

5.18 Cultural Resources

5.18.1 Introduction

Reservoir operations have the potential to result in both direct and indirect impacts on historic properties (archaeological sites and historic structures). The primary direct impact of reservoir operations on historic properties, in particular on archaeological sites, is soil erosion by rainfall, streamflow, and wave action from wind and recreational boat traffic. Another direct impact is exposure by elevation fluctuations that result in saturation or alternate saturation/drying of archaeological deposits and historic structures. Indirect impacts include development of the shoreline and back-lying lands, changes to the view shed, and looting/vandalism or disturbance from recreational activity at historic properties. To address these concerns, the analyses of three other resource areas (Shoreline Erosion, Land Use, and Visual Resources) were used in conjunction with a quantitative assessment of known historic property location data.

Consultations with the seven State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPOs) and other consulting parties under the requirements of Section 106 of the NHPA have resulted in agreement(s) stipulating the actions TVA will take to avoid or reduce the adverse effects of the selected alternative on historic properties. The agreement(s) developed through this process are provided in Appendix H.

5.18.2 Impact Assessment Methods

The shoreline erosion analysis evaluated the potential for a change in erosion, which can disturb or destroy intact archaeological deposits—resulting in a loss of site integrity and adversely affecting site significance (i.e., its eligibility for listing in the NRHP). Three erosion zones concern historic properties: the summer pool shoreline, the winter pool drawdown, and the tailwater streambanks. Alternatives with greater potential for erosion along the shoreline and streambanks were considered to be adverse for historic properties. Conversely, alternatives that may reduce erosion in those areas were expected to be beneficial for historic properties. Alternatives with longer durations at summer pool elevation decrease erosion in the winter pool drawdown zone and were considered beneficial for historic properties in those areas.

Results of the land use analysis were included in the assessment because of the relationship between shoreline development and the destruction of archaeological sites and historic structures and landscapes. Alternatives with higher water levels for longer periods of time encourage shoreline development. These alternatives are anticipated to result in the most adverse impact on historic properties, while alternatives with lower water levels for longer periods of time are expected to have less impact.

Results of the visual resources studies were included because scenic integrity or attractiveness can promote development, and development can adversely affect historic properties. Alternatives that would result in less overall fluctuation in pool levels would improve scenic

5.18 Cultural Resources

integrity and overall scenic attractiveness, and are anticipated to result in the most adverse impact on historic properties.

In addition to the results of these three analyses, a quantitative assessment of the number of archaeological sites located between June 1 pool level and winter pool at each reservoir was used to rank the alternatives (Table 5.18-01). Historic properties located in the winter pool drawdown are directly affected by reservoir operations through saturation and drying of archaeological materials and erosion of historic foundations. Indirectly, they are affected by site vandalism and looting or disturbance from recreational activity. Except for the Commercial Navigation Alternative, under all alternatives fewer archaeological sites would be located in the drawdown. Consequently, the project effects for these alternatives would be decreased compared to the Base Case. The number of archaeological sites at June 1 pool level and from June 1 pool level to 2 km above June 1 pool level was the same for all alternatives and therefore has no comparative value.

Table 5.18-01 NRHP Archaeological Sites by Zone and Policy Alternative

Alternative	Zone				Total ¹
	Below Winter Pool Level	Between Winter Pool and June 1 Pool Levels	At June 1 Pool Levels	June 1 Pool Level to 2 km above June 1 Pool Level	
Base Case	74	1,400	75	235	1,784
Reservoir Recreation A	290	1,184	75	235	1,784
Reservoir Recreation B	495	979	75	235	1,784
Summer Hydropower	391	1,083	75	235	1,784
Equalized Summer/ Winter Flood Risk	293	1,181	75	235	1,784
Commercial Navigation	74	1,400	75	235	1,784
Tailwater Recreation	442	1,032	75	235	1,784
Tailwater Habitat	529	945	75	235	1,784
Preferred	329	1,145	75	235	1,784

NRHP = National Register of Historic Places.

¹ These numbers do not match those in Tables 4.18-01 and 4.18-03, because the approximately 200 sites for which no elevation data were available were not included in the impacts analysis. Locating the data was not feasible and would not affect the conclusions.

5.18.3 Base Case

Shoreline Erosion. The Base Case would result in continued erosion of reservoir shorelines and tailwater streambanks.

Exposure by Elevation Fluctuations. The largest number of NRHP-eligible archaeological sites would be located between summer and winter pools under the Base Case and the Commercial Navigation Alternative.

Land Development. Under the Base Case, reservoir elevations and drawdown schedules would not change. Development of mainstem and tributary reservoir shorelines would continue at the same rate.

Visual Impacts. The existing scenic integrity would continue; changes in viewsheds would be related to continued trends in increased shoreline development and shoreline erosion.

5.18.4 Reservoir Recreation Alternative A

Shoreline Erosion. Longer duration at higher summer pool levels and an anticipated increase in recreational boating under Reservoir Recreation Alternative A would increase existing shoreline erosion. Longer durations at full summer pool would decrease runoff erosion in the drawdown zone. Reservoir releases would generally be at higher flows for longer durations than under the Base Case under this alternative. Because there would also be more periods of low flow, the overall change in tailwater shoreline erosion potential would be minimal. Impacts on archaeological site erosion rates are projected to be adverse under Reservoir Recreation Alternative A due to the increases in reservoir shoreline erosion.

Exposure by Elevation Fluctuations. Reservoir Recreation Alternative A has 1,184 NRHP-eligible archaeological sites located between summer and winter pool elevations. This alternative would slightly decrease the number of archaeological sites in the drawdown zone that are exposed to saturation and drying compared to the Base Case. Indirectly, this alternative would slightly decrease impacts from exposure to vandalism, looting, and disturbance from recreational activity.

Land Development. Reduced summer pool drawdowns and higher winter pools under Reservoir Recreation Alternative A could induce a slight acceleration in the rate of development, which would slightly increase impacts on historic properties.

5.18 Cultural Resources

Visual Impacts. Reservoir Recreation Alternative A would moderately improve scenic integrity because of less overall fluctuations in pool levels and generally higher pool levels. Improvements to visual integrity could accelerate the rate of shoreline development, which could slightly increase impacts on historic properties.

5.18.5 Reservoir Recreation Alternative B and Tailwater Recreation Alternative

Shoreline Erosion. Longer duration at higher summer pool levels and an anticipated increase in recreational boating under Reservoir Recreation Alternative B would increase existing shoreline erosion. Longer durations at full summer pool would decrease runoff erosion in the drawdown zone. As noted in Section 5.16, Shoreline Erosion, the Tailwater Recreation Alternative would increase summer pool erosion to a higher degree than under Reservoir Recreation Alternative B. Under both of these alternatives, reservoir releases would generally be at higher flows for longer durations than under the Base Case. Because there would also be more periods of low flow, the overall change in erosion potential would be minimal. Impacts on archaeological site erosion rates are projected to be adverse under Reservoir Recreation Alternative B and substantially adverse under the Tailwater Recreation Alternative due to the increases in reservoir shoreline erosion.

Exposure by Elevation Fluctuations. Reservoir Recreation Alternative B and the Tailwater Recreation Alternative have 979 and 1,032 NRHP-eligible archaeological sites, respectively, located between summer and winter pool elevations. They have the second and third lowest number of archaeological sites that can be exposed the changing water levels. These alternatives would reduce the number of sites in the drawdown that are exposed to saturation and drying compared to the Base Case. Indirectly, this alternative would decrease the effects resulting from exposure to vandalism, looting, and disturbance from recreational activity because fewer sites would be exposed.

Land Development. Reservoir Recreation Alternative B and the Tailwater Recreation Alternative are expected to increase the rate of open space development. An increase in development would increase impacts on historic structures and archaeological sites.

Visual Impacts. Under Reservoir Recreation Alternative B and the Tailwater Recreation Alternative, there would be an overall much greater reduction in pool level fluctuations, longer duration of pool levels at higher elevations, and higher winter pool levels. These alternatives would provide the greatest improvement of scenic integrity. Improvement to visual integrity could encourage development, which is anticipated to increase impacts on historic properties.

5.18.6 Summer Hydropower Alternative

Shoreline Erosion. Shorter periods of higher summer pool levels under the Summer Hydropower Alternative would slightly decrease existing erosion. Earlier drawdowns would result in shorter periods at higher flows and less erosion of the shoreline and tailwater streambanks. Longer periods of winter drawdown would increase runoff erosion in the drawdown zone.

Exposure by Elevation Fluctuations. The Summer Hydropower Alternative has 1,083 NRHP-eligible archaeological sites located between summer and winter pool elevations. This alternative would slightly decrease the number of archaeological sites and historic structures in the drawdown zone that are exposed to saturation and drying compared to the Base Case. Indirectly, this alternative would slightly decrease the effects resulting from exposure to vandalism, looting, and disturbance from recreational activity.

Land Development. Increased summer drawdowns under the Summer Hydropower Alternative could slow the rate of land use conversion. A decrease in development would be slightly beneficial to historic properties.

Visual Impacts. Under the Summer Hydropower Alternative, the overall reduction of the duration when pool levels are at higher levels would slightly decrease scenic integrity and may reduce the rate of development, which would decrease impacts on historic properties.

5.18.7 Equalized Summer/Winter Flood Risk Alternative

Shoreline Erosion. Shorter reservoir pool durations at summer levels and a smaller drawdown zone affected by rainfall would result in slightly less erosion and would decrease impacts on historic properties in these areas. Longer periods of winter drawdown may increase erosion in the winter pool drawdown zone and may increase impacts on historic properties located in these areas.

Exposure by Elevation Fluctuations. The Equalized Summer/Winter Flood Risk Alternative has 1,181 NRHP-eligible archaeological sites located between summer and winter pool elevations. This alternative would slightly reduce the number of archaeological sites and historic structures in the drawdown zone that are exposed to saturation and drying compared to the Base Case. Indirectly, slightly fewer sites under this alternative would be exposed to vandalism, looting, and disturbance from recreational activity, compared to the Base Case.

Land Development. The Equalized Summer/Winter Flood Risk Alternative would result in no change to a slight decrease in the rate of shoreline development, which would result in a slightly beneficial impact on historic properties.

Visual Impacts. The Equalized Summer/Winter Flood Risk Alternative would reduce elevation fluctuations and maximum reservoir levels would be lower. Low water levels might decrease the scenic integrity of the shoreline and reduce development, which could slightly decrease impacts on historic properties.

5.18.8 Commercial Navigation Alternative

Shoreline Erosion. The Commercial Navigation Alternative would result in continued erosion of reservoir shorelines and tailwater streambanks similar to the Base Case.

5.18 Cultural Resources

Exposure by Elevation Fluctuations. The Commercial Navigation Alternative, along with the Base Case, has the largest number (1,400) of NRHP-eligible archaeological sites located between summer and winter pool elevations. The effects of site exposure would be the same as the Base Case.

Land Development. Reservoir elevations and drawdown schedules would not change under the Commercial Navigation Alternative, resulting in continued development of the shorelines on mainstem and tributary reservoirs.

Visual Impacts. Scenic integrity would be slightly improved under the Commercial Navigation Alternative, primarily for the mainstem reservoirs. Mainstem reservoirs would have less pool level fluctuations. Tributary reservoirs would be the same as under the Base Case. Slightly improved scenic integrity along the mainstem reservoirs could affect the rate of shoreline development and might slightly increase impacts on historic properties.

5.18.9 Tailwater Habitat Alternative

Shoreline Erosion. Summer levels would be at high elevations for longer durations than under the Base Case, resulting in substantially more potential for shoreline erosion. As stated in Section 5.16, Shoreline Erosion, reservoir releases would generally be at higher flows for longer durations than under the Base Case. Because there would also be more periods of low flow, the overall change in erosion potential would be minimal.

Exposure by Elevation Fluctuations. The Tailwater Habitat Alternative has 945 NRHP-eligible archaeological sites located between summer and winter pool elevations. This alternative has the fewest number of sites in the area that would be affected by changing water levels and would decrease the number of archaeological sites and historic structures in the drawdown that would be exposed to saturation and drying compared to the Base Case. Indirectly, this alternative would decrease the effects resulting from exposure to vandalism, looting, and disturbance from recreational activity.

Land Development. The Tailwater Habitat Alternative could induce acceleration in the rate of development around affected reservoirs but would not increase the total amount of land developed adjacent to the reservoir shoreline. Therefore, slightly increased impacts on historic properties could occur.

Visual Impacts. The Tailwater Habitat Alternative generally would provide the longest duration of high pool elevations of all the alternatives. The greatly increased scenic integrity under this alternative could promote development, which could increase the rate of shoreline development but not the overall amount of development due to restrictions outlined in TVA's SMI. Therefore, impacts on historic properties would be slightly adverse.

5.18.10 Preferred Alternative

Shoreline Erosion. Archaeological site erosion rates along reservoir shorelines would increase slightly at those reservoirs with a slightly longer duration of pool elevation in the shoreline erosion zone due to increased exposure to wind- and boat-driven wave action.

Archaeological site erosion rates in the winter drawdown zone would slightly decrease at those reservoirs with longer summer pool durations, because the duration of exposure would decrease. In addition, fewer sites would be exposed to winter drawdown erosion at those reservoirs with higher winter pool elevations.

As noted in Section 5.16, Shoreline Erosion, shoreline erosion would not increase in tributary tailwaters under this alternative. Therefore, no substantial change in impacts on archaeological sites in these areas is anticipated. On the mainstem reservoirs, tailwater archaeological site erosion rates depend more on pool elevations than on flow rates and cumulative shear stress. Slightly adverse impacts are anticipated in these areas.

Exposure by Elevation Fluctuation. On most tributary reservoirs, the zone in which archaeological resources are subjected to exposure by elevation (i.e., the drawdown zone) would be decreased because of higher winter pool elevations. The exceptions are those reservoirs where no operational changes would occur. On mainstem reservoirs, the size of the fluctuation zone would remain the same; but the duration of exposure to looting, vandalism, and recreational activity would be decreased on those reservoirs with summer pool durations.

Land Development. As noted in the assessment methods, land development is considered to have an adverse effect on historic properties of all types. Because total development buildout is expected to eventually occur at all reservoirs, only the rate of adverse impact on historic properties would be affected. On most tributary reservoirs the rate of impact is expected to increase because of longer summer pool durations and/or higher winter pool elevations. The rate of impact on mainstem reservoirs would not change appreciably because of the relatively small difference between summer and winter pool elevations (less than 5 feet at all except Chickamauga Reservoir). Pickwick Reservoir may be an exception because of a substantial increase (64 percent) in the duration of the summer pool.

Visual Impacts. The setting/visual landscape is considered an important aspect of some kinds of historic properties (for example, historic structures). On those reservoirs where land development rates are expected to increase (most of the tributary reservoirs and Pickwick), the visual integrity of such resources could be compromised. (Also see the discussion in Chapter 6, Cumulative Impacts).

5.18.11 Summary of Impacts

All alternatives, including the Base Case, would result in adverse impacts on NRHP-eligible archaeological sites and historic structures through erosion from rainfall, streamflow, and wave action resulting from wind and recreational boat traffic. Another direct impact under all

5.18 Cultural Resources

alternatives is the exposure of archaeological deposits and historic structures to saturation and drying in the drawdown zone.

Changes in the existing reservoir operations policy could affect archaeological sites and historic structures indirectly. These impacts include exposure of historic properties in the drawdown to vandalism, looting, and disturbance from recreational activity. Other indirect impacts are development along the shoreline and in back-lying lands, and changes to visual or scenic integrity that may influence development.

Considering the relative consequences and impacts of potential effects related to the policy alternatives, a ranking based on an increase or decrease of effects compared to the Base Case was derived (Table 5.18.02).

The Base Case would result in adverse effects on historic properties, as discussed in Section 4.18. All the policy alternatives would continue to adversely affect historic properties. Compared to the Base Case, the Commercial Navigation Alternative would result in little or no change to ongoing impacts. The Summer Hydropower Alternative and the Equalized Summer/Winter Flood Risk Alternative would decrease direct and indirect impacts, resulting in a slight benefit for historic properties compared to the Base Case. The remaining five policy alternatives would increase direct and indirect impacts on historic properties and were considered slightly adverse to adverse.

Table 5.18-02 Relative Ranking of Impacts on Cultural Resources by Policy Alternative

Alternative	Direct Effects				Indirect Effects				
	Erosion ¹		Tailwater Streambanks	Exposure by Elevation Fluctuations ²	Overall Ranking of Direct Effects ³	Shoreline and Back-Lying Land Development ⁴	Visual Impacts	Exposure by Elevation Fluctuations ²	Overall Ranking of Indirect Effects
	Reservoir Erosion Shoreline Zone	Winter Pool Drawdown							
Base Case	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change – Impacts would continue at existing rates due mainly to erosion.	No change	No change	No change	No change – Impacts would continue at existing rates due to land development.
Reservoir Recreation A	Increase	Decrease	No change	Slight decrease	Adverse – Shoreline erosion would increase.	Slight increase	Increase	Slight decrease	Slightly adverse – Land development would increase.
Reservoir Recreation B	Increase	Decrease	No change	Decrease	Adverse – Shoreline erosion would increase.	Slight increase	Increase	Decrease	Slightly adverse – Land development would increase.
Summer Hydropower	Decrease	Decrease	No change	Slight decrease	Beneficial – Shoreline erosion would decrease.	Slight decrease	Decrease	Slight decrease	Slightly beneficial – Slight decrease in land development.
Equalized Summer/ Winter Flood Risk	Decrease	Decrease	No change	Slight decrease	Beneficial – Shoreline erosion would decrease.	No change to slight decrease	Decrease	Slight decrease	Slightly beneficial – Slight decrease in land development.

Table 5.18-02 Relative Ranking of Impacts on Cultural Resources by Policy Alternative (continued)

Alternative	Direct Effects				Indirect Effects				
	Erosion ¹		Tailwater Streambanks	Exposure by Elevation Fluctuations ²	Overall Ranking of Direct Effects ³	Shoreline and Back-Lying Land Development ⁴	Visual Impacts	Exposure by Elevation Fluctuations ²	Overall Ranking of Indirect Effects
	Reservoir Erosion Shoreline Zone	Winter Pool Drawdown							
Commercial Navigation	No change	Slight decrease	No change	No change	No change	No change	Slight increase	No change	No change
Tailwater Recreation	Increase	Decrease	No change	Adverse – Shoreline erosion would increase.	Slight increase	Increase	Increase	Decrease	Slightly adverse – Land development would increase.
Tailwater Habitat	Large increase	Decrease	No change	Substantially adverse – Large increase in shoreline erosion.	No change to slight increase	Increase	Increase	Decrease	Slightly adverse – Slight increase in land development.
Preferred	Slight increase	Decrease	No change	Slightly adverse – Slight increase in shoreline erosion.	Slight increase	Increase	Increase	Slight decrease	Slightly adverse – Slight increase in land development.

¹ From rainfall, streamflow, and wave action (wind and recreational boat traffic).

² Saturation/drying of archaeological deposits and historic structures in the drawdown; vandalism, looting, and disturbance from recreational activity.

³ Based on the assumption that all impact concerns are equally important.

⁴ See Section 5.15, Land Use.