# **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT (EA)**

FOR THE:

EAST TENNESSEE MIDDLE MILE FIBER BROADBAND PROJECT #NT10BIX5570034

PREPARED FOR:
DELTACOM, INC.
7037 OLD MADISON PIKE
HUNTSVILLE, ALABAMA 35806

PREPARED BY:
HULL & ASSOCIATES, INC.
4 HEMISPHERE WAY
BEDFORD, OHIO 44146

**SEPTEMBER 2010** 

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

				PAGE
EXEC	CUTIVE	SUMM	ARY	vii
1.0 F	PURPO	SE AND	NEED	1
	1.1	Introd	uction	1
	1.2		<u>se</u>	
	1.1 1.2 1.3		for Action	
2.0	PROI	POSED	ACTION	6
	2.1	Proied	et Description	6
	2.1 2.2		iption of Alternatives	
		2.2.1	Alternative 1: Original Network Build	10
		2.2.2	Alternative 2: First Choice Network Build	
		2.2.3	Alternative 3: No Network Build	14
	<u>2.4</u>	Prefer	red Alternative	14
	2.5		atives Considered But Eliminated from Further Discussion	
			_	
3.0	EXIS.	TING EN	NVIRONMENT	17
	3.1	Noise		18
	3.1 3.2		ıality	
			<del></del>	
		3.2.1	Climate, Greenhouse Gases, and Global Warming	19
	3.3	Geolo	gy and Soils	20
		3.3.1	Physiographic Region	20
		3.3.2	Regional Soil Types	
		3.3.3	Prime or Unique Farmlands	
	0.4	14/-4	Danasiman	00
	<u>3.4</u>	water	Resources	23
		3.4.1	Surface Water Streams	23
		3.4.2	Groundwater	23
		3.4.3	Coastal Zone	
		3.4.4	Floodplains	
		3.4.5	Wild and Scenic Rivers	
		3.4.6	Federal Clean Water Act Regulatory Program Applicability	25
	<u>3.5</u>	Biolog	ical Resources including Wetlands	26
		3.5.1	Ecological Regions and Vegetation	26
		3.5.2	Potential Wetlands	
		3.5.3	Rare, Threatened, and Endangered Species	

i

		F	PAGE
		3.5.4 Federal Regulatory Program Applicability	31
	3.6 3.7 3.8 3.9 3.10 3.11	Historic and Cultural Resources Aesthetic and Visual Resources Land Use Infrastructure Socioeconomic Resources Human Health and Safety	32 33 33
4.0	ENVII	RONMENTAL CONSEQENCES	36
	<u>4.1</u> <u>4.2</u>	Noise Air Quality	
		4.2.1 Climate, Greenhouse Gases, and Global Warming	37
	<u>4.3</u>	Geology and Soils	38
		4.3.1 Prime or Unique Farmland	38
	4.4 4.5 4.6	Water Resources Biological Resources Historic and Cultural Resources	40
		4.6.1 Archaeological Resources 4.6.2 Architectural Resources 4.6.3 Native Resources	43
	4.7 4.8 4.9 4.10 4.11 4.12	Aesthetic and Visual Resources  Land Use Infrastructure Socioeconomic Resources Human Health and Safety Cumulative Impacts	45 45 46 47
5.0	APPL	ICABLE ENVIRONMENTAL PERMITS AND REGULATORY REQUIREMEN	IT <b>S</b> 50
6.0	LIST	AGENCIES AND PERSONS CONSULTED	51
7.0	REFE	RENCES	52

#### **LIST OF TABLES**

Table 1	Comparison of Action Alternatives
Table 2	Summary of Number of Streams within Each Alternative Route and City Segment
Table 3	Summary of Floodplains within Each Alternative Route and City Segment
Table 4	Summary of Wetlands within Each Alternative Route and City Segment
Table 5	Federal Listing of Threatened Species by County
Table 6	Summary of Protected Lands within One Mile of the Alternative Routes

#### SURES

		LIST OF FIG
Figure 1	Project Area C	Overview Map
Figure CL	Map Index: Classification Figure CL-2 Figure CL-3 Figure CL-4 Figure CL-5 Figure CL-6 Figure CL-7 Figure CL-8 Figure CL-9	eveland Grid Cleveland Grid 1 Cleveland Grid 2 Cleveland Grid 3 Cleveland Grid 4 Cleveland Grid 5 Cleveland Grid 6 Cleveland Grid 7 Cleveland Grid 8 Cleveland Grid 8 Cleveland Grid 9
Figure SW	Figure SW-1 Figure SW-2 Figure SW-3 Figure SW-4 Figure SW-5 Figure SW-7 Figure SW-7 Figure SW-8 Figure SW-9	Sweetwater Grid 7 Sweetwater Grid 8
Figure MT	Map Index: Mo Figure MT-1 Figure MT-2 Figure MT-3 Figure MT-5 Figure MT-6 Figure MT-7 Figure MT-8 Figure MT-9 Figure MT-10 Figure MT-11	Morristown Grid 1 Morristown Grid 2 Morristown Grid 3 Morristown Grid 3 Morristown Grid 4 Morristown Grid 5 Morristown Grid 6 Morristown Grid 7 Morristown Grid 8 Morristown Grid 9 Morristown Grid 10 Morristown Grid 11

# LIST OF FIGURES CONT'D

	Figure MT-13 Figure MT-14 Figure MT-15 Figure MT-16 Figure MT-17 Figure MT-19 Figure MT-20 Figure MT-21 Figure MT-22 Figure MT-23 Figure MT-24 Figure MT-25 Figure MT-25	Morristown Grid 12 Morristown Grid 13 Morristown Grid 14 Morristown Grid 15 Morristown Grid 16 Morristown Grid 17 Morristown Grid 18 Morristown Grid 19 Morristown Grid 20 Morristown Grid 21 Morristown Grid 22 Morristown Grid 23 Morristown Grid 23 Morristown Grid 24 Morristown Grid 25 Morristown Grid 26 Morristown Grid 27 Morristown Grid 27 Morristown Grid 28
Figure JC	Map Index: Jo Figure JC-1 Figure JC-2	•
Figure BL	Map Index: Bl Figure BL-1 Figure BL-2	ountville/Bristol Grid Blountville/Bristol Grid 1 Blountville/Bristol Grid 2
Figure CO	Map Index: Co Figure CO-1 Figure CO-2 Figure CO-3 Figure CO-4	Cookeville Grid 1 Cookeville Grid 2
Figure OR	Figure OR-11 Figure OR-12	

# **LIST OF APPENDICES**

Appendix A	Original Network Build (Alternative 1) Overview Maps
Appendix B	First Choice Network Build (Alternative 2) Overview Maps
Appendix C	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service Concurrence Letter and Response
Appendix D	State Historical Preservation Office Concurrence Letter and Response
Appendix E	Ambient Air Quality Attainment Maps
Appendix F	Geology and Soils Maps
Appendix G	Prime Choice or Unique Farmlands Maps
Appendix H	Floodplain Maps for Existing Buildings
Appendix I	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Project Information Letter
Appendix J	State-Listed Rare Species within Project Area Counties
Appendix K	NRHP Listed and Eligible Sites
Appendix L	Municipal Infrastructure Information
Appendix M	Socioeconomic Information
Appendix N	Environmental First Search Reports
Appendix O	Tennessee Department of Transportation Historic Bridge Correspondence
Appendix P	Requirements for Excavation Permits

#### LIST OF ACRONYMS

BTOP Broadband Technology Opportunities Program

CEQ Council on Environmental Quality

DC Direct Current

EA Environmental Assessment

EO Executive Order

HVAC Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning

ILEC Incumbent Local Exchange Carrier

NEPA National Environmental Policy Act

NTIA National Telecommunications and Information Administration

POP Point-of-Presence

ROW Right of Way

RUS Rural Utility Service

TE&Cm Telecommunications Engineering & Construction Manual

TNDOT Tennessee Department of Transportation

TVA Tennessee Valley Authority

USGS United States Geological Survey

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Hull & Associates, Inc. (Hull) was contracted by DeltaCom, Inc. (DeltaCom, Client) to prepare an Environmental Assessment (EA) consistent with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 for the East Tennessee Middle Mile Fiber Broadband Project in eastern Tennessee. Preparation of this EA is required in order to fulfill the terms of a recent grant award to DeltaCom through the National Telecommunications and Informational Administration (NTIA) Broadband Technology Opportunities Program (BTOP). The East Tennessee Middle Mile Fiber Broadband Project will provide high bandwidth middle mile connectivity on a new fiber-optic route from Chattanooga through Knoxville to Johnson City and Blountville/Bristol, Tennessee, and add interconnection points on an existing fiber-optic route between Nashville and Knoxville. The project intends to deploy an approximately 544-mile high-capacity fiber-optic broadband Internet network. The majority of the work within the Project Area that may potentially result in impacts to the environment will be focused in seven major segments:

- Cleveland, Bradley County
- Sweetwater, Monroe County
- Morristown, Hamblen County
- Johnson City, Washington County
- Blountville/Bristol, Sullivan County
- Cookeville, Putnam County
- Oak Ridge, Anderson County

The EA process was used herein to compare three alternatives: Alternatives 1 and 2 represent action alternatives to install the fiber optic line along two different route options, and Alternative 3 represents the no action alternative. A field reconnaissance of the Project Area was completed and a review of several resource areas was completed in order to review and select the best alternative with the least amount of environmental impact. Resource areas researched included: noise, air quality, geology and soils, water resources, biological resources, historic and cultural resources, aesthetic and visual resources, land use, infrastructure, socioeconomic resources, and human health and safety.

Based on review of information presented herein, the resource areas that could potentially be impacted, though not significantly, by installation of the fiber optic pathway include: biological

resources, historic and cultural resources, and aesthetic and visual resources. As presented herein, although there is potential to impact these resource areas, there are minimal impacts anticipated based on the implementation of the action alternatives. All of the project work will be completed within a right of way (ROW), on land already owned/leased/optioned by DeltaCom or land which has been perfected with an easement. The potential disturbance activities involved in implementation of the project would include: the installation/replacement of a pole, construction of a building, or boring of an underground fiber cable. The number of these locations is minimal and each were photographed and reviewed for potential impacts to resource areas. Alternative 2 was selected as the preferred alternative, which includes installation of the fiber optic cable along a route that would result in the least amount of impact to streams, private properties, and underground pathways.

Implementation of Alternative 2 would not result in any significant direct or indirect effects on the resource areas. The great majority of areas where construction disturbance is planned within the routes contain plant communities with low ecological sensitivity and low or very low potential to support federally listed species. In some areas where disturbance will occur, large trees in the 24-30" diameter at breast height (dbh) range are present. Stands of trees that may contain elements of preferred habitat for the Indiana bat are present in the vicinity of proposed construction activities. Based on the layout of the existing ROWs and an understanding of the construction techniques to be used, it will be possible to avoid all impacts to this type of plant community. All potential wetland areas identified during field reconnaissance will be avoided by the construction. There were no properties of historical and/or cultural significance located along the project route. Implementation of Alternative 2 will have no significant impact to the aesthetic and visual resources of the area. In comparison to Alternative 1, Alternative 2 avoids disturbing private properties, passage of protected streams, and significant amount of boring for underground pathways.