Attachment 4. TVA Categorical Exclusion Checklist

Page intentionally blank

Categorical Exclusion Checklist for Proposed TVA Actions

Categorical Exclusion Number Claimed	Organization ID Number	**Tracking Number** *(NEPA Administration Use Only)*
	RLR191350	20445

Form Preparer	Project Initiator/Manager	Business Unit
Janet L Duffey	Janet L Duffey	OE&R - Environmental Stewardship & Policy

Project Title	Hydrologic Unit Code
26a Category 3 RLR191350 Mr. Dwayne Frye Knoxville Utilities Board Fort Loudoun Reservoir	

Description of Proposed Action *(Include Anticipated Dates of Implementation)* ☒ Continued on Page 3 *(if more than one line)*

For Proposed Action See Attachments and References

Initiating TVA Facility or Office	TVA Business Units Involved in Project
Little Tennessee Watershed Team	

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**	**Information Source**
1. Is major in scope?		X	For comments see attachments
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	For comments see attachments
4. Is opposed by another federal, state, or local government agency?	X		Duffey J. L. 07/29/2009
*5. Has environmental effects which are controversial?	X		Duffey J. L. 07/29/2009
*6. Is one of many actions that will affect the same resources?	X		Duffey J. L. 07/29/2009
7. Involves more than minor amount of land?	X		Duffey J. L. 07/29/2009

* 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 Insignificience**
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	Yes	For comments see attachments
3. Potentially take prime or unique farmland out of production?	X		No	No	Duffey J. L. 07/29/2009
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	Wadl E. F. 06/03/2009
11. Involve water withdrawal of a magnitude that may affect aquatic life or involve interbasin transfer of water?	X		No	No	Duffey J. L. 07/29/2009
12. Potentially affect surface water?	X		No	No	Duffey J. L. 07/29/2009
13. Potentially affect drinking water supply?	X		No	No	Duffey J. L. 07/29/2009
14. Potentially affect groundwater?	X		No	No	Duffey J. L. 07/29/2009
15. Potentially affect unique or important terrestrial habitat?	X		No	No	Wadl E. F. 06/03/2009
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 Insignificience
1. Release air pollutants?	X		No	No	Duffey J. L. 07/29/2009
2. Generate water pollutants?	X		No	No	Duffey J. L. 07/29/2009
3. Generate wastewater streams?	X		No	No	Duffey J. L. 07/29/2009
4. Cause soil erosion?	X		No	No	Duffey J. L. 07/29/2009
5. Discharge dredged or fill materials?	X		No	No	Duffey J. L. 07/29/2009
6. Generate large amounts of solid waste or waste not ordinarily generated?	X		No	No	Duffey J. L. 07/29/2009
7. Generate or release hazardous waste (RCRA)?	X		No	No	Duffey J. L. 07/29/2009
8. Generate or release universal or special waste, or used oil?	X		No	No	Duffey J. L. 07/29/2009
9. Generate or release toxic substances (CERCLA, TSCA)?	X		No	No	Duffey J. L. 07/29/2009
10. Involve materials such as PCBs, solvents, asbestos, sandblasting material, mercury, lead, or paints?	X		No	No	Duffey J. L. 07/29/2009
11. Involve disturbance of pre-existing contamination?	X		No	No	Duffey J. L. 07/29/2009
12. Generate noise levels with off-site impacts?	X		No	No	Duffey J. L. 07/29/2009
13. Generate odor with off-site impacts?	X		No	No	Duffey J. L. 07/29/2009
14. Produce light which causes disturbance?	X		No	No	Duffey J. L. 07/29/2009
15. Release of radioactive materials?	X		No	No	Duffey J. L. 07/29/2009
16. Involve underground or above-ground storage tanks or bulk storage?	X		No	No	Duffey J. L. 07/29/2009
17. Involve materials that require special handling?	X		No	No	Duffey J. L. 07/29/2009

Part 4. Social and Economic Effects

Would the proposed action---	No	Yes	Commit-ment	Information Source for Insignificience
1. Potentially cause public health effects?	X		No	Duffey J. L. 07/29/2009
2. Increase the potential for accidents affecting the public?	X		No	Duffey J. L. 07/29/2009
3. Cause the displacement or relocation of businesses, residences, cemeteries, or farms?	X		No	Duffey J. L. 07/29/2009
4. Contrast with existing land use, or potentially affect resources described as unique or significant in a federal, state, or local plan?	X		No	Duffey J. L. 07/29/2009
5. Disproportionately affect minority or low-income populations?	X		No	Duffey J. L. 07/29/2009
6. Involve genetically engineered organisms or materials?	X		No	Duffey J. L. 07/29/2009
7. Produce visual contrast or visual discord?	X		No	Duffey J. L. 07/29/2009
8. Potentially interfere with recreational or educational uses?	X		No	For comments see attachments
9. Potentially interfere with river or other navigation?	X		No	For comments see attachments
10. Potentially generate highway or railroad traffic problems?	X		No	Duffey J. L. 07/29/2009

Part 5. Other Environmental Compliance/Reporting Issues

Would the proposed action---	No	Yes	Commit-ment	Information Source for Insignificience
1. Release or otherwise use substances on the Toxic Release Inventory list?	X		No	Duffey J. L. 07/29/2009
2. Involve a structure taller than 200 feet above ground level?	X		No	Duffey J. L. 07/29/2009
3. Involve site-specific chemical traffic control?	X		No	Duffey J. L. 07/29/2009
4. Require a site-specific emergency notification process?	X		No	Duffey J. L. 07/29/2009
5. Cause a modification to equipment with an environmental permit?	X		No	Duffey J. L. 07/29/2009
6. Potentially impact operation of the river system or require special water elevations or flow conditions??	X		No	For comments see attachments
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	Duffey J. L. 07/29/2009

Description of Proposed Action *(Include Anticipated Dates of Implementation)*	☐ Continued from Page 1

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 Janet L Duffey		Date 12/22/2009
TVA Organization RSO&E	E-mail jlduffey@tva.gov	Telephone

Site Environmental Compliance Reviewer

_____
Signature

Final Review/Closure

Janet L Duffey 12/22/2009
Signature

Other Review Signatures *(as required by your organization)*

Mary A McBryar 12/22/2009
Signature

_____
Signature

_____
Signature

_____
Signature

_____
Signature

_____
Signature

Attachments/References

Description of Proposed Action

Applicant(s): KUB proposes to install a new sewer line across the river to replace the original line installed in 1947 - consists of 2 ductile iron pipes in a 3.5' deep trench.....HERITAGE (Cynthia Russell) AND RIVER OPERATIONS (John Higgins) COORDINATED VIA E-MAIL Mr. Dwayne Frye Knoxville Utilities Board 835 East Jackson Street Knoxville TN 37915

CEC General Comment Listing

1. This will be an abbreviated EA because the applicant did not feel the project design could be changed to avoid the resource
   By: Mary A McBryar 08/06/2009
2. soil testing
   By: 26a Added Comment
   File: soil testing.pdf

CEC General Comment Listing

3. archaeology phase 1 report
   By: 26a Added Comment
   File: archaeology phase 1.pdf
4. ARAP
   By: 26a Added Comment
   File: ARAP PERMIT.pdf
5. application package, project summary, and plans
   By: 26a Added Comment
   File: application package.pdf
6. D-Stage 59 and 62
   By: 26a Added Comment
   File: D-STAGE 59 and 62.jpg
7. sic
   By: 26a Added Comment
   File: sic.pdf
8. photos
   By: 26a Added Comment
   File: photos.pdf
9. conditions
   By: 26a Added Comment
   File: conditions.pdf
10. Signed MOA
    By: 26a Added Comment
    File: KUB MOA-KUB-Goose Creek Final MOA.pdf
11. unsigned permit page
    By: 26a Added Comment
    File: permit page.pdf
12. manager signed application
    By: 26a Added Comment
    File: manager signed application.pdf
13. aerial
    By: 26a Added Comment
    File: aerial.jpg
14. signed cost recovery letter
    By: 26a Added Comment
    File: signed cost recovery letter.pdf
15. Programmatic Review Coordination Form
    By: 26a Added Comment
    File: PROGRAMMATIC REVIEW FORM.doc

CEC Comment Listing

Part 1 Comments

1. EA WILL BE PREPARED
   By: Janet L Duffey 07/29/2009
2. EA WILL BE PREPARED
   By: Janet L Duffey 07/29/2009

CEC Comment Listing

3. EA WILL BE PREPARED
   By: Janet L Duffey 07/29/2009

Part 2 Comments

1. Aquatic T/E table
   By: Clinton Jones 06/03/2009
   Files: 20445 Aquatic T&E Table 1.doc 06/03/2009 41,472 Bytes
1. Review of the TVA Natural Heritage database indicated that five federal-listed and eight state-listed aquatic species have been reported to occur within a ten-mile radius of the proposed Tennessee River pipeline crossing (Aquatic T&E Table 1). The orange-foot pimpleback, tan riffleshell, ornate rocksnail, and spiny riversnail are historical records and most likely no longer occur in the vicinity of the project area. Therefore, no impacts would occur to these species. The fine-rayed pigtoe mussel record is known from the Little River, a tributary to the Tennessee River. No records are known from the mainstem of the Tennessee River in the vicinity of the proposed project area. With the exception of the highfin carpsucker, lake sturgeon, and snail darter, fish species listed in Aquatic T&E Table 1 do not typically occur in habitat known from the project area. No impacts would occur to these aquatic species. Impacts could potentially occur to the snail darter, highfin carpsucker, and lake sturgeon as a result of temporary disturbance associate with pipeline construction. However, all three species are mobile and are capable of moving out of the impact area. Additionally, sediment control structures outlined in the 26a permit, such as floating silt screens, would be used to minimize movement of sediment in the Tennessee River that could potentially impact aquatic species. With proper implementation of BMPs, no impacts would occur as a result of the proposed Tennessee River pipeline crossing.
   By: Clinton Jones 06/02/2009
1. Review of the TVA Natural Heritage database indicates that there are no federal nor state listed plants or terrestrial species known from the area potentially affected by this project.
   By: Erica Fritz Wadl 06/03/2009
2. EA WILL BE PREPARED
   By: Janet L Duffey 07/29/2009
2. If the archaeological site cannot be avoided, a Memorandum of Agreement will be executed to address the adverse effects to historic properties. It appears that the site cannot be avoided.
   By: Anthony E. Howard 08/04/2009
4. There are no Wild and Scenic Rivers in the area of project.
   By: S Clay Guerry 05/08/2009
5. There are no rivers on the Nationwide Rivers Inventory in the area of the project.
   By: S Clay Guerry 05/08/2009
6. Disturbance associated with the proposed pipeline crossing would disturb the channel bed of the Tennessee River. In order to minimize downstream impacts, sediment control structures outlined in the 26a permit, such as floating silt screens, would be implemented. If BMPs are properly implemented, impacts to the channel bed would be temporary and insignificant.
   By: Clinton Jones 06/02/2009
6. Review of the TVA Natural heritage database indicates that there is an SMI wetland present near the site. Field inspection did not reveal any wetlands in the area potentially affected by this project.
   By: Erica Fritz Wadl 06/03/2009
7. The proposed project involves the construction of an underground sewer line within the 100-year floodplain. Consistent with Executive Order 11988, an underground sewer line is considered to be a repetitive action in the floodplain that should have no adverse floodplain impacts. The project would comply with the TVA Flood Control Storage Loss Guideline because there would be no loss of flood control storage. From the standpoint of Flood Control, we have no objection to the proposed project.
   By: Roger A. Milstead 08/04/2009
8. Said project is not expected to significantly adversely 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
By: S Clay Guerry 05/08/2009

9. Since the work would not be moving aquatic species or water from different locations, there would be no potential impacts from invasive aquatic animal species.
By: Clinton Jones 06/02/2009

16. Impacts could potentially occur to habitat for the snail darter, highfin carpsucker, and lake sturgeon as a result of temporary disturbance associate with pipeline construction. However, all three species are mobile and are capable of moving out of the impact area. Additionally, sediment control structures outlined in the 26a permit, such as floating silt screens, would be used to minimize movement of sediment in the Tennessee River that could potentially impact aquatic species. With proper implementation of BMPs, no impacts would occur to potentially suitable habitat for the species listed above as a result of the proposed Tennessee River pipeline crossing.
By: Clinton Jones 06/02/2009

Part 4 Comments

8. Any impacts to recreational use (boating) is expected to be temporary (while construction is underway) and insignificant.
By: S Clay Guerry 05/08/2009

9. See attached letter
By: Deborah K Ruth 05/21/2009
Files: 191350ftl - 26a - Tennessee River Mile 646.6 - KUB.doc 05/21/2009 25,600 Bytes

Part 5 Comments

28. This was inadvertently answered YES - there is no potential impact to the operation of the river system and no special elevations or flow conditions would be warranted. The correct answer is NO.
By: Janet L Duffey 12/22/2009

28. EA WILL BE PREPARED
By: Janet L Duffey 07/29/2009

CEC Commitment Listing

Part 2 Commitments

2. Execution of a Memorandum of Agreement to address the adverse effects to historic properties.
By: Anthony E. Howard 08/04/2009