in consultation with the Alabama State Historic Preservation Officer that the Murphy-Kemper-Cockburn cemetery is not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. The Cuba cemetery is located within area 3B, which is planned as preservation. It is also fenced with a buffer. Access to both cemeteries is protected by applicable Alabama state law.

Comment: I also have concerns with the city zoning laws that are being developed as to whether or not they will be strict at allowing only commercial and private development that is in benefit to the economic sustainability of the area. If done properly, this plan could be a significant benefit to the area, but if allowed to be generally opened to commercial development just for the sake of tax revenue for local governments, there is a good chance that it would create an unsustainable, crass, and ugly landscape of empty store fronts and elitist gentrification. I believe that there should be an unbroken tree corridor along Reservation Road, and that a plan of development be executed that is in keeping with the

integrity and continuity of the natural landscape. There needs to be more public input on these zoning laws and regulations that are being developed by the cities of Sheffield and Muscle Shoals in order that these concerns are addressed.

Response: Comment noted. A 100-foot setback will be created by deed along Reservation Road for utility, roadway, and/or walking trail expansion. Buildings and parking will not be allowed within this setback. It is anticipated that much of this setback will remain vegetative. Zoning processes, including opportunities for public input, are governed by local requirements.

Comment: Another point of concern that was made at the public meeting, is the heavy industrial site located near 2nd St. This could be a hazard to residential areas, water works, and schools in this area. The traffic caused by trucks to and from these sites could also be dangerous and disruptive.

Response: Comment noted. Transportation impacts are discussed in Section 4.17 of the EIS, and TVA identified potential mitigation in Section 2.3 of the EIS. Roadway design typically takes into account existing and anticipated traffic in order to ensure the safety of local residents, including appropriate level of signalization, turn lanes, and ingress/egress corridors.

Comment: I am glad that TVA has maintained holdings on this site, and that issues such as green corridors for wildlife, and riparian buffer zones and flood zones have been addressed. Overall, I would prefer if TVA would keep all of these holdings and become stewards at addressing the needs of renewable energy research and development and conservation of natural resources. For almost a century, TVA has been a model of such industry, and could be a viable force for engineering a new plan for future industrial development in solar, wind and biodiesel. I would like to see a larger TVA presence and employment force on the Muscle Shoals Reservation. I don't have confidence that partnership with city governments and privatization of these public lands will be of long-term benefit to the public in general, and I think that is a contradiction to the TVA mandate.

Response: Comment noted.

3. **Name:** Thomas McCay

Comment: Watching the intentional destruction of the once mighty TVA is one of the most disgusting things I have ever seen in my life. Well, that is what happens when you elect people who don't believe in good government-or any government at all. Even the HEAD of TVA is paid hundreds of thousands of dollars a year to tear it all down. The TVA was supposed to bring PERMANENT PROSPERITY. I'm glad my parents and their generation are not around to watch it all get pissed away on the alter of 'free enterprise'. Franklin D. Roosevelt must be spinning in his grave. One day this country will look back on the destruction of the TVA and wonder-'What in the hell were they thinking?' Oh well, we'll always have payday loans...

Response: Comment noted.

4. **Name:** Unknown (Comment was made during the Open House to the Court Reporter)

Comment: Is there fiber on the reservation, and can it be utilized by outside developers? And what is the capacity of the fiber, if you can use it? You know, how much - - what's the capacity of fiber, if there is? That's the best way to ask that.

Response: This question is outside the scope of the CMP. For more information on this topic, the commenter may contact Greg Hadden at (423)751-8305.

5. **Name:** Nancy Muse

Comment: Hello Ms McNamee, I will be brief since I understand how many comments will be submitted and what a tedious process this must be. I have attended all the public scoping meetings from the beginning of this process and submitted in-depth comments several times over the past years. I also attended the most recent meeting at the Marriott Conference Center in Florence. I am impressed that TVA seemed to have listened to all the diverse comments that have been submitted from various groups and residents of the Shoals as the plan reflects. My main areas of concern are as follows: There should be no heavy industry AT ALL in the plan. The local business community and elected officials predictably would have asked for this however, they have failed to utilize land that has already been set aside for industrial use in all four cities of the Shoals. This land that is to be redeveloped does not need to be used in a way that involves taking water out of the river, which was explained to me as a possibility. Also heavy industry most often suggests toxic substances that must be dealt with as discharge. There are homes, schools, heavily trafficked roads and businesses nearby and it is not in the interest of public health and safety to have any type of heavy industry in this area. It would be best to utilize this area for other types of green industry such as an intensive solar installation that could also pair with offices for complimentary business.

Response: Comment noted. Job creation is a desired outcome of the redevelopment process, as reflected in the comments received by TVA on the project. The CMP reflects a balanced approach to meet environmental obligations and economic development goals in the area. Only 160 acres (Area 7) of the 1,000 acres declared surplus are identified for heavy industrial development.

Comment: I am also concerned about the areas to be developed for multi - use. I understand that the cities are to submit plans in keeping with guidelines required by TVA for a type of "smart" development utilizing best practices. I noticed that there is nothing in place that guarantees the cities will be held to this once they purchase the land. There have been instances in the Shoals where property was zoned for a specific purpose and the owner/ developers went against thier agreement and built something not within the original plan...this does happen. I asked about how the zoning and codes required would be enforced and it seems that there is no way planned for this to be done.

Any development should be state of the art Smart Growth development that could serve as an example for the entire Shoals as to how development should be done to enhance quality of life and also serve as a model for best development practices and environmental and economic sustainability. A glance down the main arteries of Muscle Shoals is the best testimony for the local governments failed attempts at development and certainly reflect NO sustainable development. We do NOT need to let the local elected officials have freedom to develop their old familiar way since most of them are not at all savvy in this department .

These officials are also temporary and may not even be around when the actual development starts. I would like to suggest that there be very strict guidelines for Smart Growth put in place and a system to safeguard the agreement.

Response: Comment noted. As stated on page 27 of the EIS, under the preferred alternative which the TVA Board selected for implementation, "TVA would not specify that land on the MSR study area be used for a particular purpose, but instead would allow future uses on the property to be driven by environmental resources and constraints taken into account in development of the Master Plan and subsequent local zoning laws or other appropriate land use ordinances." As specified in Section 2.3 of the EIS, TVA will limit its oversight and require deed restrictions for only those items specified. Zoning processes, including enforcement, are governed by local requirements.

Comment: This land that is cited for development should also be considered for integrating organic farms in appropriate areas that could serve as a local food source for the Shoals and surrounding areas. Jack o Lantern Farms hydroponic gardening is a business that could be expanded or even partnered with. It would be nice to have TVA host a meeting and try to attract those from around the south or beyond who would like to start such a business here. This would be a great opportunity that may not exist otherwise, using the expertise of TVA to help fuel interest in a science-based organic farming operation. Products could be marketed as well that are produced in an environmentally friendly way.

Response: The type of business described in the comment could align with the "Market Focus" for Area 1B (see Section 4.1.2). TVA encourages those who are interested in utilizing the property for this purpose to participate in the forthcoming public auction process.

Comment: I would like to also suggest that the University of North Alabama be invited to have a face to face meeting with the TVA redevelopment staff/ team to discuss the possibility of locating the UNA Sustainability Center on the reservation, utilizing the natural small wild areas for study and also the existing buildings for the classrooms, labs and offices. The first Sustainability Conference was held on September 25th at UNA and it was stated that the university is planning to open a school of sustainability studies. The campus is running out of room and the reservation would be the perfect place for this especially if development of surrounding land is demonstrative of sustainable design and renewable energy.

Response: Comment noted. The University of North Alabama is welcome to contact TVA to discuss possible uses on the MSR and/or interest in bidding at public auction.

Comment: There should also be an incentive for all development on the reservation to have solar installations on roofs and also in the fields (across the road on the slag pile) Perhaps low interest loans for purchasing solar panels could be provided as is with the heat pump loans for all future development and the customers could be co energy providers as with Generation Partners. I have much more that I would like to request but will stop here. Thank you for all your work and for listening to the voices of the environmental community in the Shoals as is evidenced in your plan.

Response: Comment noted. Incentives provided by TVA can be found on TVA's web site at <http://www.tva.gov>.

6. **Name:** Charles L. Rose, President, Shoals Environmental Alliance

Comment: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY, On page 3, the Draft Comprehensive Master Plan (DCMP) states: *“TVA and the NACD have developed this Comprehensive Master Plan (CMP) to serve as an overarching guiding principles tool to encourage well-managed development.”* My question: Why is TVA settling for only “encouraging” this desired “well-managed development?” Why is TVA not willing to “ensure” the intended this well-managed development?

Most of the design guidelines and development restriction mentioned in the DCMP are followed by a “Z,” meaning that they will not be enforce by deed restriction, but merely by “Local Unit of Government Zoning and /or other Mechanisms.” This is troubling to me. How will TVA ensure that these design guidelines and development restrictions are carried out and enforced after the tracts are sold? As is well known, zoning ordinances can be changed at any time. The phrase “other mechanisms” is especially curious and ambiguous. What does it mean?

Further down on page 3 the DCMP states: *“A description and the recommended design guidelines, preferred use options, and environmental and historic restrictions (where applicable) are detailed in this document.”* Again, the vagueness and uncertainty of the phrases “recommended design guidelines” and “preferred use options” is not reassuring. This development is being touted to the public as being well-managed, “green,” and “sustainable.” Why are the design guidelines not being “required” rather than merely being “recommended”?

On page 5 the DCMP states: *“An overarching CMP has been created to encourage proper and responsible development of the approximate 1,000 surplus acres of the MSR.”* Again, why it TVA only “encouraging” rather than “ensuring” proper and responsible development?

4.1.1 Area 1A – Retail/Commercial According to the DCMP, all of the design guidelines listed for Area 1A would be enforced by future city zoning ordinances only. Additionally, several of the listed development restrictions, including “No residential dwellings” and the 100-ft. setback would similarly be enforceable by future city zoning ordinances. Zoning ordinances can be changed at any time. How will TVA ensure that the desired standards will be maintained?

4.1.2 Area 1B - Retail/Commercial As with Area 1A, all of the design guidelines, and many other development restrictions, listed for Area 1B would be enforced by future city zoning ordinances only. No one at TVA can say at this time exactly what those ordinances will state. How will TVA ensure that the desired standards be maintained? Similarly, most of the other tracts for sale are lacking the deed restrictions and covenants required to protect and ensure the desired vision for this development. A drive down Woodward Avenue in Muscle Shoals or South Montgomery Ave. in Sheffield will convince one that these two cities cannot be trusted to maintain the envisioned design standards.

Response: *As stated on page 27 of the EIS, under the preferred alternative which the TVA Board selected for implementation, “TVA would not specify that land on the MSR study area be used for a particular purpose, but instead would allow future uses on the property to be driven by environmental resources and constraints taken into account in development of the Master Plan and subsequent local zoning laws or other appropriate land use ordinances.” As specified in Section 2.3 of the EIS, TVA will limit its oversight*

and require deed restrictions for only those items specified. The term “other mechanisms” could include overlays, districts, and special-use easements.

Comment: 3.1.2 Strategic Development Plan On page 8, the DCNP states: *“In the fall of 2011, TVA and NACD arranged stakeholder interviews and public workshops to facilitate public participation.....participants were given the opportunity to provide comments during and after the meetings (via a public comment period).”* I cannot recall there being a “public comment period” in the fall of 2011 concerning this Strategic Development Plan. Is this not incorrect? There is no mention of one in the *Muscle Shoals Reservation Strategic Development Plan (Appendix C)*.

Response: Comment noted. The text of the CMP has been modified to reflect that comments concerning the SDP were only collected during the 2011 meetings and no public comment period was held for the SDP.

Comment: 3.3 HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL ASSESSMENTS On page 10, the DCMP states: *“Two cemeteries are also located on the MSR property...”* There are three cemeteries on the Muscle Shoals Reservation. (The third one is the Southport Cemetery on the north side of Reservation Road.) I think what the DCMP authors intended to state was that there are two cemeteries in the *area being redeveloped*.

Response: Comment noted. The text of the CMP has been modified to reflect that the cemeteries in question are located on MSR surplus property.

Comment: Also on page 10, the DCMP states: *“No prehistoric archaeological sites eligible for the NRHP or Native American sacred sites were identified on the MSR.”* This is incorrect. Again, I think the authors intended to say *“identified on the redevelopment tracts,”* not the entire Muscle Shoals Reservation. TRC’s 2002 Cultural Resources Survey for the Muscle Shoals Reservation lists 20 prehistoric sites.

Response: Comment Noted. The text of the CMP has been modified to reflect that the archaeological sites in question are located on MSR surplus property.

Comment: Area 1A contains two jurisdictional wetlands. Why is TVA even selling these? TVA has a mandate to protect the environment, so why not retain these two wetlands?

Response: Executive Order (EO) 11990 specifies federal agencies’ responsibilities for the protection of wetlands. EO 11990 provides that, when disposing of property, federal agencies must attach appropriate restrictions to the uses of properties containing wetlands. As noted in Section 2.3 of the EIS, TVA will meet this requirement by including in sale deeds the requirement that future owners avoid construction in wetlands without approval and a prohibition on development in wetlands unless there is no practicable alternative.

Comment: The present occupant of the TVA Greenhouse Complex, Jack O’Lantern Farms, is a local success story. The CMP should guarantee this business’ right to lease this property after its sale.

Response: The owner(s) of Jack O’Lantern Farms will have equal opportunity to bid for the property at public auction or may negotiate arrangements with the future owner for the continued use of the property should another entity purchase the property.

Comment: 4.3.1 Area 3A - Woodlands Preservation Area 4.3.2 Area 3B - Woodlands Preservation Area. The DCMP forbids residential dwellings in these two tracts by deed restrictions. This is in contrast to the other tracts for sale, in which residential dwelling are to be forbidden by future zoning ordinances only. Why cannot deed restrictions be used on all tracts to avoid this undesired use of the property?

Response: *As stated on page 27 of the EIS, under the preferred alternative which the TVA Board selected for implementation, "TVA would not specify that land on the MSR study area be used for a particular purpose, but instead would allow future uses on the property to be driven by environmental resources and constraints taken into account in development of the Master Plan and subsequent local zoning laws or other appropriate land use ordinances." As specified in Section 2.3 of the EIS, TVA will limit its oversight and require deed restrictions for only those items specified. The limitation of uses in Areas 3A and 3B is in accordance with TVA's environmental stewardship mission and values, and is supported by many comments on the EIS expressing support for the inclusion of preservation areas within the MSR surplus area.*

Comment: Both of these tracts contain the following restriction: "No fencing within 150 feet of the designated "Wildlife Corridor" as illustrated in Appendix Q [D]" This is the only reference in the DCMP to a "wildlife corridor."

Response: *Comment noted. Section 3.4 of the CMP has been revised to provide additional information about the "wildlife corridor in a new Section 3.4.5."*

Comment: Appendix Q has nothing to do with a wildlife corridor; it is a NACD resolution. I remember viewing a map depicting such a wildlife corridor in a meeting my associate, John Crowder, and I had with TVA's Bill Adams and Larry Softly in November, 2012. I think this wildlife corridor is depicted by a dotted red line on the MSR Concept Map in Appendix P, but it is not labeled as such.

Response: *Comment noted. Section 4.3 the CMP has been revised to reference Appendix P, and Appendix P has been revised to reflect that the dotted red line depicts the "wildlife corridor."*

Comment: If this dotted red line is indeed the wildlife corridor, it is apparent that after leaving Area 3B, it crosses Reservation Road. It also will cross the possible road and/or rail access to Area 7 from 2nd Street. Will these two crossing feature wildlife tunnels or overpasses? Studies of wildlife crossings show that they are quite effective in combatting wildlife fragmentation and avoiding collisions 3 between animals and vehicles. One study estimated that adding such wildlife crossings to a road project only increased costs 7-8%. (Bank et al. 2002).

Response: *As stated in Section 3.14.2 of the final EIS, "[f]ragmentation of habitat is currently present both within the proposed redevelopment area boundary and the area north of Reservation Road. Such fragmentation is in the form of existing rights-of-way, roads, agricultural use, industrial use, and other disturbances. These areas also are surrounded by land use practices (commercial, residential, etc.) outside the Reservation that have smaller tracts of forests and fragmented habitat also used by wildlife. Species of terrestrial animals that continue to use these habitats have either evolved or adapted to such conditions to fulfill all or a part of their life cycles." The CMP will not require the*

installation of wildlife tunnels or overpasses, but TVA is taking measures to reduce impacts to wildlife traveling through the corridor by prohibiting fencing within 150 feet of the “wildlife corridor.”

Comment: On the northeast side of the Reservation, in Area 8A, the wildlife corridor seems to stop just south of the access road from Wilson Dam Road into Complex C. If TVA truly wants to mitigate wildlife fragmentation resulting from this redevelopment, why not extend this wildlife corridor northward from the Complex C access road to Reservation Road? The final master plan should contain a detailed description of this wildlife corridor.

Response: Comment noted. Section 3.4 of the CMP has been revised to provide additional information about the “wildlife corridor” in a new Section 3.4.5 TVA is retaining Area 8A, which will remain largely in its present condition and will continue to provide a connection to the “wildlife corridor” on the surplus property in order to promote wildlife habitat.

Comment: 4.8 AREA 8 - TVA PROPERTY On page 54, the DCMP states: “Portions of these areas include property presently utilized for walking trails and a chestnut orchard (supported by the American Chestnut Foundation).” I can find no assurances in the DCMP that the American Chestnut Foundation’s research orchard will be allowed to stay or be permitted to expand northward. I can think of no better use for this TVA tract than to support this one-of-a kind, invaluable research. TVA states that it’s overall Environmental policy objectives include supporting sustainable economic growth in the Tennessee Valley and engaging in proactive environmental stewardship. The ACF research orchard exemplifies both of these policy goals. The DCNP should state clearly that the ACF research orchard is a preferred use of this tract and that its expansion should be allowed.

Response: The chestnut orchard is located in Area 8A, which is being retained by TVA, and is therefore outside the scope of the CMP. Area 8A is shown in the CMP for context only and would continue to be managed by TVA in accordance with the 1996 Muscle Shoals/Wilson Dam Reservation Land Use Plan.

Comment: 5.1 NACD GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT PLAN COMMITMENT RESOLUTION TVA and the NACD have agreed that the cities of Sheffield and Muscle Shoals will each provide a Governance and Management Plan (GMP) and that “each GMP would be required prior to auction and “shall address jurisdictional issues, development regulations, enforcement measures and other matters necessary to assure the property is developed in a manner consistent with the Comprehensive Master Plan.” It is my understanding that the City of Sheffield has not submitted its plan at this time and that the City of Muscle Shoals has submitted a draft of it’s GMP, but it has not been finalized. Will the general public be allowed to view and comment on these plans before they are finalized? It seems to me that it is rather premature to be considering this DCMP without knowing what these Governance and Management Plans consist of.

Response: The appropriate amount and level of input into these plans will be determined by the cities. The GMPs will be developed as a result of and in coordination and alignment with the CMP but are not necessary inputs into the finalization of the CMP.

Comment: 4 5.3 PROPERTY IMPROVEMENTS On page 50, the DCMP states mentions the removal of “Japanese privet” in various areas for sale on the MSR. I am quite familiar with the privet on the MSR, having volunteered hundreds of hours in its removal at the Hall

Memorial Native Plant Garden and the Small Wild Area (First Quarters Ravine). I am quite sure that the privet on the MSR is not Japanese Privet (*Ligustrum japonicum*), but rather Chinese Privet (*Ligustrum sinense*) and/or the very similar Common Privet (*Ligustrum vulgare*). Japanese Privet has leaves 2-4 inches long and lustrous black fruit. The privet on the MSR has much smaller leaves and the fruit is a dull blue-purple color.

Response: Comment noted. The text of the CMP has been revised to reflect that various invasive species have been removed from the MSR.

Comment: Appendix C, Muscle Shoals Reservation Strategic Development Plan On page 8 of the SDP, under 02.1 Public Process Summary, there is a chart which includes the item below. This meeting is referenced twice again on page 9: *“Finally, the cornerstone of the community outreach was the public workshops. Two rounds of meetings were held to provide a forum for any and all interested community members to come and review the work of the planning team, and to provide their own ideas and vision for how the Reservation might (or might not) change over the future. In the first round of workshops, an informational presentation – covering existing physical and market conditions - was followed by a series of hand-on exercises that allowed participants to review, comment upon and ultimately edit a series of preliminary scenarios for redevelopment. Two versions of this same event were held, one in each county on back-to-back nights, and there were well over forty attendees at each. This helped with a sense of equity, and also made it more accessible for many of the citizens. After reviewing the input from these sessions, a second public open house was held to present the draft framework plan, show how prior comments were integrated into the plan, and to solicit additional input.”* “In the final phase – “Strategic Development Plan” – the planning consultants worked with the Client Team to analyze and refine the public input, in order to develop a draft Strategic Plan. This plan would be presented for comment and edits at one final Core Team meeting, and then rolled out in a final public Open House.” I don’t think this meeting ever took place. Since the SDP is dated Feb. 10, 2012, it can’t be referring to TVA’s Sept. 30, 2014 open house meeting. I *do* recall that at the two public meetings on November 14 and November 15, 2011, the facilitators from LAS mentioned to us that this future meeting would take place in early 2012, just as shown on the time table on page 8 of the SDP. When I asked later about when this meeting would occur, I was told it had been postponed. My question is: why was this meeting canceled? Why is it referenced as *actually taking place* in the SDP? After participating in the two November, 2011, public workshops, why was the general public never shown the draft for the Strategic Development Plan until September, 2014, after a Draft CMP, created with no further public input, was presented as a finished draft?

Response: A final open house meeting on the Strategic Development Plan was scheduled at the time this document was finalized. The authors of the Strategic Development Plan assumed that the meeting would go forward as scheduled and reflected that assumption in the document. When the meeting was later postponed, the document was not reopened for revision to reflect the change.

The public was able to submit comments on the Strategic Development Plan at the final open house meeting on the Comprehensive Master Plan on September 30, 2014.

Comment: On page 16 of the SDP, under 02.2.10 Site Constraints, there is a map (shown below) depicting an area of “Cultural Constraints” (the east-west brownish colored area), just to the south of Pond Creek. I am familiar with this area, but am not aware of any “cultural constraints” here. What does this consist of?

Response: *The cultural constraints identified are two cemeteries located within the surplus property.*

Comment: On page 93, under 05.2.1 Public Participation Process- Continuation, the SDP states: *“In our experience, as the plan for the reservation develops, it will remain important to maintain a “public participation” process. In our experience, an effectively managed public process can be effective in generating public interest in the property and its future, as well as providing ideas and potential solutions to particular planning challenges. Stakeholder Group input, consisting of local community groups, is invaluable, as agencies and organizations that are critical to the success of the Shoals community can provide significant and valuable information. Additionally, these 6 stakeholder groups are able contribute to the strategic understanding of any issues that must be addressed during a successful redevelopment of the Reservation property. The process consists of a series of coordinated public meetings with structured agendas that allow for an exchange of input and information. Referred to as the “Charette” approach, it includes an explanation to the public as to how their input is incorporated into the Master Plan, while simultaneously promoting effective feedback from the public. More strategic and targeted focus group meetings can be planned to allow the Stakeholders to participate in detailed assessment of the Master Plan as it is developed.”* Why was this recommendation ignored by TVA? No charrettes have been held since the two November, 2011 workshops and the promised meeting in early 2012 was cancelled. The public meeting on September 30, 2014 was pretty much a “Kabuki Theater,” “come see the wonderful plan we put together with no public input” affair. The public deserves better from TVA.

Response: *TVA solicited input during the development of the EIS, including during public scoping and during comments on the draft EIS. TVA further solicited public input during the two public participation sessions in 2011. This input was considered by TVA during the development of the Strategic Development Plan and the CMP. Further, TVA solicited additional public comments during a comment period following the September 30, 2014, open house and has considered those comments in formulating the final CMP.*

7. **Name:** Lee Anne Wofford, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer, Alabama Historical Commission

Comment: Upon review of the above referenced project, we have the following comments. On the acronyms and abbreviations page, AHC should be Alabama Historical Commission.

Response: *Comment noted. The text of the CMP has been revised appropriately.*

Comment: We were pleased to see that development restrictions and design guidelines will be applied to the various development areas. We do wonder about new construction adjacent to the actual historic district, such as 5A, 5B and also Area 7. While the document does provide some guidance of “common thread” architectural style and materials, we would recommend that the review body have the authority to review new construction directly adjacent to the historic district to ensure sensitivity to the district. We appreciate your commitment to helping us preserve Alabama’s historic archeological and architectural resources.

Response: *For development inside the Historic District, the cities of Muscle Shoals and Sheffield will have separate entities review designs for alignment with the Historic District*

Guidelines. State law would define the authority of these separate Historic District review bodies to review plans outside the Historic District.