



Questions you should ask about the TVA Power Line Expansion

Why the big secret??

- According to TVA documents, the initial open house Scoping meeting held in July 2005 was “publicized through notices in local media.” The two local newspapers that serve the communities in question, The Eagleville Times and The Courier, were not notified of this meeting. Comments on the scope and environmental issues for the EIS were accepted through August 8, 2005, at which time the public was still largely unaware of the proposal.
- Likewise, for today’s open house, TVA stated that landowners would be made aware of the proposal by April 1st. As of April 4th, landowners had not yet received any notice or invitation to the meeting.

After 30 years, is it unreasonable to expect that TVA had abandoned the Hartsville Nuclear Plant project easement?

- While TVA has maintained legal right of way to much of the easement purchased in the 1970’s for the Hartsville Nuclear Plant project, the cancellation of that project and subsequent disinterest in the use of the properties after 30 years has resulted in a community that developed far differently from one that would exist today had the power lines been put into place at the time. Many landowners and homebuilders have invested far too much of their lives, resources, and dreams to allow such devaluation to occur without proper justification or reasoning. The fact that so many people were caught blindsided by these events is true testament. Furthermore, TVA has made no attempts to maintain their monuments, or provide information to potential landowners regarding future plans. In fact, the easement does not even appear on county maps available to citizens online.

Shouldn’t TVA be considering other options, such as energy conservation and green resources, rather than such large scale community disruptions?

- Other than the other proposals described in the scoping document, TVA has done little to require their customers to reduce energy usage. The Tennessee Legislature adapted a voluntary energy code based on ASHREA 90.1/1980. Not only is this code outdated, it has not been enforced. It is estimated that updated, enforced energy codes such as those mandated by the Federal Government could reduce urban energy usage by as much as 40%. Wouldn’t it be more feasible for TVA to invest in community education, and encouraging local adaptation and enforcement of energy codes that to simply cave in to the demands of big business and developers?



- Today in Murfreesboro, numerous large mall and car dealership parking lots sit underneath burning lights in broad daylight, with no repercussions to the property owners. Is this mentality why we are being asked to make such huge sacrifices?

Why were the more feasible options under consideration so quickly abandoned?

- The first alternative was to construct a new substation in Brentwood. **The project would require no additional transmission line easements**, as it's close to the Pinhook-Davidson transmission lines that are already in existence. Thus, it would have little effect on landowners. The capital costs for this would be 8% less than the Rutherford proposal and 3% less than the Pinhook proposal; however, the costs of possible power losses during transmission makes this proposal cost about \$3 more than the Rutherford alternative solution. TVA argues that the line outages during construction are constraints that would possibly delay construction completion to 2011. **This option was TVA's first choice prior to the citizens of Brentwood banding together to fight the proposal.**
- The second alternative to the Rutherford line was to expand the existing Pinhook substation. TVA's argument against the Pinhook expansion is the possibility of damaging control equipment in the existing substation area, resulting in outages at the substation. This solution would be about 3% more than the Brentwood alternative and 6% less than the Rutherford alternative. Overall project costs are about \$17 million more than the Brentwood alternative and \$20 million more than the Rutherford alternative, but these are based on *hypothetically* damaged equipment.

Does the Rutherford alternative cause harm to the environment?

- Our option, the Rutherford alternative, involves the most destruction of and construction on Greenfield sites, resulting in **greater environmental impacts as compared to the other two options.**

Are there any health risks associated to living near high-tension power lines?

- A major new study by the Childhood Cancer Research Group at the University of Oxford found that children whose birth address was within 200 meters of an overhead power line had a 70 % increased risk of leukemia. Appearing in the June 2005 British Medical Journal, the study concludes there is a statistical link between EMF from power lines and leukemia. A 20% increase in leukemia was noted at 200-600 meters away.
- Many other Independent studies have come to similar conclusions, and can be researched online or on our web site at www.poweroutrage.org

What can we do??

GET ORGANIZED! GET INVOLVED! Regardless of what TVA claims in their scoping documents, it was nothing more than community involvement that forced them away from options 1 and 2. It is VERY late in the game, but doing SOMETHING is better than doing NOTHING!! Help support your community in opposition to this outrage! To voice your support, visit us online at <http://www.poweroutrage.org>

