

Categorical Exclusion Record for Proposed TVA Actions

Categorical Exclusion Number Claimed 26	Organization ID Number Tri ID 4015514	Tracking Number (NEPA Administration Use Only) 47279
Form Preparer Derek T South	Project Initiator/Manager Derek T South	Business Unit P&NR - Commercial & Public Recreation
Project Title 26a Permit Category 2 TRIRIGA ID 4015514 City of Clifton, Kentucky Reservoir		Hydrologic Unit Code
Description of Proposed Action (Include Anticipated Dates of Implementation) <input type="checkbox"/> Continued on Page 3 (if more than one line) For Proposed Action See Attachments and References		
Initiating TVA Facility or Office Kentucky Reservoir		TVA Business Units Involved in Project
Location (City, County, State) For Project Location see Attachments and References		

Parts 1 through 4 verify that there are no extraordinary circumstances associated with this action:

Part 1. Project Characteristics

Is there evidence that the proposed action...	No	Yes	Commitment	Information Source for Insignificance
1. Is major in scope?	X			NOA, South, Derek T. 01/07/2022
2. Is part of a larger project proposal involving other TVA actions or other federal agencies?	X			For comments see attachments
* 3. Involves non-routine mitigation to avoid adverse impacts ?	X		No	Nelson, Dana M. 02/06/2023
4. Is opposed by another federal, state, or local government agency?	X			Nelson, Dana M. 02/06/2023
* 5. Has environmental effects which are controversial?	X			NOA, South, Derek T. 01/07/2022
* 6. Is one of many actions that will affect the same resources?		X		For comments see attachments
7. Involves more than minor amount of land?	X			NOA, South, Derek T. 01/07/2022

*If "yes" is marked for any of the above boxes, consult with NEPA Administration on the suitability of this project for a categorical exclusion.

Part 2. Natural and Cultural Features Affected

Would the proposed action...	No	Yes	Permit	Commitment	Information Source for Insignificance
1.Potentially affect endangered, threatened, or special status species?	X		No	No	For comments see attachments
2.Potentially affect historic structures, historic sites, Native American religious or cultural properties, or archaeological sites?		X	No	No	For comments see attachments
3.Potentially take prime or unique farmland out of production?	X		No	No	NOA, South, Derek T. 01/07/2022
4.Potentially affect Wild and Scenic Rivers or their tributaries?	X		No	No	Nelson, Dana M. 02/09/2023
5.Potentially affect a stream on the Nationwide Rivers Inventory?	X		No	No	Nelson, Dana M. 02/09/2023
6.Potentially affect wetlands?	X		No	No	For comments see attachments
7.Potentially affect water flow, stream banks or stream channels?		X	No	No	For comments see attachments
8.Potentially affect the 100-year floodplain?		X	No	No	For comments see attachments
9.Potentially affect ecologically critical areas, federal, state, or local park lands, national or state forests, wilderness areas, scenic areas, wildlife management areas, recreational areas, greenways, or trails?	X		No	No	For comments see attachments
10.Contribute to the spread of exotic or invasive species?	X		No	No	For comments see attachments
11.Potentially affect migratory bird populations?	X		No	No	For comments see attachments
12.Involve water withdrawal of a magnitude that may affect aquatic life or involve interbasin transfer of water?	X		No	No	NOA, South, Derek T. 01/07/2022
13.Potentially affect surface water?		X	No	No	For comments see attachments
14.Potentially affect drinking water supply?	X		No	No	NOA, South, Derek T. 01/07/2022
15.Potentially affect groundwater?	X		No	No	NOA, South, Derek T. 01/07/2022
16.Potentially affect unique or important terrestrial habitat?	X		No	No	For comments see attachments
17.Potentially affect unique or important aquatic habitat?	X		No	No	For comments see attachments

Part 3. Potential Pollutant Generation

Would the proposed action potentially (including accidental or unplanned)...	No	Yes	Permit	Commitment	Information Source for Insignificance
1.Release air pollutants?	X		No	No	For comments see attachments
2.Generate water pollutants?	X		No	No	CBC, South, Derek T. 01/07/2022
3.Generate wastewater streams?	X		No	No	CBC, South, Derek T. 01/07/2022
4.Cause soil erosion?		X	No	No	For comments see attachments
5.Discharge dredged or fill materials?		X	No	No	For comments see attachments
6.Generate large amounts of solid waste or waste not ordinarily generated?	X		No	No	For comments see attachments
7.Generate or release hazardous waste (RCRA)?	X		No	No	CBC, South, Derek T. 01/07/2022
8.Generate or release universal or special waste, or used oil?		X	No	No	For comments see attachments
9.Generate or release toxic substances (CERCLA, TSCA)?	X		No	No	CBC, South, Derek T. 01/07/2022
10.Involve materials such as PCBs, solvents, asbestos, sandblasting material, mercury, lead, or paints?		X	No	No	For comments see attachments
11.Involve disturbance of pre-existing contamination?	X		No	No	Nelson, Dana M. 02/09/2023
12.Generate noise levels with off-site impacts?		X	No	No	For comments see attachments
13.Generate odor with off-site impacts?	X		No	No	CBC, South, Derek T. 01/07/2022
14.Produce light which causes disturbance?	X		No	No	CBC, South, Derek T. 01/07/2022
15.Release of radioactive materials?	X		No	No	CBC, South, Derek T. 01/07/2022
16.Involve underground or above-ground storage tanks or bulk storage?	X		No	No	CBC, South, Derek T. 01/07/2022
17.Involve materials that require special handling?	X		No	No	CBC, South, Derek T. 01/07/2022

Part 4. Social and Economic Effects

Would the proposed action...	No	Yes	Permit	Commitment	Information Source for Insignificance
1.Potentially cause public health effects?	X			No	NOA, South, Derek T. 01/07/2022
2.Increase the potential for accidents affecting the public?	X			No	For comments see attachments
3.Cause the displacement or relocation of businesses, residences, cemeteries, or farms?	X			No	NOA, South, Derek T. 01/07/2022
4.Contrast with existing land use, or potentially affect resources described as unique or significant in a federal, state, or local plan?	X			No	For comments see attachments
5.Disproportionately affect minority or low-income populations?	X			No	NOA, South, Derek T. 01/07/2022
6.Involve genetically engineered organisms or materials?	X			No	NOA, South, Derek T. 01/07/2022
7.Produce visual contrast or visual discord?	X			No	For comments see attachments
8.Potentially interfere with recreational or educational uses?	X			No	For comments see attachments
9.Potentially interfere with river or other navigation?	X		No	No	Nelson, Dana M. 02/09/2023
10.Potentially generate highway or railroad traffic problems?	X			No	For comments see attachments

Part 5. Other Environmental Compliance/Reporting Issues

Would the proposed action...	No	Yes	Commitment	Information Source for Insignificance
1.Release or otherwise use substances on the Toxic Release Inventory list?	X		No	NOA, South, Derek T. 01/07/2022
2.Involve a structure taller than 200 feet above ground level?	X		No	NOA, South, Derek T. 01/07/2022
3.Involve site-specific chemical traffic control?	X		No	NOA, South, Derek T. 01/07/2022
4.Require a site-specific emergency notification process?	X		No	NOA, South, Derek T. 01/07/2022
5.Cause a modification to an existing environmental permit or to existing equipment with an environmental permit or involve the installation of new equipment/systems that will require a permit?	X		No	NOA, South, Derek T. 01/07/2022
6.Potentially impact operation of the river system or require special water elevations or flow conditions??	X		No	Nelson, Dana M. 02/09/2023
7.Involve construction or lease of a new building or demolition or renovation of existing building (i.e. major changes to lighting, HVAC, and/or structural elements of building of 1000 sq. ft. or more)?	X		No	Nelson, Dana M. 02/09/2023

Based upon my review of environmental impacts, the discussion attached, and/or consultations with NEPA Administration, I have determined that the above action does not have a significant impact on the quality of the human environment and that no extraordinary circumstances exist.

Therefore, this proposal qualifies for a categorical exclusion under 26 TVA's NEPA procedures at 18 CFR part 1318 .

Project Initiator/Manager Derek T South		Date
TVA Organization P&NR	E-mail dtsouth@tva.gov	Telephone

Environmental Concurrence Reviewer

Dana M Nelson

Signature

Preparer Closure

Signature

Other Environmental Concurrence Signatures (as required by your organization)

Signature

Signature

Signature

Signature

Other Review Signatures (as required by your organization)

Attachments/References

Description of Proposed Action Continued from Page 1

Subject to the approval of TVA under Section 26a of the TVA Act, the City of Clifton, Tennessee, proposes to extend the existing, paved old ferry road to form a loop one block over and up to the intersection of Hwy 128 and Polk Street. Additionally, the current parking area would be moved to the inner loop and additional parking spaces added. This will improve vehicle access to the boat dock. The existing dock will be moved slightly downstream to a recessed area of the shoreline to provide better protection from river currents. The City is also proposing to add an additional ~200 feet of riprap to stabilize a portion of the shoreline.

Project Location Continued from Page 1

Wayne County, TN, County, State: Wayne County, TN Land Tract(s): Disposal GIR 66 Map Sheet(s): 33 NW Quad Sheet 243 C/D Stage Stream(s): Tennessee R 158 Right

CEC General Comment Listing

1.	In the Information Source columns associated with the checklist questions, NOA refers to Nature of Action and CBC refers to Cleared By Criteria. These criteria are described in the Resource Stewardship Prescreening Criteria Checklist Instructions. By: Derek T South 01/07/2022	
2.	Approval - Other Agency By: Derek T South 01/07/2022 Files: water_permit_arap-gp_bank-armoring-veg-stabilization-2021-2025.pdf 01/07/2022	157.76 Bytes
3.	Approval - Other Agency By: Derek T South 01/07/2022 Files: DWR-NR2108.3433-NOC-20220105-2366.pdf 01/07/2022	139.22 Bytes
4.	Bat Strategy Form By: Derek T South 01/07/2022 Files: BAT FORM.pdf 01/07/2022	1,066.65 Bytes
5.	Map - Topo/Quad (with location of interest) By: Derek T South 01/07/2022 Files: 4015514_26a_Quad.pdf 01/07/2022	531.57 Bytes
6.	Map - Aerial By: Derek T South 01/07/2022 Files: 4015514_26a_aerial.pdf 01/07/2022	1,156.71 Bytes
7.	Map - C/D Stage (with location of interest) By: Derek T South 01/07/2022 Files: 4015514_26a_dstage.pdf 01/07/2022	326.46 Bytes
8.	Applicant Disclosure Form By: Derek T South 01/07/2022 Files: adf.pdf 01/07/2022	77.04 Bytes
9.	Photo By: Derek T South 01/07/2022 Files: photos.pdf 01/07/2022	270.13 Bytes
10.	Map - General By: Derek T South 01/07/2022 Files: map.pdf 01/07/2022	173.04 Bytes
11.	Application - Signed by Applicant By: Derek T South 01/07/2022 Files: 4015514_Application.pdf 01/07/2022	2,192.24 Bytes
12.	Plans or Drawings By: Derek T South 01/07/2022 Files: drawings.pdf 01/07/2022	168.28 Bytes
13.	TDOT By: Derek T South 02/06/2023 Files: Memorandum 1803.pdf 02/06/2023	96.51 Bytes

CEC Comment Listing

Part 1 Comments

2. TVA serves as a principal partner in the Tennessee RiverLine program. The City of Clifton is a participating town in the RiverLine program; however, the proposed project is not a RiverLine associated project.
By: Dana M Nelson 02/06/2023
6. The associated dock relocation and bank stabilization are not anticipated to affect resources. Addressed in the Shoreline Management Initiative Environmental Impact Statement.
By: Derek T South 02/06/2023
- Part 2 Comments
1. Aquatics: A 01-21-2022 review of the TVA Heritage Database indicates there are 16 listed aquatic species found within 10 miles of the proposed action(s). 7 federally listed and 8 state listed species are known from extant populations within 10 miles of the proposed action(s). Based on a review of the field notes and photos, species or their habitat are unlikely to be present or near the project site and would not be impacted by the proposed action(s).
Botanical: A 01-21-2022 review of the TVA Heritage Database indicates there are 9 listed plant species found within 5 miles of the proposed action(s). No federally listed species and 9 state listed plant species are known from extant populations within 5 miles of the proposed action(s). The project site consists of mostly developed shoreline and it is unlikely that any of the listed plant species are present. The proposed action(s) will have no impact on the listed plant species.
Terrestrial: A 01-21-2022 review of the TVA Heritage Database indicates there are 3 listed terrestrial species found within 3 miles of the proposed action(s). 2 federally listed and 3 state listed species are known from extant populations within 3 miles of the proposed action(s). Based on a review of the field notes and photos, species or their habitat are unlikely to be present or near the project site and would not be impacted by the proposed action(s).
Caves: A 01-21-2022 review of the TVA Heritage Database indicates there are no caves within 3 miles of the proposed action(s).
By: Mike Hooker 01/21/2022
Files: 4015514BAT FORM_mikehooker.pdf 01/21/2022 1,066.97 Bytes
Copy of Heritage_species_list_47279.pdf 01/21/2022 203.88 Bytes
2. There are prior State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) consultations by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) in 2010 and TVA in 2015, for the project location with regards to an existing unpermitted dock and new rip rap stabilization. A review of the NRHP indicates the permit area is also within the viewshed of the NRHP-listed Water Street Historic District. The SHPO concurred with TVA in 2015 that rip rap stabilization and the existing dock at the project location would be minimally visible and would not introduce a new visual element to the Historic District. The current stabilization plans and dock do not represent a substantive change from the 2015 consultation.
- Although the Water Street Historic District is within the visual APE of project actions, the proposed road extension and parking area are inside an existing public park and are not within the boundaries of the historic district. The design drawing indicates that the parking area will have a very limited capacity for parking spaces for use by park patrons. TVA has determined that the proposed road extension and limited parking area are not out of character from urban features that have already been constructed either inside of or within view of the Walnut Street Historic District prior to TVA's involvement. In addition, the 1992 Water Street NRHP map also shows that the proposed road extension was already planned as roadway at least 30 years ago. TVA believes that the road extension and the limited parking inside an existing public park would introduce no appreciable changes to land-use, traffic patterns, or audible elements, that have the potential to cause effects to historic properties.
- Based on the results of the background research, previous survey, multiple SHPO no effect findings as well as the minimal nature of the project scope within an existing public park, TVA reiterates that the proposed actions by City of Clifton would have no adverse effects to historic properties.
By: Kerry D Nichols 02/10/2023
8. Please see the attached Word document, also located at: Main.tva.gov\share\rsoe\RG WM-Work-Flood Risk\H&H Impact Reviews & Studies\Reviews 26a\26a2022\
By: Carrie C Williamson 08/22/2022
Files: 4015514 CEC 47279 kent Clifton ferry parking 26a.docx 08/22/2022 517.21 Bytes
9. The proposed project is within the property under a license agreement by TVA to the City of Clifton for public recreation. The proposed project is intended to have a beneficial effect on the public recreation area because the facilities would be enhanced.
By: Dana M Nelson 02/22/2023
9. A 01-21-2022 review of the TVA Heritage Database indicates there are 2 Heritage Sites and/or Managed Areas within 5 miles of the proposed action(s). These sites are sufficient distance 0.5 miles from the project site not to be impacted. The Heritage sites and/or Managed Areas will not be impacted by the proposed action(s).
By: Mike Hooker 01/21/2022
10. Insignificant with implementation of General and Standard Conditions including BMPs.
By: Mike Hooker 01/21/2022
11. A 01-21-2022 review of the TVA Heritage Database indicates that there are no known wading bird colonies within 3 miles of the proposed action(s). No other aggregations of migratory birds are known from within 3 miles of the project location.
By: Mike Hooker 01/21/2022
13. Short term water pollutants; such as sedimentation may occur as a result of the proposed shoreline activities. Standard construction and erosion control BMPs will be used to minimize and prevent sedimentation and runoff of soils, concrete, or road surfacing material. Temporary impacts associated with construction and erosion would be eventually eliminated as impacted areas are revegetated or otherwise stabilized. Additionally, secondary containment measures for hydraulic fluid, oils, and gasoline for heavy equipment will be available onsite to minimize and prevent runoff of spills into nearby water bodies.
By: Dana M Nelson 02/09/2023

16. A 01-21-2022 review of the TVA Heritage Database indicates that there are no unique or important terrestrial or cave habitats on or adjacent to the project location.
By: Mike Hooker 01/21/2022
17. A 01-21-2022 review of the TVA Heritage Database indicates that there are no unique or important aquatic habitats on or adjacent to the project location.
By: Mike Hooker 01/21/2022
6. A 01-21-2022 review of site information provided indicates there are no protected wetlands on or adjacent to the project location.
By: Mike Hooker 01/21/2022
7. Impacts to water flow, stream banks or stream channels are anticipated to be minimal or insignificant with implementation of BMP's.
By: Dana M Nelson 02/24/2023

Part 3 Comments

1. It is anticipated that implementation of the proposed project would require the use of heavy equipment which will cause a minimal amount of air pollutants that will be of no environmental consequence. In addition, standard construction BMPs, such as dust control, would reduce environmental impacts to the point that no special mitigation measures would be required.
By: Dana M Nelson 02/09/2023
4. Land disturbance associated with the proposed project is anticipated to be temporary and result in minor soil erosion, which can be effectively controlled with the BMPs as outlined in standards and conditions that accompany the 26a permit; therefore, impacts would be short term and insignificant. Additionally, if greater than one acre of land is disturbed, at a given period of time, the Applicant would be required to obtain coverage under the TDEC 2016 National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Discharges Associated with Construction Activity (TNR100000). Coverage would require development of a site-specific Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, which would detail applicable BMPs to minimize surface water impacts from erosion of sediment, solid waste, chemicals usage, equipment usage and maintenance, and dust control.
By: Dana M Nelson 02/09/2023
5. Riprap is from a commercial source. Shoreline stabilization is considered fill material; therefore, requires §401 Water Quality Certification and USACE §404 permit. The §401 certification is covered under the TDEC general permit for bank armoring.
By: Dana M Nelson 02/09/2023
6. The Applicant is responsible for ensuring that all waste will be properly contained, handled, and disposed of per local, State, and federal ordinances, laws, and regulations.
By: Dana M Nelson 02/09/2023
8. When equipment is utilized on site, a spill kit of sufficient supplies to clean up and/or prevent a further release of hydraulic fluids or other petroleum products to the land or water must be maintained on site. The cleanup, disposal and reporting requirements of any such spill must be completed according to State and Federal regulations.
By: Dana M Nelson 02/09/2023
10. It is anticipated that paint will be used to mark the road surface. Proper storage, handling, and application of paints and secondary components (reflective material) used to mark the pavement will minimize the possible release of contaminants to the environment and include preventative measures for managing accidental spills of pavement marking materials.
By: Dana M Nelson 02/09/2023
12. It is anticipated that the project would be supported by a small workforce and construction crews would observe a typical eight to ten-hour workday Monday-Saturday. Noise would stem from the temporary and intermittent use of heavy equipment. Upon completion of construction, noise levels would return to preconstruction levels.
By: Dana M Nelson 02/09/2023

Part 4 Comments

2. The old ferry road is an existing, paved access to the public dock and boat ramp. It currently has a single point of entry and exit. The proposed project is to extend the road to form a loop in order to improve traffic flow and access to the dock and boat ramp.
By: Dana M Nelson 02/09/2023
4. No new impacts nor contrast with existing land uses are anticipated because the proposed project is a reconfiguration of the existing site features.
By: Dana M Nelson 02/09/2023
7. No visual contrast or discord are anticipated because the proposed project is a reconfiguration of the existing site features.
By: Dana M Nelson 02/09/2023
10. Improving the park facilities may result in additional visitors and thus, a marginal increase of traffic at the intersection. Traffic control, in accordance with the requirements of the City, County, and TDOT Traffic Departments shall be required within the public Rights-of-Way.
By: Dana M Nelson 02/22/2023
8. The proposed site modifications are anticipated to enhance the user experience.
By: Dana M Nelson 02/09/2023

CEC Permit Listing

CEC Commitment Listing