

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

500-kV TRANSMISSION LINE IN MIDDLE TENNESSEE

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

JULY 2005

Proposed project: 500-kV Transmission Line in Middle Tennessee
Stewart, Houston, Montgomery, Dickson, Cheatham, and
Davidson Counties, Tennessee

Lead agency: Tennessee Valley Authority

**For further information,
contact:** Charles P. Nicholson
Senior NEPA/Endangered Species Specialist
Tennessee Valley Authority
400 West Summit Hill Drive, WT 9B
Knoxville, Tennessee 37902-1401
Phone: (865) 632-3582
Fax: (865) 632-6855
e-mail: cpnicholson@tva.gov

Abstract: The Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) proposes to construct and operate a 500-kV transmission line in northern Middle Tennessee. The electrical load growth in Middle Tennessee will soon exceed the capacity of the high-voltage transmission lines serving it. The proposed transmission line would address this need. The proposed transmission line would connect TVA's Cumberland Fossil Plant in Stewart County, Tennessee, with either TVA's Montgomery 500-kV Substation in Montgomery County, or with TVA's Davidson 500-kV Substation in Davidson County. The EIS considers two study area alternatives based on the two alternative transmission line destinations, and various corridors within each alternative study area with potential line lengths of about 32 to 51 miles long. Two transmission line routes in the Cumberland-Montgomery study area, the Corridor B and Corridor D routes with lengths of about 38.5 and 36.1 miles, respectively, are identified and described in detail. The EIS describes the effects of the No Action alternative and the two study area alternatives, including the various corridors and the two identified Cumberland-Montgomery routes.

SUMMARY

This summary covers the major points of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) prepared for the 500-Kilovolt (kV) Transmission Line in Middle Tennessee Project proposed by the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA). The proposed new transmission line project would originate at TVA's Cumberland Fossil Plant near Cumberland City in Stewart County. It would terminate at either TVA's Montgomery 500-kV Substation near Clarksville in Montgomery County, or at TVA's Davidson 500-kV Substation near Nashville in Davidson County. This EIS has been prepared to assist TVA in meeting the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act.

PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR ACTION

TVA's 500-kV transmission system transmits large quantities of electricity over long distances between generating facilities, 500-kV substations, and interconnection points with neighboring power systems. TVA has made few additions to its 500-kV transmission system since the early 1980s, and the system's capacity has generally been adequate despite recent growth in electric loads. The projected continued growth in middle Tennessee, as well as the addition of new generating facilities to the western portion of the TVA system, are forecasted to exceed the capacity of area's 500-kV system.

The following are the purposes or objectives for increasing transmission capacity into the Middle Tennessee area:

- Maintain transmission system reliability pursuant to TVA's statutory responsibilities;
- Minimize environmental impacts in keeping with TVA's commitment to resource stewardship;
- Minimize costs as part of TVA's obligation to provide electric power at the lowest possible cost; and
- Meet the in-service date of November 1, 2007 the earliest date which is reasonably achievable.

ALTERNATIVES INCLUDING THE PROPOSED ACTION

After identifying the need for increased high-voltage transmission capacity, TVA evaluated various alternatives to meet this need. All of the action alternatives involved constructing and operating a new 500-kV transmission line. The length of the line, as well as the endpoints of the line, varied among alternatives.

The Proposed Transmission Line

The characteristics of the proposed 500-kV transmission line, as well as its construction and operation, are similar across action alternatives. The transmission line would use self-supporting, galvanized, laced steel structures between about 85 and 125 feet tall. The average distance between structures would be about 1,000 feet. The electrical conductors would consist of three sets of three cables suspended beneath the structure cross-arms by insulators.

The transmission line would be built on a right-of-way (ROW) 175 feet in width. TVA would purchase easements from landowners for the new ROW. Because of the need to maintain adequate clearance between tall vegetation and transmission line conductors, as well as to provide access for construction equipment, most trees and shrubs would be initially removed from the entire width of the ROW. Trees outside of the right-of-way which are tall enough to pass within 10 feet of a conductor if they fell towards the line would also be removed. Marketable timber would be salvaged where feasible; otherwise, woody debris and other vegetation would be piled and burned, chipped, taken offsite, or occasionally windrowed along the edge of the ROW to serve as sediment barriers depending on the location, weather conditions, and the desires of the landowners.

Following line construction, the ROW would be revegetated with low-growing plants. The transmission line ROW can be used by the landowner for many purposes that do not interfere with maintenance and operation of the line. The construction of permanent buildings, trees that grow high enough to reach the height of the electrical conductor, and storage of any flammable material would be prohibited.

Permanent access roads to each structure and other points along the ROW would be required. Existing roads would be used where feasible. New access roads would be located on the ROW wherever possible, and designed to avoid severe slope conditions and minimize stream crossings. Construction assembly areas would also be required for worker assembly, vehicle parking, and material storage. These areas, typically 5 to 10 acres in size, would be located along existing paved roads near the transmission line and would be leased from private landowners.

An additional bay containing a new 500-kV breaker would be constructed at the 500-kV switchyard at Cumberland Fossil Plant. Depending on the transmission line route selected, an additional length of new bus work would be needed inside the switchyard to connect the new bay to a line pull-off structure.

The completed transmission line would be periodically inspected by aerial surveillance and by ground observation. Periodic vegetation management would be conducted to maintain adequate clearance around the conductors. This would consist of both the felling of tall trees adjacent to the ROW and control of vegetation within the cleared ROW. Management of vegetation within the cleared ROW would use an integrated vegetation management approach designed to encourage low-growing plant species and discourage tall-growing plant species. The two principal management techniques would be mechanical mowing using tractor-mounted rotary mowers, and herbicide application. Herbicides would be selectively applied from the ground with backpack sprayers or vehicle mounted sprayers, or, for larger areas, particularly in rugged terrain, by broadcast aerial spraying. Any herbicides would be applied in accordance with applicable state and federal laws and regulations and comply with EPA-approved label instructions.

Project and Siting Alternatives

The National Environmental Policy Act and its implementing regulations direct that federal agencies commence NEPA reviews early on in the planning of proposed actions. To do this, TVA employs a detailed, comprehensive siting process when it plans its transmission line projects. This is an iterative process and takes into account sensitive environmental and cultural resource features that become “constraints” on locating proposed lines. Initially, broad study corridors are identified and line ROWs are eventually located within the

study corridors. Because transmission line ROWs are actually much narrower than these study corridors, sensitive features that are associated with specific corridors can often be avoided when final line routes are selected. Corridors and discrete line segments are discarded or redirected as analyses proceed. One of the last steps in the line siting process is selecting the exact locations for line structures after a final ROW has been identified and surveyors and construction forces begin work. It is at this point that potential impacts can be fully identified. TVA's transmission line siting process ensures that decision makers and the public are apprised of potential impacts and their potential significance before this final step.

Alternative 1 – Cumberland Montgomery Study Area

This alternative involves the construction and operation of a 500-kV transmission line from Cumberland Fossil Plant to the Montgomery 500-kV Substation. A new bay and additional 500-kV breakers would be installed at the Montgomery Substation.

Four broad alternative corridors for this transmission line were identified. The corridors vary in width according to siting constraints and opportunities, and overlap in many locations. The four corridors vary in length from about 32 to 45 miles. Corridors A and B circle around the north side of Clarksville, and Corridors C and D circle around the south side of Clarksville. Following the release of the DEIS and a series of public meetings, TVA identified proposed transmission line routes within both the preferred Corridors B and D. Alternative alignments were developed for some segments of both the Corridor B and Corridor D routes. Depending on the alternative alignments being considered, the Corridor B route is between 38.1 and 38.9 miles long, and the Corridor D route is between 31.8 and 37.7 miles long (Figure S-1).

Alternative 2 – Cumberland-Davidson Study Area

This alternative involves the construction and operation of a 500-kV transmission line from Cumberland Fossil Plant to the Davidson 500-kV Substation. A new bay containing a 500-kV breaker would be installed at the Davidson Substation.

Two broad alternate corridors from TVA's Cumberland Fossil Plant to TVA's Davidson 500-kV Substation were identified. The corridors vary in width according to siting constraints and opportunities, and overlap at each end. The corridors are about 50 and 51 miles long.

Alternative 3 – No Action

Under the No Action Alternative, the proposed transmission line would not be constructed. This would result in the risk of loss of electric service in the Nashville area, which has a total load of over 4000 megawatts. There would also be risk of loss of system stability and resultant damage to generators at Cumberland and Paradise generating plants. In order to minimize the risk of instability, generation would have to be reduced at these plants during some system conditions. This could further exacerbate the risk to service in the Nashville area.




Figure S-1. The Cumberland-Montgomery Corridor B and Corridor D transmission line routes and alternative alignments.

Alternatives Considered But Eliminated From Further Consideration

New Switching Station and Transmission Line - TVA briefly considered an alternative involving constructing a new 500-kV switching station in Humphries County, Tennessee and a 500-kV transmission line from the switching station to the Davidson 500-kV Substation. The switching station would be built near and connected to the existing Johnsonville–Davidson 500-kV transmission line. The new 500-kV transmission line would be at least 40 miles long and built on new right-of-way.

This alternative would have the additional costs and environmental impacts of a new 500-kV switching station. Detailed transmission system studies also showed that this alternative would not adequately meet the project need. This alternative was eliminated from further consideration.

Load Management/Conservation - A major objective of this project is to maintain transmission system reliability. Reliability is related to system loads as well as system configuration and external factors such as weather, catastrophic events and events on adjoining systems. In addition, the proposed project addresses a present risk to maintaining the current level of service; this risk will increase as system loads increase in the future.

The risk to maintaining service to the greater middle Tennessee area is partially load dependent and could, therefore, be affected by load reduction. However, under present conditions, it would be necessary to decrease current peak loads by at least 4000 MW to maintain acceptable voltage levels. A 2002 study conducted by Pacific Energy Associates for TVA assessed a number of demand-side management options. This study showed that the maximum peak load reduction achievable within a 2 year period, using a number of demand-side management options, was expected to be about 187 MW throughout the TVA system. Achieving an on-peak reduction of 4000 MW in middle Tennessee through demand-side management is therefore not feasible.

Conservation and load management would not fully address the system stability issues that are an objective of the proposed action. These risks can only be decreased by addition of another high capacity transmission line in the area. The load management/conservation alternative was eliminated from further consideration.

Preferred Alternative

After evaluating the potential impacts to natural features, land use, and cultural features, as well as the engineering attributes of the alternatives and corridors, TVA identified its preferred alternative in the DEIS as Alternative 1 – the Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area. Within this alternative, TVA identified its preferred corridors as Corridors B and D. Of the two transmission line routes analyzed in detail in the FEIS, TVA's preferred route is the Corridor B route with the Cumberland River South and Industrial Park Central alternative alignments. This route is illustrated in Figure S-1.

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

Groundwater

Both alternative study areas contain similar groundwater resources. The areas are underlain by limestone aquifers in Mississippian rocks, in what is known as the Highland Rim aquifer system. The carbonate rocks that form the Highland Rim aquifer are typical of karst systems. Karsts are characterized by sinkholes, springs, disappearing streams, and caves. Groundwater in karst systems is easily contaminated since the waters can travel long distances through conduits with no chance for natural filtering processes of soil or bacterial action to diminish the contamination.

In the Cumberland-Montgomery Study area, the groundwater in the Mississippian aquifers of Montgomery County is of poor quality due to rapid transfer of contaminants from surface water and storm water runoff to groundwater. Total fresh groundwater withdrawals were very low from Montgomery and Stewart Counties during 1995. Fresh groundwater withdrawals from Montgomery County were reported to be 0.22 million gallons per day and 0.37 million gallons per day from Stewart County. Several sinkholes occur along the potential transmission line routes in the Cumberland-Montgomery study area.

Surface Water

The project area is located within the Cumberland River Basin. Two large impoundments, Lake Barkley and Cheatham Lake, occur on the portion of the Cumberland River in the project area.

Alternative 1 – Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area – Larger streams in this study area include Blooming Grove Creek, Antioch Creek, Budds Creek, the Red River and its West Fork and Little West Fork tributaries, Big McAdoo Creek, Little McAdoo Creek, Hurricane Creek, and Louise Creek, as well as the Cumberland River. Most of these streams are classified for fish and aquatic life, recreation, irrigation, and livestock watering and wildlife. The Cumberland River and part of the Red River have the additional classifications of domestic and industrial water supply, and the West Fork and Little West Fork Red River have the additional classification of industrial water supply.

Big McAdoo Creek, a portion of the Red River, Seven Springs Creek, the West Fork and Little West Fork Red River, and Dunbar Cave Stream are listed on the state Section 303(d) list as not supporting or partially supporting their use classifications because of pollution loadings exceeding water quality standards.

Alternative 2 – Cumberland-Davidson Study Area – Larger streams in this study area include Yellow Creek, Little Bartons Creek, Bartons Creek, Johnson Creek, Sams Creek, Pond Creek, and the Harpeth River and its tributaries including Jones Creek, Turnbull Creek, and the South Harpeth River. The Harpeth River in Davidson County is designated a State Scenic River and therefore considered a Tier II high quality stream, as is the South Harpeth River. Most of the streams in this study area are classified for fish and aquatic life, recreation, irrigation, and livestock watering and wildlife. Additional classifications include domestic and industrial water supply for the Harpeth River, South Harpeth River, and Turnbull Creek, industrial water supply for Jones Creek, and trout stream for Yellow Creek.

Portions of Cheatham Lake as well as the Harpeth River and Jones Creek are listed on the state Section 303(d) list as not supporting or partially supporting their use classifications because of pollution loadings exceeding water quality standards.

Vegetation

Alternative 1 – Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area – Major plant community types in this study area are dry ridge forests or woodlands of the dissected uplands, mesic oak, oak-hickory, and mixed species forests, lowland riparian forests, pine plantations, red cedar stands, cultivated fields, and pastures. Upland forest comprises between 45 and 47% of the four corridors in this study area. Cultivated fields, pastures, and other grasslands comprise between 41 and 48% of the corridors. The average forest patch sizes in the four corridors range from 83 to 93 acres. Each corridor contains between 5 and 7 forest patches between 1,000 and 5,000 acres in size, and Corridor D has one patch larger than 5,000 acres.

Only one plant community of conservation concern, the Kentucky-Tennessee Big Barrens, is known to occur in the study area. High quality examples of this prairie-like community occur on the Fort Campbell Military Reservation within Corridor D. Neither this community nor other plant communities of conservation concern were encountered in field surveys of the proposed Corridor B and Corridor D transmission line routes.

Alternative 2 – Cumberland-Davidson Study Area – The major plant community types in this study area are the same as in the Alternative 1 study area. The two study area corridors are both about 60% forested upland and about 32% cultivated fields, pastures, and other grasslands. The average forest patch sizes in the two corridors are about 205 and 232 acres. The two corridors contain 8 and 15 forest patches between 1,000 and 5,000 acres in size, and Corridor A has one forest patch larger than 5,000 acres.

Six plant communities of conservation concern are known from the study area counties. Four of these communities (the Kentucky-Tennessee Big Barrens, the Limestone Cliff-Talus Seep, the Little Bluestem–Broomsedge–Grasslands, and the Western Highland Rim Escarpment Post Oak Barrens) potentially occur in the study area corridors

Wildlife

Alternative 1 – Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area – Wildlife populations in this study area are dominated by species characteristic of woodland and fields. A high number of grassland bird species, including some of very limited distribution in Tennessee, are known from the area. Because of the fragmented nature of woodlands in the study area, the diversity of forest-dwelling wildlife is only moderate. This study area contains several wetland areas, and areas managed for waterfowl occur along the Cumberland River. Two great blue heron colonies and a small cave occur along the Corridor D transmission line route. Of the four corridors, Corridor D probably has the least diverse wildlife populations, and Corridors A and B probably have the most diverse wildlife populations.

Alternative 2 – Cumberland-Davidson Study Area – Compared to the Alternative 1 study area, this study area, which is more heavily forested, probably contains a greater overall diversity of wildlife. It contains a few species of neotropical migrant birds not reported from the Alternative 1 study area. There is likely little other difference in the wildlife populations of the two study area corridors.

Aquatic Ecology

Alternative 1 – Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area – This study area includes a wide range of aquatic habitats, including Lake Barkley and both large and small streams. Streams in the Western Highland Rim area (including both alternative study areas) typically support a very diverse aquatic fauna. In the vicinity of Cumberland Fossil Plant, Lake Barkley exhibits characteristics typical of large river tailwaters, and is probably inhabited by close to 60 fish species. Yellow Creek is known to support at least 34 fish species, and the Red River supports at least 43 fish species, a very good black bass fishery, and an excellent channel and flathead catfish fishery. Yellow Creek is regularly stocked with trout. Fish population sampling results are not available from other streams in the study area.

Alternative 2 – Cumberland-Davidson Study Area – In addition to Yellow Creek, described above, fish population sampling results are available for Jones Creek, Turnbull Creek, and the Harpeth River. Jones Creek supports at least 31 fish species and Turnbull creek supports at least 22 species. Historically, 62 fish species have been reported from the Harpeth River; more recent studies reported 28 species. The fish communities in all three of these are considered healthy. Fish population sampling results are not available from the other streams in the study area.

Endangered and Threatened Species

Alternative 1 – Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area – One plant that is a candidate for listing under the Endangered Species Act, Short's bladderpod, has been reported from at least one proposed transmission line route in this study area. Price's potato-bean, federally listed as threatened, occurs in one of the corridors but not along a proposed route. Four plants listed as endangered in Tennessee, five plants listed as threatened in Tennessee, and 15 plants considered to be of special concern are known from corridors in this study area. Of these state-listed species, blue scorpion weed, listed as of special concern, is the only one that occurs along a proposed route.

The gray bat and Indiana bat, both listed as endangered under the Endangered Species Act, occur in caves within three of the study area corridors. The bald eagle, listed as threatened under the Endangered Species Act, nests along Lake Barkley a short distance downstream of the study area and winters in the study area. Two species listed as threatened in Tennessee, the northern pine snake and Bewick's wren, are known from Corridor C. An additional six animals listed as in need of management in Tennessee have been reported from the study area corridors.

Two mussels listed as endangered under the Endangered Species Act, the tan riffleshell and birdwing pearly mussel, historically occurred in study area streams; they are both presumed extirpated. The lake sturgeon, considered endangered in Tennessee, likely occurs in the affected portion of the Cumberland River. An additional two fish species listed as threatened and four fish considered in need of management in Tennessee are known from streams within the study area corridors.

Alternative 2 – Cumberland-Davidson Study Area – One plant listed as threatened under the Endangered Species Act, Eggert sunflower, is known from both corridors in this study area. An additional four plants listed as threatened in Tennessee and one listed as special concern are known from corridors in this study area.

The northern pine snake, listed as threatened in Tennessee, is known from Corridor A. The four-toed salamander and the sharp-shinned hawk, both considered in need of management in Tennessee, are also known from Corridor A. The cerulean warbler, a species of concern to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and in need of management in Tennessee, is known from both Corridor A and B.

The two endangered mussels mentioned above in the Alternative 1 study area also historically occurred in the Alternative 2 study area. The blue sucker, listed as threatened in Tennessee, as well as three other fish considered in need of management in Tennessee has been reported from this study area.

Wetlands

Alternative 1 – Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area – Early in the planning of this project, the National Wetland Inventory was used to identify wetlands within the study areas. Wetlands are present in all four corridors in this study area. A large area of forested and scrub-shrub wetlands occurs along Lake Barkley near Cumberland Fossil Plant. Two larger wetlands areas are present further upstream in the Cumberland River floodplain in Corridors A and B. Small forested wetlands are present along many of the streams in all four corridors.

Wetland surveys were conducted of the Corridor B and D transmission line routes, access roads, and construction assembly areas. In Corridor B, there are 14 wetland areas, two of which would be crossed in two separate locations, for a total of 16 wetland crossings along the proposed ROW of the various route alignments. Out of the total of 24.2 acres of wetlands, 5.8 acres are forested and 24.0 acres were categorized as moderate or high quality. Wetlands also occur adjacent to a proposed access road. Sixteen wetland areas, two of which would be crossed in two separate locations, for a total of 18 wetland crossings, occur within the proposed ROW of the various Corridor D route alignments. Out of the total of 12.3 acres of wetlands, 6.3 acres are forested and 11.9 acres were categorized as moderate or high quality.

Alternative 2 – Cumberland-Davidson Study Area – Potential wetland areas within the Cumberland-Davidson Study Area were determined from a review of NWI data. Many small and large (up to 20 acres) wetlands are present in the riparian zones of many of the streams in both corridors. Many of these wetlands are forested.

Floodplains

Both alternative study areas, as well as their various proposed corridors, cross the 100-year floodplain areas of several rivers and streams. The Cumberland Fossil Plant switchyard, the Montgomery 500-kV Substation, and the Davidson 500-kV Substation are located outside the limits of the 100-year floodplain.

Managed Areas

Alternative 1 – Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area – Managed areas and/or ecologically significant sites occur in all four study area corridors. Cross Creeks National Wildlife Refuge is a short distance downstream from Cumberland Fossil Plant. Three streams in the study area are listed on the Nationwide Rivers Inventory: Red River (Corridors A and B), Yellow Creek (Corridors A, B, and C), and West Fork Red River (Corridors C and D). The Shelton Ferry and Marks Slough wetland sites are in Corridors A

and B, and the Long Pond Slough wetland site is in Corridor C. Corridor C also contains the Wooten's Bluff site and Austin Peay State University Environmental Education Center. Corridor D passes through a portion of Fort Campbell Military Reservation and contains Barnett Woods Preserve and the Coleman Cave and Bellamy Cave sites.

Alternative 2 – Cumberland-Davidson Study Area – Both corridors cross the Harpeth State Scenic River and Jones Creek, listed on the Nationwide Rivers Inventory. Other Nationwide Rivers Inventory streams within the corridors include Yellow Creek (Corridor A), Big Turnbull Creek (Corridor B), and South Harpeth River (Corridor B). Corridor A bisects the large, state-owned Cheatham Wildlife Management Area and contains the Hidden Lakes unit of Montgomery Bell State Resort Park. Corridor B contains the Hava-Lakatu and Svenson's Bluff sites.

Recreation

Alternative 1 – Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area – The predominant recreation activities in this study area are dispersed activities including hunting, fishing, wildlife observation, and off-road vehicle use. The wildlife management areas, as well as the Cross Creeks refuge, support high levels of dispersed recreation. Dispersed recreational activities also occur on private lands in the study area. Lake Barkley is heavily used for boating. Developed recreation facilities are located in municipal areas in association with municipal parks and schools.

Alternative 2 – Cumberland-Davidson Study Area – As in the Alternative 1 study area, dispersed recreational activities are widespread and concentrated in the wildlife management areas. Developed recreation facilities are located in municipal areas in association with municipal parks. Portions of the Harpeth River also receive heavy use by canoeists.

Land Use and Prime Farmland

Alternative 1 – Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area – The primary land uses in this study area are agriculture and forest management, and the proportion of land devoted to these uses varies somewhat among the four corridors. Corridor B had the highest proportion of agricultural land, Corridor D has the highest proportion of forest land, and Corridor A has the highest proportion of developed land. All four corridors contain soils classified as prime farmland, and no prime farmland occurs at the site of proposed activities at the Cumberland Fossil Plant switchyard or the Montgomery 500-kV Substation.

Alternative 2 – Cumberland-Davidson Study Area – The primary land uses in this study area are forest management (60%) and agriculture (32%); the proportion of land devoted to these uses is similar in the two corridors. Both corridors contain soil classified as prime farmland, and no prime farmland occurs at the site of the proposed activities at the Cumberland Fossil Plant switchyard or the Davidson 500-kV Substation. Compared to the Cumberland-Montgomery study area, the proportion of the Cumberland-Davidson corridors with prime farmland soils is lower and the proportion of forest land is higher.

Visual Resources

Alternative 1 – Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area – The visual character of Cumberland Fossil Plant is primarily industrial. The rest of the four Alternative 1 corridors cross diverse landscapes including Lake Barkley, several streams, areas of farms, forest,

and low density residential development, as well as areas of higher density residential development and commercial development near Clarksville. Scenic attractiveness is common and scenic integrity is moderate over much of the corridors. Scenic attractiveness is also common and scenic integrity is moderate along most of the Corridor B and Corridor D routes. Both routes have developed portions where scenic attractiveness is minimal or moderate and scenic integrity is low, and

Alternative 2 – Cumberland-Davidson Study Area – The general visual character of the Alternative 2 corridors is similar to the Alternative 1 corridor, although more of the Alternative 2 corridors is forested. Both corridors cross the mostly undeveloped and scenic Harpeth River and its tributaries and have a concentration of major roads at their southeast ends. State highways run lengthwise through much of Corridor B, while several sections of Corridor A are relatively undeveloped and scenic.

Cultural Resources

Alternative 1 – Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area – Historic properties, identified for their architectural/historical or archaeological significance, occur in all four corridors. Corridor A contains eight properties presently listed in the National Register of Historic Places. Corridor B contains eight such listed properties, Corridor C contains nine, and Corridor D contains seven listed properties. The listed properties include historic iron furnaces, historic buildings, and archaeological sites. Each corridor also contains several properties identified as eligible or potentially eligible for listing on the National Register, and the potential exists for the discovery of additional historic properties within all four corridors. Field investigations of the proposed route in Corridor B identified four listed properties and three eligible or potentially eligible properties within the route's Area of Potential Effect (APE). Three listed properties and nine potentially eligible properties were identified during field investigations of the Corridor D route APE.

Alternative 2 – Cumberland-Davidson Study Area – Both Alternative 2 corridors contain historic properties listed in the NRHP with eleven in Corridor A and eight in Corridor B. These properties include historic iron furnaces, historic buildings, and archaeological sites. Both corridors also contain several properties identified as eligible or potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP. There is potential for the discovery of additional historic properties within both corridors.

Socioeconomics

Both alternative study areas vary greatly in socioeconomic characteristics. The two most urban counties, Davidson and Montgomery, have the highest minority population and relatively low employment rates. The two most rural and least populous counties, Houston and Stewart, have high unemployment rates, low median household incomes, and low minority populations compared to the study area and state averages.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

Groundwater

Alternatives 1 and 2 – Cumberland-Montgomery and Cumberland-Davidson Study Areas – Potential groundwater impacts are similar in the two study areas. Best management practices would be used during the construction and operation of the proposed transmission line. Mitigation measures to reduce groundwater impacts,

applicable to the Cumberland-Montgomery Corridor B route between Highway 12 and the Montgomery Substation and to the Cumberland-Montgomery Corridor D route between Lylewood Road and I-24 are: 1) no aerial applications of herbicides and 2) no use of fertilizers during revegetation. With implementation of these measures, any impacts to groundwater would be insignificant.

Based on the number of sinkholes located along each proposed Cumberland-Montgomery route, selection of the Corridor B route with the Industrial Park West alternative alignment, which crosses 9 sinkholes, would have the least potential for impacts to groundwater.

Alternative 3 – No Action – No impacts to groundwater are expected to result from implementation of this alternative.

Surface Water

Alternative 1 – Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area – Construction of the proposed transmission line in any of the Alternative 1 corridors would require crossing the Cumberland River, as well as several other streams. Potential impacts to streams include siltation and removal of the streamside tree canopy. These impacts would be minimized through avoiding stream crossings where possible, by implementation of best management practices (BMPs), and by minimizing vegetation clearing on streambanks. Impacts to surface waters are expected to be insignificant.

Alternative 2 – Cumberland-Davidson Study Area – Construction of the proposed transmission line in either of the Alternative 2 corridors would require crossing several streams, including the Harpeth River. Potential impacts to streams include siltation and removal of the streamside tree canopy. These impacts would be minimized through avoiding stream crossings where possible, by implementation of best management practices, and by minimizing vegetation clearing on streambanks. Impacts to surface waters are expected to be insignificant.

Alternative 3 – No Action – No impacts to surface waters are expected to result from implementation of this alternative.

Vegetation

Alternative 1 – Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area – Construction and operation of the proposed transmission line in any of the Alternative 1 corridors would result in the long-term conversion of forested areas to early successional habitats. Based on the forested area in each corridor, this conversion would likely be greater in Corridors A and C than in B and D. Plant communities of conservation concern could also be affected, although impacts to the Kentucky-Tennessee Big Barrens community would likely be insignificant as right-of-way management can be compatible with this early successional community.

Because no communities of conservation concern occur along the proposed Corridor B or Corridor D transmission line routes and the vegetation occurring along both of these routes is common for the region, only insignificant impacts to the regional vegetation are expected. Deforestation from construction and operation of the power line would be 387 acres on the Corridor B route and 338 to 399 acres on the Corridor D route. Fragmentation of the larger forest tracts would be greater on the Corridor B route than on the Corridor D route. Impacts would be locally significant on both routes but insignificant in a regional or state context.

Alternative 2 – Cumberland-Davidson Study Area – Construction and operation of the proposed transmission line in either of the Alternative 2 corridors would result in the permanent conversion of forested areas to early successional habitats. Based on the forested area in each of the corridors, this impact would likely be slightly greater in Corridor B than in Corridor A. This impact would also be greater in either of the Alternative 2 corridors than in any of the Alternative 1 corridors. Plant communities of conservation concern could also be affected.

Alternative 3 – No Action – No impacts to vegetation are expected to result from implementation of this alternative.

Wildlife

Alternative 1 – Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area – Potential impacts to wildlife would result from the long-term conversion of forest to early successional habitats and from the creation of forest-edge habitats. This would be detrimental to forest-dwelling wildlife but beneficial to species requiring early successional grassland/shrub habitats. The magnitude of these impacts varies with the amount of affected forest in each of the corridors. It would likely be greatest in Corridors A and B, somewhat lower in Corridor C, and lowest in Corridor D. The potential for forest fragmentation is considerably higher in Corridor B than in Corridor D. The proposed Corridor D route is shorter, has fewer forest patches and smaller average forest tract size than the Corridor B route. The Corridor B route crosses about twice as many wetlands and would require the clearing of a larger area of high-quality Category 3 forested wetlands than does the Corridor D route. The Corridor D route would impact 1 or 2 heron colonies, depending on the alternative alignments; this impact could be mitigated by seasonal restrictions on right-of-way clearing. Overall impacts to wildlife would be greater with selection of the Corridor B route than the Corridor D route.

Alternative 2 – Cumberland-Davidson Study Area – As in the Alternative 1 study area, potential impacts to wildlife would result from the long-term conversion of forest to early successional habitats, the creation of forest-edge habitats, and from forest fragmentation. This would be detrimental to forest-dwelling wildlife but beneficial to species requiring early successional grassland/shrub habitats. The magnitude of these impacts varies with the amount of affected forest in each of the corridors, which is very similar in the two corridors. Corridor A would also impact the Cheatham Wildlife Management Area.

Alternative 3 – No Action – No impacts to wildlife are expected to result from implementation of this alternative.

Aquatic Ecology

Alternative 1 – Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area – Aquatic life can be impacted either directly by alteration of conditions in the streambed or the riparian zone, or indirectly by runoff from construction and maintenance activities along the transmission line corridor entering aquatic habitats. Potential impacts include increased siltation, the removal of streamside vegetation, alteration of streambanks and stream bottoms by heavy equipment, and runoff of herbicides into streams. Although the potential for impacts varies among the combinations of alternative alignments, overall impacts to aquatic ecology, with implementation of protective measures, are expected to be insignificant.

The total number of water bodies that would be crossed by any combination of Corridor D alternative alignments is greater than the water bodies crossed by the Corridor B

alignments. The number of forested stream crossings, where the potential for impacts is often greater than at non-forested stream crossings, is slightly higher along Corridor B than Corridor D. Corridor D therefore has a somewhat lower potential to impact aquatic life.

Alternative 2 – Cumberland-Davidson Study Area – Under this alternative, transmission line construction and maintenance could impact aquatic life in numerous small streams as well as Lake Barkley, Cheatham Lake, and the Harpeth River. Impacts to aquatic life found in any of the proposed corridors would likely be reduced to insignificant levels with implementation of protective measures.

Alternative 3 – No Action – No impacts to aquatic ecology are expected to result from implementation of this alternative.

Endangered and Threatened Species

Alternative 1 – Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area – Two bats, listed as endangered under the Endangered Species Act, are known to occur within the Alternative 1 study area corridors; neither would be adversely affected. Short's bladderpod, a candidate species for federal listing, has been reported from the study area corridors but was not observed along either of the proposed routes and would not be affected. No federally listed aquatic animals are known from the study area. Eight plant species and five animal species listed as endangered or threatened in Tennessee are known from the study area corridors or line routes, as are several additional species listed as of special concern or in need of management in Tennessee. The only listed plant that would be affected is blue scorpionweed; the loss of some individuals would result from selection of the Corridor B route. The potential for impacts to state-listed terrestrial and aquatic animals is somewhat greater in Corridor B than Corridor D. Impacts to listed plants, terrestrial animals, and aquatic animals are expected to be insignificant under Alternative 1

Alternative 2 – Cumberland-Davidson Study Area – One plant listed as threatened under the Endangered Species Act is known from both Alternative 2 corridors. An additional four plants and two animals listed as threatened in Tennessee, as well as one plant and several animal species listed as of special concern or in need of management in Tennessee, are known from the study area corridors. TVA would minimize potential impacts to endangered and threatened species by avoiding populations during transmission line construction and, where this is not feasible, by mitigating impacts as necessary.

Alternative 3 – No Action – No impacts to endangered or threatened species are expected to result from implementation of this alternative.

Wetlands

Alternative 1 – Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area – Construction and future maintenance of the proposed transmission line in any of the Alternative 1 study area corridors have the potential to impact wetlands. Emergent and scrub-shrub wetlands could be impacted by siltation and alteration of drainage patterns resulting from ROW construction activities. A less common but potentially significant direct impact is the loss of forested wetlands through conversion to scrub-shrub and/or emergent wetlands during ROW clearing. In addition to the potential construction impacts, future maintenance activities could result in direct and indirect impacts to wetlands within the ROW. TVA will minimize potential impacts to wetlands by avoiding wetlands during transmission line construction where possible, minimizing clearing of vegetation in wetlands, and applying

appropriate BMPs during construction and maintenance activities. Based on the review of National Wetland Inventory data, Corridor D appears to have a higher potential for wetland impacts than Corridors A, B, or C.

The area of wetlands on the Corridor B route and alternative alignments ranges from 21.7 to 23.2 acres, and on the Corridor D alternative alignments from 5.6 to 11.1 acres. The approximate acreages in non-forested wetlands on the Corridor B route and alternative alignments are 13.7 and 13.9 acres. On the Corridor D route and alternative alignments, approximate acreages in non-forested wetlands range from 0.45 to 5.9 acres. Impacts to non-forested wetlands are expected to be minimal due to avoidance of these areas and implementation of appropriate BMPs during construction and future ROW maintenance activities.

The largest acreage of forested wetlands is in the Corridor B/Cumberland River South alternative alignment (6.2 acres), and smallest acreage is in the Corridor D/Woodlawn West alternative alignment (4.1 acres). The largest acreage of forested wetlands categorized as high-quality is in Corridor B (7.0 acres, of which 3.8 acres would be cleared). There are approximately 2.5 acres of high-quality forested wetlands, all of which would require clearing, in Corridor D.

Overall, the alternative alignments that would result in the lowest potential for wetland impacts are the Corridor D/Woodlawn West alternative alignment and the D/Woodlawn East alternative alignment. The alternative alignments that would have the lowest potential for forested wetland clearing are the D/Woodlawn West and D/Woodlawn West/Fossil Plant East. All Corridor B alternative alignments would require more clearing of high quality forested wetlands than would Corridor D alignments, and the largest amount of forested wetland clearing would occur under the B/Cumberland River South alternative alignment.

For both the Corridor B and Corridor D routes, potential impacts to unavoidably impacted wetlands could be mitigated by purchasing credits from a nearby mitigation bank or restoration of forested wetlands. Doing so would reduce wetland impacts to insignificant levels.

Alternative 2 – Cumberland-Davidson Study Area – Construction and maintenance of the proposed transmission line in either of the Alternative 2 study area corridors has the potential to impact wetlands. The potential for wetland impacts is similar in both corridors and the types of impacts would be similar to those described above for the Alternative 1 Study Area. TVA could minimize potential impacts to wetlands by avoiding wetlands during transmission line construction where possible, minimizing clearing of vegetation in wetlands, and applying appropriate BMPs during construction and maintenance activities.

Alternative 3 – No Action – No impacts to wetlands are expected to result from implementation of this alternative.

Floodplains

Alternatives 1 and 2 – Cumberland-Montgomery and Cumberland-Davidson Study Areas – Both alternative study areas and the proposed corridors cross 100-year floodplains. TVA would avoid siting transmission structures in streams; siting transmission structures in associated floodplains is not expected to significantly impact flood elevations or floodplain functions. Any floodplain impacts from the construction of access roads would be expected to be insignificant.

Alternative 3 – No Action – No impacts to floodplains are expected to result from implementation of this alternative.

Managed Areas

Alternative 1 – Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area – Managed areas and/or ecologically significant sites such as National Wildlife Refuges, Wildlife Management Areas, and streams listed on the Nationwide Rivers Inventory occur in all of the Alternative 1 study area corridors. Based solely on the number and area of such sites, the potential for impacting them is greatest in Corridor D and lowest in Corridors A and B. The proposed Corridor B route would cross the Marks Slough wetland site; the clearing of wetlands on the site is not expected to significantly affect the integrity of the site. Both the Corridor B and Corridor D routes would cross streams listed on the Nationwide Rivers Inventory; impacts to these streams are expected to be insignificant.

Alternative 2 – Cumberland-Davidson Study Area – Streams listed in the Nationwide Rivers Inventory as well as the Harpeth State Scenic River would be crossed by either of the Alternative 2 corridors. Corridor A would also cross Cheatham Wildlife Management Area. Two other small ecologically significant sites occur in Corridor B. The potential for impacts to managed areas and ecologically significant sites is greater in Corridor A than in Corridor B.

Alternative 3 – No Action – No impacts to managed areas are expected to result from implementation of this alternative.

Recreation

Alternative 1 – Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area – All of the proposed Alternative 1 study area corridors cross areas where dispersed recreation activities such as fishing, hunting, and wildlife observation take place; these activities are concentrated in wildlife management areas and a few other locations. Although some of these recreation activities could be disrupted during transmission line construction, the long-term impacts are expected to be insignificant. The potential for impacts to recreation appears somewhat higher in Corridors C and D than in Corridors A and B. No developed recreation areas would be directly affected by either the Corridor B or Corridor D route, and overall impacts to recreation would be insignificant.

Alternative 2 – Cumberland-Davidson Study Area – Both of the proposed Alternative 2 study area corridors cross areas where dispersed recreation activities such as fishing, hunting, and wildlife observation take place. The Cheatham Wildlife Management Area, which would be crossed by Corridor A, received a high level of dispersed recreational use. Although some of dispersed recreation activities could be disrupted during transmission line construction, the long-term impacts are expected to be insignificant.

Alternative 3 – No Action – No impacts to recreation are expected to result from implementation of this alternative.

Land Use and Prime Farmland

Alternative 1 – Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area – Construction and operation of the proposed transmission line in any of the four corridors would affect land use and prime farmland. The Corridor D route would cross more prime farmland than the Corridor B route. The farmland area removed from production on either route would be small and limited to the transmission structure foundations. Both routes would remove land from forest management and the acreage affected depends on the combination of alternative alignments. The Corridor D route would require many more building relocations than would the Corridor B route.

Alternative 2 – Cumberland-Davidson Study Area – Overall impacts to land use for this alternative are expected to be similar to those of Alternative 1, except that the proportion of forestland affected would be greater and the proportion of prime farmland affected would be less.

Visual Resources

Alternative 1 – Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area – Construction and operation of the proposed transmission line in any of the Alternative 1 corridors would result in long-term changes in the visual character of the area resulting from the clearing of the ROW and the construction of metal transmission line structures and conductors. Construction and operation of the proposed transmission line on the Corridor B route would result in long-term but minor visual impacts. The greatest visual changes would occur near Attaway Road, an area northwest of Cunningham comprised mostly of open pasture land with rolling topography. The new transmission line would provide discordant contrast in the pastoral landscape and would likely change the Scenic Value Class by one level from good to fair and reduce visual coherence and harmony. However, this reduction in scenic class would not result in significant visual impacts. The visual changes resulting from the selection of the Corridor D route would be similar to those of the Corridor B route but the level of impacts would be somewhat lower. This would contribute to a cumulative reduction of visual integrity but not significant visual impacts.

Alternative 2 – Cumberland-Davidson Study Area – The construction and operation of the proposed transmission line in either of the Alternative 2 study area corridors would result in long-term changes in the visual character of the area. Scenic areas within this study area include the Harpeth State Scenic River and several other stream valleys, the many forested ridges, and the Cheatham Wildlife Management Area (in Corridor A). There are also several scenic rural areas with a low density of houses and other developments in each corridor.

Alternative 3 – No Action – No alterations of the visual character of the project area are expected to result from implementation of this alternative.

Cultural Resources

Alternative 1 – Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area – All four Alternative 1 study area corridors contain properties that are listed, eligible for listing, or potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP. Corridor D has fewer such identified properties than the other three corridors.

Neither the Corridor B nor the Corridor D route would adversely affect archaeological sites eligible for or listed in the NRHP. Selection of the Corridor B would affect one historic structure potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP; the effects on this structure would not be adverse. Selection of Corridor D with the Ringgold South alternative alignment would adversely affect a historic structure, Ringgold Mill, listed in the NRHP. Other Corridor D alignments would not adversely affect listed or eligible historic structures.

Alternative 2 – Cumberland-Davidson Study Area – Both Alternative 2 study area corridors contain properties that are listed, eligible for listing, or potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP. Corridor A has fewer such identified properties than does Corridor B.

Alternative 3 – No Action – No impacts to cultural resources are expected to result from implementation of this alternative.

Socioeconomics

Alternatives 1 and 2 – Cumberland-Montgomery and Cumberland-Davidson Study Areas – The construction of the proposed transmission line in either of the alternative study areas would result in some short-term employment, as well as some local expenditures for housing, food, and some purchases of materials. The labor force is expected to originate outside the study area, and local employment impacts would be minimal. TVA would pay fair market value for transmission line easements purchased from landowners and impacts to property values are expected to be insignificant. Environmental justice impacts are likely to be insignificant and no significant disproportionate impacts would result from the selection of either the Cumberland-Montgomery Corridor B or Corridor D routes.

Alternative 3 – No Action – Under the No Action alternative, no immediate socioeconomic impacts are anticipated. Some long-term impacts could occur if reliable electric service to the middle-Tennessee area cannot be maintained because of inadequate transmission capacity.

Electric and Magnetic Fields

Alternatives 1 and 2 – Cumberland-Montgomery and Cumberland-Davidson Study Areas – New electric and magnetic fields would be created from the operation of the proposed transmission line. TVA would minimize public exposure to these fields through engineering features (e.g., conductor height, grounding of metal objects), line routing decisions (e.g., buffers around occupied buildings), and removal of occupied buildings from the selected ROW, and no significant impacts from these fields are anticipated.

Alternative 3 – No Action – Under the No Action alternative, no new electric and magnetic fields would be created from the operation of the proposed transmission line.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR ACTION	1
1.1	Background.....	1
1.2	Proposed Action	2
1.3	The Decision.....	2
1.4	Other Pertinent Environmental Reviews or Documentation	2
1.5	The Scoping Process.....	2
1.6	Issues to Be Addressed.....	4
1.7	DEIS Public Review Process.....	4
1.8	Permits And Approvals	5
1.9	EIS Overview	6
2	ALTERNATIVES.....	9
2.1	Description of the Proposed 500-kV Transmission Line	9
2.1.1	Property Acquisition	9
2.1.2	Construction.....	10
2.1.3	Operation and Maintenance	13
2.2	Project and Siting Alternatives.....	14
2.2.1	Project Alternatives	15
2.2.2	Siting Alternatives	16
2.3	Alternatives Considered But Eliminated From Further Consideration.....	37
2.3.1	New Switching Station and Transmission Line.....	37
2.3.2	Load Management/Conservation.....	37
2.4	Comparison of Alternatives.....	38
2.4.1	Alternative Study Areas and Corridors	38
2.4.2	Cumberland-Montgomery Transmission Line Routes	41
2.5	The Preferred Alternative and Route	43
2.6	Mitigation Measures.....	44
3	AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT	47
3.1	Groundwater	47
3.1.1	Alternative 1 - Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area.....	48
3.1.2	Alternative 2 - Cumberland-Davidson Study Area.....	49
3.2	Surface Water.....	49
3.2.1	Alternative 1 - Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area.....	49
3.2.2	Alternative 2 - Cumberland-Davidson Study Area.....	51
3.3	Vegetation.....	52
3.3.1	Alternative 1 - Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area.....	52
3.3.2	Alternative 2 - Cumberland-Davidson Study Area.....	59
3.4	Wildlife	61

3.4.1	General Overview of the Study Areas	61
3.4.2	Indicators for Wildlife Populations	63
3.4.3	Alternative 1 - Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area.....	64
3.4.4	Alternative 2 - Cumberland-Davidson Study Area.....	65
3.5	Aquatic Ecology.....	66
3.5.1	Alternative 1 - Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area.....	66
3.5.2	Alternative 2 - Cumberland-Davidson Study Area.....	69
3.6	Endangered and Threatened Species.....	70
3.6.1	Alternative 1 - Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area.....	77
3.6.2	Alternative 2 - Cumberland-Davidson Study Area.....	81
3.7	Wetlands.....	81
3.7.1	Alternative 1 - Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area.....	83
3.7.2	Alternative 2 - Cumberland-Davidson Study Area.....	89
3.8	Floodplains	90
3.9	Managed Areas	90
3.9.1	Alternative 1 - Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area.....	90
3.9.2	Alternative 2 - Cumberland-Davidson Study Area.....	94
3.10	Recreation	95
3.10.1	Alternative 1 - Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area.....	95
3.10.2	Alternative 2 - Cumberland-Davidson Study Area.....	95
3.11	Land Use and Prime Farmland	96
3.11.1	Alternative 1 - Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area.....	96
3.11.2	Alternative 2 - Cumberland-Davidson Study Area.....	98
3.12	Visual Resources.....	99
3.12.1	Alternative 1 - Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area.....	99
3.12.2	Alternative 2 - Cumberland-Davidson Study Area.....	105
3.13	Cultural Resources.....	106
3.13.1	Alternative 1 - Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area.....	108
3.13.2	Alternative 1 - Cumberland-Davidson Study Area.....	112
3.14	Socioeconomics	113
3.14.1	Alternative 1 – Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area.....	113
3.14.2	Alternative 2 – Cumberland-Davidson Study Area.....	113
4	ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES.....	117
4.1	Groundwater.....	117
4.1.1	Alternative 1 - Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area.....	117
4.1.2	Alternative 2 - Cumberland-Davidson Study Area.....	118
4.1.3	Alternative C No Action.....	118
4.1.4	Mitigation Measures.....	118
4.2	Surface Water.....	119
4.2.1	Alternative 1 - Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area.....	119
4.2.2	Alternative 2 - Cumberland-Davidson Study Area.....	120
4.2.3	Alternative 3 No Action	120
4.3	Vegetation.....	120

4.3.1	Alternative 1 - Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area.....	120
4.3.2	Alternative 2 - Cumberland-Davidson Study Area.....	124
4.3.3	Alternative 3 No Action	124
4.3.4	Mitigation Measures.....	124
4.4	Wildlife	125
4.4.1	General Effects to Wildlife and Their Habitats.....	125
4.4.2	Alternative 1 - Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area.....	125
4.4.3	Alternative 2 - Cumberland Davidson Study Area.....	127
4.4.4	Alternative 3 No Action	127
4.4.5	Cumulative Impacts	127
4.4.6	Mitigation Measures.....	128
4.5	Aquatic Ecology	128
4.5.1	Alternative 1 - Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area.....	129
4.5.2	Alternative 2- Cumberland Davidson Study Area.....	130
4.5.3	Alternative 3 No Action	130
4.6	Endangered and Threatened Species.....	130
4.6.1	Alternative 1 - Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area.....	131
4.6.2	Alternative 2- Cumberland Davidson Study Area.....	133
4.6.3	Alternative 3 No Action	134
4.7	Wetlands.....	134
4.7.1	Alternative 1 - Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area.....	135
4.7.2	Alternative 2- Cumberland Davidson Study Area.....	138
4.7.3	Alternative 3 No Action	138
4.7.4	Comparison of Cumberland-Montgomery Corridors B and D	138
4.7.5	Cumulative Impacts	139
4.8	Floodplains.....	142
4.9	Managed Areas	143
4.9.1	Alternative 1 - Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area.....	143
4.9.2	Alternative 2 - Cumberland-Davidson Study Area.....	144
4.9.3	Alternative 3 No Action	144
4.10	Recreation.....	145
4.10.1	Alternative 1 - Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area.....	145
4.10.2	Alternative 2- Cumberland Davidson Study Area.....	145
4.10.3	Alternative 3 No Action	145
4.11	Land Use and Prime Farmland.....	145
4.11.1	Alternative 1 - Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area.....	146
4.11.2	Alternative 2 - Cumberland-Davidson Study Area.....	148
4.11.3	Alternative 3 No Action	148
4.12	Visual Resources.....	148
4.12.1	Alternative 1 - Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area.....	149
4.12.2	Alternative 2- Cumberland Davidson Study Area.....	155
4.12.3	Alternative 3 – No Action	156
4.13	Cultural Resources	156
4.13.1	Alternative 1 - Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area.....	156
4.13.2	Alternative 2- Cumberland Davidson Study Area.....	157

4.13.3	Alternative 3 No Action	157
4.14	Socioeconomics	158
4.14.1	Alternatives 1 - Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area.....	158
4.14.2	Alternative 2-Cumberland Davidson Study Area	161
4.14.3	Alternative 3 – No Action	163
4.14.4	Cumulative Impacts	163
4.15	Electric and Magnetic Fields.....	165
4.15.1	Alternative 1 - Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area.....	166
4.15.2	Alternative 2- Cumberland Davidson Study Area.....	166
4.15.3	Alternative 3 No Action	166
4.16	Unavoidable Adverse Effects	166
4.17	Relationship of Short-Term Uses of the Environment and Maintenance and Enhancement of Long-Term Productivity.....	167
4.18	Irreversible and Irrecoverable Commitments of Resources.....	167
5	LIST OF PREPARERS	169
5.1	Project Management	169
5.2	Other Contributors	169
6	LIST OF AGENCIES, ORGANIZATIONS, AND PERSONS TO WHOM COPIES HAVE BEEN SENT	175
7	SUPPORTING INFORMATION.....	179
7.1	Literature Cited	179
7.2	Glossary and Abbreviations.....	184
7.3	Index	186

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX A – NOTICE OF INTENT	189
APPENDIX B – RIGHT-OF-WAY CLEARING SPECIFICATIONS.....	191
APPENDIX C – ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY PROTECTION SPECIFICATIONS FOR TRANSMISSION LINE CONSTRUCTION	197
APPENDIX D – ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY PROTECTION SPECIFICATIONS FOR TRANSMISSION SUBSTATION OR COMMUNICATIONS CONSTRUCTION.....	203
APPENDIX E – RIGHT-OF-WAY VEGETATION MANAGEMENT	211
APPENDIX F – TVA TRANSMISSION CONSTRUCTION GUIDELINES NEAR STREAMS	217
APPENDIX G – TVA WETLANDS RAPID ASSESSMENT METHOD (TVARAM) FIELD DATA SHEET	221
APPENDIX H – DEMAND-SIDE MANAGEMENT EFFORTS	223
APPENDIX I – RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE DEIS	227

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2-1.	Length of right-of-way and associated new or upgraded access roads for the Cumberland-Montgomery Corridor B transmission line route.	26
Table 2-2.	Length of right-of-way and associated new or upgraded access roads for the Cumberland-Montgomery Corridor D transmission line route.	35
Table 2-3.	Summary of selected attributes of Alternative Study Areas and Corridors.....	39
Table 2-4.	Summary of differences in potential impacts between the Cumberland-Montgomery Corridor B and Corridor D transmission line routes.....	42
Table 3-1.	State of Tennessee use classifications for streams along the proposed Corridor B and Corridor D routes in the Cumberland Montgomery study area. Source: TDEC (2004a).....	50
Table 3-2.	State of Tennessee 303(d) listed streams along the proposed Corridor B and Corridor D routes in the Cumberland Montgomery study area. Source: TDEC (2004b).....	51
Table 3-3.	State of Tennessee 303(d) listed streams in the Cumberland-Davidson Study Area. Source: TDEC (2004a).	52
Table 3-4.	Changes in timberland in Dickson, Houston, Montgomery, and Stewart Counties, Tennessee between 1989 and 2002.	54
Table 3-5.	Land Use / Land Cover data summarizing major vegetation types within the Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area Corridors.	54
Table 3-6.	Forest patch statistics in acres for the Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area. The minimum patch size in this analysis is 5 acres and Total Area is the sum of all patches within each size class.....	56
Table 3-7.	Plant communities of conservation concern reported from one or more of the counties containing the two study areas ¹	57
Table 3-8.	Proportions of various vegetation types and non-vegetated lands along Route B and associated access roads.	58
Table 3-9.	Proportions of various vegetation types and non-vegetated lands along Route D and associated access roads.	58
Table 3-10.	Land Use / Land Cover data summarizing major vegetation types within the Cumberland-Davidson Study Area.	60
Table 3-11.	Forest patch statistics in acres for the Cumberland-Davidson Study Area. The minimum patch size in this analysis is 5 acres and total acreage is the sum of all patches within each size class.....	60
Table 3-13.	Federally listed and state-listed plant species reported from the project area. For federally listed species, all species reported from the project area counties are listed. For state-listed species, those known from within five miles of each study area corridor are listed. In the Study Area/Corridor columns, "X" indicates the occurrence of the species in the vicinity of the study area and letter codes denote the presence of the species within the particular corridor or corridor segment.	71
Table 3-14.	Federally listed and state-listed terrestrial animal species reported from the project area. For federally listed species, all species reported from the project area counties are listed. For state-listed species, those known from within three miles of each study area are listed. In	

the Study Area/Corridor columns, X denotes the occurrence of a species in the vicinity of the study area and letter codes denote the presence of a species within the particular corridor or corridor segment 75

Table 3-15. Federally listed and state-listed aquatic animal species reported from the project area. For federally listed species, all species reported from the project area counties are listed. For state-listed species, those known from potentially affected streams are listed. In the Study Area/Corridor columns, X denotes the occurrence of a species in the vicinity of the study area and letter codes denote corridors containing streams from which a species has been reported... 78

Table 3-16. Percentage of High, Medium, and Low Quality Indiana Bat Habitat Along the Forested Sections of the Alternative 1 – Cumberland-Montgomery Corridor B and Corridor D Transmission Line Routes. 80

Table 3-17. Wetlands in the proposed Cumberland Montgomery Corridor B transmission line right-of-way and access roads..... 86

Table 3-18. Total acreage of wetlands by wetland class and TVARAM Category in Corridor B alignments..... 87

Table 3-19. Wetlands in the proposed Corridor D Cumberland Montgomery 500-kV transmission line right-of-way. 88

Table 3-20. Total acreage of wetlands by wetland class and TVARAM Category in Corridor D alignments..... 89

Table 3-24. Historic properties in the Alternative 1 - Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area, as reported in available records. The status column describes the eligibility of the properties for listing on the National Register of Historic Places..... 109

Table 3-25. Cultural resources present within the Area of Potential Effect of Cumberland-Montgomery Routes B and D as determined by field investigations. The status column describes the eligibility of the properties for listing on the National Register of Historic Places..... 110

Table 3-26. Historic properties in the Alternative 2 - Cumberland-Davidson Study Area, as reported in available records. The status column describes the eligibility of the properties for listing on the National Register of Historic Places..... 112

Table 3-27. Socioeconomic characteristics of the four counties in the Alternative 1 Cumberland-Montgomery project area..... 114

Table 3-28. Socioeconomic characteristics of the five counties in the Alternative 2 Cumberland-Davidson project area..... 115

Table 4-3. Number of wetland crossings, acreage of all wetlands, and acreage of Category 2 and Category 3 forested (PFO1) wetlands on the Cumberland-Montgomery Corridor B and D transmission line route alignments. 141

Table H-1. *energy right* Installations and Direct Load Control in the Middle Tennessee area, April 2004 – April 2005..... 224

Table H-2. Findings of Pacific Energy Associates (PEA) Study of Load Reduction Potential for the Entire TVA Service Area and the Middle Tennessee Service Area 226

Table I-1. Commenters on the Draft EIS. 228

Table J-1. Estimated annoyance from background noise (FICON 1992)..... 273

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1-1.	The project area for the proposed 500-kV transmission line.	3
Figure 2-1.	Typical 500-kV Transmission Line Structure.	12
Figure 2-2.	The Cumberland-Montgomery Study Area and transmission line corridors.	18
Figure 2-3.	The Cumberland-Montgomery Corridor B and Corridor D transmission line routes...	19
Figure 2-4.	Index map of the Cumberland-Montgomery Corridor B and Corridor D transmission line routes.....	20
Figure 2-5.	The Cumberland-Montgomery Corridor B transmission line route, Part 1.....	21
Figure 2-6.	The Cumberland-Montgomery Corridor B transmission line route, Part 2.....	22
Figure 2-7.	The Cumberland-Montgomery Corridor B transmission line route, Part 3.....	23
Figure 2-8.	The Cumberland-Montgomery Corridor B transmission line route, Part 4.....	24
Figure 2-9.	The Cumberland-Montgomery Corridor B transmission line route, Part 5.....	25
Figure 2-10.	The Cumberland-Montgomery Corridor D transmission line route, Part 1.	29
Figure 2-11.	The Cumberland-Montgomery Corridor D transmission line route, Part 2.	30
Figure 2-12.	The Cumberland-Montgomery Corridor D transmission line route, Part 3.	31
Figure 2-13.	The Cumberland-Montgomery Corridor D transmission line route, Part 4.	32
Figure 2-14.	The Cumberland-Montgomery Corridor D transmission line route, Part 5.	33
Figure 2-15.	The Cumberland-Davidson Study Area and transmission line corridors.....	36
Figure 4-1.	Proportion of nonwhite population by census block group in vicinity of Cumberland- Montgomery Corridor B and Corridor D transmission line routes.....	160
Figure 4-2.	Proportion of population below poverty level by census block group in vicinity of Cumberland-Montgomery Corridor B and Corridor D transmission line routes.....	161