

**FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**  
**TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY**  
TIMS FORD RESERVOIR LAND MANAGEMENT PLAN REVISION  
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT  
FRANKLIN AND MOORE COUNTIES, TENNESSEE

The Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) proposes to revise the 2000 Tims Ford Reservoir Land Management Plan (2000 RLMP) to respond to new issues and changes in conditions and circumstances on TVA-managed land on Tims Ford Reservoir in Franklin and Moore counties in Middle Tennessee. To resolve these issues, TVA proposes to change the land use allocations of approximately 563.6 acres<sup>1</sup> (12 percent) of the 4,685.5 acres of TVA reservoir property on Tims Ford Reservoir. TVA prepared an environmental assessment (EA), incorporated herein by reference, to review the potential environmental impacts of the proposed 2026 RLMP revisions.

TVA issued the final *Tims Ford Reservoir Environmental Impact Statement and Land Management and Disposition Plan* (TVA 2000a and 2000b) in June of 2000, that examined the potential effects of several alternative methods proposed to manage the 6,453.0 acres of TVA-managed public lands and State of Tennessee lands surrounding Tims Ford Reservoir. A land transfer between the State of Tennessee and TVA occurred in 2010, making this land management partnership unnecessary. Therefore, the proposed 2026 RLMP only includes TVA reservoir property and the planned acreage has been updated from 6,453.0 acres in the 2000 RLMP to 4,685.5 acres to account for the change.

The purpose of TVA's RLMP planning process is to apply a systematic method of evaluating and identifying the most suitable uses of TVA-managed public lands in furtherance of TVA's responsibilities under the TVA Act. Up-to-date RLMPs are needed to make land planning allocations on reservoirs consistent with standing TVA policies like the TVA Land Policy and the Shoreline Management Policy, regulations under Section 26a of the TVA Act, and other guidance incorporating TVA's goals for managing natural resources on TVA public lands. RLMPs govern decisions about whether land is disposed of or retained and establish how the land may be used and by whom.

The RLMP planning process also supports compliance with applicable state and federal regulations and executive orders, and helps ensure the protection of significant resources, including threatened and endangered species, cultural resources, wetlands, unique habitats, natural areas, water quality, and the visual character of the reservoirs. Updates to RLMPs are needed to reflect changing land use needs and circumstances and to incorporate TVA's business needs and goals for managing natural resources on public lands.

---

<sup>1</sup> Includes previously unallocated lands.

Consistent with TVA RLMP planning methodology, the public lands managed by TVA on Tims Ford Reservoir have been reviewed by the planning team and placed into one of the seven land use zones consistent with existing land use and staff recommendations. Under Alternative B1 (Preferred Alternative), the proposed 2026 RLMP would update other allocations as appropriate to become consistent with current land planning practices.

The 2026 RLMP addresses a number of legacy issues (2010 transfer of lands between TVA and the State of Tennessee, Zone 8 (Conservation Partnership) parcels, and grandfathered facilities) and responds to changes in land use on Tims Ford Reservoir and updates the plan to current planning standards. Additionally, many transactions and allocation changes have been approved since 2000 and the proposed RLMP incorporates all updates to TVA lands on Tims Ford Reservoir.

The Zone 8 (Conservation Partnership) allocation is unique to Tims Ford Reservoir and was developed in response to public comments on the draft 2000 RLMP to offer more shoreline access while limiting potential shoreline impacts. Originally, 51 parcels were approved for the Zone 8 allocation; however, the criteria for how to implement a conservation easement and issue Section 26a permit for a community facility was complicated and at times not achievable based on site-specific circumstances. Only 10 percent of the Zone 8 parcels have been able to move forward with development of a water-use facility in 25 years. In the final 2026 RLMP, TVA has developed a Preferred Alternative (Alternative B1) that provides a path forward for these parcels that would allow staff to work with individuals or groups to permit a water-use facility and still meet the intent of the Zone 8 allocation.

## **RLMP Alternatives**

In the EA, TVA considered four alternatives that would update the 2000 RLMP, in addition to the No Action Alternative. Each alternative would be consistent with TVA's Comprehensive Valleywide Land Plan target allocation ranges, as described in Section 2.5.3 of the EA.

### **Alternative A - The No Action Alternative**

Under the No Action Alternative, TVA would not take any action to amend the 2000 RLMP for TVA-managed lands on Tims Ford Reservoir. All parcels would continue to be managed by TVA according to the allocations of the 2000 RLMP and subsequent approved allocation changes that have taken place since the 2000 RLMP was completed. Consideration of the No Action Alternative provides a baseline against which to consider the environmental impacts of the action alternatives.

### **Alternative B - Proposed RLMP Alternative (identified as the Preferred Alternative in the Draft EA)**

Under Alternative B, approximately 10.2 percent (477.6 acres) of TVA-owned land on Tims Ford Reservoir would be allocated as Zone 2, and about 7.8 percent (366.3 acres) would be allocated as Zone 3. Approximately 57.2 percent or 2,681.2 acres would be allocated as Zone 4. One 0.22-acre parcel (less than 1 percent) would be allocated as

Zone 5 to reflect existing industrial uses. Approximately 13.7 percent (641.7 acres) would be allocated as Zone 6. Approximately 11.1 percent (518.5 acres) would be allocated as Zone 7. Additionally, there would be changes in how some Zone 7 parcels are managed. Under Alternatives B, B1, and D, there would no longer be a Zone 8 allocation; rather, those parcels would be reallocated to either Zone 7 (with Restrictions) or Zone 4, depending on the unique circumstances. Generally speaking, restrictions under Alternative B include being limited to only shared or community water-use facilities rather than individual water-use facilities.

*Alternative B1 - Modified RLMP Alternative (Preferred Alternative)*

After issuing the draft RLMP and EA and considering public comments received, TVA determined that Alternative B - (identified as the Preferred Alternative in the draft EA) should be slightly modified. Alternative B1 - Modified Proposed RLMP Alternative has been developed as the Preferred Alternative and is substantively the same as Alternative B with the following exceptions: Parcel 20 (1.19 acres), Zone 4 (Natural Resource Conservation), would be changed to Zone 7 (Shoreline Access with Restrictions), and a 0.33-acre portion of Parcel 43 (Zone 7) would be changed to Zone 4 and added to Parcel 40.

Under the proposed Alternative B1, TVA would revise the 2000 RLMP and revise the land use allocations for 95 parcels in response to new issues and changes in conditions and circumstances that affect approximately 563.6 acres (12.0 percent) of the 4,685.5 acres of public lands managed by TVA on Tims Ford Reservoir. Under Alternative B1, TVA would not change the current land use allocation for 84 parcels. The current allocation for these parcels would be incorporated into the 2026 Tims Ford RLMP. Of the 563.6 acres proposed for allocation changes, TVA would allocate 96.9 acres or 2.0 percent to reflect existing land use agreements or commitments. The remaining 466.3 acres (9.5 percent) involve parcel allocations that are not based on existing land use agreements or commitments.

Tims Ford Reservoir would no longer have a Zone 8 allocation, and these parcels would be allocated as Zone 4 (Natural Resource Conservation) or Zone 7 (Shoreline Access) “with Restrictions.” Generally speaking, restrictions under Alternative B1 include being limited to only shared or community water-use facilities rather than individual water-use facilities or only allowing for limited size individual water-use facilities. TVA shoreline maps would have an orange line on the parcel boundary alerting landowners to additional restrictions that these parcels would be subject to. The interactive map on the [land plan website](#) would also indicate what type of restriction applies at the parcel level.

Of the 4,685.5 acres of planned reservoir land on Tims Ford Reservoir, TVA has proposed, under Alternative B1, to allocate the land as summarized in the table below:

### Summary of Alternative B1 - Preferred Alternative Allocation Designations

	Allocation Designation	Acres	Percentage
Zone 2	Project Operations	477.6	10.2
Zone 3	Sensitive Resource Management	366.3	7.8
Zone 4	Natural Resource Conservation	2,680.3	57.2
Zone 5	Industrial	0.2	0.0
Zone 6	Developed Recreation	641.7	13.7
Zone 7	Shoreline Access	519.3	11.1

The proposed land use allocation changes below would result in minor changes to the percentage of overall lands allocated to each land use zone for Tims Ford Reservoir as compared to current allocations.

- Reallocate 87.1 acres to Zone 2 where there are existing road rights-of-way, and public infrastructure projects. Under the 2000 RLMP, most of the public works projects were not allocated for Zone 2.
- Reallocate 64.1 acres to Zone 3 where sensitive resources have been identified.
- Reallocate 333.9 acres to Zone 4 to reflect lack of sensitive resources or lack of deeded access rights.
- Reallocate 0.22 acres to Zone 5 to correct an administrative error.
- Reallocate 16.6 acres to Zone 6 to support existing developed recreation areas and one heavily used informal recreation area.
- Reallocate 1.4 acres to Zone 7 to reflect existing deeded rights and historical permitting practices.
- Reallocate 61.7 acres to Zone 7 with Restrictions to eliminate the Zone 8 allocation while still meeting the intent of the Zone 8 purpose. The dock size of proposed facilities on these tracts will be restricted based on the amount of shoreline controlled, and a few limited parcels will be restricted to community facilities where individual facilities are not feasible based on site-specific conditions, but facilities on these parcels will otherwise follow the current Section 26a Regulations. Communications will be sent to affected parties upon approval of the RLMP.

#### Alternative C - Modified Zone 8 (Conservation Partnership)

Alternative C would be substantially the same as Alternatives B and B1 and except that the Zone 8 allocation would remain with updated criteria. Some parcels that would not qualify for the updated Zone 8 allocation would revert to Zone 4. The proposed allocations to Zone 2, Zone 3, Zone 5 and Zone 6 are consistent with Alternative B.

Under Alternative C, approximately 58.0 percent, or 2,715.6 acres, would be allocated as Zone 4. This would be more acreage (0.8 percent and 34.4 acres) than Alternative B because more Zone 8 parcels would be reallocated to Zone 4 than under Alternatives B, B1, and D. Approximately 9.8 percent (459.7 acres) would be allocated as Zone 7, and

this would be less acreage (1.3 percent and 58.7 acres) than Alternatives B, B1, and D because there would be no parcels reallocated to Zone 7. Zone 8 parcels would remain, and the qualification criteria would be modified. Approximately 0.5 percent (24.3 acres) would be allocated as Zone 8.

#### Alternative D – Individual Water-Use Facilities with Restrictions

Under Alternative D, the proposed allocations to Zone 2 and Zone 5 are consistent with Alternatives B and B1. The proposed allocations to Zone 4 and Zone 7 (with Restrictions) are consistent with Alternative B but there would be an additional 0.87 acre of Zone 7 parcels and 0.87 acres less of Zone 4 parcels under Alternative B1. Parcel 136 (Zone 6) would allow for developed recreation instead of informal recreation (e.g., a small public park versus a public greenway). The change would result in additional Zone 6 acreage (9.3 acres) but would decrease Zone 3 land by 9.3 acres compared to Alternatives B and B1.

Approximately 7.6 percent (357.0 acres) would be allocated as Zone 3. This would be slightly less Zone 3 acreage (0.2 percent and 9.3 acres) than Alternatives B and B1 due to an expansion of Parcel 136 proposed for Zone 6. Approximately 13.9 percent (651.0 acres) is proposed for allocation to Zone 6. Under Alternative D, there would no longer be a Zone 8 allocation. Instead, those parcels would be reallocated to either Zone 7 (with Restrictions) or Zone 4, depending on the unique circumstances. Generally speaking, restrictions under Alternative D would only allow limited size individual water-use facilities.

### **Impacts Assessment**

The EA is a programmatic document that addresses the proposed allocation changes to the Tims Ford RLMP and the potential impacts associated with the various types of uses allowable under each land use zone for the following resources: prime farmlands, recreation, terrestrial and aquatic ecology, threatened and endangered species, water quality, wetlands, floodplains, air quality, cultural and historic resources, managed and natural areas, visual resources and socioeconomics.

Under any of the alternatives reviewed by TVA in the EA, all proposed future projects on TVA lands would be subject to additional site-specific environmental review. Potential impacts to sensitive resources would be identified and avoided or minimized, as appropriate, in a manner consistent with applicable laws and regulations. Whenever such individual projects are proposed in the future, TVA will determine the need for permits, coordination with other agencies, and the appropriate level of NEPA review and documentation.

TVA assumes that the potential for adverse impacts to environmental or cultural resources would be greater when parcels are allocated to Zone 2, Zone 5, or Zone 6, where more development and intensive land uses are permitted to occur. Activities allowed on Zone 7 also have the potential to impact environmental or cultural resources, but development on Zone 7 is typically at a smaller scale (i.e., residential) and impacts are generally minor and localized. Allocating parcels to Zone 3 and Zone 4 has the least

potential to result in impacts to environmental or cultural resources because development or intensive land uses are not permitted in these zones. Under each proposed action alternative, a large percentage of reservoir lands would continue to be allocated to Zones 3 and 4 and managed to protect and maintain their natural character. See Tables 1 and 2 below for a comparison of land use allocations by Alternatives A, B, B1, C and D.

Under the 2000 RLMP (Alternative A), approximately 44.2 percent of prime farmlands on TVA parcels are unavailable for agricultural use. TVA is considering changes to only approximately 12 percent of public lands managed on Tims Ford Reservoir. As such there would be minor differences between the potential effects on prime farmland across the alternatives. There would be a slight increase in lands that would be unavailable for agricultural use to 47.2 percent under Alternatives B, B1, C and D.

Under the 2000 plan, approximately 79.7 percent of TVA lands are allocated to support public recreational opportunities (Zones 3, 4 or 6). Under Alternatives B and B1, there would be a negligible decrease in allocations providing recreation; the decrease would primarily be due to allocations of existing road infrastructure from Zone 4 to Zone 2. Generally, there would be minor impacts on dispersed recreation and developed recreation under Alternatives B and B1.

**Table 1. Comparison of Zone Allocations by Alternative – Alternatives A, B and B1**

Zone	Alternative A		Alternative B			Alternative B1		
	Acres	Percentage	Acres	Acreage Change	Percentage	Acres	Acreage Change	Percentage
2	390.5	8.3	477.6	+87.1	10.2	477.6	+87.1	10.2
3	642.6	13.7	366.3	-276.3	7.8	366.3	-276.3	7.8
4	2,462.8	52.6	2,681.2	+217.5	57.2	2,680.3	+218.4	57.2
5	8.7	0.2	0.2	-8.5	0.0	0.2	-8.5	0.0
6	632.1	13.5	641.7	+9.6	13.7	641.7	+9.6	13.7
7	460.9	9.8	519.3	+57.6	11.1	518.5	+58.4	11.1
8	66.3	1.4	0	-66.3	0	0	-66.3	0

**Table 2. Comparison of Zone Allocations by Alternative – Alternatives A, C, D**

Zone	Alternative A		Alternative C			Alternative D		
	Acres	Percentage	Acres	Acreage Change	Percentage	Acres	Acreage Change	Percentage
2	390.5	8.3	477.6	+87.1	10.2	477.6	+87.1	10.2
3	642.6	13.7	366.3	-276.3	7.8	357.0	-285.6	7.6
4	2,462.8	52.6	2,715.6	+252.8	58.0	2,681.2	+218.4	57.2
5	8.7	0.2	0.2	-8.5	0.0	0.2	-8.5	0.0
6	632.1	13.5	641.7	+9.6	13.7	651.0	+18.9	13.9
7	460.9	9.8	459.7	-1.2	9.8	518.5	+57.6	11.1
8	66.3	1.4	24.3	-42.0	0.5	0	-66.3	0

Under Alternatives C and D, the effects would generally be like those under Alternative B, except that there would be slightly more dispersed recreation under Alternative C and slightly more developed recreation opportunities under Alternative D compared to Alternative B and B1. Recreational opportunities would be insignificantly impacted by TVA's proposed revision of the 2000 RLMP.

Alternative A has 66.5 percent of TVA lands allocated as Zone 3 and Zone 4 and all the action alternatives (B, B1, C and D) have slightly fewer lands (65.8 percent to 64.8 percent or 23.5 acres to 67.2 acres) allocated to these zones. There would be negligible to minor effects to terrestrial ecological resources, including threatened or endangered species, under Alternatives B, B1, C and D because the change from Zones 3 and 4 to zones with greater potential for development is so small. Allocations with this potential are limited, however, and the protection of terrestrial ecological resources would continue and site-specific NEPA reviews would ensure site-specific impacts are addressed in the future.

Impacts to water quality and aquatic life would be negligible under Alternatives B, B1, C and D when compared to Alternative A. Allocations to Zones 2, 5, 6 and 7 have the greatest potential for impacting water quality because of the greater potential for ground-disturbing activities to occur. Under Alternative B, allocations to these zones would be increased by 154.3 acres and Alternative B1 would see these zones increase by 155.2 acres. But these increases are mostly due to allocating unplanned land to reflect existing land uses, allocations to Zone 2 for existing infrastructure, and allocation changes from Zone 8 to Zone 7 with Restrictions. Therefore, adoption of Alternative B1 would have no adverse impacts on water quality. In comparison to Alternatives B and B1, Alternative C would have 34.5 acres less and Alternative D would have 9.3 acres more allocated to these zones. Under each alternative, any proposed land use would be required to protect water quality through either restricted development or the commitment to use best management practices. The selection of any of the alternatives would result in insignificant impacts to water quality and aquatic life.

Under any RLMP alternative, adverse effects to wetlands from any ground disturbing activities that may occur on TVA public lands would be mitigated under Executive Order (EO) 11990 (Protection of Wetlands). Most allocation changes proposed by TVA under Alternatives B, B1, C and D would have neutral to beneficial impacts to wetlands because allocation changes would reflect current conditions (e.g., existing roadway infrastructure) or there would be additional parcels containing wetlands allocated to Zone 3 or Zone 4 for conservation purposes. In consideration of total anticipated impacts for the administrative changes to reflect current conditions, the neutral impacts and the additional allocation of parcels containing the overall wetland impacts under Alternatives B, B1, C and D are anticipated to have no significant impact on wetland resources compared to the No Action Alternative.

Similarly, under any RLMP alternative, any development proposed in the 100-year floodplain would be subject to the requirements of EO 11988 (Floodplain Management). Compared to the No Action Alternative, Alternatives B and B1 would result in a slight net increase of overall environmental impact to floodplains, if parcels allocated for more intensive uses are developed over time. Under Alternative C, there would be neutral to slightly beneficial impacts compared to Alternative A and more beneficial impacts than under Alternatives B and B1. Alternative D would result in similar impacts as Alternatives B and B1.

Under any RLMP alternative, there would be very low potential for impacts to air quality. Under Alternatives B and B1, because TVA's proposed changes to current allocations would result in a slight decrease in lands allocated for Zones 3 and 4, fewer lands would be available for potential carbon sequestration. Under Alternatives B, B1, C and D, TVA's proposed changes would increase areas allocated to Zone 2, Zone 6 and Zone 7, but would decrease areas allocated to Zone 5, when compared to Alternative A, thereby decreasing the potential for greenhouse gas emissions for those parcels because there would be less property allocated for Industrial use. There would be a decrease in land previously allocated as Zones 3 and 4 and the acreage changes are primarily due to the reallocation to Zone 2 to reflect existing uses for roadway and utility ROWs. There would be an increase in lands allocated as Zone 7 under Alternatives B, B1 and D but this is because there would no longer be a Zone 8 allocation and many of those parcels would change to Zone 7 "with Restrictions." Such negligible changes would result in negligible effects to air quality or greenhouse gas emissions, when comparing Alternatives B, B1, C and D to Alternative A. Future projects would be subject to applicable federal, state, and local air quality regulations.

Under any RLMP alternative, TVA would continue to protect known cultural resources. Under Alternatives B and B1, the proposed changes include allocation from Zone 4 to Zone 3 due to the presence of sensitive resources, to Zone 6 to support the maintenance and possible expansion of an existing public access area with limited facilities, and to Zone 7 where there is a history of water-use facility permitting and it is immediately adjacent to another Zone 7 parcel. A majority of allocation changes (about 66 percent) under Alternatives B and B1 would result in management that is similar or more protective of these cultural sites when compared to the 2000 RLMP (Alternative A), while about 33 percent of allocation changes would increase the potential for

disturbance or development of parcels with cultural sites (although some of these changes were made to reflect existing ROW and infrastructure, thereby resulting in no change). Under Alternative C, there would be a small increase in land allocated to Zones 3 and 4 and a decrease in allocations to other zones. Alternative C would result in minor beneficial impacts to cultural resources because there is a lower potential for land disturbance. Alternative D would result in no change in parcels allocated to Zone 4, and there would be slightly less Zone 3 acreage (0.2 percent) than Alternatives B and B1. Prior to implementing any future projects on Tims Ford Reservoir lands, TVA would comply with established procedures for identifying, evaluating, and avoiding or mitigating impacts to archaeological resources and historic structures. Specific procedures for addressing these cultural resources are described in a Programmatic Agreement (PA) between TVA, the Tennessee State Historic Preservation Officer, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. For any proposed undertaking, TVA would take necessary steps to ensure compliance with the regulatory requirements under the National Historic Preservation Act.

Existing managed areas such as natural areas and ecologically significant sites were also considered during TVA's planning and review process. Under Alternative B and B1, proposed changes to parcel allocations intersecting or adjacent to natural areas would affect small areas but most of the proposed allocation changes reflect land use changes that have already taken place. About 65 percent of TVA lands would remain under protective or conservation management, therefore ensuring that the majority of TVA parcels on Tims Ford Reservoir would remain natural and managed in a way that preserves natural areas. The potential effects to managed areas under Alternatives C and D would be substantially the same as Alternatives B and B1, except Under Alternative C fewer parcels would be identified for potential new development. Like under Alternatives B and B1, there would be no additional adverse effects to natural areas under Alternatives C and D. The proposed reallocations most likely to affect natural areas, whether those that intersect or are adjacent to parcels proposed for reallocation, would result in negligible to minor effects to natural areas on Tims Ford Reservoir.

Under Alternatives B and B1, there would be minor changes in scenic resources on Tims Ford Reservoir. TVA would change allocations of approximately 563.6 acres of land (about 12 percent of TVA-managed lands on the reservoir). While the effects of Alternatives B and B1 to visual resources would be limited to these parcels, many of the proposed changes are proposed to reflect existing land uses. Alternative C would result in slightly less development potential and Alternative D would involve reallocation of a parcel to Zone 6. There is potential for minor effects on visual resources under Alternatives B, B1, C and D compared to Alternative A, although localized effects may be moderate. The effects of Alternative C to visual resources would be similar to Alternatives B, B1 and D; there would be slightly fewer impacts to visual resources under Alternative C because fewer areas would be allocated for potential development or use.

The proposed RLMP alternatives also have potential to have socioeconomic effects. The allocations with the most opportunities to impact socioeconomics are Zones 5, 6, 7

and 8. Compared to Alternative A, those zones combined would decrease by 7.6 acres compared to Alternative B and Alternative B1 would result in those zones decreasing by 6.7 acres. Thus, the Zone 5, 6, 7 and 8 allocation changes would result in nominal changes in socioeconomic outcomes. Proposed allocations under Alternative C would result in a slight decrease of parcels allocated for Zones 3 and 4 and Alternative D would have a minor shift in acreage to Zone 6, which has potential for minor socioeconomic benefits. Under Alternatives B, B1, C and D, there would continue to be large amounts of land available to the public, and there would be no impacts under this alternative that would measurably impact minorities or low-income residents.

TVA's analysis found that revising the 2000 RLMP would not result in significant reasonably foreseeable future impacts. Potential effects may occur when specific future projects are proposed and implemented. Site-specific NEPA reviews will be conducted for future proposed projects and unavoidable adverse effects would be determined at that time. The potential to negatively affect long-term productivity of the land, as well as potential irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources, would be slightly greater under Alternatives B and B1 than under the other alternatives.

### **Public Involvement**

In June 2024, TVA initiated a public scoping process for the Tims Ford RLMP planning process to gather the public's recommendations on plan revisions and to gather input on relevant issues to be addressed during the planning process. During the scoping period, TVA received a total of 49 submissions from members of the public and intergovernmental entities. TVA reviewed the public's scoping input when developing the draft planning alternatives and EA.

On June 23, 2025, TVA issued the draft EA and RLMP for public review and comment. During the 60-day review period, TVA received 75 comment letters, including submittals from nearby residents, other members of the public and organizations. Numerous commenters expressed support for TVA's proposal to revise the RLMP, while a few commenters urged TVA to continue implementing the 2000 RLMP and to make no changes. Some commenters provided comments or questions relating to how specific parcels were managed or would be allocated under a revised plan. TVA carefully reviewed the input and incorporated it into the final EA and RLMP. TVA's responses to the public comments are included in Appendix A of the final EA.

### **Permits, Consultation and Environmental Commitments**

No federal permits are required to develop an RLMP. Information on reservoir resources were characterized in the EA, and potential impacts on these resources were considered in making land use allocation recommendations. As previously noted, when specific actions are proposed on TVA parcels addressed in the RLMP, additional environmental reviews for these actions would be undertaken as necessary to address potential project specific impacts. When considering future development of reservoir lands, TVA would also comply with applicable environmental requirements, including the Endangered Species Act (ESA), Clean Water Act, Clean Air Act, and applicable

Executive Orders, and ensure that proper agency coordination and permitting requirements are met.

Appropriate agencies and offices regulating historic resources and endangered species have been consulted during this planning process. TVA will comply with the Programmatic Agreement (PA) executed in January 2020 in consultation with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, seven State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPO), including the Tennessee SHPO, and federally recognized Indian Tribes, to address a suite of activities. This PA addresses TVA's compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act when implementing the various land plan activities. In June 2025, TVA initiated consultation with the Tennessee SHPO and Tribes who have expressed an interest in Franklin and Moore counties.

TVA will comply with TVA's ESA Section 7 Programmatic Bat Consultation, first completed in 2018 and most recently revised in 2024 in coordination with the seven USFWS state ecological service offices for federally listed bats and 96 routine activities. TVA will also complete any necessary consultation with the USFWS under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act during environmental reviews of proposed site-specific activities on TVA reservoir lands.

### **Conclusion and Findings**

Based on the findings of the EA, TVA concludes that revising the Tims Ford RLMP, as proposed under Alternative B, B1, C or D, would not be a major federal action significantly affecting the environment. Accordingly, an environmental impact statement is not required.



---

Dawn Booker  
Senior Manager, NEPA Compliance  
Tennessee Valley Authority

1/30/2026

---

Date