

Document Type: Environmental Impact Statement-
Administrative Record
Index Field: Final Environmental Document
Project Name: Watts Bar Land Plan
Project Number: 2004-1

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

WATTS BAR RESERVOIR LAND MANAGEMENT PLAN

Loudon, Meigs, Rhea, and Roane Counties, Tennessee

PREPARED BY:
TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

FEBRUARY 2009

Direct Comments to:

Richard L. Toennisson
Tennessee Valley Authority
400 West Summit Hill Drive
Knoxville, Tennessee 37902
Phone: (865) 632-8517
Fax: (865) 632-3451
E-mail: rltoennisson@tva.gov

Page intentionally blank

Final Environmental Impact Statement

February 2009

Proposed project: Watts Bar Reservoir Land Management Plan
Loudon, Meigs, Rhea, and Roane Counties, Tennessee

Lead agency: Tennessee Valley Authority

Cooperating agencies: None

**For further information,
contact:** Richard L. Toennisson
Senior NEPA Specialist
Tennessee Valley Authority
400 West Summit Hill Drive
Knoxville, Tennessee 37902
Phone: (865) 632-8517
Fax: (865) 632-3451
E-mail: rltoennisson@tva.gov

**Comments must be
submitted by:** March 23,2009

Abstract: Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) proposes to update the 1988 *Watts Bar Reservoir Land Management Plan* (1988 Plan) for approximately 16,220 acres of TVA public land on Watts Bar Reservoir in Loudon, Meigs, Rhea, and Roane counties, Tennessee. The proposed updated *Watts Bar Reservoir Land Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement* (Land Plan) would guide land use approvals, private water use facility permitting, and resource management decisions on Watts Bar Reservoir. The proposed Land Plan allocates land into broad categories or "Zones," including Project Operations, Sensitive Resource Management, Natural Resource Conservation, Industrial, Developed Recreation, and Shoreline Access.

This Land Plan considers three alternatives and incorporates TVA's November 2006 Land Policy and other administrative changes. The alternatives are a No Action Alternative to continue to use the 1988 Plan with accrued updates; a Modified Development and Recreation Alternative, providing suitable industrial use and developed recreation; and a Modified Conservation and Recreation Alternative, providing an emphasis on natural resource conservation and dispersed recreation activities. TVA's preferred alternative is the Modified Development and Recreation Alternative.

Page intentionally blank

SUMMARY

PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR ACTION

The Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) manages its public lands to protect the integrated operation of the TVA reservoir and power systems, to provide for appropriate public use and enjoyment of the reservoir system, and to provide for continuing economic growth in the Tennessee Valley. TVA is proposing to update the 1988 *Watts Bar Reservoir Land Management Plan* (1988 Plan) to reflect changing community needs and current TVA policies. This includes allocating additional public lands on the reservoir that were not previously allocated in the 1988 Plan. These additional lands include narrow shoreline strips, TVA operation areas, and lands committed under legal agreements.

The purpose of the *Watts Bar Reservoir Land Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement* (Land Plan) is to update the 1988 Plan by incorporating the changes derived from implementation of the TVA Land Policy (November 2006) and other subsequent updates for approximately 16,220 acres of TVA managed public land on Watts Bar Reservoir in Loudon, Meigs, Rhea, and Roane counties, Tennessee. The Land Plan would allow an additional opportunity to assess environmental impacts of a reasonable range of alternatives for allocating TVA public land on Watts Bar Reservoir and provide a means for additional public involvement in the decision-making process. The proposed updated Land Plan would guide land use approvals, private water use facility permitting, and resource management decisions on Watts Bar Reservoir. The proposed Land Plan alternatives allocates land into broad categories or “Zones,” including Project Operations, Sensitive Resource Management, Natural Resource Conservation, Industrial, Developed Recreation, and Shoreline Access.

In January 2009, TVA began developing a recovery plan for the December 2008 coal ash spill at Kingston Fossil Plant. At least six parcels on Watts Bar Reservoir were affected by the spill. The continued appropriateness of the allocation of these affected parcels would be reevaluated through the recovery planning process. Future TVA actions to reallocate any of the six parcels would be subject to environmental reviews under the *National Environmental Policy Act* (NEPA).

The Watts Bar Reservoir, which is part of the Watts Bar project, is a multipurpose reservoir operated by TVA for navigation, flood control, power production, recreation, and economic development. The Land Plan is intended to be consistent with the purposes of the Watts Bar project. The Land Plan also seeks to address issues and concerns raised by the general public. Each reservoir land management plan is submitted for approval to the TVA Board of Directors and adopted as policy to provide for long-term stewardship and accomplishment of TVA responsibilities under the TVA Act of 1933.

ALTERNATIVES

TVA is considering three alternatives for managing public land under its control around Watts Bar Reservoir. In order to fulfill the purpose, need and goals of land planning, these alternatives have been modified during the review process based on evaluations, new and existing data, TVA policy and program needs, public and agency comments, and the information previously described in Section 1.3.

- Under the No Action Alternative (Modified Alternative A) , TVA would continue to use the existing 1988 Plan, with minor revisions to reflect allocation changes made over the past 19 years and current TVA policy.
- Alternative B (Modified Development and Recreation) would provide suitable economic and recreation opportunities as prescribed by the TVA Land Policy.
- Alternative C (Modified Conservation and Recreation) proposes a small amount of land allocated for industrial use and large portions to enhance conservation and dispersed recreation.

Under all alternatives:

- TVA would continue to conduct environmental reviews prior to the approval of any proposed development or activity on public land to address site-specific issues.
- Future activities and land uses will be guided by TVA Land Policy.
- TVA land use allocations are not intended to supersede deeded land rights or land ownership (See Section 2.2.1 for more information)

TVA's selected alternative would guide TVA resource management and property administration decisions on the TVA public land surrounding Watts Bar Reservoir until the Land Plan is revised in the future, which is expected to be about 10 years.

No Action (Modified Alternative A): TVA would continue to use the existing 1988 Plan, with minor revisions to reflect allocation changes made over the past 19 years and current TVA policy. The 19 allocation categories defined by the 1988 Plan would continue to be used, although activities and land uses not provided for by the Land Policy would not occur. Five thousand nine hundred acres of the TVA land on Watts Bar Reservoir (project operations and marginal strip) would continue to be administered by TVA but remain unplanned.

Modified Development and Recreation (Modified Alternative B): The proposed Modified Alternative B would continue to provide suitable economic and recreation opportunities as prescribed by the TVA Land Policy. This alternative would allocate public land and deeded rights into seven "Zones," including Non TVA Land, Project Operations, Sensitive Resource Management, Natural Resource Conservation, Industrial, Developed Recreation, and Shoreline Access. Each of the Watts Bar Reservoir land parcels being planned would be allocated to one of the land use Zones.

Under this alternative, TVA would help promote some industrial development and commercial recreation by allocating 357 acres of land for industrial use and 1,552 acres to developed recreation totaling about 12 percent of TVA-owned land on Watts Bar Reservoir. In addition, 760 acres of the former Clinch River Breeder Reactor (CRBR) site would be allocated to Zone 2 (Project Operations). Approximately 7,600 acres (47 percent) of land would be allocated for sensitive and natural resource use. Although natural resource conservation and dispersed recreation would predominate on the reservoir, industrial development and developed recreation would occur on TVA land where those activities are most suitable and have the greatest opportunity for success. This alternative includes minor administrative changes and alterations to the boundaries of land parcels or changes

to their allocation zones that reflect new information about deeded rights or natural resources.

Modified Conservation and Recreation (Modified Alternative C): The Modified Alternative C proposes a small amount of land allocated for economic development or industrial use and large portions to sensitive resource management and natural resource conservation. This alternative would allocate public land similar to Modified Alternative B. Under Modified Alternative C, TVA would help promote conservation of natural resources and dispersed and commercial recreation by allocating about 8,900 acres of land for sensitive resource protection or natural resource conservation and 1,350 acres to developed recreation totaling about 63 percent of TVA-owned land on Watts Bar Reservoir. TVA would apply one of the appropriate land allocation zones to all Watts Bar Reservoir lands. Only those lands with existing industrial facilities, about 80 acres (less than 1 percent), would be allocated for industrial use. This alternative would also include the minor administrative changes and alterations like Modified Alternative B. Under this alternative, natural resource conservation and dispersed recreation would predominate on TVA Watts Bar Reservoir land. Developed recreation would occur on TVA land where those activities are most suitable and have the greatest opportunity for success.

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

TVA manages about 16,220 acres of federally owned public land on Watts Bar Reservoir. The principal towns on the reservoir are Spring City, Kingston, Loudon, Rockwood, Lenoir City, Oak Ridge, and Harriman. Rural populations are concentrated in the numerous long valleys between the forested ridges. Watts Bar Reservoir flows from the northeast to southwest through Loudon, Meigs, Rhea, and Roane Counties in east Tennessee. At normal summer pool, the reservoir extends 72.4 miles up the Tennessee River to Fort Loudoun Dam, and 62.5 miles to Melton Hill Dam on the Clinch River. Including parts of the Emory and Little Emory rivers, the shoreline length totals 721 miles. TVA public land surrounding the reservoir includes natural areas, habitat protection areas, land fronting residential development, wildlife management areas, forested areas, licensed recreation areas, power transmission line corridors, riparian/wetland areas along streams and the reservoir shoreline, and Kingston Fossil Plant, Watts Bar Nuclear Plant, and the Watts Bar Dam Reservation.

There are 15 TVA areas managed for Species/Habitat Protection; Recreation; Resource Production; or Scientific, Cultural or Visual Resources. Other local, state, or federal agencies currently manage 19 similar areas located on or in the vicinity of public lands on Watts Bar Reservoir. Segments of the Emory and Little Tennessee rivers, and Piney Creek, which are tributaries to the reservoir, are listed on the National Rivers Inventory. Privately owned land surrounding the reservoir is a mosaic of residential and industrial/commercial development, upland and bottomland forests, and farmland comprised of hay, pasture, row crops, and small woodlots. The reservoir is similar to other reservoirs in the Tennessee River system in landscape character. Substantial visual features throughout the reservoir include secluded coves and vegetated large islands, visual buffering shoreline areas, and attractive isolated areas.

The numerous plant communities on Watts Bar Reservoir provide suitable habitat for a variety of wildlife species. These diverse plant communities include pine/hardwood forests, upland and riparian hardwood forests, and old field and agricultural field habitats. Many features, such as forested and emergent wetlands, streams, limestone bluffs, and caves on

reservoir parcels provide unique habitats for wildlife. In addition, the reservoir has one of the largest populations of nesting osprey in the Tennessee River Valley and a significant establishment of heron colonies suggesting that the reservoir may provide suitable nesting habitat for other wading birds uncommon in Tennessee.

The various aquatic and terrestrial habitats in the vicinity of Watts Bar Reservoir provide suitable habitat for several federally and state-listed wildlife species. Although 13 plant species listed by the state of Tennessee occur on TVA land, there are no known federally listed plant species. Several protected terrestrial animal species occur on TVA land and approximately 24 caves and 37 heron colonies were identified from the project area. One of these species (gray bats) is federally listed, one species (bald eagles) has federal protection status, and 14 species are listed by the state of Tennessee. There are 10 mollusks and six fish in the vicinity of the reservoir that are state or federally listed species. However, five of the mollusk species are believed to be extirpated from the reservoir. Currently, there are four federally listed mussels and one state-listed mussel and two federally listed and four state-listed fish known from the reservoir and its tributaries.

The overall reservoir ecological health rating for Watts Bar Reservoir was fair in 2004, with some ratings declining from good to poor between 1994 and 2002. The overall water quality characteristics of the reservoir are strongly affected by waters outside of the local watershed. Sediment quality ratings have varied from good to fair (1991-2003) with a greater frequency of occurrence of organic chemicals such as chlordane and polychlorinated biphenyls. Institutional controls (warning signs, fish consumption advisories, and monitoring) are in place to reduce health and environmental risks.

Throughout the reservoir, aquatic bottom-dwelling (benthic) animal communities rated generally 'poor,' although there may be an improving trend since 2002, except for the midreservoir area, which rated 'excellent' in 2004. With only two exceptions since 1994, vital stations' fish community monitoring results have rated fish communities as 'good' in the reservoir, which indicates a consistently well-balanced fish assemblage.

Soils occurring in the Watts Bar Reservoir project area with properties to be classified as prime farmland (about 2,900 acres total) are generally located on the floodplains of the river and smaller streams. Especially significant areas of wetlands occur in the embayments associated with Hines Creek, Whites Creek, Muddy Creek, Greasy Run Creek, and Wolf Creek. Other important wetland areas are located in parcels located along the Little Emory River, in the Swan Pond and former CRBR area and on various forested islands in the reservoir.

The 100-year flood elevations for the Tennessee River part of Watts Bar Reservoir vary from 746.5 to 760.0 feet mean sea level (msl), while on the Clinch River arm of the reservoir, they vary from 747.1 to 755.3 feet msl. The flood risk profile elevations for the Tennessee River vary from elevation 747.0 to 769.3 feet msl and on the Clinch River they vary from 748.4 to 759.2 feet msl.

Watts Bar Reservoir is bounded by three dams (Watts Bar, Fort Loudoun, and Melton Hill) with navigation locks that connect it to the National Inland Waterway System. There are several barge terminals near the principal towns of Spring City, Kingston, Loudon, Rockwood, Lenoir City, Oak Ridge, and Harriman, as well as some concentrations of residential shoreline developments and marinas. In 2005, over 1.2 million tons of

commercial cargo was transported on the reservoir with an annual savings to shippers averaging \$9 million.

TVA land comprises about 11 percent of the land within 0.25 mile of Watts Bar Reservoir. There are over 17,000 acres of platted residential property adjacent to public land on the reservoir; approximately half of the platted area has already been converted to residential housing. Since the completion of Watts Bar Reservoir, TVA has sold or transferred over 9,000 acres (35 percent of the original TVA land base) to private, state, or federal ownership. Of the 721 miles of shoreline, 340 miles (47 percent) is available for Shoreline Access, which includes current development. TVA has several long-term land use agreements with other federal, state, and local government agencies for wildlife management areas, refuges, and parks.

Over 700 archaeological resources have been identified on TVA public land surrounding Watts Bar Reservoir from existing data and recent survey results. Prehistoric components and sites dating from the Paleo-Indian through Mississippian periods have been recorded along with historic archaeological sites associated with the 19th to 20th century habitation of the area. Historic structures eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places on TVA lands include the Watts Bar Fossil Plant, the Watts Bar Dam, Locks, and Power House, and a number of remaining dwellings from the original construction village (now Watts Bar Resort).

The reservoir receives an estimated 1.9 million recreation user days per year; approximately 313,000 gained access to the reservoir through public use areas, 702,000 through private residential areas, and 874,000 through commercial use areas. There are 67 developed recreation areas on Watts Bar Reservoir. Twenty-six are commercial recreation areas (e.g., marinas and campgrounds), and 37 are public recreation areas (e.g., boat ramps, picnic areas, beaches, and trails). In addition, there are four quasi-public recreation areas such as summer camps. Dispersed recreation is actively managed on 41 parcels allocated for natural resource conservation management but occurs on most undeveloped TVA-managed land. Most of Watts Bar Reservoir water recreation is designated as suburban and the Clinch River arm of the reservoir is designated as rural developed. There are over 50 paved boat ramps on the reservoir, 3,600 permitted docks, and marina facilities with about 1,500 boat docking slips (with an additional 200 plus out-of-water storage slips).

The 2000 census population of the four counties in the Watts Bar Reservoir area is estimated to have increased by 17.7 percent over the 1990 population and estimates for 2006 indicate an additional 7.2 percent growth since 2000. This was a faster growth rate than in either the state or the nation, in contrast to the previous decade in which the area grew much more slowly than the state and the nation. Minorities account for 5.7 percent of the population, which is well below the Tennessee state average of 22.1 percent. In 2006, the civilian labor force of the area was 67,220 with an unemployment rate of 5.3 percent, which is higher than both the state and the national rates. The area is more dependent on manufacturing, farming, and government employment than either the state or the nation. In 2005, farm employment accounted for 4.8 percent, manufacturing 16.8 percent, government 15.4 percent, and, except for Roane County manufacturing and Meigs County government, all were 1 to 4 percent higher than both the state and national averages. Per capita personal income is lower than the state and national averages, averaging 78.4 percent of the national average in 2005. The estimated poverty rate in the area in 2004 was

14.1 percent, slightly lower than the state rate of 15.0 percent, but higher than the national average of 12.7 percent.

Except for ozone and particulate matter, all counties that surround Watts Bar Reservoir and their surrounding counties are currently in attainment with the National Ambient Air Quality Standards that establish safe concentration limits for pollutants in the ambient atmosphere. The closest Prevention of Significant Deterioration Class I area is the Great Smoky Mountains National Park to the east and southeast from the reservoir, which is about 20 miles distant.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

Under any alternative, impacts to sensitive resources such as endangered and threatened species, cultural resources, and wetlands would be mitigated through regulatory requirements and commitments prior to any undertaking. Future residential, industrial, and recreational developments on adjacent private property or TVA property have the potential to impact water quality by increased soil erosion, chemical usage, and sewage loading. These impacts can be avoided or minimized by vegetated buffer zones and development restrictions similar to the Shoreline Management Policy.

Under any alternative, impacts to floodplain values would be insignificant and any development proposed in the 100-year floodplain would be subject to the requirements of Executive Order (EO) 11988 (Floodplain Management). Likewise, adverse effects to wetlands from land clearing and ground disturbance would be mitigated under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and EO 11990 and would be insignificant. The potential for activities to affect archaeological and historic properties would be mitigated through phased compliance with the implementation of the programmatic agreement with the Tennessee State Historic Preservation Officer and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

All of the alternatives result in insignificant impacts on air quality. Proposed industry or project operations development actions would be carefully reviewed for potential impacts and compliance with air quality requirements. There may be some incremental clearing of wetland vegetation by landowners which results in some minor cumulative losses of wetland function, primarily shoreline stabilization, wildlife habitat provision, and plant community diversity. In cases where wetland impacts occur, mitigation requirements would offset any long-term loss of wetland functions.

Under the No Action Alternative, there would be an insignificant loss of public lands. However, there would be potential for habitat alteration of up to 1,300 acres from future industrial use and the eventual loss of 3,300 acres of high-quality habitat from future industrial and developed recreation use. Loss and fragmentation of terrestrial habitat by clearing and alteration of vegetation could impact the composition and abundance of species. There would be no federally listed as threatened and endangered plants impacted, and use of the 1988 Plan would not likely adversely affect federally listed animal species. There would be some insignificant impacts to state-listed species from clearing and alteration of vegetation and pollution and siltation from erosion and ground disturbance activities. There would be temporary insignificant adverse impacts to managed areas and sensitive ecological sites from incompatible land use on adjacent areas. There would be no change to aquatic ecology and commercial navigation from the existing conditions that would have insignificant impacts and the gradual minor degradation of visual resources would continue.

Under the No Action Alternative, Developed Recreation (Zone 6) would have the largest amount of land available for current and future opportunities than under the other two alternatives. The eventual use of land allocated for industrial or recreation development would cause loss of existing dispersed recreation at some sites resulting in a reduction of diversity in recreation opportunities. There would be no impacts to environmental justice and no change in impacts to socioeconomic issues with opportunities for future beneficial development. Insignificant air quality adverse impacts from emissions of construction and development activities would occur depending on the industries recruited. Some insignificant noise impacts from future industrial or recreation development are expected. Insignificant adverse impacts would occur to water quality from the release of toxic substances, erosion, or nutrient loading from future industrial and recreation development, and the potential loss of prime farmland would have an insignificant impact to region.

Under Modified Alternative B, the loss of public lands and other impacts described below would be less than the No Action Alternative. There would be potential for the habitat alteration of up to 1,100 acres from future industrial use and the eventual loss of 2,700 acres of high-quality habitat from future industrial and developed recreation use; loss and fragmentation of terrestrial habitat by clearing and alteration of vegetation could impact the composition and abundance of species. No federally listed threatened or endangered plants would be affected and the effects on federally listed animal species would not be adverse. There would be slightly less insignificant impacts to state-listed species from clearing and alteration of vegetation and pollution and siltation from erosion and ground disturbance activities. There would be temporary insignificant impacts to managed areas and sensitive ecological sites from incompatible land use of adjacent areas. There would be beneficial impacts from the adjustment of boundaries or designation of new management areas. There would be insignificant adverse impacts to aquatic ecology and the gradual minor degradation of visual resources would continue. There would be no impacts to environmental justice and insignificant impacts to socioeconomic issues with opportunities for future beneficial development. Insignificant air quality impacts from emissions of construction and development activities would occur depending on the industries recruited. Some insignificant noise impacts from future industrial or recreation development are expected. Insignificant impacts would occur to water quality from the release of toxic substances, erosion, or nutrient loading from future industrial and recreation development, and the potential loss of prime farmland would have an insignificant impact to the region.

Under Modified Alternative B, the minor reduced amount of land available for Developed Recreation (Zone 6) when compared to the No Action Alternative would be offset by an increase in land allocated for Natural Resource Conservation (Zone 4) which would support more dispersed recreation. There would be insignificant impacts to commercial navigation from loss of the potential barge terminals; however, the designation of safety harbor land would be beneficial.

Under Modified Alternative C, TVA would maintain public ownership of almost all Watts Bar Reservoir land and the greatest amount of land would be allocated for Natural Resource Conservation, offsetting the reduced amount of land available for Developed Recreation. Only 77 acres of public land would likely eventually be converted to industrial uses; however, there would be beneficial impacts to environmental justice because of the greater availability of public and dispersed recreation opportunities. Because there would be minimal clearing and alteration of vegetation and consequently minimal pollution and siltation from erosion or ground disturbance activities, there would be some beneficial

impacts to federally listed as threatened and endangered species. This alternative would also have the least impact to state-listed species. The retention of high-quality terrestrial habitat would be a benefit to terrestrial ecology on the Watts Bar Reservoir area. This alternative would have the least potential alteration of aquatic habitat and most beneficial improvement to aquatic ecology and water quality, because there would be less industrial and recreation development of land that typically leads to the release of toxic substances, erosion, or nutrient loading. There would be similar impacts to managed areas and sensitive ecological sites as Modified Alternative B. Among the alternatives, the least noise, prime farmland, air quality, and visual impacts of all the alternatives would occur under Modified Alternative C. Although still insignificant, this alternative has the greatest impacts on commercial navigation from loss of potential future barge terminals; however, the designation of safety harbor land would be beneficial.

IMPACTS SUMMARY

The No Action Alternative has greater acreages of land allocated to developed uses, including Industrial and Developed Recreation, than the other alternatives. Adoption of Modified Alternative B would allow greater recreational and industrial development than Modified Alternative C, but slightly less than the No Action Alternative. Therefore, Modified Alternative B would have greater potential for impacts to natural resources than Alternative C, but less than Modified Alternative A. Implementation of Modified Alternative C would result in the largest amount of acres allocated to Zone 4, Natural Resource Conservation.

PREFERRED ALTERNATIVES

The preferred alternative is Modified Alternative B, which provides suitable opportunities for economic development and the conservation of natural resources. The environmentally preferred alternative is Alternative C, which has the least adverse impact on the environment of all the alternatives.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR ACTION	1
1.1.	Background	1
1.2.	Purpose and Need	3
1.3.	Development and Modification of the Land Plan	4
1.3.1.	Natural Resource Management	5
1.3.2.	TVA Land Policy	6
1.3.3.	Former Clinch River Breeder Reactor (CRBR) Site	6
1.3.4.	Other Modifications	7
1.4.	The Decision	8
1.5.	Other Pertinent Environmental Reviews or Documents	8
1.6.	The Scoping Process	12
1.6.1.	Scoping Response	12
1.6.2.	Allocation Proposals	13
1.6.3.	Issue and Resource Identification	13
1.7.	Public Review Process	15
1.7.1.	Public Comments	15
1.7.2.	Alternatives and Agency Response	16
1.8.	Necessary Federal Permits or Licenses	18
2.	ALTERNATIVES	19
2.1.	Alternatives	19
2.1.1.	Alternative A – The No Action Alternative	19
2.1.2.	The Planning Process for the Action Alternatives	23
2.1.3.	Modified Action Alternative Allocation Proposals	30
2.1.4.	Action Alternative B – Modified Development and Recreation	31
2.1.5.	Action Alternative C – Modified Conservation and Recreation	33
2.2.	Comparison of Alternatives	33
2.3.	Impacts Summary	36
2.4.	Preferred Alternatives	38
3.	AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT	39
3.1.	Regional Setting	39
3.2.	Terrestrial Ecology (Plant and Animal Communities)	39
3.3.	Sensitive (Endangered and Threatened) Species	43
3.3.1.	Plants	43
3.3.2.	Terrestrial Animals	48
3.3.3.	Aquatic Animals	51
3.4.	Managed Areas and Sensitive Ecological Sites	52
3.4.1.	TVA Small Wild Areas (SWAs)	54
3.4.2.	TVA Ecological Study Areas (ECSAs)	54
3.4.3.	TVA Habitat Protection Areas (HPAs)	54
3.4.4.	Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs), Wildlife Refuges, and Wildlife Observation Areas (WOAs)	56
3.4.5.	Parks	57
3.4.6.	Other Managed Areas	58

3.4.7. Nationwide Rivers Inventory-Listed Streams.....	59
3.5. Water Quality and Shoreline.....	59
3.5.1. General Water Quality Characteristics	60
3.5.2. TVA Water Quality Monitoring and Results	61
3.6. Aquatic Ecology	64
3.6.1. Benthic Community.....	64
3.6.2. Fish Community.....	65
3.7. Wetlands and Floodplains	66
3.7.1. Wetlands.....	66
3.7.2. Floodplains.....	71
3.8. Land Use and Prime Farmland.....	72
3.8.1. Land Use.....	72
3.8.2. Prime Farmland	76
3.9. Cultural Resources	77
3.9.1. Archaeological Resources	79
3.9.2. Historic Structures	79
3.10. Navigation.....	80
3.11. Recreation	81
3.11.1. Developed Recreation	86
3.11.2. Dispersed Recreation	86
3.12. Visual Resources.....	88
3.12.1. Environmental Setting of Watts Bar Reservoir	89
3.12.2. Environmental Setting of the Clinch River Segment of Watts Bar Reservoir	91
3.12.3. Environmental Setting of the Emory River Segment of Watts Bar Reservoir.....	92
3.13. Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice	92
3.13.1. Socioeconomics.....	92
3.13.2. Environmental Justice.....	95
3.14. Air Quality	96
4. ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES	97
4.1. Introduction	97
4.2. Terrestrial Ecology (Plant and Animal Communities).....	97
4.3. Sensitive (Endangered and Threatened) Species.....	101
4.3.1. Plants	101
4.3.2. Terrestrial Animals.....	104
4.3.3. Aquatic Animals	107
4.4. Managed Areas and Sensitive Ecological Sites	108
4.5. Water Quality and Shoreline.....	110
4.6. Aquatic Ecology	112
4.7. Wetlands and Floodplains	114
4.7.1. Wetlands.....	114
4.7.2. Floodplains.....	116
4.8. Land Use and Prime Farmland.....	116
4.8.1. Land Use.....	116
4.8.2. Prime Farmland	120
4.9. Cultural Resources	123
4.9.1. Archaeological Resources	124
4.9.2. Historic Structures	125

- 4.10. Navigation 126
- 4.11. Recreation..... 130
- 4.12. Visual Resources..... 134
- 4.13. Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice 137
 - 4.13.1. Socioeconomics 137
 - 4.13.2. Environmental Justice 139
- 4.14. Air Quality 139
- 4.15. Noise 141
- 4.16. Unavoidable Adverse Effects..... 141
- 4.17. Relationship of Short-Term Uses and Long-Term Productivity 141
- 4.18. Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources 142
- 4.19. Energy Resources and Conservation Potential..... 142
- 4.20. Summary of Proposed Mitigation Measures..... 143
- 5. LIST OF PREPARERS 145**
- 6. LIST OF AGENCIES, ORGANIZATIONS, AND PERSONS TO WHOM COPIES ARE SENT
..... 149**
- 7. SUPPORTING INFORMATION 155**
 - 7.1. Literature Cited 155
 - 7.2. Glossary of Terms..... 162
- INDEX 503**

LIST OF APPENDICES

- Appendix A – TVA Land Policy 167
- Appendix B – Planned Land Information..... 173
- Appendix C – Scoping Information..... 233
- Appendix D – Supporting Data and Information 289
- Appendix E – Recreation and Industrial Assessment..... 353
- Appendix F – Public Comments and Responses..... 377
- Appendix G – Correspondence..... 415
- Appendix H – Biological Assessment..... 449

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1-1.	Allocation Category Definitions (1988)	20
Table 2.1-2.	Land Use Zone Definitions	24
Table 2.1-3.	Comparison of Proposed Zone Allocations, by Alternatives	31
Table 2.2-1.	Comparison of Land Uses by Alternatives	35
Table 2.2-2.	Comparison of Acres Allocated to Sensitive and Natural Resource Uses	36
Table 2.3-1.	Summary of the Environmental Impacts of the Alternatives.....	36
Table 3.2-1.	Vegetation Type of the 1994 Inventory.....	40
Table 3.3-1.	Listed Plant Species by Community Type Known From or Potentially Occurring Adjacent (within 5 miles) of Watts Bar Reservoir	46
Table 3.3-2.	Listed Terrestrial Animals Known to Occur in Loudon, Meigs, Rhea, and Roane Counties, Tennessee.....	48
Table 3.3-3.	State- and Federally Listed Aquatic Animal Species Reported From Watts Bar Reservoir and its Tributaries, and Recent Status of Those Species in and Around Watts Bar Reservoir.....	51
Table 3.5-1.	Watts Bar Reservoir Water Quality Ratings, Reservoir Vital Signs Monitoring Data	61
Table 3.6-1.	Benthic Community Ratings, Vital Signs Monitoring Data.....	65
Table 3.6-2.	Fish Community Ratings, Vital Signs Monitoring Data.....	66
Table 3.7-1.	Wetland Types on Zone 7 Parcels	70
Table 3.7-2.	Watts Bar Parcels With Significant Wetlands.....	70
Table 3.8-1.	Comparison TVA Planned Land and Private Land Within 0.25 Mile of Watts Bar Reservoir	72
Table 3.8-2.	Number of Land Use Agreements by Category Existing in 1988 and 2004.....	75
Table 3.8-3.	Change in Farm Size and Value of Agricultural Products from 1987 to 2002 in Counties Adjacent to the Watts Bar Reservoir	76
Table 3.8-4.	Acreage of Farmland in the Counties Adjacent to the Watts Bar Reservoir	77
Table 3.11-1.	Demand for Recreation Opportunities on Watts Bar Reservoir	82
Table 3.11-2.	Current Shoreline Use	83
Table 3.11-3.	WROS Opportunity Classes as a Function of Density	83
Table 3.11-4.	WROS Opportunity Class Calculation for Clinch River	84
Table 3.11-5.	WROS Opportunity Class Calculation for Main Watts Bar	84
Table 3.11-6.	National Survey on Recreation and Environment for the Watts Bar Reservoir Area	85
Table 3.11-7.	Recreation Facilities on Watts Bar Reservoir.....	86
Table 3.11-8.	Dispersed Recreation Areas Identified on Watts Bar Reservoir	87
Table 3.13-1.	Population and Population Projections, 1980-2020	93
Table 3.13-2.	Percent Change in Population.....	93

Table 3.13-3. Labor Force Data, Residents of Watts Bar Reservoir Area, 2006..... 94

Table 3.13-4. Employment, 2005 94

Table 3.13-5. Percent Distribution of Employment, 2005 94

Table 3.13-6. Occupation of Workers (Percent Distribution), 2000 95

Table 3.13-7. Per Capita Personal Income 95

Table 3.13-8. Minority Population, 2005, and Poverty, 2004 96

Table 4.3-1. Rare Plant Species Occurring on Watts Bar Reservoir Land for All Alternatives,
Listed by Zone 102

Table 4.8-1. New Private Developments on Watts Bar Reservoir 117

Table 4.8-2. TVA Land Use Valleywide 120

Table 4.11-1. Acres of Developed and Dispersed Recreation on Watts Bar Reservoir 131

Table 4.11-2. Comparison of Recreation Allocation Differences by Alternative 132

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1-1. Map of Watts Bar Reservation and Vicinity 2

Figure 3.5-1. Trend in Chlorophyll-a Concentrations in Watts Bar Reservoir Forebay (TRM
532.5)..... 62

Figure 3.5-2. Trend in Chlorophyll-a Concentrations in Watts Bar Reservoir Transition Zone
(TRM 560.8)..... 62

Figure 3.12-1. Viewing Distance 89

Page intentionally blank

Acronyms and Abbreviations

1988 Plan	1988 <i>Watts Bar Reservoir Land Management Plan</i>
APE	Area of Potential Effects
ARPA	Archaeological Resources Protection Act
BMPs	Best Management Practices
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CRBR	Clinch River Breeder Reactor
CRM	Clinch River Mile
cfs	Cubic Feet Per Second
DEIS	Draft Environmental Impact Statement
DO	Dissolved Oxygen
EA	Environmental Assessment
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
ECSA	Ecological Study Area
ERM	Emory River Mile
EO	Executive Order
ESA	Endangered Species Act
FEIS	Final Environmental Impact Statement
FRP	Flood Risk Profile
GIS	Geographic Information System
HPA	Habitat Protection Area
HUC	Hydrologic Unit Code
ibid	Abbreviation for the Latin term, <i>ibidem</i> , meaning “in the same place”; refers to the immediately preceding work cited
IRM	Integrated Resources Management
KIF	Kingston Fossil Plant
Land Plan	<i>Watts Bar Reservoir Land Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement</i>
LWBU	Lower Watts Bar Management Unit
mg/m³	Milligrams per cubic meter
msl	Mean Sea Level
n.d.	Indicates “no date,” or date which Web site was accessed is unknown
NRI	Nationwide Rivers Inventory

NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NNL	National Natural Landmark
NOI	Notice of Intent
NPS	Nonpoint Source
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NWI	National Wetlands Inventory
PA	Programmatic Agreement
PCB	Polychlorinated Biphenyls
PM_{2.5}	Particulate Matter With a Diameter Less Than or Equal to 2.5 Micrometers
PPNL	Potential National Natural Landmark
PPS	Protection Planning Site
PSD	Prevention of Significant Deterioration
ROD	Record of Decision
ROS	Reservoir Operations Study
ROS FEIS	<i>Reservoir Operations Study Final Environmental Impact Statement</i>
SAHI	Shoreline Aquatic Habitat Index
SEG	Scientific Ecology Group Inc.
SEIS	Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Officer
SMI	Shoreline Management Initiative, TVA
SMI EIS	<i>Shoreline Management Initiative: An Assessment of Residential Shoreline Development Impacts in the Tennessee Valley Final Environmental Impact Statement</i>
SMIN	Shoreline Management Inventory
SMP	Shoreline Management Policy, TVA
SWA	Small Wild Area
TDEC	Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation
TRM	Tennessee River Mile
TVA	Tennessee Valley Authority
TWRA	Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency
U.S.	United States
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USCG	U.S. Coast Guard
USDOE	U.S. Department of Energy

USEPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
WBN	Watts Bar Nuclear Plant
WBWG	Watts Bar Working Group
WMA	Wildlife Management Area
WOA	Wildlife Observation Area
WROS	Water Reservoir Opportunity Spectrum