

**FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**  
**TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY**  
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT GRANT PROPOSAL FOR THE  
DEVELOPMENT OF SNAPPS FERRY ROAD INDUSTRIAL SITE  
GREENE COUNTY, TENNESSEE (GREENEVILLE)

An integral part of Tennessee Valley Authority’s (TVA) mission is to promote economic development within the TVA service area. TVA provides financial assistance to help bring to market new/improved sites and facilities within the TVA service area and position communities to compete successfully for new jobs and capital investment. TVA proposes to provide an economic development grant through InvestPrep funds to the Greene County Partnership (GCP) to assist with the development of a portion of the Snapps Ferry Road Industrial Site (SFRIS) in Greene County, Tennessee. The area of TVA’s Proposed Action (herein referred to as the Project Area) encompasses 49.2 acres of mostly open grassy land with some forested strips and patches located adjacent to Snapps Ferry Road and Gass Drive, 0.2 mile from U.S. Highway 321, in Greeneville, Tennessee.

The proposal is the subject of an Environmental Assessment (EA) prepared by TVA, which is incorporated herein by reference. In the EA, TVA evaluated potential impacts of the Proposed Action (i.e., the Action Alternative) as well as the alternative of not implementing the action (i.e., the No Action Alternative). Under the No Action Alternative, TVA would not provide InvestPrep funds to the GCP. TVA would not be furthering its mission of promoting economic development by assisting the local community to compete successfully for new jobs and capital investment through the Proposed Action. The GCP may seek alternate funding (if available) to combine with their existing funds to develop the site. Success in obtaining alternate funding would result in similar impacts and benefits as the Action Alternative. If the GCP were not able to secure the funding for the Proposed Action, the site would likely remain unchanged, no environmental impacts would be anticipated, and the economic benefits associated with the Action Alternative would not be accomplished.

Under the Action Alternative, TVA would provide InvestPrep funds to the GCP, to be matched with non-TVA funds to facilitate the development of a portion of the SFRIS. TVA funds for the 49.2-acre Project Area would be used for clearing 4.11 acres of trees. Trees and stumps would be burned onsite. The Project Area would be graded to create a 350,000 square foot (SF) dirt building pad along with a gravel marketing road, three detention basins, and stabilization after grading activities are completed. The Proposed Action is expected to require a 14-month duration and would require a small workforce that would most likely be assigned by a local contractor.

TVA’s preferred alternative is the Proposed Action Alternative. This alternative would meet the purpose of the Project and would further TVA’s mission to promote economic development in the TVA service area.

The potential impacts of the Action Alternative are described in detail in the EA. Implementation of the Action Alternative would have no impact on solid and hazardous wastes, floodplains, land use, historic structures and sites, prime farmland, managed and natural areas and recreation.

Resources that could potentially be impacted (negatively or positively) by implementing the Action Alternative include air quality and climate change, groundwater, soils, surface water, wetlands, aquatic zoology, terrestrial zoology, botany, and archaeology. Implementation of the Action Alternative could create potential impacts to the human environment, including visual effects, noise, socioeconomics and environmental justice, and transportation issues.

Construction-related activities, including burning of trees and stumps, would result in minor and short-term impacts to air quality and climate change. With the use of best management practices (BMPs) impacts would be minimal, temporary, and localized; and would not be anticipated to result in any violation of applicable ambient air quality standards, impact regional air quality, or affect nearby persons.

Near-surface grading activities would not intersect with the principal water supply aquifer in the area and effects to groundwater would be minor. Soils disturbed by grading would be stabilized after construction, thereby preventing erosion and sedimentation.

The Action Alternative could affect four presumed jurisdictional streams (three intermittent streams and one perennial stream), four presumed non-jurisdictional channels, and two presumed jurisdictional wetlands if they cannot be avoided. All of the identified surface waterbodies and wetlands were located along the north/northwestern/southwestern and eastern/southeastern Project Area boundaries and it is possible that the GCP may be able to avoid these features during site development given their locations. Erosion control measures would be implemented, in accordance with a project-specific construction general permit/stormwater pollution prevention plan, to sufficiently reduce sedimentation. Direct and unavoidable impacts to regulated waterbodies, if they occur, would be coordinated with the Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and permit approval and any associated compensatory mitigation would ensure impacts are not significant. This would ensure that this TVA-funded Proposed Action would be compliant with the Clean Water Act (CWA) Sections 401 and 404 and Executive Order 11990. Impacts to common aquatic species found in the perennial waterbody would not be significant and no rare, threatened, or endangered aquatic species occur in the Project Area.

Impacts to common plant species removed and common wildlife species removed or disturbed would be minor and insignificant. Approximately 4.11 acres of trees would be cleared in the Project Area. No habitat for uncommon or rare plant communities is present within the Project Area or would be affected by the Proposed Action. No plants protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), or habitat suitable for listed plant species, are present in the Project Area. No state-listed protected species would be significantly affected.

Under Section 7 of the ESA, presence of the federally endangered rusty patched bumblebee should be presumed only in zones of high potential. Greene County occurs within the historical range of the species, and there are no high-potential zones in Tennessee. As such, Section 7 consultation is not required for the rusty patched bumblebee.

No suitable winter roosting habitat exists in the Project Area for the federally endangered gray bat or northern long-eared bat, or the proposed endangered tricolored bat. Approximately 0.45 acre of suitable summer roosting habitat for northern long-eared bat, and foraging habitat for northern long-eared bat, gray bat, and tricolored bat exists in fields, woodlots, and over and around streams and wetlands within and adjacent to the Project Area.

A number of activities associated with the Action Alternative were addressed in TVA's programmatic consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on routine actions and federally listed bats in accordance with ESA Section 7(a)(2), which was completed in April 2018 and updated in May 2023. For those activities with potential to affect bats, TVA committed to implementing specific conservation measures. These activities and associated conservation measures are identified in the TVA Bat Strategy Project Screening Form (Attachment 2 of EA) and must be reviewed/implemented as part of the Action Alternative. With implementation of these conservation measures, no significant impacts are expected to affect federally listed or proposed listed bats. Therefore, the requirements under Section 7 of the ESA have been met.

No archaeological sites were identified during the field survey. Under the Action Alternative, there would be no impacts on archaeological resources.

Construction vehicles and equipment visible during grading activities would have a minor visual impact over the temporary construction period. Therefore, implementation of the Proposed Action would result in only a minor overall change in visual quality.

Construction noise, including blasting, would be localized and temporary, and no receptor would be exposed to significant noise levels for an extended period. Further, construction activities would be expected to be conducted during daylight hours, when ambient noise levels are often higher, and most individuals are less sensitive to noise. Thus, noise-related impacts resulting from implementation of the Action Alternative are anticipated to be temporary and minor.

Minor beneficial socioeconomic impacts during construction and operation would occur. No long-term impacts to community services are anticipated and there would be no disproportionate impacts to low-income or minority communities in the area.

Additional traffic would be generated during construction activities. However, the amount of additional traffic generated would be minor and have a negligible impact on overall traffic volumes.

### **Mitigation**

To minimize or reduce the environmental effects of site activities associated with the Action Alternative, the GCP, or its contractors, would ensure all grading activities conducted comply with construction stormwater permitting requirements and utilize applicable BMPs to minimize and control erosion and fugitive dust during these actions. These practices include, but are not limited to, installation of sediment and erosion controls (silt fences, sediment traps, etc.); management of fugitive dust; and a restriction allowing work during daytime work hours.

Operations involving chemical or fuel storage or resupply and vehicle servicing would be handled outside of riparian areas and in such a manner as to prevent these items from reaching a watercourse. Earthen berms or other effective means would be installed to protect nearby surface

waters from direct surface runoff. Servicing of equipment and vehicles would be done with care to avoid leakage, spillage, and subsequent surface or ground water contamination. Oil waste, filters, and other litter would be collected and disposed of properly.

Specific avoidance and conservation measures would be implemented as a part of the Action Alternative to reduce effects to gray bat, northern long-eared bat, and tricolored bat. These measures are identified in the TVA Bat Strategy Project Screening Form (Attachment 2 of EA).

### **Conclusion and Findings**

Based on the findings listed above and the analyses in the EA, we conclude that the Proposed Action of TVA funding to assist with the development of a portion of the SFRIS would not be a major federal action significantly affecting the environment. This finding is dependent on implementation of the mitigation measures described above. Accordingly, an environmental impact statement is not required.



---

Dawn Booker  
Senior Manager  
NEPA Compliance  
Environment & Sustainability

May 6<sup>th</sup>, 2024

---

Date Signed