

Categorical Exclusion Checklist for Proposed TVA Actions

Categorical Exclusion Number Claimed	Organization ID Number	Tracking Number <i>(NEPA Administration Use Only)</i> 21069
Form Preparer Jeffrey H. Parris	Project Initiator/Manager Jeffrey H. Parris	Business Unit FPG - Fossil Projects
Project Title Interim Risk Remediation Measures		Hydrologic Unit Code
Description of Proposed Action <i>(Include Anticipated Dates of Implementation)</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Continued on Page 3 <i>(if more than one line)</i> For Proposed Action See Attachments and References		
Initiating TVA Facility or Office Johnsonville Fossil Plant	TVA Business Units Involved in Project	
Location <i>(City, County, State)</i> TN, North-East side of the Johnsonville island.		

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	Information Source
1. Is major in scope?	X		Parris J. H. 09/15/2009
2. Is part of a larger project proposal involving other TVA actions or other federal agencies?	X		Parris J. H. 09/15/2009
*3. Involves non-routine mitigation to avoid adverse impacts?	X		Parris J. H. 09/15/2009
4. Is opposed by another federal, state, or local government agency?	X		Parris J. H. 09/15/2009
*5. Has environmental effects which are controversial?	X		Parris J. H. 09/15/2009
*6. Is one of many actions that will affect the same resources?	X		Parris J. H. 09/15/2009
7. Involves more than minor amount of land?	X		Parris J. H. 09/15/2009

* 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	Per- mit	Commit- ment	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	Parris J. H. 09/17/2009
4. Potentially affect Wild and Scenic Rivers or their tributaries?	X		No	No	For comments see attachments
5. Potentially affect a stream on the Nationwide Rivers Inventory?	X		No	No	For comments see attachments
6. Potentially affect wetlands, water flow, or stream channels?		X	No	No	For comments see attachments
7. Potentially affect the 100-year floodplain?		X	No	No	For comments see attachments
8. 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
9. Contribute to the spread of exotic or invasive species?	X		No	No	For comments see attachments
10. Potentially affect migratory bird populations?	X		No	No	For comments see attachments
11. Involve water withdrawal of a magnitude that may affect aquatic life or involve interbasin transfer of water?	X		No	No	Keller J. D. 01/04/2010
12. Potentially affect surface water?		X	Yes	No	For comments see attachments
13. Potentially affect drinking water supply?	X		No	No	Parris J. H. 09/24/2009
14. Potentially affect groundwater?	X		No	No	Parris J. H. 09/24/2009
15. Potentially affect unique or important terrestrial habitat?	X		No	No	For comments see attachments
16. 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	Per- mit	Commit- ment	Information Source for Insignificance
1. Release air pollutants?	X		No	No	Parris J. H. 09/17/2009
2. Generate water pollutants?	X		No	No	Stiefel M. B. 12/21/2009
3. Generate wastewater streams?	X		No	No	Stiefel M. B. 12/21/2009
4. Cause soil erosion?		X	Yes	No	For comments see attachments
5. Discharge dredged or fill materials?		X	Yes	No	For comments see attachments
6. Generate large amounts of solid waste or waste not ordinarily generated?	X		No	No	Parris J. H. 09/17/2009
7. Generate or release hazardous waste (RCRA)?	X		No	No	Parris J. H. 09/17/2009
8. Generate or release universal or special waste, or used oil?	X		No	No	Parris J. H. 11/02/2009
9. Generate or release toxic substances (CERCLA, TSCA)?	X		No	No	Parris J. H. 11/02/2009
10. Involve materials such as PCBs, solvents, asbestos, sandblasting material, mercury, lead, or paints?	X		No	No	Parris J. H. 09/17/2009
11. Involve disturbance of pre-existing contamination?	X		No	No	Parris J. H. 11/02/2009
12. Generate noise levels with off-site impacts?	X		No	No	Parris J. H. 09/17/2009
13. Generate odor with off-site impacts?	X		No	No	Parris J. H. 09/17/2009
14. Produce light which causes disturbance?	X		No	No	For comments see attachments
15. Release of radioactive materials?	X		No	No	Parris J. H. 09/17/2009
16. Involve underground or above-ground storage tanks or bulk storage?	X		No	No	Parris J. H. 09/17/2009
17. Involve materials that require special handling?	X		No	No	Parris J. H. 09/17/2009

Part 4. Social and Economic Effects

Would the proposed action---	No	Yes	Commit- ment	Information Source for Insignificance
1. Potentially cause public health effects?	X		No	Parris J. H. 11/02/2009
2. Increase the potential for accidents affecting the public?	X		No	Parris J. H. 09/17/2009
3. Cause the displacement or relocation of businesses, residences, cemeteries, or farms?	X		No	Parris J. H. 09/17/2009
4. Contrast with existing land use, or potentially affect resources described as unique or significant in a federal, state, or local plan?	X		No	Parris J. H. 09/17/2009
5. Disproportionately affect minority or low-income populations?	X		No	Parris J. H. 09/17/2009
6. Involve genetically engineered organisms or materials?	X		No	Parris J. H. 09/17/2009
7. Produce visual contrast or visual discord?	X		No	For comments see attachments
8. Potentially interfere with recreational or educational uses?	X		No	Parris J. H. 09/17/2009
9. Potentially interfere with river or other navigation?	X		No	Parris J. H. 09/17/2009
10. Potentially generate highway or railroad traffic problems?	X		No	Parris J. H. 09/17/2009

Part 5. Other Environmental Compliance/Reporting Issues

Would the proposed action---	No	Yes	Commit- ment	Information Source for Insignificance
1. Release or otherwise use substances on the Toxic Release Inventory list?	X		No	Parris J. H. 09/17/2009
2. Involve a structure taller than 200 feet above ground level?	X		No	Parris J. H. 09/17/2009
3. Involve site-specific chemical traffic control?	X		No	Parris J. H. 09/17/2009
4. Require a site-specific emergency notification process?	X		No	Parris J. H. 09/17/2009
5. Cause a modification to equipment with an environmental permit?	X		No	Parris J. H. 09/17/2009
6. Potentially impact operation of the river system or require special water elevations or flow conditions??	X		No	Parris J. H. 09/17/2009
7. Involve construction of a new building or renovation of existing building (i.e., major changes to lighting, HVAC, and/or structural elements of building of 2000 sq. ft or more) on which TVA will pay/pays the utilities??	X		No	Parris J. H. 09/17/2009

Parts 1 through 4: If "yes" is checked, describe in the discussion section following this form why the effect is insignificant. Attach any conditions or commitments which will ensure insignificant impacts. Use of non-routine commitments to avoid significance is an indication that consultation with NEPA Administration is needed.

An EA or EIS will be prepared.

Based upon my review of environmental impacts, the discussions 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 Section 5.2. _____ of TVA NEPA Procedures.

Project Initiator/Manager Jeffrey H. Parris		Date 12/22/2009
TVA Organization FPG	E-mail jhparris@tva.gov	Telephone

Site Environmental Compliance Reviewer

Final Review/Closure

_____ <i>Signature</i>	J Darlene Keller _____ <i>Signature</i>
	01/04/2010

Other Review Signatures (as required by your organization)

_____ <i>Signature</i>	_____ <i>Signature</i>
_____ <i>Signature</i>	_____ <i>Signature</i>
_____ <i>Signature</i>	_____ <i>Signature</i>

Attachments/References

Description of Proposed Action

Add rip rap, and drainage measures to reduce risks of global shear in the dikes located on the North-East side of the Johnsonville island. See attached drawings.

CEC General Comment Listing

- Three drawings showing the areas of risk remediation.
By: Jeffrey H. Parris 09/17/2009
Files: 68118SP-501.pdf 09/17/2009 777,976 Bytes
68118XS-502.pdf 09/17/2009 296,543 Bytes

2. Topo Map

By: Corita A Wallace 09/25/2009

Files: CEC 21069 topo map.jpg 09/25/2009 188,158 Bytes

CEC Comment Listing

Part 2 Comments

1. Review of the TVA Natural Heritage database indicates that NO federal and six state-listed plant species are recorded from within 5 miles of the Johnsonville Fossil Plant. The only species known to occur within two miles of the project area is an historic record of *Rosa virginiana* reported to occur near New Johnsonville. Individuals of this species have not been seen since the 1950's. Review of maps and aerial photographs and knowledge of rare plants in the vicinity of JOF, indicates the proposed project area has been drastically disturbed for JOF operations and would not provide habitat for these species of conservation concern. The proposed action as described is not expected to result in impacts to rare plant populations. No permits or commitments are required.
By: Patricia B Cox 10/07/2009
Files: CEC 21069_JOF_Botany_plant list_Table 1.docx 10/07/2009 16,088 Bytes
1. Review of the TVA Natural Heritage database in October, 2009, found records of four Tennessee state-listed and one federally listed terrestrial animal species within three miles of the proposed project area. No suitable habitat exists for the western pigmy rattlesnake (*Sistrurus miliarius streckeri*) and northern pine snake (*Pituophis melanoleucus melanoleucus*). Suitable habitat exists for the little blue heron (*Egretta caerulea*) and alligator snapping turtle (*Macrochelys temminckii*) along the shoreline. Construction actions associated with this project would not impact these species. These species and their habitats will not be affected by the proposed actions. There are records of one federally listed (piping plover) terrestrial animal species from within three miles of the project area and one federally protected (bald eagle) terrestrial animal species within Humphreys County, Tennessee. Many pairs of bald eagles (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*) are known from the vicinity of Kentucky Reservoir. The closest extant nesting record is greater than seven miles away. There is no suitable habitat for bald eagles in the area of proposed actions, thus the proposed project will not affect this species. One record of piping plover (*Charadrius melodus*) exists greater than one mile from the project site. This species uses mudflats and sand bars along the Kentucky Reservoir to forage for invertebrates during migration. No suitable habitat exists for this species in the area of the proposed actions. This species will not be impacted by the proposed actions. This project would not affect these, or any other federally or state-listed species, or their habitats.
By: Holly G. LeGrand 10/28/2009
1. Mussel survey of the project area indicated high quality mussel bed exists that may support endangered species of mussels. Thus, further review for this project is being evaluated in an Environmental Assessment and Biological Assessment. ~CSH
By: Charles S. Howard 12/29/2009
2. Adding rip rap and drainage measures would not have the potential to affect standing historical structures. Concur with project.
By: W. Chett Peebles 10/26/2009
4. Because no such designated waters occur at or adjacent to the project site, the proposed action is not anticipated to impact Wild and Scenic Rivers or their tributaries.
By: Jan K Thomas 11/02/2009
5. Because no such designated waters occur at or adjacent to the project site, the proposed action is not anticipated to impact streams listed on the Nationwide Rivers Inventory.
By: Jan K Thomas 11/02/2009
6. A review of project photographs indicates no wetlands are present within the proposed project area.
By: Kim Pilarski-Brand 11/05/2009
7. The proposed project involves the placement of riprap for stabilization of an existing ash pond dike. Consistent with Executive Order 11988, riprap is considered to be a repetitive action in the floodplain. Based on project design information, the rip-rap is not only for shoreline stabilization, but it's mass helps resist against global shear of the

dike. From geotechnical borings collected in the dike, that section of the dike has a factor of safety less than 1.5. The application of this rip-rap will increase the factor of safety to greater than 1.5. Thus stabilizing the dike to prevent potential failure. The project would result in the loss of about 9.0 acre-feet of flood control storage. We believe the amount of lost flood control storage has been minimized while achieving the project objective. Therefore, the project would comply with the TVA Flood Control Storage Loss Guideline. From the standpoint of Flood Control, we have no objection to the proposed project.

By: Roger A. Milstead 12/22/2009

7. FEMA 100 year flood plain.

By: Jeffrey H. Parris 11/02/2009

Files: FM47085C0140D.pdf 11/02/2009 1,254,337 Bytes

8. The closest natural area to the project site is Camden State Wildlife Management Area (WMA), approximately 0.6 mile southwest of the project site. Other natural areas in the vicinity of the project site are Eva Park (approximately 1.5 miles northwest) and New Johnsonville State Historic Area (approximately 1.6 miles northeast). Because the distance from the project site to these features is sufficient, the proposed action is not anticipated to impact natural areas.

By: Jan K Thomas 11/02/2009

9. If disturbed areas where woody vegetation is removed are revegetated with approved TVA seed mixes and with conditions stated to use clean rock or gravel for bank stabilization, there is no potential for this project to contribute to the spread of exotic or invasive terrestrial plant species. No permits or commitments are required

By: Patricia B Cox 10/07/2009

9. Based on review of the actions (addition of rip rap and drainage measures) and site location information, including maps provided by the project lead, the proposed project would not contribute to the spread of exotic or invasive terrestrial animal species.

By: Holly G. LeGrand 10/28/2009

10. There are records of two heron colonies within three miles of the proposed project. These heronries are greater than 0.6 miles away and will not be impacted by the proposed actions. Actions associated with the proposed project would not result in impacts to migratory bird populations or associated resources.

By: Holly G. LeGrand 10/28/2009

12. Erosion controls and BMP"s will be utilized.

By: Jeffrey H. Parris 09/24/2009

15. : No uncommon vegetational communities are reported to occur in the area to be impacted and none are indicated in the photographs or maps. Therefore, there is no known potential for this project, as described, to impact such resources. No permits or commitments are required.

By: Patricia B Cox 10/07/2009

15. There are no recorded caves or designated critical habitat for terrestrial animals within three miles of the proposed project. Actions associated with the proposed project would not impact caves or other unique or important terrestrial habitats.

By: Holly G. LeGrand 10/28/2009

16. Project area may support habitat for endangered mussel species. Further review will be done in an Environmental Assessment and Biological Assessment. ~CSH

By: Charles S. Howard 12/29/2009

Part 3 Comments

4. Best management practices for sediment and erosion control will be implemented.

By: Michael B. Stiefel 12/21/2009

5. The placement of fill below the normal high water elevation will not occur until a Corps of Engineers 404 permit and TDEC ARAP issued.

By: Michael B. Stiefel 12/21/2009

14. There is no lighting indicated for this project. Therefore, waste light is not anticipated.

By: W. Chett Peebles 10/26/2009

Part 4 Comments

CEC Comment Listing

7. Stabilizing with riprap and crushed stone would prevent further erosion and global shear. Viewing riprap and crushed stone along an area that has been smoothly graded and free of debris and obstruction is preferable to an area that is eroding and could experienced bank failure. Some minor visual discord may occur during construction, but would be temporary until these activities are completed.

By: W. Chett Peebles 10/26/2009

CEC Permit Listing

Part 2 Permits

12. Aquatic Resource Alteration Permit

By: Jeffrey H. Parris 09/24/2009

Part 3 Permits

4. A construction storm water permit will be required if 1 or more acres will be disturbed.

By: Michael B. Stiefel 12/21/2009

5. A Corps of Engineers Section 404 Permit and a TDEC ARAP are required.

By: Michael B. Stiefel 12/21/2009