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ABSTRACT: This Environmental Assessment (EA) evaluates the Proposed Action of the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) to acquire, develop, operate, and maintain a site in Washington County, Maine as a new National Veterans Burial Ground (rural National Veterans Cemetery). This EA discusses two alternatives: (1) Preferred Action Alternative – Acquire approximately six acres of unimproved land located on the northern side of Harrington Road (US Route 1), approximately 2.25 miles east of intersection of Harrington Road and Indian River Road (Route 187) in Jonesboro, Washington County, Maine, to develop, operate, and maintain as a new National Veterans Burial Ground; and (2) the No Action Alternative. This EA evaluates possible effects to aesthetics; air quality; cultural resources; geology and soils; hydrology and water quality; wildlife and habitat; noise; land use; floodplains, wetlands, and coastal zone management; socioeconomics; community services; solid and hazardous materials; transportation and parking; utilities; and environmental justice. The EA concludes there would be no significant adverse impact, either individually or cumulatively, to the local environment or quality of life associated with implementing the Preferred Action Alternative, provided the management measures and best management practices identified in this EA are implemented.
This Environmental Assessment (EA) has been prepared to identify, analyze, and document the potential physical, environmental, cultural, and socioeconomic impacts associated with the Department of Veterans Affairs’ (VA’s) proposed selection and acquisition of approximately three to six acres of land located in Washington County, Maine, to develop, operate, and maintain as a new National Veterans Burial Ground. As a Federal action, preparation of this EA is required by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 ([NEPA]; 42 United States Code [USC] 4321 et seq.), the President’s Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations Implementing the Procedural Provisions of NEPA (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1500-1508), and 38 CFR Part 26 (Environmental Effects of the Department of Veterans Affairs Actions). This EA has also been prepared in accordance with the VA NEPA Interim Guidance for Projects dated 30 September 2010.

**PROPOSED ACTION**

VA’s Proposed Action is to acquire approximately three to six acres of land located in Washington County, Maine to develop, operate, and maintain as a new National Veterans Burial Ground. The proposed cemetery would provide additional capacity, as well as improved access to Veterans and their families (i.e., reduced travel time to a National Cemetery and would help balance the currently unequal geographic distribution of National Cemeteries within the region.

The proposed National Veterans Burial Ground would be open to the public every day throughout the year. VA estimates that the cemetery would receive approximately 20 visitors per day. VA anticipates approximately 2 to 3 funeral processions per week, averaging 20 cars per procession.

**PURPOSE AND NEED**

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to provide a National Veterans Burial Ground of sufficient size and capacity to serve the projected needs of Veterans in eastern Maine for the next 100 or more years. The Proposed Action would provide burial facilities for eligible Veterans in eastern Maine currently not served by a National Cemetery or State Veterans Cemetery.

A new National cemetery is needed to better serve the needs of Veterans and their families in eastern Maine. The new cemetery would provide additional burial capacity, as well as improved access to Veterans and their families (i.e., reduced travel time to a National Cemetery), and would help to balance the current unequal geographic distribution of National Cemeteries in this region. There are currently no open National or State Veterans Cemeteries located within 100 miles of Machias, Maine. In addition, the new National Veterans Burial Ground is needed for VA to comply with the Rural Initiatives program.

VA has established three objectives that define outcomes for VA burial programs. One of these objectives is to ensure that burial needs of Veterans and eligible family members are met. The VA National Cemetery Administration (NCA) further defines this objective on the assumption that the burial needs of a Veteran are met if they have reasonable access to burial option, where reasonable access to a burial option is defined as “...a first interment option (whether for casketed remains or cremated remains, either in-ground or in columbaria) in a National or State Veterans Cemetery...available within 75 miles of the Veteran’s place of residence.” VA established a 75-mile service area standard because NCA data show that more than 80 percent of persons interred in National Cemeteries resided within 75 miles of the cemetery at the time of death. VA has also
developed unserved Veteran population thresholds for eligibility to establish a new National Cemetery or a National Veterans Burial Ground.

In the independent *Evaluation of the VA Burial Benefits Program* (August 2008), NCA reviewed where it has been and reflected on future burial strategy to continue meeting the needs of our Nation’s Veterans. This evaluation also noted that there is a gap between the size of population centers served by a National Cemetery and State Veteran cemeteries. Hence, based upon that study, NCA established a new Veteran population threshold to increase access to a burial option where the unserved Veteran population is at least 80,000.

In addition and to account for areas where Veteran populations do not exceed the threshold for a National Cemetery, the NCA Performance Plan of the 2013 VA Budget established a *Rural Initiatives* program which is intended to establish a cemetery presence in rural areas where Veterans populations are less than 25,000 Veterans within a 75-mile radius. The goal is to build small National Veterans Burial Grounds in certain rural areas where the Veteran population has been identified by VA to be underserved. The Rural Initiatives program targets states with no National Cemeteries open for first interments, and areas within those states that are not currently served by a State Veterans Cemetery or a National Cemetery in another state. NCA identified eight states (Idaho, Montana, Nevada, North Dakota, Maine, Utah, Wisconsin, and Wyoming) that met these criteria.

**ALTERNATIVES**

After identifying a need for a National Veterans Burial Ground in eastern Maine, VA considered various alternatives for establishing a National Cemetery in the region. VA published Solicitation for Federal Business Opportunity (FBO) VA101-13-I-0152, soliciting offers for no less than three acres of land suitable for a cemetery development in the Calais, Washington County, Maine area.

VA received several responses to this advertisement. Through a comprehensive screening process, VA narrowed the number of viable sites based on an analysis of site-specific attributes, including: topography and natural aesthetics, soil/geology, environmental issues, site configuration, availability of utilities, existing structures and obstructions, site adjacencies, aesthetic quality and zoning, proximity to catchment area, and accessibility. Through this additional analysis, VA initially identified two suitable sites that best met all of the screening criteria, located in Calais and Robbinston, Maine.

During the initial stages of NEPA consultation with Federal, State, and local agencies, the Washington County Commissioner’s Office expressed concern about the location of the proposed cemetery in the vicinity of Calais or Robbinston due to their location at the far northeastern edge of Washington County. Washington County personnel stated that the majority of the population in Washington County is located along the Atlantic Coast, which could result in up to a 2.5-hour drive for many Veterans in the central and western portion of the County to the Calais or Robbinston vicinities. Washington County personnel stated that Machias, Maine is the county seat, is centrally located, and is approximately a one hour drive from the majority of Washington County’s population, including a large percentage of the County’s Veterans, and recommended that VA reconsider the siting of the cemetery to a more central location. NCA conducted additional analysis, further assessed the Veteran population and determined that the target location in Machias, Maine would be a more suitable location.

VA published FBO VA101-14-I-0168, in June 2014, but due to the limited viable sites, VA republished through the same FBO VA101-14-I-0168 in September 2014, soliciting offers for approximately 3-6 acres of land located inside or adjacent to an existing cemetery, or any other location that could be suitable for a cemetery development in the Machias, Maine area. VA required that the offered site must be located within a 12-mile radius of the intersection of Court and Cooper Streets in Machias, Maine.
VA received several responses to this second advertisement. Through a similar comprehensive screening process, VA narrowed the number of viable sites and identified one suitable site that best met all of the screening criteria. This site includes approximately six acres of unimproved land located on the northern side of Harrington Road (US Route 1), approximately 2.25 miles east of intersection of Harrington Road and Indian River Road (Route 187) in Jonesboro, Washington County, Maine (the Site).

This EA examines in-depth two alternatives, the Preferred Action Alternative and the No Action Alternative, defined as follows:

- **Preferred Action Alternative**: VA would acquire approximately six acres of land located on the northern side of Harrington Road (US Route 1), approximately 2.25 miles east of intersection of Harrington Road and Indian River Road (Route 187) in Jonesboro, Washington County, Maine, to develop, operate, and maintain as a new National Veterans Burial Ground.

- **No Action Alternative**: Do not implement the Proposed Action as identified (do not establish a new National Veterans Burial Ground in Washington County, Maine). Veterans and their families residing in eastern Maine region continue to be underserved by a National Cemetery or State Veterans Cemetery and would continue to be required to travel a substantial distance to a National or State Veterans Cemetery. The distribution of National Cemeteries throughout the region would continue to be unbalanced and VA would not be in compliance with the requirements of the Rural Initiatives program. The Preferred Action Alternative Site likely would remain unimproved land.

The Preferred Action Alternative effectively provides the option that most closely meets the requirements of the VA. The No Action Alternative would not enable the VA to provide adequate, long-term National cemetery facilities in eastern Maine or comply with the requirements of the Rural Initiatives program. However, the No Action Alternative is assessed in this EA to provide a comparative baseline analysis, as required under the CEQ Regulations.

**AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT**

The approximately six-acre Preferred Action Alternative Site is located on the northern side of Harrington Road (US Route 1), approximately 2.25 miles east of intersection of Harrington Road and Indian River Road (Route 187) in Jonesboro, Washington County, Maine. The Site is a portion of a much larger parcel of land owned by Worcester Holdings, LLC. The Site is currently unimproved land that is wooded along its southern boundary, grassy in the central portion, and overgrown with fields and small Balsam fir trees in the remaining areas. Since 2001, the Balsam fir brush at the Site has been harvested approximately every three years to make wreaths (for Wreaths Across America). From 1917 to 2001, the site was owned by various paper companies who likely logged the site. The site has remained unimproved since at least 1910.

The areas located to the north, east, and west of the Site are unimproved wooded and vacant land. The area located to the south across Harrington Road is occupied by unimproved wooded land and three residences.

**ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES**

Both considered alternatives are evaluated in this EA to determine their potential direct, indirect, and cumulative effect(s) on the physical, environmental, cultural, and socioeconomic aspects of the affected site and its region of influence (ROI). Technical areas evaluated include:

- **Aesthetics**
- **Air Quality**
- **Cultural Resources**
- **Socioeconomics**
- **Community Services**
- **Solid and Hazardous Materials**
The Preferred Action Alternative would result in the impacts identified throughout Section 3 of this EA. These include potential less-than-significant adverse impacts to aesthetics, air quality, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, wildlife and habitat, noise, coastal zones, solid and hazardous materials, and transportation. All of these impacts would be further reduced through careful implementation of the general Best Management Practices (BMPs), management measures, and compliance with regulatory requirements as identified throughout Section 3; BMPs are summarized in Section 5.

Under the No Action Alternative, the Proposed Action would not be implemented and Veterans in eastern Maine would continue to reside greater than 75 miles from the nearest National or State Veterans Cemetery. No positive impacts attributable to the Preferred Action Alternative would occur, and a significant adverse effect to the socioeconomic environment would occur. Specifically, Veterans and their families would have to travel a substantial distance to National or State Veterans Cemetery. In addition, VA would not comply with the Rural Initiatives program.

The EA also examines the potential cumulative effects of implementing each of the considered alternatives. This analysis finds that implementation of the Preferred Action Alternative, with the implementation of BMPs and the management measures specified in this EA, would not result in significant adverse cumulative impacts to onsite or regional natural or cultural resources, and would maintain or enhance the socioeconomic environment of the area through long-term provision of required cemetery facilities in the region. The No Action Alternative would not produce these potential positive socioeconomic gains from VA. No significant cumulative effects are identified.

AGENCY AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

VA consulted with the following agencies during the preparation of this EA: the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS); US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA); US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE); United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS); Maine Department of Environmental Protection (MDEP); Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife (MDIFW); Maine Department of Agriculture, Conservation, and Forestry (MDACF); Maine Department of Transportation (MDOT); Maine Historic Preservation Commission (SHPO); Maine Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS); Maine Association of Conservation Districts (MACD); Washington County Administration; and the Town of Jonesboro.

VA received responses from the following agencies regarding the Proposed Action. The following summarizes that input, which VA used to focus this EA’s analysis:

• The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), Maine Ecological Services Field Office stated that available information pertaining to threatened and endangered species is available in the Species List and Project Reviews application on their internet website. According to the USFWS Information for Planning and Conservation (IPaC) database, one Federally-listed endangered species (Atlantic Salmon) and one Federally-listed threatened species (Northern Long-Eared Bat) were identified in the Site vicinity. The nearest surface water body to the Site is the Indian River, located approximately 900 feet west of the Site. Based on the distance between the Site and Indian River, it is unlikely that the Preferred Action Alternative would impact critical Atlantic Salmon habitats. The Northern Long-Eared Bat requires intact tracts of wooded land. Based on the disturbed nature of the Site and areas to the north, east, and south (with limited areas of mature trees), it is unlikely that the Northern Long-Eared Bat occurs at
the Site or in the immediate Site vicinity or would be impacted by the Preferred Action Alternative.

- The Maine Historic Preservation Commission (SHPO) stated that it reviewed Site information provided by CES, Inc. on July 6, 2015 on behalf of VA and concluded that there would be no historic properties affected as a result of the Preferred Action Alternative and no further Section 106 consultation is required unless additional resources are discovered during the implementation of the project.

- The Maine Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS), Division of Environmental Health (DEH) Drinking Water Program and Subsurface Water Unit stated that there are no records of regulated public water supplies or sewage disposal systems at the Site. The MDHHS DEH stated they were not aware of any concerns or issues related to the Site or the implementation the Proposed Action.

- The Maine Department of Agriculture, Conservation & Forestry, Natural Areas Program (MNAP) stated that are no known rare or unique botanical features documented in the Site area. The MNAP provided a list of six rare and exemplary botanical features within four miles of the Site. Five of the six features are associates with wetlands, which are not present at or adjacent to the Site. The sixth feature (Blinks, a Maine special concern species) requires a rocky coastal habitat, which also is not present at the site or surrounding area. Therefore, the Preferred Action Alternative is unlikely to impact rare and exemplary botanical features.

- The Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife (MDIFW) stated three species of bat (Little Brown Bat, Northern Long-Eared Bat, and Eastern Small-Footed Bat, which are State threatened or endangered) are proposed to be listed under the Maine Endangered Species Act (MESA) and four species of bat (Red Bat, Hoary Bat, Silver-Haired Bat, and Tri-Colored Bat) are considered species of special concern. The MDIFW stated that it is likely that several of these species occur within the Site area during migration and/or breeding season and deferred to the guidance and recommendations of the USFWS regarding the bat species.

  The MDIFW stated that there are no known Essential Habitats or Significant Wildlife Habitats (SWHs) within the project area. However, the MDIFW stated that surveys for Significant Vernal Pools are incomplete and recommended that surveys for vernal pools be conducted at the Site prior to project design to determine whether Significant Vernal Pools are present in the area. No wetlands or vernal pools were identified at the Site.

  The MDIFW also provided general recommendations regarding mapped streams. The MDIFW recommended a 100-foot undisturbed vegetated buffer be maintained along streams. No streams are located on or adjacent to the Site.

- The Maine Department of Transportation (MDOT) stated that the Preferred Action Alternative would require a MDOT entrance permit to access the Site from US Route 1 (Harrington Road), including an evaluation of sight distances and other transportation safety considerations. In addition, MDOT stated that they would like to review proposed stormwater management systems for the project to determine potential effects to the US Route 1 drainage system. MDOT also stated that the Maine Geological Survey has mapped a "significant sand and gravel aquifer" (ID# 5958) along US Route 1 in the area of the Site.

- The Washington County Soil and Water Conservation District (WCSWCD) stated that they do not anticipate any potential environmental concerns or issues related to the Preferred Action Alternative.

Received agency information and comments have been fully incorporated and addressed in this EA. Copies of relevant correspondence can be found in Appendix A.
For Federal proposed actions, Federal agencies are required to consult with federally recognized Native American Tribes in accordance with the NEPA, the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), and Executive Order (EO) 13175. VA identified four Native American Tribes as having possible ancestral ties to the Site area and invited each Tribe to provide input regarding the Proposed Action (Appendix B). These Tribes included: Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians of Maine; Aroostook Band of Micmacs; Penobscot Nation; and Passamaquoddy Tribe of Maine. As of the date of this EA, no response has been received from the Tribes (VA 2016).

VA, as the Federal proponent of this Proposed Action, published and distributed the Draft EA for a 30-day public comment period as announced by a Notice of Availability (NOA) published in the Machias Valley News Observer on December 23 and 30, 2015 and January 6, 2016. A copy of the Draft EA was also made available for public review at the Porter Memorial Library in Machias, Maine. VA also made a copy of the Draft EA available for download via a link on the VA internet website (http://www.cem.va.gov/EA.asp). VA received no public comments during the public review of the Draft EA.

CONCLUSIONS

The Preferred Action Alternative would result in the effects identified throughout Section 3 of this EA. These include potential less-than-significant adverse impacts to aesthetics, air quality, cultural resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, wildlife and habitat, noise, coastal zones, solid and hazardous materials, and transportation. All of these potential impacts would be further reduced through careful implementation of the general BMPs and management measures, and compliance with regulatory requirements.

The analysis performed in this EA concludes there would be no significant adverse impact, either individually or cumulatively, to the local environment or quality of life associated with implementation of the Preferred Action Alternative, provided the management and regulatory compliance measures described in this EA are implemented. This EA’s analysis determines, therefore, that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is unnecessary for the Preferred Action Alternative, and that a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) is appropriate.
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SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

This Section provides the reader with necessary introductory and background information concerning the Proposed Action for proper analytical context; identifies the purpose of and need for the Proposed Action; describes the Federal decision to be made concerning the Proposed Action; and identifies relevant environmental documents. Section 4 provides a summary of public and agency involvement (and key issues and concerns identified). Section 11 identifies Federal, State, and local regulations applicable to the Proposed Action.

This Environmental Assessment (EA) has been prepared to identify, analyze, and document the potential physical, environmental, cultural, and socioeconomic effects associated with the Department of Veterans Affairs’ (VA’s), a Federal executive agency, Proposed Action. VA’s Proposed Action is to acquire approximately three to six acres of land located in Washington County, Maine to develop, operate, and maintain as a new National Veterans Burial Ground. The Proposed Action would be implemented in accordance with the National Cemetery Administration (NCA) Rural Initiatives Program, which is intended to establish a cemetery presence in rural areas where unserved Veterans populations are less than 25,000 Veterans within a 75-mile radius. The Rural Initiatives Program targets states with no National Cemeteries; no regional State Veterans Cemeteries; and no reasonably accessible National Cemeteries in adjacent states.

Preparation of this EA is required in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 ([NEPA]; 42 United States Code [USC] 4321 et seq.), the President’s Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations Implementing the Procedural Provisions of NEPA (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Parts 1500-1508), and 38 CFR Part 26 (Environmental Effects of the Department of Veterans Affairs Actions). This EA also has been prepared in accordance with VA’s NEPA Interim Guidance for Projects (VA 2010).

In accordance with the above regulations, this EA: allows for public input into the Federal decision-making process; provides Federal decision-makers with an understanding of potential environmental effects of their decisions, before making these decisions; identifies measures the Federal decision-maker could implement to reduce potential environmental effects; and documents the NEPA process.

This EA examines in-depth two alternatives, the Preferred Action Alternative and the No Action Alternative as defined below:

- **Preferred Action Alternative:** Acquire approximately six acres of land located on the northern side of Harrington Road (US Route 1), approximately 2.25 miles east of intersection of Harrington Road and Indian River Road (Route 187) in Jonesboro, Washington County, Maine, to develop, operate, and maintain as a new National Veterans Burial Ground. The Preferred Action Alternative Site location and features are depicted on Figures 1 through 3.

- **No Action Alternative:** Do not implement the Proposed Action as identified (do not establish a new National Veterans Burial Ground in Washington County, Maine) and continue to operate only the existing National Cemeteries in the region.
1.2 Background

VA is proposing to acquire approximately six acres of land located on the northern side of Harrington Road (US Route 1), approximately 2.25 miles east of intersection of Harrington Road and Indian River Road (Route 187) in Jonesboro, Washington County, Maine, to develop, operate, and maintain as a new National Veterans Burial Ground. The proposed National Veterans Burial Ground would provide additional burial capacity, as well as improved access to Veterans and their families (i.e. reduced travel time to a National Cemetery, and would balance the current unequal geographic distribution of National Cemeteries in the region.

Currently there are no design plans for this proposed National Veterans Burial Ground. VA would follow the VA's NCA Facilities Design Guide (VA 2008, or its successor) in developing the proposed cemetery, which would include preplaced crypts, columbarium niches, and in-ground burial sections. VA is seeking to acquire the site in early 2016 via donation and would initiate design/construction later in 2016.

The proposed National Veterans Burial Ground would be open to the public every day throughout the year. VA estimates that the cemetery would receive approximately 20 visitors per day. VA anticipates approximately 2 to 3 funeral processions per week, averaging 20 cars per procession.

1.3 Purpose and Need

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to provide a National Veterans Burial Ground of sufficient size and capacity to serve the projected needs of Veterans in eastern Maine for the next 100 or more years. The Proposed Action would provide burial facilities for eligible Veterans in eastern Maine region not served by a National Cemetery or State Veterans Cemetery.

A new National cemetery is needed to better serve the needs of Veterans and their families in eastern Maine. The new cemetery would provide additional burial capacity, as well as improved access to Veterans and their families (i.e., reduced travel time to a National Cemetery), and would improve the balance the current unequal geographic distribution of National Cemeteries in this region. There are currently no open National or State Veterans Cemeteries located within 100 miles of Machias, Maine. In addition, the new National Veterans Burial Ground is needed for VA to comply with the Rural Initiatives program.

VA has established three objectives that define outcomes for VA burial programs. One of these objectives is to ensure that burial needs of Veterans and eligible family members are met. NCA further defines this objective on the assumption that the burial needs of a Veteran are met if they have reasonable access to burial option, where reasonable access to a burial option is defined as “...a first interment option (whether for casketed remains or cremated remains, either in-ground or in columbaria) in a National or State Veterans Cemetery...available within 75 miles of the Veteran’s place of residence.” VA established a 75-mile service area standard because NCA data show that more than 80 percent of persons interred in National Cemeteries resided within 75 miles of the cemetery at the time of death. VA has also developed unserved Veteran population thresholds for eligibility to establish a new National Cemetery or a National Veterans Burial Ground.

In the independent Evaluation of the VA Burial Benefits Program (August 2008), NCA reviewed where it has been and reflected on future burial strategy to continue meeting the needs of our Nation’s Veterans. This evaluation also noted that there is a gap between the size of population centers served by a National Cemetery and State Veteran cemeteries. Hence, based upon that study, NCA established a new Veteran population threshold to increase access to a burial option where the unserved Veteran population is at least 80,000.
In addition and to account for areas where Veteran populations do not exceed the threshold for a National Cemetery, the NCA Performance Plan of the 2013 VA Budget established a Rural Initiatives program which is intended to establish a cemetery presence in rural areas where Veterans populations are less than 25,000 Veterans within a 75-mile radius. The goal is to build small National Veterans Burial Grounds in certain rural areas where the Veteran population has been identified by VA to be underserved. The Rural Initiatives program targets states with no National Cemeteries open for first interments, and areas within those states that are not currently served by a State Veterans Cemetery or a National Cemetery in another state. NCA identified eight states (Idaho, Montana, Nevada, North Dakota, Maine, Utah, Wisconsin, and Wyoming) that met these criteria.

1.4 Decision-Making

This EA has been prepared to identify, analyze, and document the potential physical, environmental, cultural, and socioeconomic effects associated with VA's proposed acquisition, development, operation, and maintenance of a Site in Washington County, Maine as a new National Veterans Burial Ground.

VA, as a Federal agency, is required to incorporate environmental considerations into their decision-making process for the actions they propose to undertake. This is done in accordance with the regulations identified in Section 1.1.

In accordance with the NEPA regulations described above, this EA: allows for public input into the Federal decision-making process; provides Federal decision-makers with an understanding of potential environmental effects of their decisions, before making these decisions; identifies measures the Federal decision-maker could implement to reduce potential adverse environmental effects; and documents the NEPA process.

Ultimately, VA will decide, in part based on the analysis presented in this EA and after having taken potential physical, environmental, cultural, and socioeconomic effects into account, whether VA should implement the Proposed Action, and, as appropriate, carry out management and avoidance measures to reduce effects to the environment.
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1.5  Related Environmental Documents

Related environmental documents include:

- Initial Cultural Resources Impact Prediction, CES, Inc., dated August 2015.
- Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, prepared by TTL Associates, Inc. and dated August 31, 2015.
SECTION 2: DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

2.1 Introduction

This Section provides the reader with necessary information regarding the Proposed Action and its alternatives, including those that VA initially considered, but eliminated, and the reasons for eliminating them. The screening criteria and process developed and applied by VA to hone the number of reasonable alternatives are described, providing the reader with an understanding of VA’s rationale in ultimately retaining for analysis the Preferred Action Alternative Site, the six-acre unimproved property located on the northern side of Harrington Road in Jonesboro, Washington County, Maine, that best meets VA’s purpose of and need for the Proposed Action.

2.2 Proposed Action

VA’s Proposed Action is to acquire approximately three to six acres of land located in Washington County, Maine, to develop, operate, and maintain as a new National Veterans Burial Ground. The proposed cemetery would provide additional capacity, as well as improved access to Veterans and their families (i.e., reduced travel time to a National Cemetery) and would help balance the currently unequal geographic distribution of National Cemeteries within the region. VA has identified approximately six acres of unimproved land located on the north side of Harrington Road in Jonesboro, Maine as the Preferred Action Alternative Site for the Proposed Action.

The proposed National Veterans Burial Ground would be open to the public every day throughout the year. VA estimates that the cemetery would receive approximately 20 visitors per day. VA anticipates approximately 2 to 3 funeral processions per week, averaging 20 cars per procession.

Currently there are no specific design plans for this proposed National Veterans Burial Ground. VA would follow the VA’s NCA Facilities Design Guide (VA 2008, or its successor) in developing the proposed cemetery.

Based on the NCA Guide (VA 2008), the Rural Initiatives program (VA 2012), and preliminary conceptual design data, the initial development of the proposed National Veterans Burial Ground would, at minimum, include the following components:

- Approximately 1,500 casket burial sites and 500 cremation burial sites (both in-ground cremation sites and columbarium niche).
- Provide a full range of burial options and control the operation and maintenance to the same “national shrine” standards as VA-run National Cemeteries.
- Planned areas for burial elements to include approximately double-depth, 3-foot by 8-foot pre-placed crypts.
- Columbarium niches in columbarium wall.
• In-ground 4-foot by 4-foot cremain urn vault sites.
• Private/oversized 4-foot by 10-foot casket burial sites.
• A private non-potable water well and irrigation system.
• A committal shelter with wind screening.
• A gateway entrance sign and flag pole.

Prior to construction, VA would obtain all applicable Federal, State, and local permits for the proposed cemetery from appropriate government authorities.

2.3 Alternatives Analysis

The NEPA, CEQ Regulations, and 38 CFR Part 26 require that all reasonable alternatives to be rigorously explored and objectively evaluated. Alternatives that are eliminated from detailed study must be identified along with a brief discussion of the reasons for eliminating them. For purposes of analysis, an alternative was considered “reasonable” only if it would enable VA to accomplish the primary mission of providing a suitable cemetery site that meets the purpose of and need for the Proposed Action, including availability at a price consistent with the fair market value based on an independent appraisal, or donation. “Unreasonable” alternatives would not enable VA to meet the purpose of and need for the Proposed Action.

2.3.1 Alternatives Development (Screening Criteria)

After identifying a need for a National Veterans Burial Ground in eastern Maine, VA considered various alternatives for establishing a National Cemetery in the region. VA published Solicitation for Federal Business Opportunity (FBO) VA101-13-I-0152 in 2013, soliciting offers for no less than three acres of land located suitable for a cemetery development in the Calais, Maine area.

VA received several responses to this advertisement. Through a comprehensive screening process, VA narrowed the number of viable sites based on an analyses of site-specific attributes, including environmental (natural) conditions, man-made conditions, compatibility of the surrounding area, and accessibility (see general screening criteria, below). Through this additional analysis, VA initially identified two suitable sites that best met all of the screening criteria, located in Calais, Maine and Robbinston, Maine.

During the initial stages of NEPA consultation with Federal, State, and local agencies, the Washington County Commissioner’s Office expressed concern about the location of the proposed cemetery in the vicinity of Calais or Robbinston due to their location at the far northeastern edge of Washington County. Washington County personnel stated that the majority of the population in Washington County is located along the Atlantic Coast, which could result in up to a 2.5-hour drive for many Veterans in the central and western portion of the County to the Calais or Robbinston vicinities. Washington County personnel stated that Machias, Maine is the county seat, is centrally located, and is approximately a one hour drive from the majority of Washington County’s population, including a large percentage of the County’s Veterans and recommended that VA reconsider the siting of the cemetery to a more central location. NCA conducted additional analysis, further assessed the Veteran population and determined that the target location in Machias, Maine would be a more suitable location.

VA published FBO VA101-14-I-0168, in June 2014, but due to the limited viable sites, VA republished through the same FBO VA101-14-I-0168 in September 2014, soliciting offers for approximately 3-6 acres of land located inside or adjacent to an existing cemetery, or any other location that could be suitable for a cemetery development in the Machias, Maine area.
VA required that the offered site must be located within a 12-mile radius of the intersection of Court and Cooper Streets in Machias, Maine.

VA received several responses to this second advertisement. Through a comprehensive rescreening process, VA narrowed the number of viable sites based on general screening criteria.

The following are the Site Evaluation Factor Guidelines (screening criteria) which describe the factors (under four broad headings) that the VA applied to score and rank each site. VA completed this process based on the information that was available at the time of the evaluation:

- **Environmental (Natural) Conditions**
  - Topography and Natural Aesthetics
  - Soil/Geology
  - Environmental Issues

- **Man-made Conditions**
  - Site Configuration
  - Availability of Utilities
  - Existing Structures and Obstructions

- **Compatibility of the Surrounding Area**
  - Site Adjacencies
  - Aesthetic Quality and Zoning
  - Proximity to Catchment Area

- **Accessibility**
  - Major Highways, Connecting Roadways, and Familiarity
  - Vehicular Ingress/Egress

Through this analysis, VA identified one suitable site that best met all of the VA's screening criteria. This site was identified as approximately six acres of land located on the northern side of Harrington Road (US Route 1), approximately 2.25 miles east of intersection of Harrington Road and Indian River Road (Route 187) in Jonesboro, Washington County, Maine.

**2.3.2 Evaluated Alternatives**

This EA examines in-depth two alternatives, the Preferred Action Alternative and the No Action Alternative, defined as follows:

**Preferred Action Alternative**

VA would acquire approximately six acres of land located on the northern side of Harrington Road in Jonesboro, Washington County, Maine, to develop, operate, and maintain as a new National Veterans Burial Ground (see Figures 1 through 3). The Site is unimproved land that is wooded along its southern boundary near Harrington Road, grassy in the central portion, and overgrown (fields and small Balsam Fir trees) in the remaining areas. A gravel access road from Harrington Road crosses the western portion of the Site and would be used as an ingress/egress point for the cemetery. The Preferred Action Alternative would be implemented as described in Section 2.2.
The Preferred Action Alternative Site effectively provides a suitable combination of land, location, and existing access and meets the purpose of and need for the Proposed Action.

**No Action Alternative**

Under the No Action Alternative, the Proposed Action as identified (the acquisition of land and the development and operation of a new National Veterans Burial Ground in eastern Maine) would not be implemented. Veterans and their families residing in eastern Maine would continue to be underserved by a National Cemetery or State Veterans Cemetery and would continue to be required to travel a substantial distance to a National or State Veterans Cemetery. The distribution of National Cemeteries throughout the region would continue to be unequal and VA would not be in compliance with the requirements of the Rural Initiatives program. The Preferred Action Alternative Site likely would remain unimproved.

While the No Action Alternative would not satisfy the purpose of or need for the Proposed Action, this alternative was retained to provide a comparative baseline against which to analyze the effects of the Proposed Action, as required under the CEQ Regulations (40 CFR Part 1502.14). The No Action Alternative reflects the *status quo* and serves as a benchmark against which the effects of the Proposed Action can be evaluated.

**2.3.3 Alternatives Eliminated From Detailed Consideration**

VA initially considered two sites in the Calais and Robbinston, Maine for the development of the new cemetery. However, as discussed in Section 2.3.1, based on initial consultations with Washington County representatives, VA reconsidered the siting of the cemetery to a more central location within the county (near Machias). As such, the Calais and Robbinston, Maine sites were eliminated from further consideration.

As described in Sections 2.3.1 and 2.3.2, VA eliminated additional offered sites through a screening process. Each of the considered sites, with the exception of the approximately six-acre Preferred Action Alternative Site, failed to meet all of the required screening criteria. As such, these other sites were eliminated from further consideration.
3.1 Introduction

This Section describes the baseline (existing) physical, environmental, cultural, and socioeconomic conditions at the proposed National Veterans Burial Ground site located on Harrington Road in Jonesboro, Washington County, Maine (i.e., the Preferred Action Alternative Site or Site; see Figures 1, 2 and 3) and its general vicinity, with emphasis on those resources potentially affected by the Proposed Action. Appendix C provides photographs, with captions, of the Site and its surroundings. Under each resource area, the potential direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of implementing the Proposed Action and the No Action Alternative on this environment are identified.

In this EA, impacts are identified as either significant, less than significant (i.e., common impacts that would not be of the context or intensity to be considered significant under the NEPA or CEQ Regulations), or no impact. As used in this EA, the terms “effects” and “impacts” are synonymous. Where appropriate and clearly discernible, each impact is identified as either adverse or positive.

The CEQ Regulations specify that in determining the significance of effects, consideration must be given to both “context” and “intensity” (40 CFR 1508.27):

**Context** refers to the significance of an effect to society as a whole (human and national), to an affected region, to affected interests, or to just the locality. In other words, the context measures how far the effect would be “felt.”

**Intensity** refers to the magnitude or severity of the effect, whether it is beneficial or adverse. Intensity refers to the “punch strength” of the effect within the context involved.

In this EA, the significance of potential direct, indirect, and cumulative effects has been determined through a systematic evaluation of each considered alternative in terms of its effects on each individual environmental resource component.

Resource areas considered in this EA are as follows:

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Cultural Resources
- Geology, Topography, and Soils
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Wildlife and Habitat
- Noise
- Land Use
- Floodplains, Wetlands, and Coastal Zone Management
- Socioeconomics
- Community Services
- Solid and Hazardous Materials
- Transportation and Parking
- Utilities
- Environmental Justice
3.2 Aesthetics

The approximately six-acre Site is situated in a predominantly rural, wooded area approximately 2.4 miles east of the intersection of Harrington Road and Indian River Road (Route 187) and approximately three miles west of the intersection of Harrington Road and Bay Road (Route 187) in Jonesboro, Washington County, Maine (see Figures 1, 2, and 3). The Site is located approximately 4.3 miles west-southwest of the Town of Jonesboro, Maine and approximately 11 miles west-southwest of Machias, Maine, the county seat. Worcester Holdings, LLC currently owns the Site and surrounding land to the north, east, and west. The Site is currently unimproved land that is wooded along its southern boundary near Harrington Road, grassy in the central portion, and overgrown in the remaining areas. A gravel access road crosses the Site near its western boundary. From 1917 to 2001, the Site was owned by various paper companies who likely logged the Site. Since 2001, the brush at the site (small Balsam Fir trees) has been harvested approximately every three years to make wreaths (for Wreaths Across America). The site has remained unimproved since at least 1910.

The areas located to the north, east, and west of the Site are unimproved wooded and vacant land. The area located to the south across Harrington Road is occupied by unimproved wooded land and three residences. The surrounding land uses are depicted on Figure 3.

Aesthetics are managed by the Town of Jonesboro through the Jonesboro Land Use and Planning Ordinances.

Currently there are no specific design plans for the proposed National Veterans Burial Ground. VA plans to develop the cemetery, with preplaced crypts, a columbarium wall, in-ground cremain burial sections, and casket burial sites. The cemetery would include a gateway entrance sign and flagpole. No regularly occupied buildings are planned for the cemetery. Refer to Section 2.2 for additional details.

3.2.1 Effects of the Preferred Action Alternative

Development and operation of the Site as a National Veterans Burial Ground would produce minor visual changes. The Site is currently unimproved vacant land, mostly cleared of mature trees. Development and operation of the Site by VA as a National Veterans Burial Ground would create a grassy, landscaped atmosphere suitable to its proposed use.

Cemetery development would be designed to comply, to the extent practicable, with the Jonesboro Land Use and Planning Ordinances. By complying with these ordinances and given the low visual impact of the cemetery development, aesthetics impacts would be less-than-significant.

3.2.2 Effects of the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, no development or changes to the Site by the VA would occur. The Site would likely remain in its current use for the foreseeable future and no aesthetics impacts would result.

3.2.3 Mitigation/Management Measures

No project-specific mitigation measures are required. Proposed cemetery development for the Site would comply, to the extent practicable, with the Jonesboro Land Use and Planning Ordinances. Compliance with these local established regulations would ensure that aesthetics effects are maintained at acceptable levels.
3.3 Air Quality

3.3.1 Regulatory Background

**Ambient Air Quality**

The ambient air quality in an area can be characterized in terms of whether or not it complies with the primary and secondary National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). The Clean Air Act, as amended (CAA and CAAA) requires the US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) to set NAAQS for pollutants considered harmful to public health and the environment. NAAQS are provided for principal pollutants, called “criteria pollutants”, which include carbon monoxide, lead, nitrogen oxides, particulate matter, and sulfur dioxide.

Areas are designated by the USEPA as *attainment*, *non-attainment*, *maintenance* (formerly *non-attainment*), or *unclassified* (no monitoring data), based on compliance with the NAAQS standards. According to the USEPA Green Book, Washington County, Maine is currently designated as a full attainment area (USEPA Green Book, January 2015).

**Greenhouse Gases**

Gases that trap heat in the atmosphere are often called greenhouse gases (GHG). Some greenhouse gases, such as carbon dioxide occur naturally and are emitted to the atmosphere through natural processes and human activities. Other greenhouse gases (e.g., fluorinated gases) are created and emitted solely through human activities.

Other than USEPA requirements for Mandatory Reporting of Greenhouse Gases Rule (74 FR 56260), which requires reporting of greenhouse gas data and other relevant information from large sources and suppliers in the United States, no regulatory guidelines are in place. The purpose of the Rule is to collect accurate and timely GHG data to inform future policy decisions. However, EOs 13423 and 13514 require Federal agencies to reduce GHG emissions.

**Operating Permits**

Given current land use of the Site (i.e., unimproved land used for period brush harvesting), no sources of regulated air emissions exist.

**State and Local Regulations**

The Maine Department of Environmental Protection (MDEP) implements air quality programs under the Clean Air Act, the Maine Revised Statutes, Title 38 (Waters and Navigation), Chapter 4 (Protection and Improvement of Air), and the MDEP Air Rules (Chapters 100-199).

The Town of Jonesboro does not maintain specific air quality regulations. Air quality issues in the Site area are overseen by the MDEP.

**Conformity with State Implementation Plans**

The General Conformity Provision of the CAA of 1970 (42 USC 7401 et seq.; 40 CFR Parts 50-87) Section 176(c), including the USEPA’s implementation mechanism, the General Conformity Rule (40 CFR Part 51, Subpart W), prohibits the Federal government from conducting, supporting, or approving any actions that do not conform to a USEPA-approved State Implementation Plan (SIP). A SIP is a state’s self-authored blueprint for achieving and maintaining compliance with the goals of the CAA. Federal agencies prepare written Conformity Determinations for Federal actions in or affecting NAAQS non-attainment areas or maintenance areas when the total direct and indirect emissions of non-attainment pollutants
(or their precursors) exceed specified thresholds. Conformity with the SIP is demonstrated if project emissions fall below threshold values.

According to the USEPA, Washington County is currently designated as a full attainment area (USEPA Green Book, January 2015).

### 3.3.2 Sensitive Receptors

Sensitive air quality receptors in the vicinity of the Site are limited and include three residences located to the south of the Site across Harrington Road. No other sensitive air quality receptors were identified within 0.5-mile of the Site.

### 3.3.3 Effects of the Preferred Action Alternative

Development and operation of the Site by VA as a National Veterans Burial Ground would produce minimal air quality effects, discussed below.

Air emissions generated from the proposed VA cemetery would be expected to have less-than-significant direct and indirect, short- and long-term adverse impacts to the existing air quality environment around the Site. Impacts would include short-term and long-term increased air emission levels as a result of: 1) Construction activities and 2) Operation of the proposed National Veterans Burial Ground.

Construction-related emissions are generally short-term, but may still have adverse impacts on air quality, primarily due to the production of dust. Dust can result from a variety of activities, including excavation, grading, and vehicle travel on paved and unpaved surfaces. Dust from construction can lead to adverse health effects and nuisance concerns, such as reduced visibility on nearby roadways. The amount of dust is dependent on the intensity of the activity, soil type and conditions, wind speed, and dust suppression activities used. Dust control measures (BMPs) significantly reduce dust emissions from construction. Implementation of BMPs, discussed below, would further minimize these anticipated less-than-significant adverse, short-term impacts.

Over the long-term, the Proposed Action would result in site visits by Veterans and their families, including additional vehicle miles traveled to and from the National Veterans Burial Ground. A net minor long-term increase in local vehicle miles (and associated emissions) is anticipated, as visitors would travel to the Site. However, overall vehicle emissions would decrease because regional Veterans and their families would not be required to travel greater distances to other National and State Cemeteries.

The Preferred Action Alternative is located in a full attainment area; as such, a Record of Non-Applicability (RONA) under the Clean Air Act of 1990 would not be required or applicable.

### 3.3.4 Effects of the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, no direct significant air quality impacts by VA would result. The additional driving required by area Veterans to visit more distant National and State Cemeteries, which would contribute to increased regional air emissions, would be a less-than-significant long-term adverse impact under the No Action Alternative. The likely continued unimproved use of the Site would have no air quality impacts.

### 3.3.5 Mitigation/Management Measures

No project-specific mitigation measures are required. Implementing BMPs to reduce fugitive dust emissions during cemetery construction would further minimize the potential impacts on local air quality. To minimize the potential for adverse, short-term air quality impacts, VA
would implement the following typical dust control BMPs, as applicable, and in accordance with State requirements:

- Comply with the Maine Protection and Improvement of Air Statutes and MDEP Air Rules.
- Comply with Federal requirements pertaining to greenhouse gases and implement a site design that minimizes greenhouse gas emissions.
- Use appropriate dust suppression methods during onsite construction activities. Dust minimization concepts:
  - Available methods include application of water, dust palliative, or soil stabilizers; use of enclosures, covers, silt fences, or wheel washers; and suspension of earth-moving activities during high wind conditions.
  - Maintain an appropriate speed to minimize dust generated by vehicles and equipment on unpaved surfaces.
  - Cover haul trucks with tarps.
  - Stabilize disturbed areas through re-vegetation or mulching if the area would be inactive for several weeks or longer.
  - Visually monitor all construction activities regularly, particularly during extended periods of dry weather, and implement dust control measures when appropriate.

These dust-reducing BMPs would be briefed to the construction contractors. The onsite managers would be responsible for addressing air quality issues if they arise. Implementation of these BMPs would reduce the potential for short-term adverse air quality impacts to acceptable levels, notably for nearby sensitive receptors (i.e., residences near the Site).

In addition, VA would secure any required, individual minor air emissions permits from the MDEP, as appropriate and prior to construction activities at the proposed National Veterans Burial Ground.

3.4 Cultural Resources

Cultural resources are the physical evidence of our heritage. Cultural resources include: historic properties as defined in the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), cultural items as defined in the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), archeological resources as defined in the Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA), sacred sites as defined in EO 13007 to which access is provided under the American Indian Religious Freedom Act (AIRFA), and collections as defined in 36 CFR Part 79, Curation of Federally Owned and Administered Collections. Requirements set forth in NEPA, NHPA, ARPA, NAGPRA, AIRFA, 36 CFR Part 79, EO 13007, and Presidential Memorandum on Government-to-Government Relations with Native American Tribal Governments define the basis of VA’s compliance responsibilities for management of cultural resources. Regulations applicable to VA’s management of cultural resources include those promulgated by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) and the National Park Service (NPS).

3.4.1 Architectural and Archaeological Resources

A review of the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) did not identify any listed eligible properties in the vicinity of the Site.
CES, Inc. (CES) prepared an Initial Cultural Resource Impact Prediction (ICRIP) report on behalf of VA for the Site in August 2015 (Appendix D).

The ICRIP stated that the Site and surrounding lands were owned by several individuals from at least 1837 to 1917, owned by several paper companies for the harvesting of timber, from 1917 to 2001, and has been owned by Worcester Holdings, LLC since 2001. An 1881 atlas indicated a possible structure in the site area; however, the former location of this possible structure was not confirmed. No other evidence of previous structures was identified for the Site.

The ICRIP concluded that the Proposed Action does not appear likely to have any adverse effects on the human environment under Section 106 of the NHPA. The ICRIP stated that no excavations were completed to determine Native American activity; however, the area does not appear to include any significant natural areas that would make it an area of interest. No significant or critical natural areas were identified on, or adjacent to, the Site.

As part of the ICRIP, CES provided information regarding the Site and proposed cemetery development to the Maine Historic Preservation Commission (SHPO) on July 6, 2015. On July 20, 2015 the SHPO indicated that it reviewed the information provided by CES and concluded that there would be no historic properties affected as a result of the Preferred Action Alternative and no further Section 106 consultation is required unless additional resources are discovered during the implementation of the project (Appendix A).

3.4.2 Native American Consultation/Coordination

For all Federal proposed actions, Federal agencies are required to consult with federally recognized Native American Tribes in accordance with the NEPA, the NHPA, the NAGPRA, and EO 13175. VA consulted with four federally recognized Native American tribes as part of this NEPA process, in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800.2 and EO 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments, 6 November 2000. These tribes, identified as having possible ancestral ties to the area by the Native American Consultation Database (NACD), were invited by VA to participate in the EA process as Sovereign Nations per EO 13175. VA sent a coordination and consultation letter to each of these tribes in August 2015. All correspondence was conducted by certified letters. The tribes consulted include: Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians of Maine, Aroostook Band of Micmacs, Penobscot Nation, and Passamaquoddy Tribe of Maine. A sample letter sent to the tribes and their responses are included in Appendix B. As of the date of this EA, no responses have been received from the consulted tribes (VA 2016).

3.4.3 Effects of the Preferred Action Alternative

No NRHP-listed or eligible historic properties or other cultural resources were identified in the Site area by VA’s historic resource consultant. Therefore, no adverse effects to NRHP-listed or eligible historic structures or archaeological resources are anticipated as a result of the Preferred Action Alternative. The SHPO concurred that no historic properties would likely be impacted and that no further cultural resources investigations are required.

3.4.4 Effects of the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, no cultural resources impacts would occur.

3.4.5 Mitigation/Management Measures

No mitigation measures are required. Implementing BMPs during construction would further minimize potential impacts to local cultural resources.
Should human remains or other cultural items as defined by NAGPRA be discovered during project construction, the construction contractor would immediately cease work until VA, a qualified archaeologist, and SHPO are contacted to properly identify and appropriately treat discovered items in accordance with applicable State and Federal law(s).

3.5 Geology and Soils

The Columbia Falls, Maine United States Geological Survey (USGS) Topographic Quadrangle (dated 2014) indicates that surficial topography at the Site [elevation ranging from approximately 130 feet above mean sea level (amsl) in the northeastern portion to approximately 85 feet amsl in the southwestern portion] slopes to the west. The nearest surface water body is the Indian River (elevation approximately 50 feet amsl), located approximately 900 feet west of the Site.

According to the Physiographic Regions of the US, dated 2003 and published by the USGS, the Site is located in the Seaboard Lowland physiographic section of the New England physiographic province of the Appalachian Highlands physiographic division, characterized as gravelly sand with pebble to boulder-sized rocks and underlain by Silurian and Ordovician volcanic and granite rocks.

According to the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Web Soil Survey, the Site contains two soil types identified as Colton-Adams complex, 3 to 15 percent slopes (northern portion), and Lamoine-Buxton-Scantic complex, 0 to 15 percent slopes (southern portion). The Colton-Adams complex soils are characterized as gravelly sandy loam, excessively drained soils with moderately high to high permeability that were formed along glacial eskers and kame terraces. The Lamoine-Buxton-Scantic complex soils are characterized as silt loam and silty clay, somewhat poorly drained soils with very low to moderately high permeability that were formed along coastal plains. Site soils are shown on Figure 4.

TTL completed a geotechnical investigation of the Site in June 2015. Soils were characterized as sand and silty sand to at least 12 feet below ground surface (bgs) in the northern portion of the Site and sandy clay to at least 12 feet bgs in the southern portion of the Site.

In a letter dated July 30, 2015, the Washington County Soil and Water Conservation District (WCSWCD) stated that they do not anticipate any potential environmental concerns or issues related to the Preferred Action Alternative.

3.5.1 Prime and Unique Farmland Soils

Prime and Unique Farmlands are regulated in accordance with the Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) (7 USC 4201, et seq.) to ensure preservation of agricultural lands that are of statewide or local importance. Soils designated as prime farmland are capable of producing high yields of various crops when managed using modern farming methods. Prime farmland is land that has the best combination of physical and chemical characteristics for producing food, feed, fiber, forage, oilseed, and other agricultural crops with minimum inputs of fuel, fertilizer, pesticides, and labor, and without intolerable soil erosion. Unique farmlands are also capable of sustaining high crop yields and have special combinations of favorable soil and climate characteristics that support specific high-value foods or crops.

According to the USDA NRCS Web Soil Survey, the Site soils are characterized as farmland of statewide importance.
3.5.2 Soil Erosion and Stormwater Management

The National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit process was initiated by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act amendments of 1972. The purpose of the program is to control the discharge of pollutants into surface waters by imposing effluent limitations to protect the environment. Authority to administer this program was delegated to the State of Maine by the USEPA in October of 1973. Currently, authority for NPDES permit issuance rests with the MDEP Waste Discharge Program. The wastewater discharge law requires that a license (NPDES Permit) be obtained for the discharge of pollutants to a stream, river, wetland, or lake of the state, or to the ocean. The NPDES program is intended to control direct discharge into the surface waters of the State by imposing effluent limits and other conditions necessary to meet State and Federal requirements. Construction projects that propose to disturb more than one acre of the ground surface must obtain and comply with the MDEP NPDES General Permit for Stormwater Discharges Associated with Construction Activity. In addition, Maine’s Stormwater Management Law provides stormwater standards for projects located in organized areas that include one acre of more of disturbed area.

3.5.3 Effects of the Preferred Action Alternative

The development and operation of a National Veterans Burial Ground on the Site would produce less-than-significant geology and soils effects, as discussed below.

No significant changes to topography or drainage are expected at the Site due to the development of a National Veterans Burial Ground. The cemetery development would be designed in concert with the nature topography. No significant cutting or filling is anticipated.

Less-than-significant impacts to geology would be anticipated. Based on the results of the onsite geotechnical investigation, soils at the Site are suitable for the Proposed Action.

No active significant faults are known to extend through the Site’s subsurface geology. As such, no impacts associated with seismic hazards are identified. No significant impacts to mineral resources are anticipated, as the proposed cemetery would not involve the commercial extraction of mineral resources, nor affect mineral resources considered important on a local, State, national, or global basis.

During construction of the National Veterans Burial Ground, less-than-significant, direct and indirect, short-term soil erosion and sedimentation (E&S) impacts would be possible. Construction activities would remove the current vegetative cover, disturb the soil surface, and compact the soil. The soil would then be susceptible to erosion by wind and surface runoff.

Exposure of the soils during construction has the potential to result in offsite discharges of sediment-laden runoff. However, such potential adverse E&S effects would be prevented through utilization of appropriate BMPs and adherence to the terms of the MDEP NPDES Stormwater Discharge General Permit Associated with Construction Activity (General Permit) and Maine’s Stormwater Management Law. Permit standards would be adhered to during all construction activities.

No long-term E&S impacts would be anticipated due to the nature of the Proposed Action. No long-term soil erosion impacts would occur as a result of increased impervious surfaces onsite; there would be limited impervious surfaces associated with the cemetery development and long-term soil erosion impact would be managed by maintaining stormwater features as part of future development of the Site as a National Veterans Burial Ground. On-site stormwater retention will be included in the cemetery design.
The Proposed Action would irreversibly convert approximately six acres of soil statewide importance into nonagricultural use. As such, the Proposed Action is subject to the FPPA requirements. VA would be required to complete, in conjunction with the NRCS, a Farmland Conversion Impact Rating (Form AD-1006) for the Preferred Action Alternative. This process evaluates the relative value of the Site as farmland compared to other farmland in the area and assesses the site by examining the Site, surrounding areas, and the programs and policies of the State or local government agency. Based on the characteristics of the Site and surrounding area and the small amount of farmland soils that would be converted, the Preferred Action Alternative is anticipated to have a less-than-significant adverse impact on important farmland soils.

3.5.4 Effects of the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, no construction by VA would occur. The Site would likely remain unimproved and no impacts to soils, topography, or geology would occur.

3.5.5 Mitigation/Management Measures

No project-specific mitigation measures are required. To satisfy the requirements of FPPA, VA would complete Form AD-1006, Farmland Conversion Impact Rating, and submit the completed form to the local NRCS office.

Implementing BMPs to reduce E&S impacts during construction would further minimize the potential impacts on local soils and water quality. VA would develop, submit to MDEP, and have approved, an NPDES permit application. The NPDES permit would require stormwater runoff and erosion management using BMPs, such as earth berms, vegetative buffers and filter strips, and spill prevention and management techniques. The construction contractor would implement the following as appropriate and necessary to protect surface water quality, as part of the NPDES permit:

- Install and monitor erosion-prevention measures (BMPs), such as silt fences and water breaks, detention basins, filter fences, sediment berms, interceptor ditches, straw bales, rip-rap, and/or other sediment control structures; re-spread stockpiled topsoil; and seed/re-vegetate areas temporarily cleared of vegetation.

- Retain on-site vegetation to the maximum extent possible.

- Plant and maintain soil-stabilizing vegetation on disturbed areas.

- Use native vegetation to re-vegetate disturbed soils.

The construction contractor would obtain all required permits before any proposed construction activities commence and would adhere to permit conditions during all onsite construction activities.

If measures in the NPDES permit and BMPs are correctly utilized for site development, direct soil erosion and resulting indirect sedimentation impacts would be minimized to less-than-significant levels. Successful implementation of these measures would ensure that the Proposed Action is in compliance with State and Federal water quality standards and minimizes both the short- and long-term potential for erosion and sedimentation. Implementation of these measures would maintain identified impacts at less-than-significant levels by properly controlling and limiting soil erosion and sedimentation impacts.
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3.6 Hydrology and Water Quality

3.6.1 Surface Waters

The Site is located in the Indian River Watershed, part of the Eastern Coastal Watersheds of Maine. The Columbia Falls, Maine USGS Topographic Quadrangle indicates that the nearest surface water body is the Indian River, located approximately 900 feet west of the Site. The Indian River flows generally south to the Gulf of Maine/Atlantic Ocean, located approximately 4 miles south. No evidence of natural surface waters was observed on the Site or adjoining properties. A drainage ditch associated with Harrington Road is located along the southern site boundary.

In a letter dated July 30, 2015, the WCSWCD stated that they do not anticipate any potential environmental concerns or issues related to the implementation of the Preferred Action Alternative.

3.6.2 Groundwater

According to the Groundwater Atlas of the United States, the Site vicinity is underlain by crystalline rock aquifers. Groundwater was not encountered in any of the soil borings completed at the Site by TTL in May 2015, which extended 12 feet bgs. According to water well information provided by the Maine Geological Survey, bedrock aquifers in the Site vicinity are situated at least 160 bgs.

The Maine Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS), Division of Environmental Health (DEH) Drinking Water Program and Subsurface Water Unit stated that there are no records of regulated public water supplies or sewage disposal systems at the Site. The MDHHS DEH stated they were not aware of any concerns or issues related to the implementation the Proposed Action. In addition, the MDHHS stated that the installation of drinking (potable) water supply wells (public or private) require the use of a Maine-licensed well driller and the installation non-potable water supply wells do not require the use of a Maine-licensed well driller. No permit or reporting measures are required.

In a letter dated August 13, 2015, the Maine Department of Transportation (MDOT) stated that the Maine Geological Survey has mapped a “significant sand and gravel aquifer” (ID# 5958) along US Route 1 in the area of the Site.

3.6.3 Effects of the Preferred Action Alternative

Construction and operation of the National Veterans Burial Ground on the Site could produce less-than-significant hydrology and water quality effects, as discussed below.

Construction-related surface water impacts associated with the Preferred Action Alternative (associated with soil erosion and sedimentation) would be low as no significant grading of the Site is anticipated and there are no surface water resources at the Site or surrounding area.

VA would implement the BMPs described in Section 3.5.4 and 3.6.5 to control construction-related impacts of soil erosion and sedimentation, and would provide proper onsite stormwater management. Based on the geotechnical investigation, groundwater is greater than 12 feet bgs and likely would not be encountered during Site construction activities.

No significant long-term groundwater impacts are anticipated as a result of the Proposed Action. Based on standard modern burial practices, it is unlikely that embalming fluid or other decomposition byproducts would be released into the soil and/or groundwater. The standard NCA design incorporates (for full casket burials) sub-surface concrete crypts, an entire section of which would be installed during site construction. Using this technique, the caskets are not
buried directly in the soil, but are rather set in a pre-placed concrete crypt (established turf and soil temporarily removed, crypt lid removed, casket placed, followed by the reverse process to complete). Modern embalming fluids are markedly less toxic as the primary active ingredients are no longer arsenic based. Additionally, as selection of either cremain interment or columbaria placement increase, the potential for soil or groundwater contamination commensurately decreases as no embalming fluids are used.

As part of the Proposed Action, VA would install an on-site water well to provide non-potable water for irrigation. According to the MDHHS DEH, only wells being installed for drinking water require the use of a licensed well driller and there are no permit requirements for wells from the State. The planned limited use of groundwater for irrigation of the cemetery would have a negligible impact on groundwater resources.

### 3.6.4 Effects of the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, no impacts to hydrology or water quality by VA would occur. The Site would likely remain unimproved and no hydrology or water quality impacts would be anticipated.

### 3.6.5 Mitigation/Management Measures

No project-specific mitigations measures are required. To minimize potential adverse impacts to water resources, VA would implement the following BMPs:

- Ensure the Site includes sufficient on-site stormwater management so as to not adversely affect the water quantity/quality in receiving waters and/or offsite areas.

- Implement BMPs to reduce soil erosion and sedimentation impacts as described in Section 3.5.4.

Implementation of these BMPs would ensure identified water resources impacts are maintained as less-than-significant levels.

### 3.7 Wildlife and Habitat

#### 3.7.1 Vegetation and Wildlife

Very little of the original natural vegetation communities, comprised of mixed coniferous and deciduous woods, are present on the Site. With the exception of the limited area of mature trees along the southern boundary near Harrington Road, the Site is grassy and overgrown land (fields and small Balsam Fir trees). The original woods and successive woods were likely harvested for timber during the time that paper companies owned the Site (1917 through 2001). Since that time, the small Balsam Fir trees have been harvested approximately every three years to make wreaths. The lands immediately adjacent to north, east, and west of the Site are also unimproved vacant land with limited natural forested areas that were formerly logged. The area to the south of the Site across Harrington Road contains mixed coniferous and deciduous wooded land, with three residential properties. On-site vegetation is typical of rural land cleared of trees and undergoing periodic brush harvesting and grass mowing. Such vegetation communities support wildlife species associated with rural areas in Maine.

#### 3.7.2 Threatened and Endangered Species

According to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Information for Planning and Conservation (IPaC) database, one Federally-listed endangered species (Atlantic Salmon) and one Federally-listed threatened species (Northern Long-Eared Bat) were identified in the Site vicinity. The nearest surface water body to the Site is the Indian River, located approximately...
900 feet west of the Site. Based on the distance between the Site and Indian River, it is unlikely that the Preferred Action Alternative would impact critical Atlantic Salmon habitats. The Northern Long-Eared Bat requires intact tracts of wooded land. Based on the disturbed nature of the Site and areas to the north, east, and south (with limited areas of mature trees), it is unlikely that the Northern Long-Eared Bat occurs at the Site or in the immediate Site vicinity or would be impacted by the Preferred Action Alternative.

As part of the preparation of this EA, the USFWS, Maine Department of Agriculture, Conservation & Forestry, Natural Areas Program (MNAP), Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife (MDIFW), and the WCSWCD were contacted to identify the potential presence of State or Federally-listed threatened or endangered species on or in the vicinity of the Site. The following provides a summary of the information provided by these agencies (please see Appendix A for these agencies’ complete responses):

- The USFWS, Maine Ecological Services Field Office stated that available information pertaining to threatened and endangered species is available in the Species List and Project Reviews application on their internet website (http://www.fws.gov/mainefieldoffice/Project%20reviews.html). As noted above, the USFWS IPaC database identified one Federally-listed endangered species (Atlantic Salmon) and one Federally-listed threatened species (Northern Long-Eared Bat) in the Site vicinity, which are unlikely to be impacted by the Preferred Action Alternative.

- The MNAP stated that are no known rare or unique botanical features documented in the Site area. The MNAP provided a list of six rare and exemplary botanical features within four miles of the Site. Five of the six features are associates with wetlands, which are not present at or adjacent to the Site. The sixth feature (Blinks, a Maine special concern species) requires a rocky coastal habitat, which also is not present at the site or surrounding area. Therefore, the Preferred Action Alternative is unlikely to impact rare and exemplary botanical features.

- The MDIFW stated three species of bat (Little Brown Bat, Northern Long-Eared Bat, and Eastern Small-Footed Bat, which are State threatened or endangered) are proposed to be listed under the Maine Endangered Species Act (MESA) and four species of bat (Red Bat, Hoary Bat, Silver-Haired Bat, and Tri-Colored Bat) are considered species of special concern. The MDIFW stated that it is likely that several of these species occur within the Site area during migration and/or breeding season and deferred to the guidance and recommendations of the USFWS regarding the bat species.

The MDIFW stated that there are no known Essential Habitats or Significant Wildlife Habitats (SWHs) within the project area. However, the MDIFW stated that surveys for Significant Vernal Pools are incomplete and recommended that surveys for vernal pools be conducted at the Site prior to project design to determine whether Significant Vernal Pools are present in the area. No wetlands or vernal pools were identified at the Site.

The MDIFW also provided general recommendations regarding mapped streams. The MDIFW recommended a 100-foot undisturbed vegetated buffer be maintained along streams. No streams are located on or adjacent to the Site.

- The WCSWCD stated that it considered Federally and State-listed threatened and endangered species, significant wildlife habitats, and migratory bird habitats and found no potential environmental issues or concerns related to the Preferred Action Alternative.
Based on the information received from the consulted agencies and the Site conditions and features, no Federal or State-listed threatened and/or endangered species or critical habitat for such species are likely to occur at the Site or adjacent areas.

3.7.3 Effects of the Preferred Action Alternative

Development and operation of a National Veterans Burial Ground on the Site is not likely to have significant biological resources effects. No Federal or State-listed threatened and/or endangered species or critical habitat for such species was identified for the Site or adjacent areas.

3.7.4 Effects of the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, no impacts to vegetation or wildlife habitat by VA would occur. The ongoing harvesting of Balsam Fir brush to make wreaths would have less-than-significant biological resources effects.

3.7.5 Mitigation/Management Measures

No project-specific mitigation measures are required. VA would implement the following BMPs to reduce biological resources impacts during construction and operation:

- Construction activities would be timed to avoid migratory birds on the Site and protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. This Act prohibits the taking of migratory birds, their nests, and eggs. Tree removal at the Site would be conducted outside the migratory bird nesting season of February through August so that nests are not disturbed. If it is not practical to clear the site outside of this timeframe, a qualified biologist would survey the Site prior to tree clearing to ensure that no active nests are disturbed.

- Although the Site and surrounding properties do not contain intact tracts of mature woods, several species of bat occur within the general Site area during migration and/or breeding season. To further minimize possible impacts to bats, VA would not clear the wooded areas at the Site during June or July (the bat migration and breeding season).

- Native species should be used to the extent practicable when re-vegetating land disturbed by construction to avoid the potential introduction of non-native or invasive species.

Implementation of these BMPs would ensure biological resources impacts are maintained at less-than-significant levels.

3.8 Noise

The existing noise environment around the Site is dominated by vehicle traffic along Harrington Road (U.S. Route 1). No other notable noise-generating sources are present in the immediate vicinity of the Site. As such, the Site's noise environment can be characterized as that typical of a rural area.

The Town of Jonesboro does not maintain noise regulations.

3.8.1 Effects of the Preferred Action Alternative

Construction and operation of a new National Veterans Burial Ground on the Site would produce less-than-significant noise effects, as discussed below.
Based on the proposed use of the Site as a cemetery, no long-term noise impacts would be anticipated. Noise generated from the Proposed Action would have short-term impacts to the existing noise environment due to construction activities onsite associated with the cemetery. Noise generating sources during construction activities would be associated primarily with standard construction equipment and construction equipment transportation. These increased noise levels could directly affect the neighboring area, including the three residential properties located approximately 200 to 400 feet south of the Site across Harrington Road; however, these increased noise levels would be less-than-significant and short term.

Construction activities generate noise by their very nature and are highly variable, depending on the type, number, and operating schedules of equipment. Construction projects are usually executed in stages, each having its own combination of equipment and noise characteristics and magnitudes. Construction activities are expected to be typical of other similar construction projects and would include mobilization, site preparation, excavation, placing foundations, utility development, heavy equipment movement, and paving roadways and parking areas.

The most prevalent noise source at typical construction sites is the internal combustion engine. General construction equipment using engines includes, but is not limited to: heavy, medium, and light equipment such as excavators; roller compactors; front-end loaders; bulldozers; graders; backhoes; dump trucks; water trucks; concrete trucks; pump trucks; utility trucks; and lube, oil, and fuel trucks.

Peak noise levels vary at a given location based on line of sight, topography, vegetation, and atmospheric conditions. In addition, peak noise levels would be variable and intermittent because each piece of equipment would only be operated when needed. However, peak construction noise levels would be considerably higher than existing noise levels. Relatively high peak noise levels in the range of 93 to 108 dBA (decibels, A-weighted scale) would occur within the active construction site, decreasing with distance from the construction areas. Table 1 presents peak noise levels that could be expected from a range of construction equipment during proposed construction activities.

Generally speaking, peak noise levels within 50 feet of active construction areas and material transportation routes would most likely be considered “striking” or “very loud”, comparable to peak crowd noise at an indoor sports arena. At approximately 200 feet, peak noise levels would be loud - approximately comparable to a garbage disposal or vacuum cleaner at 10 feet. At 0.25 mile, construction noise levels would generally be quiet enough so as to be considered insignificant, although transient noise levels may be noticeable at times.

Combined peak noise levels, or worst-case noise levels when several loud pieces of equipment are used in a small area at the same time as described in Table 1, are expected to occur rarely, if ever, during the project. However, under these circumstances, peak noise levels could exceed 90 dBA within 200 feet of the construction area, depending on equipment being used.

Although noise levels would be quite loud in the immediate area, the intermittent nature of peak construction noise levels would not create the steady noise level conditions for an extended duration that could lead to hearing damage. Construction workers would follow standard Federal Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) requirements to prevent hearing damage.

Areas that could be most affected by noise from construction include those closest to the construction footprint, including the three residential properties located approximately 200 to 400 feet south of the Site across Harrington Road. Indoor noise levels would be expected to be 15-25 decibels lower than outdoor levels.
Indirect impacts include noise from workers commuting and material transport. Area traffic volumes and noise levels would increase slightly as construction employees commute to and from work at the project area, and service vehicles (including trucks of various sizes) transit to and from the Site. Because trucks are present during most phases of construction and leave and enter the Site via local thoroughfares, truck noises tend to impact more people over a wider area. For this Proposed Action, persons in the residences near the Site would experience temporary increases in traffic noise during day-time hours. These effects are not considered significant because they would be temporary and similar to existing traffic noise levels in the area.

### Table 1. Peak Noise Levels Expected from Typical Construction Equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Peak Noise Level (dBA, attenuated)</th>
<th>Distance from Source (feet)</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>200</th>
<th>400</th>
<th>1,000</th>
<th>1,700</th>
<th>2,500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Truck</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td>84-89</td>
<td>78-93</td>
<td>72-79</td>
<td>66-71</td>
<td>58-63</td>
<td>54-59</td>
<td>50-55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dump Truck</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Mixer</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack-hammer</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scraper</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
<td>80-89</td>
<td>74-82</td>
<td>68-77</td>
<td>62-71</td>
<td>56-63</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulldozer</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
<td>87-102</td>
<td>81-96</td>
<td>75-90</td>
<td>69-84</td>
<td>61-76</td>
<td>57-72</td>
<td>53-68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generator</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crane</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td>75-88</td>
<td>69-82</td>
<td>63-76</td>
<td>57-70</td>
<td>49-62</td>
<td>45-48</td>
<td>41-54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loader</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td>73-86</td>
<td>67-80</td>
<td>61-74</td>
<td>55-68</td>
<td>47-60</td>
<td>43-56</td>
<td>39-52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grader</td>
<td>108</td>
<td></td>
<td>88-91</td>
<td>82-85</td>
<td>76-79</td>
<td>70-73</td>
<td>62-65</td>
<td>58-61</td>
<td>54-57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pile driver</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forklift</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Worst-Case Combined Peak Noise Level (Bulldozer, Jackhammer, Scraper)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Peak Noise Level</td>
<td>Distance from Source (feet)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>¼ Mile</td>
<td>½ Mile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Tipler 1976

Proposed operational activities at the National Veterans Burial Ground would include vehicle traffic to and from the cemetery, use of powered equipment for grave site preparation, maintenance, and upkeep, and period ceremonial rifle discharges. These activities would not produce excessive noise, and would not produce an adverse noise impact on surrounding land uses. The facility would be a relatively quiet cemetery.

### 3.8.2 Effects of the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, the noise environment surrounding the Site would not change. No significant noise impacts presently occur at the Site.

### 3.8.3 Mitigation/Management Measures

No project-specific mitigation measures are required. Implementing BMPs to reduce noise generated during construction would further minimize the potential impacts on the local noise environment. To minimize the potential for adverse, short-term noise impacts, the construction contractor would implement the following typical noise control BMPs, as applicable. These measures would be briefed to the contractor at the construction kick-off meeting, and daily at tailgate safety meetings. The onsite construction manager would be responsible to immediately address noise issues, if they arise.

- Via written notification, coordinate proposed construction activities in advance with nearby sensitive receptors (i.e., residential properties to the south of the Site). Via written notification, let local sensitive receptors know what operations would be
occurring at what times, including when they would start and when they would finish each day. Post signage, updated daily, at the entry points of the site providing current construction information, including schedule and activity.

- Limit, to the extent possible, construction and associated heavy truck traffic to occur between 8:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. on Monday through Friday, or during normal, weekday, work hours. This measure would reduce noise impacts during sensitive night-time hours.

- Locate stationary operating equipment as far away from sensitive receptors as possible.

- Select material transportation routes as far away from sensitive receptors as possible.

- Shut down noise-generating heavy equipment when it is not needed.

- Maintain equipment per manufacturer’s recommendations to minimize noise generation.

- Encourage construction personnel to operate equipment in the quietest manner practicable (e.g., speed restrictions, retarder brake restrictions, engine speed restrictions, etc.).

Implementation of these BMPs would maintain short-term noise impacts at less-than-significant levels for nearby sensitive receptors.

3.9 Land Use

The Site has been unimproved land since at least 1910. From 1917 to 2001, the Site was owned by various paper companies, who likely logged the Site one or more times. The Site is currently unimproved land that is wooded along its southern boundary, grassy in the central portion, and contains overgrown fields and small Balsam Fir trees in the remaining areas. Since 2001, the Balsam Fir brush at the site has been harvested approximately every three years to make wreaths for Wreaths Across America.

The areas located to the north, east, and west of the Site are unimproved wooded and vacant land that was also likely harvested for wood in the past. The area located to the south across Harrington Road is occupied by unimproved wooded land and three residences. The surrounding land uses are depicted on Figure 3.

Land use zoning for the Site and surrounding properties is regulated by the Town of Jonesboro. These areas are all currently zoned Residential.

3.9.1 Effects of the Preferred Action Alternative

The Jonesboro Land Use and Planning Ordinances are generic in nature and are designed to direct development within the Town to suit the services and capabilities of the community. No specific permitted uses are designated for its zoning districts. However, the use of the Site as a cemetery is generally compatible with the surrounding land uses and as a Federal agency, VA is not subject to local zoning regulations.

Short-term dust and noise from construction have the potential to adversely affect adjacent offsite areas and land uses, notably the nearby sensitive receptors. Potential air quality and noise effects to offsite land uses and sensitive receptors are discussed in Sections 3.3 and 3.8. BMPs would be used to reduce construction dust and noise emissions to the extent possible.
Implementation of these BMPs would result in a short-term, less-than-significant effects to adjacent land uses. No significant long-term noise or dust effects are anticipated.

### 3.9.2 Effects of the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, no land use impacts due to VA's Proposed Action would occur. The Site would likely continue to be used to harvest brush to make wreaths.

### 3.9.3 Mitigation/Management Measures

No project-specific mitigation or management measures are required.

### 3.10 Wetlands, Floodplains, and Coastal Zone Management

#### 3.10.1 Wetlands

This section discusses wetlands at or near the Site and surface waters (streams) as they pertain to wetlands. Additional information regarding surface waters is provided in Section 3.6.

Information provided by the USFWS Online Wetland Mapper indicates that no mapped wetlands are located on or near the Site. No wetlands, vernal pools, or other surface water features were identified at the Site or surrounding properties during the Site reconnaissance or from the resources consulted as part of this EA.

#### 3.10.2 Floodplains

According to available FEMA floodplain mapping, the Site and vicinity are not currently mapped for floodplains. Based on the distance (approximately 900 feet) of the Site to the nearest surface water (the Indian River) and the elevation difference between the Site and the Indian River (at least 35 feet), it is unlikely that the Site or adjacent properties would be classified as being included in the 100-year or 500-year floodplains.

#### 3.10.3 Coastal Zone

The Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) was promulgated to control nonpoint pollution sources that affect coastal water quality. The CZMA of 1990, as amended (16 USC 1451 et seq.) encourages States to preserve, protect, develop, and where possible, restore or enhance valuable natural coastal resources such as wetlands, floodplains, estuaries, beaches, dunes, barrier islands, and coral reefs, as well as the fish and wildlife using those habitats. According to the Maine Department of Agriculture, Conservation, and Forestry (MDACF), Jonesboro Township, which includes the Site, is located within the Maine Coastal Zone Boundary. The CZMA grants Maine the authority to review federal activities, federal license or permit activities, and federally funded activities to ensure that federal actions that may affect its coastal area meet the "enforceable policies" of the State's coastal program. The process by which a state decides whether a federal action meets its enforceable policies is called federal consistency review. The MDACF coordinates and provides a point of contact for federal consistency review in Maine. The Maine Guide to Federal Consistency Review lists the enforceable policies of Maine's Coastal Program and outlines the State's federal consistency review process. In Maine, standards and criteria of state environmental permitting and licensing laws and regulations serve as the enforceable policies of the Maine Coastal Program. Based on the location of the Site within Maine’s Coastal Zone, the Preferred Action Alternative would require a federal consistency review from the MDCAF.
3.10.4 Effects of the Preferred Action Alternative

No wetlands were identified on or adjacent to the Site and it is not likely that the Site is located in a 100-year or 500-year floodplain. No impacts to wetlands or floodplains would occur with the Preferred Action Alternative. The Site is located within the boundaries of the Maine Coastal Zone. Due to the distance of the site from Indian River (approximately 900 feet) and the Atlantic Ocean (approximately 3.5 miles) and the nature of the Proposed Action, the Preferred Action Alternative would not result in adverse impacts to Maine’s Coastal Zone; however, the MDACF requires a federal consistency review for any Federal project located within Maine’s Coastal Zone.

3.10.5 Effects of the No Action Alternative

No impacts to wetlands, floodplains, or coastal zones resources would occur.

3.10.6 Mitigation/Management Measures

No project-specific mitigation measures are required. However, VA would be required to obtain a federal consistency review from the MCDAF.

3.11 Socioeconomics

The following subsections identify and describe the socioeconomic environment of Washington County, Maine. Presented data provide an understanding of the socioeconomic factors that have developed the area. Socioeconomic areas of discussion include the local demographics of the area, regional and local economy, and local housing. Data used in preparing this section were collected from the 2010 Census of Population and Housing (US Census Bureau), subsequent US Census Bureau data, and the US Department of Commerce Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA).

3.11.1 Demographics

The Site is located in Jonesboro, Washington County, Maine. Washington County’s estimated population in 2014 was 31,808 citizens. The estimated population total for Maine was 1,330,089 residents in 2014. Population totals for the Washington County have decreased since 1990; while population totals for the State of Maine have increased slightly since 1990 (see Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2014 estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>1,227,928</td>
<td>1,274,923</td>
<td>1,330,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>35,308</td>
<td>33,941</td>
<td>31,808</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: US Census Bureau, Profile of General Demographic Characteristics - 2014 estimate.

Baseline information identified that Washington County and the State of Maine have similarly low minority populations (Table 3).
Table 3. Regional Population by Race and Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>All Individuals</th>
<th>White (%)</th>
<th>African-American (%)</th>
<th>American Indian and Alaska Native (%)</th>
<th>Asian or Pacific Islander (%)</th>
<th>Other Race (%)</th>
<th>Hispanic or Latino* (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>1,330,089</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>31,808</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The six percentages reported by the US Census Bureau for each geographic region may total more than 100% because individuals may report more than one race.

Source: US Census Bureau, Census, Profile of General Demographic Characteristics.

According to the 2009-2013 US Census statistics, Washington County has a slightly lower percentage of high school graduates and a lower percentage of persons with bachelor’s degrees or higher than the State of Maine as a whole. Educational attainment data are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Educational Attainment: Washington County and Maine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Attainment</th>
<th>Washington County (%)</th>
<th>Maine (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate (incl. equivalency)</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>91.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree or higher</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau, Census, Profile of General Demographic Characteristics.

3.11.2 Employment and Income

The region’s employment is primarily centered on healthcare and social assistance (30%), educational services (17%), retail trade (12%), accommodation and food services (7%), other services (5%), public administration (5%), and manufacturing (5%).

Incomes for Washington County are lower and poverty and unemployment rates are higher than Maine as a whole, as presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Regional Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Number of Households</th>
<th>Median Household Income ($)</th>
<th>Per Capita Income ($)</th>
<th>Population Below Poverty Level (%)</th>
<th>Unemployment Rate April 2015 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>553,823</td>
<td>48,453</td>
<td>26,824</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>14,209</td>
<td>37,236</td>
<td>20,807</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau, Census, Profile of General Demographic Characteristics.

3.11.3 Commuting Patterns

Residents of Washington County are largely dependent on personal automobiles for transportation to and from work. Local commuting times are approximately 19 minutes (one-
way) due to the large area and low population density of the region. Public transportation is not available in Washington County.

3.11.4 Housing

Rates of owner-occupied housing in Washington County and Maine as a whole are similar; however, median housing values in Washington County are lower than the rest of Maine (see Table 6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Total Housing Units</th>
<th>Occupied (%)</th>
<th>Owner-Occupied (%)</th>
<th>Median Value ($)</th>
<th>Renter-Occupied (%)</th>
<th>Median Contract Rent ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>723,128</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>174,500</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>22,937</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>103,500</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau, Census, Profile of General Demographic Characteristics.

3.11.5 Protection of Children

Because children may suffer disproportionately from environmental health risks and safety risks, EO 13045, *Protection of Children From Environmental Health Risks and Safety Risks*, was introduced in 1997 to prioritize the identification and assessment of environmental health risks and safety risks that may affect children and to ensure that Federal agencies’ policies, programs, activities, and standards address environmental risks and safety risks to children. This section identifies the distribution of children and locations where numbers of children may be proportionately high (e.g., schools, childcare centers, family housing, etc.) in areas potentially affected by the Proposed Action.

Children are not regularly present at the Site, which is unimproved land and contains no recreation areas. In addition, children are not regularly present on the neighboring properties except for the three residences located south of Harrington Road. The percentage of the population under age 18 is similar within Washington County and Maine (see Table 7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Total Population (2014 estimate)</th>
<th>Population Under 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>1,330,089</td>
<td>262,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>31,808</td>
<td>6,012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau, Census, Profile of General Demographic Characteristics.

3.11.6 Effects of the Preferred Action Alternative

The land acquisition and development of the proposed National Veterans Burial Ground at the Site is anticipated to result in minor short-term, direct, positive socioeconomic impacts to local employment and personal income. Development of the proposed National Veterans Burial Ground would potentially provide additional temporary construction jobs in the private sector, thus providing short-term socioeconomic benefit to the area. However, due to the intermittent and finite nature of this construction project, no long-term impacts to the construction labor force are anticipated. The Proposed Action would indirectly benefit the local economy through
the spending of business and personal income generated from the construction and operation of the proposed facility, along these impacts would be minor and less-than-significant. The Proposed Action would result in long-term significant positive socioeconomic impacts by providing a regionally proximate National Cemetery to US Veterans.

No adverse health or safety risks to children are anticipated to result from operation of the National Veterans Burial Ground. In addition, children would only be present at the Site as visitors. Construction areas would be secured to prevent unauthorized access by children. The construction contractor would limit and control construction dust and noise as discussed in Sections 3.3 and 3.8, thereby minimizing adverse effects to children, if any, in the area.

### 3.11.7 Effects of the No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would result in no increased short- or long-term socioeconomic benefit due to VA's action. Under this alternative, no new construction jobs would be created, and no additional incidental spending (e.g., at local restaurants, shops, and hotels) by an increased number of people potentially traveling to the National Veterans Burial Ground would occur.

Most importantly, the inability of VA to provide adequate regional burial sites commensurate with the need for these services would result in a significant adverse, long-term, impact to US Veterans. US Veterans would have to rely on regional cemeteries or travel a substantial distance (at least 100 miles) to the nearest National Cemetery (Togus National Cemetery in Togus, Maine and Mount Pleasant Cemetery Soldiers’ Lot in Augusta, Maine) or at least 100 miles to the nearest State Veterans Cemetery in Augusta, Maine.

### 3.11.8 Mitigation/Management Measures

No project-specific mitigation or management measures are required.

### 3.12 Community Services

The Site is located within the Jonesboro and Machias School Districts. Jonesboro includes one elementary school (kindergarten through eighth grade) and Machias supplements this with one high school. No public schools are located with one mile of the Site.

The Washington County Sheriff’s Department provides police protection to the Site and its vicinity. The Jonesboro Volunteer Fire Department provides fire protection and emergency medical services to the Site and its vicinity. The Maine Department of Transportation (MDOT) provides local road and bridge maintenance to the Site and its vicinity. No medical facilities are located within ten miles of the Site.

Public transportation in Washington and Hancock Counties is provided by the Washington Hancock Community Agency, SunRides Community Transit. Service is limited and generally only provides prearranged public transportation between cities, towns and villages. No public transportation is provided to the Site area.

There are no developed recreational facilities on or in the immediate vicinity of the Site.

### 3.12.1 Effects of the Preferred Action Alternative

Use of the Site as a National Veterans Burial Ground would have minimal community services effects. No significant additional load is expected to be placed on the fire or police departments as the result of the Proposed Action. Use of other public or community services as a result of the proposed National Veterans Burial Ground is not expected. As such, the Proposed Action is expected to have a negligible impact on local public services.
3.12.2 Effects of the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, no community services effects would be anticipated. The Site would likely remain unimproved with no community services impacts.

3.12.3 Mitigation/Management Measures

No mitigation or management measures are required.

3.13 Solid and Hazardous Materials

Hazardous and toxic materials or substances are generally defined as materials or substances that pose a risk (i.e., through either physical or chemical reactions) to human health or the environment. Regulated hazardous substances are identified through a number of Federal laws and regulations. The most comprehensive list is contained in 40 CFR 302, and identifies quantities of these substances, when released to the environment, that require notification to a Federal agency. Hazardous wastes, defined in 40 CFR 261.3, are considered hazardous substances. Generally, hazardous wastes are discarded materials (e.g., solids or liquids) not otherwise excluded by 40 CFR 261.4 that exhibit a hazardous characteristic (i.e., ignitable, corrosive, reactive, or toxic), or are specifically identified within 40 CFR 261. Petroleum products are specifically exempted from 40 CFR 302, but some are also generally considered hazardous substances due to their physical characteristics (i.e., especially fuel products), and their ability to impair natural resources.

TTL conducted a Phase I ESA for the Site on behalf of VA (TTL, dated August 2015). The Phase I ESA identified no significant hazardous substance or petroleum handling or storage at the Site and no recognized environmental conditions (RECs) at the Site.

3.13.1 Effects of the Preferred Action Alternative

The Preferred Action Alternative could result in short-term, less-than-significant adverse impacts due to the increased presence and use of solid and hazardous materials during construction of the cemetery. During construction, a small increase in construction vehicle traffic would increase the possibility of a release of vehicle operating fluids (e.g., oil, diesel, gasoline, antifreeze, etc.) and maintenance materials. As such, a less-than-significant, direct, short-term adverse impact is possible. Implementation of standard construction BMPs would serve to ensure this impact is further minimized.

No significant adverse long-term impacts during operation are anticipated; long-term operational solid and hazardous materials would be managed in accordance with applicable Federal and State laws. The Preferred Action Alternative would not result in a substantial increase in the generation of solid or hazardous substances or wastes, increase the exposure of persons to hazardous or toxic substances, increase the presence of hazardous or toxic materials in the environment, or place substantial restrictions on property use due to hazardous waste, materials, or site remediation. As noted in Section 3.6.3, based on standard modern burial practices, it is unlikely that embalming fluid would be released into the soil or groundwater.

3.13.2 Effects of the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, no actions by VA would occur. The Site would likely remain generally unused except for period brush harvesting, and no significant solid and hazardous materials use or effects would be anticipated.
3.13.3 Mitigation/Management Measures

No project-specific mitigation measures are required. Construction effects associated with the development of the cemetery would be minimized through BMPs. During operation, the National Veterans Burial Ground would comply with applicable Federal and State laws governing the use, generation, storage, or transportation of solid or hazardous materials.

3.14 Transportation and Parking

Access to the Site is currently provided directly from Harrington Road (US Route 1), located along the southern site boundary.

US Route 1 is a generally northeast - southwest oriented, two-lane, paved road near the Site with a current estimated Level of Service\(^1\) (LOS) rating of B or better. No LOS information was provided by MDOT or Washington County. MDOT reported that the 2012 annual average daily traffic (AADT) for US Route 1 at the intersection of Indian River Road, located approximately 2.25 miles west of the Site and the closest traffic count station to the site, was 7,520 vehicles. Local roadway characteristics are shown in Table 8.

Traffic in the Site area is regulated by MDOT. Under current conditions, US Route 1 operates above acceptable LOS ratings mainly due to the rural nature of the Site vicinity. MDOT stated that the Preferred Action Alternative would require a MDOT entrance permit to access the Site from US Route 1 (Harrington Road), including an evaluation of sight distances and other transportation safety considerations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Width (feet)</th>
<th>Lanes</th>
<th>2012 Average Daily Traffic (vehicles)</th>
<th>Level of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US Highway</td>
<td>Harrington Road (US</td>
<td>Northeast-Southwest</td>
<td>Site</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,520</td>
<td>B or better*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Route 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2012 AADT: MDOT
* - Estimated LOS based on site reconnaissance on August 18, 2015.

3.14.1 Effects of the Preferred Action Alternative

Construction traffic associated with VA’s proposed cemetery construction, consisting of trucks, workers’ personal vehicles, and construction equipment, would temporarily increase traffic volumes in the local area, but would not likely cause significant delays. Harrington Road is not heavily used and operate at estimated LOS of B or better. Thus, only less-than-significant, short-term adverse impacts would be anticipated.

During operation, public roadways in the vicinity of the proposed National Veterans Burial Ground would not experience significant additional traffic as a result of the National Cemetery. VA estimates that the National Veterans Burial Ground would be used every day throughout the year by approximately 20 visitors. VA anticipates that there would be approximately 2 to

\(^1\) **Level of Service** - LOS represents a set of qualitative descriptions of a transportation system’s performance. The Federal Highway Administration Highway Capacity Manual defines levels of service for intersections and highway segments, with ratings that range from A (best) to F (worst). Generally, a LOS of D or higher is considered acceptable by transportation planning agencies.
3 funeral processions per week (averaging 20 cars per procession). Based on the anticipated burial and visitation rates, VA estimates that the proposed National Veterans Burial Ground will generate about 40 vehicles (80 vehicle trips) per day on average.

Traffic associated with the National Veterans Burial Ground would likely be accommodated by Harrington Road and would likely occur outside of peak travel times.

Given the proposed operational use, traffic generated by the Proposed Action would occur throughout the day, every day. Visitors of the National Veterans Burial Ground would travel at various times during the day during daylight hours. No permanent staff would be present at the National Veterans Burial Ground. Contracted personnel would periodically travel to the Site for general maintenance and operations.

Based on the proposed maximum usage estimates, operational traffic would not produce a significant adverse impact to local traffic conditions as defined at 38 CFR 26(2)(ii); this regulation defines a significant traffic impact as “an increase in average daily traffic volume of at least 20 percent on access roads to the Site or the major roadway network.” The additional daily traffic associated with the Proposed Action (estimated 80 vehicle trips/day) would be an increase of approximately one percent over existing traffic conditions on US Route 1, much less than the 20 percent threshold that would indicate a potentially significant traffic impact. Although funeral processions could have some traffic impacts at peak times, the overall impacts would be less-than-significant.

No parking impacts are anticipated. Parking at the cemetery would be designed to accommodate all required parking on-site.

### 3.14.2 Effects of the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, no actions by VA would occur. The existing traffic conditions in the Site area would remain.

### 3.14.3 Mitigation/Management Measures

No project-specific mitigation measures are required. Implementing BMPs to reduce transportation impacts would further minimize the potential impacts on local roadways. As part of the Preferred Action Alternative, transportation impacts would be maintained at acceptable levels through implementation of the following BMPs:

- VA would obtain an MDOT entrance permit to access the Site from US Route 1 (Harrington Road), including an evaluation of sight distances and other transportation safety considerations. VA would coordinate with MDOT, as necessary, if any roadway improvements are needed.

- VA would ensure debris and/or soil is not deposited on local roadways during the construction of the cemetery.

- VA would ensure construction activities associated with the cemetery construction do not adversely affect traffic flow on local roadways; construction would be timed to avoid peak travel hours.

Implementation of these BMPs would ensure transportation impacts are maintained at less-than-significant levels by properly controlling and limiting impacts to local traffic and transportation infrastructure during cemetery construction and operation.
3.15 Utilities

Municipal water and sanitary sewer services are not available in the Site vicinity. Property owners rely on private water wells and septic systems. In addition, natural gas service is not available in the Site vicinity and property owners rely on alternative fuel sources (i.e., propane, heating oil, wood, etc.).

Emera Maine supplies the electric service to the Site vicinity. The electrical service in the Site vicinity is likely adequate for the Proposed Action.

Various companies provide telecommunication services to the Site vicinity. The Proposed Action would not require telecommunication services.

3.15.1 Effects of the Preferred Action Alternative

The only utility provided to the Site and necessary for the Proposed Action is electricity. The Preferred Action Alternative is anticipated to have minimal electrical service requirements; as such, no electric utility impacts are anticipated.

3.15.2 Effects of the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, no operations by VA would occur. No utility use at the Site would likely occur.

3.15.3 Mitigation/Management Measures

No project-specific mitigation or management measures are required.

3.16 Environmental Justice

In 1994, EO 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, was issued to focus attention of Federal agencies on human health and environmental conditions in minority and low-income communities and to ensure that disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on these communities are identified and addressed. In order to provide a thorough environmental justice evaluation, this socioeconomics’ presentation gives particular attention to the distribution of race and poverty status in areas potentially affected by implementation of the Proposed Action. For purposes of this analysis, minority and low-income populations are defined as:


- Low-Income Populations: Persons living below the poverty level, based on a total annual income of $24,250 for a family of four persons as reported by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services in January 2015.

The Site is not located in area with a disproportionate concentration of minority citizens relative to the remainder of Maine (see Section 3.11 for data and discussion). Average incomes are lower in Washington County than Maine as a whole; however, no low-income housing or specific low-income populations are located in the Site area.

3.16.1 Effects of the Preferred Action Alternative

Use of the Site as a National Veterans Burial Ground is not anticipated to have environmental justice effects. No specific concentrations of minority or low-income populations are located in
the Site vicinity. No local groups are known to principally rely on fish or wildlife for subsistence. Consequently, no impacts to such disadvantaged segments of the population are anticipated.

The Proposed Action is not likely to have an adverse effect on the local population; but is likely to have a minor short and long-term positive socioeconomic effect on local employment and personal income.

3.16.2 Effects of the No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, no operations by VA would occur at the Site, the Site would likely remain unimproved, and there would be no environmental justice effects.

3.16.3 Mitigation/Management Measures

No project-specific mitigation or management measures are required.

3.17 Cumulative Impacts

As defined by CEQ Regulations in 40 CFR Part 1508.7, cumulative impacts are those which "result from the incremental impact of the Proposed Action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions, without regard to the agency (Federal or non-Federal) or individual who undertakes such other actions." Cumulative impact analysis captures the effects that result from the Proposed Action in combination with the effects of other actions taken during the duration of the Proposed Action in the same geographic area. Because of extensive influences of multiple forces, cumulative effects are the most difficult to analyze.

NEPA requires the analysis of cumulative environmental effects of a Proposed Action, or set of actions, on resources that may often be manifested only at the cumulative level, such as traffic congestion, air quality, noise, biological resources, cultural resources, socioeconomic conditions, utility system capacities, and others.

The approximately six-acre Site is situated in a predominantly unimproved, rural area in Jonesboro, Washington County, Maine and is currently unimproved vacant land. The areas located adjoining to the north, east, and west of the Site are also unimproved wooded and vacant land, while the area adjoining to the south of the Site across Harrington Road is occupied by unimproved wooded land and three residences.

The ROI for the Site is mostly unimproved wooded and vacant land. There has been little recent development in the vicinity of the Site. No proposed additional development in the Site vicinity has been identified from resources consulted as part of this EA.

The Preferred Action Alternative would result in the impacts to the Site area identified throughout Section 3. These primarily include potential less-than-significant adverse impacts to aesthetics (long-term), air quality (short and long-term), geology and soils (short and long-term), hydrology and water quality (short and long-term), wildlife and habitat (short and long-term), noise (short-term), land use (long-term), coastal zones (short and long-term), solid and hazardous materials (short and long-term), and transportation (short and long-term). All of these impacts are less-than-significant and would be further reduced through careful coordination and implementation of the general BMPs and management measures, and compliance with regulatory requirements as identified throughout Section 3. Given the nature of the Proposed Action and the area surrounding the Site, no significant cumulative adverse effects to any of these resource areas are anticipated.
No adverse effects to wetlands, floodplains, socioeconomics, community services, parking, utilities, or environmental justice would occur. As such, no cumulative adverse effects to any of these resource areas are anticipated.

No significant adverse cumulative impacts to the environment, induced by changes at the Site are anticipated within the region. Close coordination between VA and State and local representatives would serve to manage and control cumulative effects within the region. Implementation of land use and resource management plans would serve to control the extent of environmental impacts, and proper planning would ensure future socioeconomic conditions maintain, if not improve the local standard of living. Implementation of effective resource management plans and programs should minimize or eliminate any potential cumulative degradation of the natural ecosystem.

Under the No Action Alternative, no cumulative impacts are anticipated.

3.18 Potential for Generating Substantial Public Controversy

As discussed in Section 4.0, VA has solicited input from various Federal, State, and local government agencies regarding the Proposed Action. Several of these agencies have provided input. None of the government agency input has identified opposition or controversy related to the Proposed Action or the Preferred Action Alternative.

Based on the significant positive effects of the Proposed Action and the findings of this EA (no significant adverse environmental impact), it is not anticipated that there will be substantial public controversy regarding the Proposed Action or the Preferred Action Alternative. VA published and distributed the Draft EA for a 30-day public comment period; no comments were received from the public.
SECTION 4: PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

4.1 Public and Agency Involvement

The VA invites public participation in decision-making on new proposals through the NEPA process. Public participation with respect to decision-making on the Proposed Action is guided by 38 CFR Part 26, the VA’s policy for implementing the NEPA. Additional guidance is provided in the VA’s NEPA Interim Guidance for Projects (VA 2010). Consideration of the views and information of all interested persons promotes open communication and enables better decision-making. Agencies, organizations, and members of the public with a potential interest in the Proposed Action, such as minority, low-income, and disadvantaged persons, are urged to participate. A record of agency coordination and public involvement associated with this EA is provided in Appendix A and Appendix E, respectively.

4.1.1 Public Review

VA, as the Federal proponent of this Proposed Action, published and distributed the Draft EA for a 30-day public comment period as announced by a Notice of Availability (NOA) published in the Machias Valley News Observer on December 23 and 30, 2015 and January 6, 2016. A copy of the Draft EA was also made available for public review at the Porter Memorial Library in Machias, Maine. VA also made a copy of the Draft EA available for download via a link on the VA internet website (http://www.cem.va.gov/EA.asp). VA received no public comments during the public review of the Draft EA.

4.1.2 Agency Coordination

Interagency and Intergovernmental Coordination for Environmental Planning (IICEP) is a federally mandated process for informing and coordinating with other governmental agencies regarding Federal Proposed Actions. CEQ Regulations require intergovernmental notifications prior to making any detailed statement of environmental impacts. Through the IICEP process, the VA notifies relevant Federal, State, and local agencies and allows them sufficient time to make known their environmental concerns specific to a Proposed Action. Comments and concerns submitted by these agencies during the IICEP process are subsequently incorporated into the analysis of potential environmental impacts conducted as part of the EA. This coordination fulfills requirements under EO 12372 (superseded by EO 12416, and subsequently supplemented by EO 13132), which requires Federal agencies to cooperate with and consider State and local views in implementing a Federal proposal. It also constitutes the IICEP process for this EA.

VA consulted with the following agencies during the preparation of this EA: the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS); US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA); US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE); United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS); Maine Department of Environmental Protection (MDEP); Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife (MDIFW); Maine Department of Agriculture, Conservation, and Forestry (MDACF); Maine Department of Transportation (MDOT); Maine Historic Preservation Commission (SHPO); Maine Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS); Maine Association of Conservation Districts (MACD); Washington County Administration; and the Town of Jonesboro.
Received agency information and comments have been fully incorporated and addressed in this EA. Copies of relevant correspondence can be found in Appendix A.

VA received responses from the following agencies: USFWS, SHPO, MDOT, MNAP, MDIFW, MDHHS, and WCSWCD. Input provided by these agencies is detailed in the appropriate resource sub-sections of Section 3.

4.1.3 Native American Consultation

For proposed actions, Federal agencies are required to consult with federally recognized Native American Tribes in accordance with the NEPA, the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), and Executive Order (EO) 13175. VA identified four Native American Tribes as having possible ancestral ties to the Proposed Action’s ROI and invited each Tribe to provide input on this Proposed Action (Appendix B). As of the date of this EA, no response was received from the Tribes (VA 2016).
SECTION 5: MANAGEMENT AND MINIMIZATION MEASURES

This section summarizes the management and minimization measures, if any, identified in Section 3 that are proposed to minimize and maintain adverse effects of the Preferred Action Alternative at acceptable, less-than-significant levels.

Per established protocols, procedures, and requirements, the construction contractor would implement BMPs and would satisfy all applicable regulatory requirements in association with the design, construction, and operation of the Preferred Action Alternative site. These “management measures” are described in this EA, and are included as components of each of the alternatives. “Management measures” are defined as routine BMPs and/or regulatory compliance measures that are regularly implemented as part of proposed activities, as appropriate, across Maine. In general, implementation of such management measures, as identified throughout Section 3, would maintain impacts at acceptable levels for all resource areas analyzed. These are different from “mitigation measures,” which are defined as project-specific requirements, not routinely implemented as part of development projects, necessary to reduce identified potentially significant adverse environmental impacts to less-than-significant levels.

No project-specific mitigation measures are required for the Preferred Action Alternative.

The routine BMP and minimization measures summarized in Table 9 would be included in the Preferred Action Alternative to minimize and maintain adverse effects at less-than-significant levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Resource Area</th>
<th>Best Management Practice/Minimization Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>Comply, to the extent practicable, with Jonesboro Land Use and Planning Ordinances during the cemetery design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Use appropriate dust suppression methods during onsite construction activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comply with Federal requirements pertaining to greenhouse gases and implement a site design that minimizes greenhouse gas emissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comply with the Maine Protection and Improvement of Air Statutes and Maine Department of Environmental Protection (MDEP) Air Rules. Secure any required, individual minor air emissions permits from the MDEP, as appropriate and prior to construction activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Should human remains or other cultural items as defined by the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) be discovered during project construction, the construction contractor would immediately cease work until VA, a qualified archaeologist, and the SHPO are contacted to properly identify and appropriately treat discovered items in accordance with applicable State and Federal law(s).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 9. Best Management Practices and Minimization Measures
Incorporated into the Proposed Action (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Resource Area</th>
<th>Best Management Practice/Minimization Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geology, Topography, and Soils</strong></td>
<td>Control soil erosion and sedimentation impacts during construction by implementing erosion prevention measures and complying with the MDEP National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting process. Prior to construction, VA would develop, submit to MDEP, and have approved, an NPDES plan. The MDEP NPDES permit would require stormwater runoff and erosion management using BMPs, such as earth berms, vegetative buffers and filter strips, and spill prevention and management techniques. The construction contractor would implement the following as appropriate and necessary to protect surface water quality, as part of the MDEP NPDES permit:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Install and monitor erosion-prevention measures, such as silt fences and water breaks, detention basins, filter fences, sediment berms, interceptor ditches, straw bales, rip-rap, and/or other sediment control structures; re-spread stockpiled topsoil; and seed/re-vegetate areas temporarily cleared of vegetation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Retain on-site vegetation to the maximum extent possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Plant and maintain soil-stabilizing vegetation on disturbed areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>– Use native vegetation to re-vegetate disturbed soils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Document impacts to prime and unique farmland in accordance with the Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) by completing and submitting Form AD-1006 to the local Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hydrology and Water Quality</strong></td>
<td>Control soil erosion and sedimentation impacts during construction by complying with the MDEP NPDES permit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure the site includes sufficient on-site stormwater management so as not to adversely affect the water quantity/quality in receiving water and/or offsite areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wildlife and Habitat</strong></td>
<td>Construction activities would be timed to avoid migratory birds on the Site protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Tree removal at the Site would be conducted outside the migratory bird nesting season of February through August so that nests are not disturbed. If it is not practical to clear the site outside of this timeframe, a qualified biologist would survey the Site prior to tree clearing to ensure that no active nests are disturbed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tree clearing activities would not be conducted during the bat migration and breeding season (June and July).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native species should be used to the extent practicable when re-vegetating land disturbed by construction to avoid the potential introduction of non-native or invasive species.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Resource Area</td>
<td>Best Management Practice/Minimization Measure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Via written notification, coordinate proposed construction activities in advance with nearby sensitive receptors (i.e., residential properties located approximately 200 to 400 feet south of the Site). Via written notification, let local sensitive receptors know what operations would be occurring at what times, including when they would start and when they would finish each day. Post signage, updated daily, at the entry points of the site providing current construction information, including schedule and activity. Limit, to the extent possible, construction and associated heavy truck traffic to occur between 8:00 a.m. and 6:00 p.m. Locate stationary operating equipment as far away from sensitive receptors as possible. Select material transportation routes as far away from sensitive receptors as possible. Shut down noise-generating heavy equipment when it is not needed. Maintain equipment per manufacturer’s recommendations to minimize noise generation. Encourage construction personnel to operate equipment in the quietest manner practicable (e.g., speed restrictions, retarder brake restrictions, engine speed restrictions, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>None required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands, Floodplains, and Coastal Zone Management</td>
<td>Obtain a federal consistency review from the Maine Department of Agriculture, Conservation, and Forestry (MCDAF) based on the Site’s location within a designated Maine Coastal Zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomics</td>
<td>None required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Services</td>
<td>None required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid and Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>Comply with applicable Federal and State laws governing the use, generation, storage, or transportation of solid or hazardous materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Parking</td>
<td>Obtain a Maine Department of Transportation (MDOT) entrance permit to access the Site from US Route 1, including an evaluation of sight distances and other transportation safety considerations. Coordinate with MDOT, as necessary, if any roadway improvements are needed. Ensure construction activities associated with cemetery construction do not adversely affect traffic flow on local roadways; construction would be timed to avoid peak travel hours. Ensure debris and/or soil is not deposited on local roadways during the construction of the cemetery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>None required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Justice</td>
<td>None required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 6: CONCLUSIONS

This EA evaluates the Proposed Action of the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) to acquire, develop, operate, and maintain a site in Washington County, Maine as a new National Veterans Burial Ground (rural National Veterans Cemetery). This EA discusses two alternatives: (1) Preferred Action Alternative – Acquire approximately six acres of unimproved land located on the northern side of Harrington Road (US Route 1), approximately 2.25 miles east of intersection of Harrington Road and Indian River Road (Route 187) in Jonesboro, Washington County, Maine, to develop, operate, and maintain as a new National Veterans Burial Ground; and (2) the No Action Alternative. This EA evaluates possible effects to aesthetics; air quality; cultural resources; geology and soils; hydrology and water quality; wildlife and habitat; noise; land use; floodplains, wetlands, and coastal zone management; socioeconomics; community services; solid and hazardous materials; transportation and parking; utilities; and environmental justice. The EA concludes there would be no significant adverse impact, either individually or cumulatively, to the local environment or quality of life associated with implementing the Preferred Action Alternative, provided the management measures and best management practices identified in this EA are implemented. Therefore, this EA concludes that a FONSI is appropriate, and that an EIS is not required.
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### SECTION 9: LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACA</td>
<td>Air Compliance Assurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACHP</td>
<td>Advisory Council on Historic Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA</td>
<td>Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIRFA</td>
<td>American Indian Religious Freedom Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amsl</td>
<td>above mean sea level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARPA</td>
<td>Archaeological Resources Protection Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEA</td>
<td>Bureau of Economic Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMP</td>
<td>Best Management Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAA</td>
<td>Clean Air Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERCLA</td>
<td>Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQ</td>
<td>Council on Environmental Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFR</td>
<td>Code of Federal Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMP</td>
<td>Coastal Management Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Carbon Monoxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWA</td>
<td>Clean Water Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZARA</td>
<td>Coastal Zone Act Reauthorization Amendments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZMA</td>
<td>Coastal Zone Management Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;S</td>
<td>Erosion and Sedimentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Environmental Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDR</td>
<td>Environmental Data Resources, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EO</td>
<td>Executive Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESA</td>
<td>Endangered Species Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMA</td>
<td>Federal Emergency Management Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRM</td>
<td>Flood Insurance Rate Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FONSI</td>
<td>Finding of No Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPPA</td>
<td>Farmland Protection Policy Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS</td>
<td>Feasibility Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>Geographic Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAP</td>
<td>Hazardous Air Pollutant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IICEP</td>
<td>Interagency and Intergovernmental Coordination for Environmental Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Level of Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACD</td>
<td>Maine Association of Conservation Districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDACF</td>
<td>Maine Department of Agriculture, Conservation, and Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDEP</td>
<td>Maine Department of Environmental Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDHHS</td>
<td>Maine Department of Health and Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDIFW</td>
<td>Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDOT</td>
<td>Maine Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAAQS</td>
<td>National Ambient Air Quality Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAGPRA</td>
<td>Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPA</td>
<td>National Environmental Policy Act of 1969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHPA</td>
<td>National Historic Preservation Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOA</td>
<td>Notice of Availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOAA</td>
<td>National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOx</td>
<td>Nitrogen Oxides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPDES</td>
<td>National Pollution Discharge Elimination System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPS</td>
<td>National Park Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRCS</td>
<td>Natural Resources Conservation Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRHP</td>
<td>National Register of Historic Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWI</td>
<td>National Wetland Inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O3</td>
<td>Ozone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSHA</td>
<td>Occupational Safety and Health Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pb</td>
<td>Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBF</td>
<td>Public Buildings and Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Particulate matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ppm</td>
<td>parts per million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTE</td>
<td>Potential to emit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCRA</td>
<td>Resource Conservation and Recovery Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>Remedial Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROD</td>
<td>Record of Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RONA</td>
<td>Record of Non-applicability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFHA</td>
<td>Special Flood Hazard Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHPO</td>
<td>Maine Historic Preservation Commission (State Historic Preservation Office)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIP</td>
<td>State Implementation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO₂</td>
<td>Sulfur dioxide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWPPP</td>
<td>Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPY</td>
<td>Tons per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USACE</td>
<td>United States Army Corps of Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USC</td>
<td>United States Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USEPA</td>
<td>United States Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USFWS</td>
<td>United States Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USGS</td>
<td>United States Geological Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Department of Veterans Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCA</td>
<td>Washington County Administration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 10: AGENCIES AND INDIVIDUALS CONSULTED

Agencies Consulted

**U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service**
**Maine Ecological Services Field Office**
17 Godfrey Drive, Suite 2 -
Orono, Maine 04473-3702 -
Phone: (207) 866-3344 -

**US Environmental Protection Agency, Region 1/New England**
5 Post Office Square, Suite 100 -
Boston, Massachusetts 02109-3912 -
Phone: (617) 918-1111 -

**US Army Corps of Engineers – New England District**
Public Affairs Office -
696 Virginia Road -
Concord, Massachusetts 01742 -
Phone: (978) 318-8238 -

**Maine Department of Environmental Protection**
Bangor – Eastern Maine Regional Office -
106 Hogan Road -
Bangor, Maine 04401 -
Phone: (207) 941-4570 -

**Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife**
41 State House Station -
Augusta, Maine 04333-0041 -
Phone: (207) 287-8000 -

**Maine Department of Agriculture, Conservation, and Forestry**
18 Elkins Lane, Harlow Building -
Augusta, Maine 04333-0022 -
Phone: (207) 287-3200 -

**Maine Department of Transportation, Region 4**
219 Hogan Road -
Bangor, Maine 04401-5603 -
Phone: (207) 941-4500 -

**Maine Historic Preservation Commission (SHPO)**
55 Capitol Street -
65 State House Station -
Augusta, Maine 04333-0065 -
Phone: (207) 287-2132 -

**Maine Department of Health and Human Services**
**Maine Drinking Water Program**
Mr. Roger L. Crouse -
286 Water Street, 3rd Floor -
#11 State House Station -
Augusta, Maine 04333-0011 -
Phone: (207) 287-5684 -

**Natural Resources Conservation Service**
**Machias Service Center**
8 M & M Place, Suite 5 -
Machias, Maine 04654 -
Phone: (207) 255-3612 -

**Maine Association of Conservation Districts**
Washington County Soil and Water Conservation District -
51 Court Street -
P.O. Box 121 -
Machias, Maine 04654 -
Phone: (207) 255-4659 -

**Washington County Administration**
P.O. Box 297 -
85 Court Street -
Machias, Maine 04654 -
Phone: (207) 255-3127 -

**Town of Jonesboro**
P.O. Box 86 -
Jonesboro, Maine 04648 -
Phone: (207) 434-5141 -
List of Tribes Consulted

**Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians of Maine**
Attn: Ms. Sharri Venno, NAGPRA Contact  
88 Bell Road  
Littleton, Maine 04730

**Aroostook Band of Micmacs**
Attn: Ms. Donna Augustine, NAGPRA Contact  
7 Northern Road  
Presque Isle, Maine 04769

**Penobscot Nation**
Attn: Mr. Arnold Neptune  
2 Sarah Springs Drive  
Indian Island, Maine 04468

**Passamaquoddy Tribe of Maine**
Attn: Mr. Roger Paul, NAGPRA Contact  
Indian Township Reservation  
P.O. Box 413  
Old Town, Maine 04468
SECTION 11: LIST OF ENVIRONMENTAL PERMITS REQUIRED

11.1 Regulatory Framework

This EA has been prepared under the provisions of, and in accordance with the NEPA, the CEQ Regulations Implementing the Procedural Provisions of NEPA, and 38 CFR Part 26. In addition, the EA has been prepared as prescribed in VA’s NEPA Interim Guidance for Projects (VA 2010b). Federal, State, and local laws and regulations specifically applicable to this Proposed Action are specified, where appropriate, within this EA, and include:

- Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973, as amended (7 USC 136; 16 USC 1531 et seq.).
- Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, as amended (NAGPRA) (25 USC 3001 et seq.).
- Federal Clean Air Act (CAA) of 1990 (42 USC 7401 et seq., as amended).
- Federal Clean Water Act (Federal Water Pollution Control Act) of 1948, as amended (1972, 1977) (33 USC 1251 et seq.); Sections 401 and 404.
- Executive Order 12898, Environmental Justice (11 February 1994).
- Servicemembers Civil Relief Act, also known as the Veteran’s Benefit Act of 2010, Public Law 111-275, Sec.503. Reports on Selection of New National Cemeteries (38 USC 2400).
- NCA Performance Plan of the 2013 VA Budget, Rural Initiatives Program.
- MDEP National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for General Construction Activity.
- Town of Jonesboro Land Use and Planning Ordinances.
11.2 Environmental Permits Required

In addition to the regulatory framework of the NEPA, the CEQ Regulations Implementing the Procedural Provisions of NEPA, 38 CFR Part 26, and VA’s NEPA Interim Guidance for Projects, the following Federal, State, and/or local environmental permits are required as part of this Proposed Action, and include:

- MDEP National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Stormwater Discharge General Permit Associated with Construction Activity (General Permit).
- Farmland Protection Policy Act Farmland Conversion Impact Rating (Form AD-1006).
- MCDAF Federal Consistency Review.
- MDOT Entrance Permit.
**100-Year Flood** - A flood event of such magnitude that it occurs, on average, every 100 years; this equates to a one percent chance of its occurring in a given year.

**Aesthetics** - Pertaining to the quality of human perception of natural beauty.

**Ambient** - The environment as it exists around people, plants, and structures.

**Ambient Air Quality Standards** - Those standards established according to the CAA to protect health and welfare (AR 200-1).

**Aquifer** - An underground geological formation containing usable amounts of groundwater which can supply wells and springs.

**Asbestos** - Incombustible, chemical-resistant, fibrous mineral forms of impure magnesium silicate used for fireproofing, electrical insulation, building materials, brake linings, and chemical filters. Asbestos is a carcinogenic substance.

**Attainment Area** - Region that meets the National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) for a criteria pollutant under the CAA.

**Bedrock** - The solid rock that underlies all soil, sand, clay, gravel and loose material on the earth's surface.

**Best Management Practices (BMPs)** - Methods, measures, or practices to prevent or reduce the contributions of pollutants to U.S. waters. Best management practices may be imposed in addition to, or in the absence of, effluent limitations, standards, or prohibitions (AR 200-1).

**Commercial land use** - Land use that includes private and public businesses (retail, wholesale, etc.), institutions (schools, churches, etc.), health services (hospitals, clinics, etc.), and military buildings and installations.

**Compaction** - The packing of soil together into a firmer, denser mass, generally caused by the pressure of great weight.

**Contaminants** - Any physical, chemical, biological, or radiological substances that have an adverse effect on air, water, or soil.

**Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ)** - An Executive Office of the President composed of three members appointed by the President, subject to approval by the Senate. Each member shall be exceptionally qualified to analyze and interpret environmental trends, and to appraise programs and activities of the Federal Government. Members are to be conscious of and responsive to the scientific, economic, social, aesthetic, and cultural needs of the Nation; and to formulate and recommend national policies to promote the improvement of the quality of the environment.

**Criteria Pollutants** - The CAA of 1970 required the USEPA to set air quality standards for common and widespread pollutants in order to protect human health and welfare. There are six "criteria pollutants": ozone (O3), carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur dioxide (SO2), lead (Pb), nitrogen dioxide (NO2), and particulate matter.

**Cultural Resources** - The physical evidence of our Nation's heritage. Included are: archaeological sites; historic buildings, structures, and districts; and localities with social significance to the human community.

**Cumulative Impact** - The impact on the environment that results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonable foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time (40 CFR 1508.7).
Decibel (dB) - A unit of measurement of sound pressure level.

Direct Impact - A direct impact is caused by a Proposed Action and occurs at the same time and place.

Emission - A release of a pollutant.

Endangered Species - Any species which is in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range.

Environmental Assessment (EA) - An EA is a publication that provides sufficient evidence and analyses to show whether a proposed system will adversely affect the environment or be environmentally controversial.

Erosion - The wearing away of the land surface by detachment and movement of soil and rock fragments through the action of moving water and other geological agents.

Farmland - Cropland, pastures, meadows, and planted woodland.

Fauna - Animal life, especially the animal characteristics of a region, period, or special environment.

Flora - Vegetation; plant life characteristic of a region, period, or special environment.

Floodplain - The relatively flat area or lowlands adjoining a river, stream, ocean, lake, or other body of water that is susceptible to being inundated by floodwaters.

FONSI - Finding of No Significant Impact, a NEPA document.

Fugitive Dust - Particles light enough to be suspended in air, but not captured by a filtering system. For this document, this refers to particles put in the air by moving vehicles and air movement over disturbed soils at construction sites.

Geology - Science which deals with the physical history of the earth, the rocks of which it is composed, and physical changes in the earth.

Groundwater - Water found below the ground surface. Groundwater may be geologic in origin and as pristine as it was when it was entrapped by the surrounding rock or it may be subject to daily or seasonal effects depending on the local hydrologic cycle. Groundwater may be pumped from wells and used for drinking water, irrigation, and other purposes. It is recharged by precipitation or irrigation water soaking into the ground. Thus, any contaminant in precipitation or irrigation water may be carried into groundwater.

Hazardous Substance - Hazardous materials are defined within several laws and regulations to have certain meanings. For this document, a hazardous material is any one of the following:

- Any substance designated pursuant to section 311 (b)(2)(A) of the Clean Water Act.
- Any element, compound, mixture, solution, or substance designated pursuant to Section 102 of Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA).
- Any hazardous substance as defined under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA).
- Any toxic pollutant listed under TSCA.
- Any hazardous air pollutant listed under Section 112 of CAA.
- Any imminently hazardous chemical substance or mixture with respect to which the EPA Administrator has taken action pursuant to Subsection 7 of TSCA.

The term does not include: 1) Petroleum, including crude oil or any thereof, which is not otherwise specifically listed or designated as a hazardous substance in above. 2) Natural gas, natural gas liquids, liquefied natural gas, or synthetic gas usable for fuel (or mixtures of natural gas and such synthetic gas). A list of hazardous substances is found in 40 CFR Part 302.4.

Hazardous Waste - A solid waste which, when improperly treated, stored, transported, or disposed of, poses a substantial hazard to human health or the environment. Hazardous wastes are identified in 40 CFR Part 261.3 or applicable foreign law, rule, or regulation.
Hazardous Waste Storage - As defined in 40 CFR Part 260.10, "... the holding of hazardous waste for a temporary period, at the end of which the hazardous waste is treated, disposed of, or stored elsewhere".

Hydric Soil - A soil that is saturated, flooded, or ponded long enough during the growing season to develop anaerobic (oxygen-lacking) conditions that favor the growth and regeneration of hydrophytic vegetation. A wetland indicator.

Indirect Impact - An indirect impact is caused by a Proposed Action that occurs later in time or farther removed in distance, but is still reasonably foreseeable. Indirect impacts may include induced changes in the pattern of land use, population density or growth rate, and related effects on air, water, and other natural and social systems. For example, referring to the possible direct impacts described above, the clearing of trees for new development may have an indirect impact on area wildlife by decreasing available habitat.

Industrial Land Use - Land uses of a relatively higher intensity that are generally not compatible with residential development. Examples include light and heavy manufacturing, mining, and chemical refining.

Isolated Wetland - Areas that meet the wetland hydrology, vegetation, and hydric soil characteristics, but do not have a direct connection to the Waters of the US.

Jurisdictional Wetland - Areas that meet the wetland hydrology, vegetation, and hydric soil characteristics, and have a direct connection to the Waters of the US. These wetlands are regulated by the USACE.

Listed Species - Any plant or animal designated as a State or Federal threatened, endangered, special concern, or candidate species.

Mitigation - Measures taken to reduce adverse impacts on the environment.

Mobile Sources - Vehicles, aircraft, watercraft, construction equipment, and other equipment that use internal combustion engines for energy sources.

Monitoring - A process of inspecting and recording the progress of mitigation measures implemented.

National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) - Nationwide standards set up by the USEPA for widespread air pollutants, as required by Section 109 of the Clean Air Act (CAA). Currently, six pollutants are regulated by primary and secondary NAAQS: carbon monoxide (CO), lead (Pb), nitrogen dioxide (NO2), ozone (O3), particulate matter, and sulfur dioxide (SO2).

National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) - U.S. statute that requires all Federal agencies to consider the potential effects of Proposed Actions on the human and natural environment.

Non-attainment Area - An area that has been designated by the EPA or the appropriate State air quality agency as exceeding one or more National or State ambient air quality standards.

Parcel - A plot of land, usually a division of a larger area.

Particulates or Particulate Matter - Fine liquid or solid particles such as dust, smoke, mist, fumes, or smog found in air.

Physiographic Region - A portion of the Earth's surface with a basically common topography and common morphology.

Pollutant - A substance introduced into the environment that adversely affects the usefulness of a resource.

Potable Water - Water which is suitable for drinking.

Prime Farmland - A special category of highly productive cropland that is recognized and described by the US Department of Agriculture's Soil Conservation Service and receives special protection under the Surface Mining Law.

Remediation - A long-term action that reduces or eliminates a threat to the environment.

Riparian Areas - Areas adjacent to rivers and streams that have a high density, diversity, and productivity of plant and animal species relative to nearby uplands.
**River Basin** - The land area drained by a river and its tributaries.

**Sensitive Receptors** - Include, but are not limited to, asthmatics, children, and the elderly, as well as specific facilities, such as long-term health care facilities, rehabilitation centers, convalescent centers, retirement homes, residences, schools, playgrounds, and childcare centers.

**Significant Impact** - According to 40 CFR Part 1508.27, "significance" as used in NEPA requires consideration of both context and intensity.

- **Context.** The significance of an action must be analyzed in several contexts such as society as a whole (human, national), the affected region, the affected interests, and the locality. Significance varies with the setting of the Proposed Action. For instance, in the case of a site-specific action, significance would usually depend upon the effects in the locale rather than in the world as a whole. Both short- and long-term effects are relevant.

- **Intensity.** This refers to the severity of impact. Responsible officials must bear in mind that more than one agency may make decisions about partial aspects of a major action.

**Small quantity generator** - A generator who generates greater than 220 pounds but less than 2,200 pounds of hazardous waste in a calendar month and who does not accumulate more than 13,200 pounds of hazardous waste at any one time (if either threshold is exceeded, the generator becomes a large quantity generator). A small quantity generator may accumulate hazardous waste up to 180 days from the accumulation start date.

**Soil** - The mixture of altered mineral and organic material at the earth's surface that supports plant life.

**Solid Waste** - Any discarded material that is not excluded by section 261.4(a) or that is not excluded by variance granted under sections 260.30 and 260.31.

**Threatened species** - Any species that is likely to become an endangered species within the foreseeable future throughout all or a significant portion of its range.

**Topography** - The relief features or surface configuration of an area.

**Toxic Substance** - A harmful substance which includes elements, compounds, mixtures, and materials of complex composition.

**Waters of the United States** - Include the following: (1) All waters which are currently being used, were used in the past, or may be susceptible to use in interstate or foreign commerce, including all waters which are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide. (2) All interstate waters including interstate wetlands. (3) All other waters such as intrastate lakes, rivers, streams (including intermittent streams), mudflats, sandflats, wetlands, sloughs, prairie potholes, wet meadows, playa lakes, or natural ponds; the use, degradation or destruction of which could affect interstate or foreign commerce.

**Watershed** - The region draining into a particular stream, river, or entire river system.

**Wetlands** - Areas that are regularly saturated by surface or groundwater and, thus, are characterized by a prevalence of vegetation that is adapted for life in saturated soil conditions. Examples include swamps, bogs, fens, marshes, and estuaries.

**Wildlife Habitat** - Set of living communities in which a wildlife population lives.
APPENDIX A

Agency Correspondence
Hi Paul:

In Maine the only wells that require a licensed driller are wells intended for use as a drinking water supply, both public and private. Irrigation wells, monitoring wells, etc., do not require a licensed driller. In addition, there are no permit requirements for wells at the State level, and very few municipalities require a permit for well installation. A quick call to the Town Office in the community you’re working in should answer that question.

If you are drilling monitoring wells for a client with suspected contamination you should contact the Maine Department of Environmental Protection as they may have some requirements.

www.maine.gov/dep/index.html
800-452-1942

I hope this answered your questions, let me know if you have any others.

Take Care/

David Braley, C.G.
Senior Environmental Hydrogeologist
Maine Center for Disease Control and Prevention
Division of Environmental Health
Drinking Water Program
Well Drillers Commission, and
Subsurface Wastewater Disposal

(207) 441-5324

david.braley@maine.gov

Visit us at: www.medwp.com

Confidentiality Notice: This e-mail message, including any attachments, is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient, or an authorized agent of the intended recipient, please immediately contact the sender by reply e-mail and destroy/delete all copies of the original message. Any unauthorized review, use, copying, disclosure, or distribution by other than the intended recipient or authorized agent is prohibited.
Can you take care of this?

---

From: Paul Jackson [mailto:pjacksontl@charter.net]
Sent: Wednesday, July 01, 2015 10:02 AM
To: Crouse, Roger
Subject: New Water Well

Mr. Crouse:
Could you please explain to me what the process would be for the installation of a new non-potable water well (irrigation)?
Looking at the Maine Drinking Water Program, it looks like the only requirement is the use of Maine Well Drillers Commission-licensed operator, but I’m wondering if there are other requirements, such as permits, notice of completion, etc.

Thanks,
Paul Jackson
Environmental Scientist
TTL Associates, Inc.
44265 Plymouth Oaks Boulevard | Plymouth, MI 48170 | www.ttlassoc.com
Direct: (734) 582-4960 | Fax: (734) 455-8608
August 13, 2015

TTL Associates, Inc.
Attn.: Paul J. Jackson, Environmental Scientist
44265 Plymouth Oaks Boulevard
Plymouth, MI 48170

RE: Maine Freedom of Access Act (“FOAA”) Request Dated July 17, 2015, for Property Located Along Route 1, Jonesboro

Dear Mr. Jackson:

On behalf of the Department of Health and Human Services, Division of Environmental Health (“Division”) I am responding to your above-referenced request.

Based upon the information you provided the subject property appears to be located at approximately 44°38’47” North, 67°39’39” West. It is my understanding from our correspondence that the property is presently undeveloped and has been so since at least 1910.

I have reviewed our Drinking Water Program and Subsurface Wastewater Team records for Jonesboro, specifically for this property.

- I did not locate any permits for onsite sewage disposal systems nor any related documents, for the subject property.
- I did not locate any documents related to a regulated public water supply for the subject property.

You asked for information this agency can provide on any of the following environmental issue areas at or in the vicinity of the subject property, including but not limited to:

- Potential environmental concerns or issues;

  **The Division of Environmental Health is not aware of any such issues.**

- Surface and groundwater resources, including streams, wetlands, floodplains, open water features, wells, and local aquifers;

  **The Division of Environmental Health is not aware of any issues related to these resources.**

- Federally or state listed threatened or endangered species, or any species proposed for such listing, or critical habitat for such species that may occur within a one-mile radius around the proposed site;

  **The Division of Environmental Health is not aware of any issues related to these resources.**

- Parks, nature preserves, conservation areas, designated wild or scenic rivers, migratory bird habitats, or special wildlife issues;

  **The Division of Environmental Health is not aware of issues related to these resources.**

- Natural resource issues;

  **The Division of Environmental Health is not aware of any such issues.**
Soils and geologic data, including lists of hydric soils;

*The Division of Environmental Health possesses no such information.*

Prime and unique farmland (National Resources Conservation Services (NRCS) only);

*The Division of Environmental Health is not aware of issues related to these resources.*

Traffic, noise, or socioeconomic concerns;

*The Division of Environmental Health is not aware of any such issues.*

Air quality concerns; and

*The Division of Environmental Health is not aware of any such issues.*

Additional environmental, cultural, land use, or socioeconomic information or concerns your agency may have with regard to the referenced site.

*The Division of Environmental Health has no such information or concerns.*

Feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

James A. Jacobsen, Environmental Specialist IV
Project Manager, Webmaster
Division of Environmental Health
Drinking Water Program
Subsurface Wastewater Unit
286 Water Street, Augusta, ME 04333
e-mail: james.jacobsen@maine.gov

xc: Jonesboro File

/jaj
July 22, 2015

Paul Jackson
TTL Associates, Inc.
44265 Plymouth Oaks Boulevard
Plymouth, MI 48170

RE: Information Request - Route 1 Project Review, Jonesboro

Dear Paul:

Per your request received July 01, 2015, we have reviewed current Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife (MDIFW) information for known locations of Endangered, Threatened, and Special Concern species; designated Essential and Significant Wildlife Habitats; and fisheries habitat concerns within the vicinity of the Route 1 Project Review in Jonesboro. For purposes of this review, we are assuming that the proposed development will also include the undeveloped and/or forested portion(s) of the project search area. Also, as project details are lacking and due to the general nature and scale of the map that was provided, our comments are non-specific and should be considered preliminary.

Our Department has not mapped any Essential Habitats in the project area that would be directly affected by your project.

**Endangered, Threatened, and Special Concern Species**

**Bats**

Of the eight species of bats that occur in Maine, four species are listed as Special Concern: red bat (*Lasiurus borealis*), hoary bat (*Lasiurus cinereus*), silver-haired bat (*Lasionycteris noctivagans*), and tricolored bat (*Perimyotis subflavus*). The three *Myotis* species of bats in Maine will soon be protected under Maine’s Endangered Species Act (MESA) and will be afforded special protection against activities that may cause “Take” (kill or cause death), “harassment” (create injury or significantly disrupt normal behavior patterns), and other adverse actions. MDIFW has the legal right, power, and authority to enforce MESA under 12 M.R.S § 12805. The three *Myotis* species include little brown bat (*M. lucifugus*, State Endangered); northern long-eared bat (*M. septentrionalis*, State Endangered); and eastern small-footed bat (*M. leibii*, State Threatened).

While a comprehensive statewide inventory for bats has not been completed, it is likely that several of these species occur within the project area during migration and/or the breeding season. Therefore, we will defer to guidance and recommendations provided from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Maine Field Office (Wende Mahaney, 207-866-3344), as the northern long-eared bat is also listed as a Threatened Species under the Federal Endangered Species Act.
Fisheries Habitat

Without project details, and due to the scale of the map that was provided, it is difficult to know what impacts your project may have on the mapped streams within the search area. That being said, MDIFW makes the following general recommendations as they pertain to streams.

We recommend that a 100-foot undisturbed vegetated buffer be maintained along these streams. Buffers should be measured from the edge of stream or associated fringe and floodplain wetlands. Maintaining buffers along coldwater fisheries is critical to the protection of water temperatures, water quality, and inputs of coarse woody debris necessary to support conditions required by brook trout. Stream crossings should be avoided, but if a stream crossing is necessary, or an existing crossing needs to be modified, it should be designed to provide adequate fish passage. Small streams, including intermittent streams, can provide crucial rearing habitat, cold water for thermal refugia, and abundant food for juvenile salmonids on a seasonal basis and undersized crossings may inhibit these functions. Generally, MDIFW recommends that all new, modified, and replacement stream crossings be sized to span 1.2 times the bankfull width of the stream. In addition, we generally recommend that stream crossings be open bottomed (i.e. natural bottom), although embedded structures which are backfilled with representative streambed material have been shown to be effective in not only providing habitat connectivity for fish but also for other aquatic organisms. We encourage you to contact our Region C Fisheries staff (207-434-5925) for crossing design recommendations that best maintain fish passage. Construction Best Management Practices should be closely followed to avoid erosion, sedimentation, alteration of stream flow, and other impacts to stream habitat. In addition, we recommend that any necessary instream work or work within 100 feet of streams occur between July 15 and October 1.

This consultation review has been conducted specifically for known MDIFW jurisdictional features and should not be interpreted as a comprehensive review for the presence of other regulated features that may occur in this area. Prior to the start of any future site disturbance we recommend additional consultation with the municipality, and other state resource agencies including the Maine Natural Areas Program and Maine Department of Environmental Protection in order to avoid unintended protected resource disturbance.

Please feel free to contact my office if you have any questions regarding this information, or if I can be of any further assistance.

Best regards,

John Perry
Environmental Review Coordinator
Environmental Review of Fish and Wildlife Observations and Priority Habitats

Project Name: Columbia Falls, Route 1 review (Version 1)

Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife

Projection: UTM, NAD83, Zone 19N

Date: 7/3/2015

ProjectPoints
- Deer Winter Area
- LURC p-fw
- Cooperative DWAs
- Seabird Nesting Islands
- Shorebird Areas
- Inland Waterfowl/Wading Bird
- Shoreland Zoning_Iwwh
- Tidal Waterfowl/Wading Bird
- Significant Vernal Pools
- Environmental Review Polygons

ProjectLines
- Roseate Tern
- Piping Plover/Least Tern
- Aquatic ETsc (2.5 mi review)
- Rare Mussels (5 mi review)
- Maine Heritage Fish Waters
- Arctic Charr Habitat
- E. Brook Trout Joint Venture Subwatershed Classification
- Redfin Pickerel/Swamp Darter Habitats (buffer100ft)
- Special Concern-occupied habitats(100ft buffer)
- Wild Lake Trout Habitats
Hi Paul,

Attached is MDIFW’s response to your request for information for the project in Jonesboro, ME. Please let me know if you need additional information. Also, any future requests should be sent to IFWEnvironmentalreview@maine.gov

Thank you,

John
August 13, 2015

Paul Jackson
TTL Associates, Inc.
44265 Plymouth Oaks Boulevard
Plymouth, MI 48170

RE: Information Request - Route 1 Project Review, Jonesboro

Dear Paul:

Per your request received July 21, 2015, we have reviewed current Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife (MDIFW) information for known locations of Endangered, Threatened, and Special Concern species; designated Essential and Significant Wildlife Habitats; and fisheries habitat concerns within the vicinity of the Route 1 Project Review in Jonesboro. For purposes of this review, we are assuming that the proposed development will also include the undeveloped and/or forested portion(s) of the project search area. Also, as project details are lacking, our comments are non-specific and should be considered preliminary.

Our Department has not mapped any Essential Habitats in the project area that would be directly affected by your project.

Endangered, Threatened, and Special Concern Species

Bats

Of the eight species of bats that occur in Maine, four species are listed as Special Concern: red bat (*Lasiurus borealis*), hoary bat (*Lasiurus cinereus*), silver-haired bat (*Lasionycteris noctivagans*), and tricolored bat (*Perimyotis subflavus*). The three *Myotis* species of bats in Maine will soon be protected under Maine’s Endangered Species Act (MESA) and will be afforded special protection against activities that may cause “Take” (kill or cause death), “harassment” (create injury or significantly disrupt normal behavior patterns), and other adverse actions. MDIFW has the legal right, power, and authority to enforce MESA under 12 M.R.S § 12805. The three *Myotis* species include little brown bat (*M. lucifugus*, State Endangered); northern long-eared bat (*M. septentrionalis*, State Endangered); and eastern small-footed bat (*M. leibii*, State Threatened).

While a comprehensive statewide inventory for bats has not been completed, it is likely that several of these species occur within the project area during migration and/or the breeding season. Therefore, we will defer to guidance and recommendations provided from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Maine Field Office (Wende Mahaney, 207-866-3344), as the northern long-eared bat is also listed as a Threatened Species under the Federal Endangered Species Act.
Significant Wildlife Habitat

At this time, MDIFW Significant Wildlife Habitat (SWH) maps indicate no known presence of SWHs within the project area, which include Waterfowl and Wading Bird Habitats, Deer Wintering Areas, Seabird Nesting Islands, Shorebird Areas, and Significant Vernal Pools. However, a comprehensive statewide inventory for Significant Vernal Pools has not been completed. Therefore, we recommend that surveys for vernal pools be conducted within the project boundary by qualified wetland scientists prior to final project design to determine whether there are Significant Vernal Pools present in the area. These surveys should extend up to 250 feet beyond the anticipated project footprint because of potential impacts to off-site Significant Vernal Pools, assuming such pools are located on land owned or controlled by the applicant. Once surveys are completed, our Department will need to verify vernal pool data sheets prior to final determination of significance.

This consultation review has been conducted specifically for known MDIFW jurisdictional features and should not be interpreted as a comprehensive review for the presence of other regulated features that may occur in this area. Prior to the start of any future site disturbance we recommend additional consultation with the municipality, and other state resource agencies including the Maine Natural Areas Program and Maine Department of Environmental Protection in order to avoid unintended protected resource disturbance.

Please feel free to contact my office if you have any questions regarding this information, or if I can be of any further assistance.

Best regards,

John Perry
Environmental Review Coordinator
Environmental Review of Fish and Wildlife Observations and Priority Habitats

Project Name: Columbia Falls, Route 1 review (Version 1)

© Miles Projection: UTM, NAD83, Zone 19N

Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife

Date: 7/23/2015

ProjectPoints

Deer Winter Area

LURC p-fw

Cooperative DWAs

Seabird Nesting Islands

Shorebird Areas

Inland Waterfowl/Wading Bird

Shoreland Zoning

Tidal Waterfowl/Wading Bird

Significant Vernal Pools

Environmental Review Polygons

Roseate Tern

Piping Plover/Least Tern

Aquatic ETSc (2.5 mi review)

Rare Mussels (5 mi review)

Maine Heritage Fish Waters

Arctic Char Habitat

E. Brook Trout Joint Venture Subwatershed Classification

Redfin Pickerel/Swamp Darter Habitats (buffer100ft)

Special Concern-occupied habitats(100ft buffer)

Wild Lake Trout Habitats
Dear Mr. Jackson,

The Maine Department of Transportation (MaineDOT) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs proposal to acquire 6 acres of land for the establishment of a National Veterans Burial Grounds along U.S. Route 1 west of Jonesboro. If the project proceeds, the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs will need to acquire an entrance permit from MaineDOT to access the site from U.S. Route 1. MaineDOT encourages the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs to begin the entrance permit process as soon as possible so that sight distance and other transportation safety considerations related to the entrance can be evaluated. MaineDOT would also like an opportunity to review the site's stormwater management plan to determine potential effects to the U.S. Route 1 drainage system.

In reviewing our records for U.S. Route 1 in this area, it appears that the Maine Geological Survey has mapped a "Significant sand and gravel aquifer, ID#5958" along U.S. Route 1 at the proposed site location.

If you have questions or would like additional information regarding our transportation infrastructure in the area please contact me. My direct line is (207)-941-4507.

Sincerely,

John Devin, P.E.
Region Engineer
MaineDOT
July 1, 2015

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Paul Jackson
TTL Associates, Inc.
44265 Plymouth Oaks Boulevard
Plymouth, ME 48170

Re: Rare and exemplary botanical features in proximity to: Project along Route 1, Jonesboro, Maine

Dear Mr. Jackson:

I have searched the Natural Areas Program’s Biological and Conservation Data System files in response to your request received July 1, 2015 for information on the presence of rare or unique botanical features documented from the vicinity of the project site in Jonesboro, Maine. Rare and unique botanical features include the habitat of rare, threatened, or endangered plant species and unique or exemplary natural communities. Our review involves examining maps, manual and computerized records, other sources of information such as scientific articles or published references, and the personal knowledge of staff or cooperating experts.

Our official response covers only botanical features. For authoritative information and official response for zoological features you must make a similar request to the Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife, 284 State Street, Augusta, Maine 04333.

According to the information currently in our Biological and Conservation Data System files, there are no rare botanical features documented specifically within the project area. This lack of data may indicate minimal survey efforts rather than confirm the absence of rare botanical features. You may want to have the site inventoried by a qualified field biologist to ensure that no undocumented rare features are inadvertently harmed.

If a field survey of the project area is conducted, please refer to the enclosed supplemental information regarding rare and exemplary botanical features documented to occur in the vicinity of the project site. The list may include information on features that have been known to occur historically in the area as well as recently field-verified information. While historic records have not been documented in several years, they may persist in the area if suitable habitat exists. The enclosed list identifies features with potential to occur in the area, and it should be considered if you choose to conduct field surveys.

This finding is available and appropriate for preparation and review of environmental assessments, but it is not a substitute for on-site surveys. Comprehensive field surveys do not exist for all natural areas in Maine, and in the absence of a specific field investigation, the Maine Natural Areas Program cannot provide a definitive statement on the presence or absence of unusual natural features at this site.
The Natural Areas Program is continuously working to achieve a more comprehensive database of exemplary natural features in Maine. We would appreciate the contribution of any information obtained should you decide to do field work. The Natural Areas Program welcomes coordination with individuals or organizations proposing environmental alteration, or conducting environmental assessments. If, however, data provided by the Natural Areas Program are to be published in any form, the Program should be informed at the outset and credited as the source.

The Natural Areas Program has instituted a fee structure of $75.00 an hour to recover the actual cost of processing your request for information. You will receive an invoice for $150.00 for two hours of our services.

Thank you for using the Natural Areas Program in the environmental review process. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have further questions about the Natural Areas Program or about rare or unique botanical features on this site.

Sincerely,

Don Cameron
Ecologist
Maine Natural Areas Program
207-287-8041
don.s.cameron@maine.gov
### Rare and Exemplary Botanical Features within 4 miles of TTL Project, Route 1, Jonesboro, Maine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>State Status</th>
<th>State Rank</th>
<th>Global Rank</th>
<th>Date Last Observed</th>
<th>Occurrence Number</th>
<th>Habitat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blinks</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Rocky coastal (non-forested, upland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blunt-leaved Bedstraw</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>SX</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>1885-06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Coastal non-tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Featherfoil</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>S1</td>
<td>G4</td>
<td>1914-08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Open water (non-forested, wetland), Forested wetland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritime Huckleberry Bog</td>
<td>&lt;null&gt;</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>G3G5</td>
<td>2000-06-07</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Coastal non-tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt-hay Saltmarsh</td>
<td>&lt;null&gt;</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;null&gt;</td>
<td>S3</td>
<td>G5</td>
<td>2014-09-26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Tidal wetland (non-forested, wetland)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Marsh Sedge</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>S2</td>
<td>GNR</td>
<td>2006-09</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;null&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STATE RARITY RANKS

S1 Critically imperiled in Maine because of extreme rarity (five or fewer occurrences or very few remaining individuals or acres) or because some aspect of its biology makes it especially vulnerable to extirpation from the State of Maine.
S2 Imperiled in Maine because of rarity (6-20 occurrences or few remaining individuals or acres) or because of other factors making it vulnerable to further decline.
S3 Rare in Maine (20-100 occurrences).
S4 Apparently secure in Maine.
S5 Demonstrably secure in Maine.
SU Under consideration for assigning rarity status; more information needed on threats or distribution.
SNA Rank not applicable.
S#? Current occurrence data suggests assigned rank, but lack of survey effort along with amount of potential habitat create uncertainty (e.g. S3?).

Note: State Rarity Ranks are determined by the Maine Natural Areas Program for rare plants and rare and exemplary natural communities and ecosystems. The Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife determines State Rarity Ranks for animals.

GLOBAL RARITY RANKS

G1 Critically imperiled globally because of extreme rarity (five or fewer occurrences or very few remaining individuals or acres) or because some aspect of its biology makes it especially vulnerable to extinction.
G2 Globally imperiled because of rarity (6-20 occurrences or few remaining individuals or acres) or because of other factors making it vulnerable to further decline.
G3 Globally rare (20-100 occurrences).
G4 Apparently secure globally.
G5 Demonstrably secure globally.
GNR Not yet ranked.

Note: Global Ranks are determined by NatureServe.

STATE LEGAL STATUS

Note: State legal status is according to 5 M.R.S.A.§ 13076-13079, which mandates the Department of Conservation to produce and biennially update the official list of Maine’s Endangered and Threatened plants. The list is derived by a technical advisory committee of botanists who use data in the Natural Areas Program’s database to recommend status changes to the Department of Conservation.

E ENDANGERED; Rare and in danger of being lost from the state in the foreseeable future; or federally listed as Endangered.
T THREATENED; Rare and, with further decline, could become endangered; or federally listed as Threatened.

NON-LEGAL STATUS

SC SPECIAL CONCERN; Rare in Maine, based on available information, but not sufficiently rare to be considered Threatened or Endangered.
PE Potentially Extirpated; Species has not been documented in Maine in past 20 years or loss of last known occurrence has been documented.

Visit our website for more information on rare, threatened, and endangered species!
http://www.maine.gov/dacf/mnap
Element Occurrence ranks are used to describe the quality of a rare plant population or natural community based on three factors:

- **Size**: Size of community or population relative to other known examples in Maine. Community or population’s viability, capability to maintain itself.

- **Condition**: For communities, condition includes presence of representative species, maturity of species, and evidence of human-caused disturbance. For plants, factors include species vigor and evidence of human-caused disturbance.

- **Landscape context**: Land uses and/or condition of natural communities surrounding the observed area. Ability of the observed community or population to be protected from effects of adjacent land uses.

These three factors are combined into an overall ranking of the feature of A, B, C, or D, where A indicates an excellent example of the community or population and D indicates a poor example of the community or population. A rank of E indicates that the community or population is extant but there is not enough data to assign a quality rank. The Maine Natural Areas Program tracks all occurrences of rare (S1-S3) plants and natural communities as well as A and B ranked common (S4-S5) natural communities.

**Note:** Element Occurrence Ranks are determined by the Maine Natural Areas Program for rare plants and rare and exemplary natural communities and ecosystems. The Maine Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife determines Element Occurrence ranks for animals.

Visit our website for more information on rare, threatened, and endangered species!

http://www.maine.gov/dacf/mnap
MHPC# 0929-15 US Dept. VA new cemetery; Jonesboro, Maine

Paul:

In response to your recent request, our office has reviewed the information received July 20, 2015 to continue consultation on the above referenced project pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended.

Please see enclosed our recent correspondence on this project – see our stamp on the applicant’s letter.

No further review is required with our office on this project.

Robin K. Reed
Maine Historic Preservation Commission
55 Capitol Street
65 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333
phone: 207-287-2132 ext. 1
fax: 207-287-2335
robin.k.reed@maine.gov
http://www.maine.gov/mhpc
July 6, 2015

Maine Historic Preservation Commission
Attn: Robin Reed
55 Capitol Street
65 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333

Re: Historic and Archeology Site Inquiry | Parcel 5 | Jonesboro, Maine

Dear Robin:

We are currently preparing an initial cultural resource impact prediction report for a project in Jonesboro, Maine. The project will consist of construction of a new Veterans cemetery located on US Route 1. The attached location map shows the approximate location of the proposed project area. The property includes approximately 885 feet of frontage on Route 1 and extends approximately 450 feet off the road.

The site has an existing gravel access road and the majority of land cover includes old blueberry fields. Wooded areas do exist along Route 1 and adjacent lands to the west.

At your earliest convenience, please provide us with any information we should be aware of from your office.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Tim Brochu, Project Manager
Senior Vice President

Based on the information submitted, I have concluded that there will be no historic properties affected by the proposed undertaking, as defined by Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Consequently, pursuant to 36 CFR 800.4(d)(1), no further Section 106 consultation is required unless additional resources are discovered during project implementation pursuant to 36 CFR 800.13.

Kirk F. Mohney
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer
Maine Historic Preservation Commission

Date

Robin Reed | 07.06.2015 | 10747 002

Six Locations in Maine | www.ces-maine.com
Legend
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MAP NOTES:
1. ADMINISTRATIVE BOUNDARIES COURTESY OF THE MAINE OFFICE OF GIS (MEGIS).
2. BASE MAP AERIAL IMAGES ARE SEPT., 2013 6-METER NAIP IMAGERY, COURTESY OF USDA FSA. ACQUIRED FROM ESRI, 2015.
Dear Sir:

The Washington County Soil and Water Conservation District finds no potential environmental concerns or issues with the proposed activities at the proposed site in Jonesboro, Maine.

To reach this conclusion, we considered the following:
1. surface and ground water resources, including streams, wetlands, floodplains, open water beaver flowages, wells, and aquifers
2. Federally and state listed threatened or endangered species, and those proposed to be listed, especially Atlantic salmon and Northern Long Eared Bats
3. migratory bird habitats,
4. soils and geologic data
5. air quality, traffic and noise
6. land use and cultural/traditional use
7. personal knowledge of the site and nearby resources

I would be happy to discuss any and or all of these issues and answer any questions you may have.

Sincerely,

Nathan Pennell, District Manager
Washington County Soil and Water Conservation District
P.O. Box 121 / 89 Court St., Suite 4
Machias, Maine 04654
(207) 255-4659 or (207) 255-3995 ext. 3
Fax (207) 255-0936
e-mail nate.pennell@myfairpoint.net
Paul Jackson  
TTL Associates, Inc.  
44265 Plymouth Oaks Boulevard  
Plymouth, Michigan 48170

Re: Species List Request/Review: Harrington Road, US Route 1, Jonesboro

Dear Mr. Jackson:

We have received your request for information regarding the occurrence of federally listed threatened and endangered species within the vicinity of the above referenced project/property. In an effort to streamline project reviews in a time of increasing workloads, we are directing all species list requests to our Web site at: [http://www.fws.gov/mainefieldoffice/Project%20reviews.html](http://www.fws.gov/mainefieldoffice/Project%20reviews.html). If you have not already done so, please paste this link into your browser and follow the instructions at Species Lists and Project Reviews. Step-by-step instructions are provided. Using this Web-based process will allow you to print an official species list response from the Maine Field Office. If you have questions on your results please submit your findings/questions to the Federal Agency you are working with (e.g., USDA Rural Utilities or NRCS, Veterans Affairs, etc.). The Federal agency you are working with should be able to determine for you if a consultation with the US Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) is necessary. If you have questions regarding this process and/or you are not working with a Federal agency, please feel free to contact our office for assistance.

Please Note: Even if you have already printed out a preliminary species list request from the online system Information, Planning, and Conservation (IPaC), you will still need to return to the IPaC site to generate an official species list request.

As a reminder, Section 9 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) (87 Stat. 884, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) prohibits unauthorized taking* of listed species and applies to both Federal and non-federal activities. Additionally, endangered and threatened species and their habitats are protected by Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA, which requires Federal agencies, in consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), to ensure that any action it authorizes, funds, or carries out is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of listed species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat. An assessment of the potential direct, indirect, and cumulative effects is required for all Federal actions that may affect listed species. For projects not authorized, funded, or carried out by a Federal agency, consultation with the Service pursuant to Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA is not required. However, no person is authorized to “take”* any listed species without appropriate authorization from the Service.
Therefore, we provide technical assistance to individuals and agencies to assist with project planning to avoid the potential for “take,” or when appropriate, to provide assistance with their application for an incidental take permit pursuant to Section 10(a)(1)(B) of the ESA.

Project construction or implementation should not commence until all requirements of the ESA have been fulfilled. If you have any questions or require further assistance regarding our Web-based Species List and Project Reviews process, please contact Shay White at Shay_White@fws.gov or by telephone at 207/866-3344, Extension 1157. If you have questions about our Endangered Species Program, please contact Mark McCollough at Mark_Mccollough@fws.gov or by telephone at 207/866-3344, Extension 1115. For questions about Atlantic salmon, please contact Wende Mahaney at Wende_Mahaney@fws.gov or by telephone at 207/866-3344, Extension 1118.

*Under the Act and regulations, it is illegal for any person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States to take (includes harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect; or to attempt any of these), import or export, ship in interstate or foreign commerce in the course of commercial activity, or sell or offer for sale in interstate or foreign commerce any endangered fish or wildlife species and most threatened fish and wildlife species. It is also illegal to possess, sell, deliver, carry, transport, or ship any such wildlife that has been taken illegally. “Harm” includes any act which actually kills or injures fish or wildlife, and case law has clarified that such acts may include significant habitat modification or degradation that significantly impairs essential behavioral patterns of fish or wildlife.
Project Description

NAME
Jonesboro Cemetery

PROJECT CODE
CIVZE-YP3WB-C5DPF-GWYOP-QTZQPY

LOCATION
Washington County, Maine

DESCRIPTION
Harrington Road, Jonesboro, Maine

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Contact Information

Species in this report are managed by:

Maine Ecological Services Field Office
17 Godfrey Drive, Suite 2
Orono, ME 04473-3702
(207) 866-3344
Endangered Species

Proposed, candidate, threatened, and endangered species that are managed by the Endangered Species Program and should be considered as part of an effect analysis for this project.

This unofficial species list is for informational purposes only and does not fulfill the requirements under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, which states that Federal agencies are required to "request of the Secretary of Interior information whether any species which is listed or proposed to be listed may be present in the area of a proposed action." This requirement applies to projects which are conducted, permitted or licensed by any Federal agency.

A letter from the local office and a species list which fulfills this requirement can be obtained by returning to this project on the IPaC website and requesting an Official Species List from the regulatory documents section.

**Fishes**

**Atlantic Salmon** Salmo salar

- **CRITICAL HABITAT**
  - There is final critical habitat designated for this species.

  [https://ecos.fws.gov/speciesProfile/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=E07L](https://ecos.fws.gov/speciesProfile/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=E07L)

**Mammals**

**Northern Long-eared Bat** Myotis septentrionalis

- **CRITICAL HABITAT**
  - No critical habitat has been designated for this species.

  [https://ecos.fws.gov/speciesProfile/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=A0JE](https://ecos.fws.gov/speciesProfile/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=A0JE)

**Critical Habitats**

Potential effects to critical habitat(s) within the project area must be analyzed along with the endangered species themselves.

**Atlantic Salmon Critical Habitat** Final designated

[https://ecos.fws.gov/speciesProfile/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=E07L#crithab](https://ecos.fws.gov/speciesProfile/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=E07L#crithab)
Migratory Birds

Birds are protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act.

Any activity which results in the take of migratory birds or eagles is prohibited unless authorized by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (1). There are no provisions for allowing the take of migratory birds that are unintentionally killed or injured.

You are responsible for complying with the appropriate regulations for the protection of birds as part of this project. This involves analyzing potential impacts and implementing appropriate conservation measures for all project activities.

American Bittern Botaurus lentiginosus  
Season: Breeding  
https://ecos.fws.gov/speciesProfile/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=B0F3

Arctic Tern Sterna paradisaea  
Season: Breeding

Bald Eagle Haliaeetus leucocephalus  
Year-round  
https://ecos.fws.gov/speciesProfile/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=B008

Bay-breasted Warbler Dendroica castanea  
Season: Breeding

Black-billed Cuckoo Coccyzus erythropthalmus  
Season: Breeding  
https://ecos.fws.gov/speciesProfile/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=B0HI

Canada Warbler Wilsonia canadensis  
Season: Breeding

Great Cormorant Phalacrocorax carbo  
Season: Wintering

Hudsonian Godwit Limosa haemastica  
Season: Migrating

Least Bittern Ixobrychus exilis  
Season: Breeding

Nelson’s Sparrow Ammodramus nelsoni  
Season: Breeding

Olive-sided Flycatcher Contopus cooperi  
Season: Breeding  
https://ecos.fws.gov/speciesProfile/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=B0AN

Peregrine Falcon Falco peregrinus  
Season: Breeding  
https://ecos.fws.gov/speciesProfile/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=B0FU

Pied-billed Grebe Podilymbus podiceps  
Season: Breeding

Purple Sandpiper Calidris maritima  
Season: Wintering

Bird of conservation concern
**Short-eared Owl** *Asio flammeus*
Season: Wintering
[https://ecos.fws.gov/speciesProfile/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=B0HD](https://ecos.fws.gov/speciesProfile/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=B0HD)
Bird of conservation concern

**Upland Sandpiper** *Bartramia longicauda*
Season: Breeding
[https://ecos.fws.gov/speciesProfile/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=B0HC](https://ecos.fws.gov/speciesProfile/profile/speciesProfile.action?spcode=B0HC)
Bird of conservation concern

**Wood Thrush** *Hylocichla mustelina*
Season: Breeding
Bird of conservation concern
Refuges

Any activity proposed on National Wildlife Refuge lands must undergo a 'Compatibility Determination' conducted by the Refuge. If your project overlaps or otherwise impacts a Refuge, please contact that Refuge to discuss the authorization process.

There are no refuges within this project area
Wetlands

Impacts to NWI wetlands and other aquatic habitats from your project may be subject to regulation under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, or other State/Federal Statutes.

Project proponents should discuss the relationship of these requirements to their project with the Regulatory Program of the appropriate U.S. Army Corps of Engineers District.

DATA LIMITATIONS

The Service's objective of mapping wetlands and deepwater habitats is to produce reconnaissance level information on the location, type and size of these resources. The maps are prepared from the analysis of high altitude imagery. Wetlands are identified based on vegetation, visible hydrology and geography. A margin of error is inherent in the use of imagery; thus, detailed on-the-ground inspection of any particular site may result in revision of the wetland boundaries or classification established through image analysis.

The accuracy of image interpretation depends on the quality of the imagery, the experience of the image analysts, the amount and quality of the collateral data and the amount of ground truth verification work conducted. Metadata should be consulted to determine the date of the source imagery used and any mapping problems.

Wetlands or other mapped features may have changed since the date of the imagery or field work. There may be occasional differences in polygon boundaries or classifications between the information depicted on the map and the actual conditions on site.

DATA EXCLUSIONS

Certain wetland habitats are excluded from the National mapping program because of the limitations of aerial imagery as the primary data source used to detect wetlands. These habitats include seagrasses or submerged aquatic vegetation that are found in the intertidal and subtidal zones of estuaries and nearshore coastal waters. Some deepwater reef communities (coral or tuberficid worm reefs) have also been excluded from the inventory. These habitats, because of their depth, go undetected by aerial imagery.

DATA PRECAUTIONS

Federal, state, and local regulatory agencies with jurisdiction over wetlands may define and describe wetlands in a different manner than that used in this inventory. There is no attempt, in either the design or products of this inventory, to define the limits of proprietary jurisdiction of any Federal, state, or local government or to establish the geographical scope of the regulatory programs of government agencies. Persons intending to engage in activities involving modifications within or adjacent to wetland areas should seek the advice of appropriate federal, state, or local agencies concerning specified agency regulatory programs and proprietary jurisdictions that may affect such activities.

Wetland data is unavailable at this time.
Consultation Code: 05E1ME00-2015-SLI-0370     August 20, 2015
Event Code: 05E1ME00-2015-E-00509
Project Name: Jonesboro Cemetery

Subject: List of threatened and endangered species that may occur in your proposed project location, and/or may be affected by your proposed project

To Whom It May Concern:

The enclosed species list identifies the threatened, endangered, candidate, and proposed species and designated or proposed critical habitat that may occur within the boundary of your proposed project or may be affected by your proposed project. This species list fulfills the requirements of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) under section 7(c) of the Endangered Species Act (Act) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

New information based on updated surveys, changes in the abundance and distribution of species, changed habitat conditions, or other factors could change this list. Please feel free to contact us if you need more current information or assistance regarding the potential impacts to federally proposed, listed, and candidate species and federally designated and proposed critical habitat. Please note that under 50 CFR 402.12(e) of the regulations implementing section 7 of the Act, the accuracy of this species list should be verified after 90 days. This verification can be completed formally or informally as desired. The Service recommends that verification be completed by visiting the ECOS-IPaC Web site at regular intervals during project planning and implementation for updates to species lists and information. An updated list may be requested through the ECOS-IPaC system by completing the same process used to receive the enclosed list.

The purpose of the Act is to provide a means whereby threatened and endangered species and the ecosystems upon which they depend may be conserved. Under sections 7(a)(1) and 7(a)(2) of the Act and its implementing regulations (50 CFR 402 et seq.), Federal agencies are required to utilize their authorities to carry out programs for the conservation of threatened and endangered species and to determine whether projects may affect threatened and endangered species and/or designated critical habitat.
A Biological Assessment is required for construction projects (or other undertakings having similar physical impacts) that are major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment as defined in the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(c)). For projects other than major construction activities, the Service suggests that a biological evaluation similar to a Biological Assessment be prepared to determine whether the project may affect listed or proposed species and designated or proposed critical habitat. Recommended contents of a Biological Assessment are described at 50 CFR 402.12.

If a Federal agency determines, based on the Biological Assessment or biological evaluation, that listed species or designated critical habitat may be affected by the proposed project, the agency is required to consult with the Service pursuant to 50 CFR 402. In addition, the Service recommends that candidate species, proposed species and proposed critical habitat be addressed within the consultation. More information on the regulations and procedures for section 7 consultation, including the role of permit or license applicants, can be found in the Endangered Species Consultation Handbook at:
http://www.fws.gov/endangered/esa-library/pdf/TOC-GLOS.PDF

This species list also identifies candidate species under review for listing and those species that the Service considers species of concern. Candidate species have no protection under the Act but are included for consideration because they could be listed prior to completion of your project. Species of concern are those taxa whose conservation status is of concern to the Service (i.e., species previously known as Category 2 candidates), but for which further information is needed.

If a proposed project may affect only candidate species or species of concern, you are not required to prepare a Biological Assessment or biological evaluation or to consult with the Service. However, the Service recommends minimizing effects to these species to prevent future conflicts. Therefore, if early evaluation indicates that a project will affect a candidate species or species of concern, you may wish to request technical assistance from this office to identify appropriate minimization measures.

Please be aware that bald and golden eagles are not protected under the Endangered Species Act but are protected under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 668 et seq.). Projects affecting these species may require development of an eagle conservation plan: http://www.fws.gov/windenergy/eagle_guidance.html Information on the location of bald eagle nests in Maine can be found on the Maine Field Office Web site: http://www.fws.gov/maine/fieldoffice/Project%20review4.html

Additionally, wind energy projects should follow the wind energy guidelines: http://www.fws.gov/windenergy/ for minimizing impacts to migratory birds and bats. Projects may require development of an avian and bat protection plan.

Migratory birds are also a Service trust resource. Under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, construction activities in grassland, wetland, stream, woodland, and other habitats that would result in the take of migratory birds, eggs, young, or active nests should be avoided. Guidance for minimizing impacts to migratory birds for projects including communications towers (e.g., cellular, digital television, radio, and emergency broadcast) can be found at: http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/CurrentBirdIssues/Hazards/towers/towers.htm and at:
http://www.towerkill.com; and at:

We appreciate your concern for threatened and endangered species. The Service encourages Federal agencies to include conservation of threatened and endangered species into their project planning to further the purposes of the Act. Please include the Consultation Tracking Number in the header of this letter with any request for consultation or correspondence about your project that you submit to our office.

Attachment
Official Species List

Provided by:
Maine Ecological Services Field Office
17 GODFREY DRIVE, SUITE 2
ORONO, ME 04473
(207) 866-3344
http://www.fws.gov/mainefieldoffice/index.html

Consultation Code: 05E1ME00-2015-SLI-0370
Event Code: 05E1ME00-2015-E-00509

Project Type: ** OTHER **

Project Name: Jonesboro Cemetery
Project Description: Approximately Six Acres North of Harrington Road In Jonesboro, Washington County, Maine

Please Note: The FWS office may have modified the Project Name and/or Project Description, so it may be different from what was submitted in your previous request. If the Consultation Code matches, the FWS considers this to be the same project. Contact the office in the 'Provided by' section of your previous Official Species list if you have any questions or concerns.
Project Location Map:

**Project Coordinates:** MULTIPOLYGON (((-67.66050338745117 44.646139474517916, -67.66037464141846 44.64745236004899, -67.65814304351807 44.64755922151702, -67.6578426361084 44.64633793586505, -67.66050338745117 44.646139474517916)),

**Project Counties:** Washington, ME
Endangered Species Act Species List

There are a total of 2 threatened or endangered species on your species list. Species on this list should be considered in an effects analysis for your project and could include species that exist in another geographic area. For example, certain fish may appear on the species list because a project could affect downstream species. Critical habitats listed under the Has Critical Habitat column may or may not lie within your project area. See the Critical habitats within your project area section further below for critical habitat that lies within your project. Please contact the designated FWS office if you have questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fishes</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Has Critical Habitat</th>
<th>Condition(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic salmon <em>(Salmo salar)</em> Population: Gulf of Maine DPS</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Final designated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern long-eared Bat <em>(Myotis septentrionalis)</em></td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Critical habitats that lie within your project area

The following critical habitats lie fully or partially within your project area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fishes</th>
<th>Critical Habitat Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic salmon (<em>Salmo salar</em>)</td>
<td>Final designated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population: Gulf of Maine DPS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

Native American Consultation
August 12, 2015

Aroostook Band of Micmacs
Attn: Ms. Donna Augustine, NAGPRA Contact
7 Northern Road
Presque Isle, Maine 04769

SUBJECT: Intergovernmental and Interagency Coordination of Environmental Planning (NEPA Scoping Letter) for the
US Department of Veterans Affairs
Proposed National Veterans Burial Grounds
Harrington Road (US Route 1)
Jonesboro, Washington County, Maine

Dear Ms. Augustine:

The US Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) is preparing environmental documentation to assist in the Federal decision-making process concerning the acquisition of approximately 6 acres of land for the establishment of a National Veterans Burial Grounds. The approximately 6-acre site is located on the northern side of Harrington Road (US Route 1), approximately 2.25 miles east of intersection of Harrington Road and Indian River Road (Route 187). The site is currently partially wooded undeveloped land, with an unpaved access road from Harrington Road. The site location is depicted in Attachments 1a, 1b and 1c.

VA is conducting an Environmental Assessment (EA) to evaluate the environmental, cultural, and socioeconomic issues associated with the proposal, pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended (42 U.S. Code (USC) §4321 et seq.); the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations Implementing the Procedural Provisions of NEPA (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Parts 1500-1508); and VA’s Implementing Regulations (38 CFR Part 26 (Environmental Analysis of VA Actions)). In coordination with preparation of the EA, we are initiating compliance with relevant cultural resource laws and regulations, including but not limited to the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), the Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act (AHPA), and Executive Order 13175.

To the best of our knowledge and belief, this Proposed Action will have no effects on Native American graves or cultural items, historic properties, or archaeological, historic, or scientific data, but we would appreciate your advice about this, and would be happy to undertake government-to-government consultation with your Tribe in accordance with Executive Order 13175, NAGPRA, and NHPA. We would also be glad to discuss any other concerns you may have about this project as we carry out our analyses under NEPA. With your advice and assistance, we hope to establish an ongoing cooperative relationship.
If you would like to confer with Project Management within VA, please contact me by telephone at (202) 632-5176 or by email at Almaira.Garcia@va.gov.

Sincerely,

Almaira Garcia
VA Project Manager

Attachment 1a – 1c: Site Location Maps
Attachment 2: List of Tribes Consulted
ATTACHMENT 1A

SITE LOCATION MAP (STREET MAP)
Proposed National Veterans Burial Grounds
Jonesboro, Washington County, Maine
ATTACHMENT 1C

SITE LOCATION MAP (2010 AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH)
Proposed National Veterans Burial Grounds
Jonesboro, Washington County, Maine
Attachment 2
List of Tribes Consulted
Department of Veterans Affairs
NEPA Environmental Assessment
Proposed National Veterans Burial Grounds
Jonesboro, Washington County, Maine

Houlton Band of Maliseet Indians of Maine
Attn: Ms. Sharri Venno, NAGPRA Contact
88 Bell Road
Littleton, Maine 04730

Aroostook Band of Micmacs
Attn: Ms. Donna Augustine, NAGPRA Contact
7 Northern Road
Presque Isle, Maine 04769

Penobscot Nation
Attn: Mr. Arnold Neptune
2 Sarah Springs Drive
Indian Island, Maine 04468

Passamaquoddy Tribe of Maine
Attn: Mr. Roger Paul, NAGPRA Contact
Indian Township Reservation
PO Box 413
Old Town, Maine 04468
APPENDIX C

Photograph Log
Photo #1: Looking northeast across the site

Photo #2: Looking north along the western boundary of the site

Photo #3: Looking northeast across the site

Photo #4: Looking south along the western boundary of the site

Photo #5: Looking northeast across the central portion of the site

Photo #6: North adjoining wooded land
APPENDIX D

Other Relevant Environmental Data
INITIAL CULTURAL RESOURCE IMPACT PREDICTION
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INITIAL CULTURAL RESOURCE
IMPACT PREDICTION

INTRODUCTION

This report was prepared for the United States of America Department of Veteran’s Affairs Administration for a proposed National Veteran’s Burial Grounds in Jonesboro, Maine. Information in this report includes an initial cultural resource impact prediction. This is a brief determination of the possible effects of the project on the human environment under the National Environmental Policy Act and on historic resources under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. The purpose of the report is to provide baseline data and recommendations to inform the Veteran’s Administration, and its consultants, The State of Maine Historic Preservation Officer, or other interested parties, and recommendations for a more detailed impact assessment, if required.

EXISTING INVESTIGATED SITE

The existing investigated site includes an approximately six acre parcel of land with approximately 885 feet of frontage on US Route 1. The parcel is generally rectangular in shape and extends off US Route 1 approximately 450 feet northerly off the roadway.

The site is generally undeveloped. It does contain an existing gravel roadway running along the westerly site boundary. This roadway appears to be the principal access to commercial blueberry fields located to the north and northeast of the site. An approximately 1.5 acre mowed field is located near the center of the site adjacent to the gravel access road. The remaining site is generally a mixture of fields and Balsam Fir regeneration growth. Mature trees consisting of Red Maple and Balsam Fir extend along the road frontage and approximately 75 feet into the site.

Topography is generally in a northeast to southwest direction with the northeast corner of the property being the highest point. There is approximately 36 feet of relief across the site with slopes averaging 5%. Indian River is located approximately 850 feet to the west.

LITERATURE AND RECORDS RESEARCH

The literature and records research for the site began with investigations at the Washington County Registry of Deeds. The current property owner purchased the site from International Paper Company in 2001. From early 1917 to 2001 the property was owned by several paper companies including Eastern Pulp Company, St. Croix Paper, and St. Regis Paper. Prior to 1917 the property was owned by several individuals including E.P. Grimes, Briggs C. Floyd, and William T. Tenney. These individuals owned the site for various periods extending from 1837 to 1917.

Deed descriptions throughout the history of ownership did not reference any structures, homesteads, or improvements on the property.

An 1881 Atlas of Washington County by George N. Colby indicated a possible structure with a notation of “B. Floyd in the project site area. A copy of this map is included in the Exhibit 8 of this report.
The Town of Jonesboro was formed in 1809. They began keeping vital records in 1766 and Town records in 1918. Investigation of readily available tax and property information did not result in any historic data. Further investigation of archived information may produce information on historic property owners and their status in the community.

The Town of Jonesboro, being a very small rural community, does not appear to have any significant historical society or organization which could have information on the historic uses of the property. Discussions with residents in the Town did not generate any information on the property. As far as anyone knew, the site was always undeveloped and part of the adjacent commercial blueberry lands.

In regard to the natural environment, research of public records and maps did not indicate any special areas on the site, or lands directly adjacent. This investigation included published information by the Maine Department of Environmental Protection in regard to know Bald Eagle nesting site, inland wading waterfowl habitat areas, significant wetlands and vernal pools, and deer wintering areas. Review of State of Maine soils and geologic information also did not indicate the presence of any unique land forms.

FIELD INVESTIGATION

A field investigation was completed on the proposed project site on July 10, 2015. This investigation included the project site as well as adjacent lands extending approximately 200 feet from the westerly, northerly, and easterly proposed site boundaries.

Transect lines were walked through the property starting on US Route 1 and extending into the site approximately every 200 feet along the frontage. These transects were compassed and paced and no instrument survey was completed.

The results of the field investigation did not identify any structures, cellar holes, rock walls, dug wells, or apparent soil disturbance that would indicate historic use of the site. An existing wood sculpture of an eagle on a post was found in the mowed field area adjacent to the gravel road. This was reportedly recently installed by the current landowner and does not appear to be of any historic significance.

As previously noted, a mature stand of trees runs along US Route 1 and extends approximately 75 feet into the site. Beyond that area and extending to the northerly line of the proposed site, a mixture of fields, woody vegetation, and Balsam Fir saplings dominate the landscape. This area may have been part of the commercial blueberry lands which exist to the north and east. Aerial images of the site from 2010 show evidence the site may have had forest harvesting activities completed. The extent of these activities is unknown; however, cut tree stumps were noted throughout the site during the investigation.

The only soils disturbance noted included the existing access road and possibly the existing mowed field area. The proposed site appears to contain upland soils, vegetation, and hydraulic conditions. Off site of the project boundaries to the west and portions of the north, drainage swales and possible wetland areas were noted. These areas appear to be associated with the floodplain and recharge areas of Indian River which is located approximately 850 feet to the west of the site.
Additional investigations were completed between the proposed site and Indian River to attempt to identify a possible structure or foundation hole as indicated on the 1881 Atlas noted in the Literature and Records Research section of this report. This initial investigation did not identify any evidence of any structure or human activity in the area. It is possible if there ever was a structure in the area, it no longer exists.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Based on the initial cultural resource impact investigation completed and described in this report, the project does not appear to have any adverse effects on the human environment under the NEPA or Historic Resources under Section 106 of the NHPA. The only potential human activity near the proposed site may have been an apparent structure shown on the 1881 Atlas of the area. It appears that any structure that may have existed is no longer standing. If required, further more in depth investigations could be performed to attempt to identify its possible location in the area. No excavations were completed as part of this study to determine any Native American activity; however the area does not appear to include any significant natural areas that would make it an area of interest. No significant or critical natural areas were identified on, or adjacent, to the project site.

A list of State, local agencies, and individuals is provided in his report (Exhibit 9- Historic and Cultural Resources) in the event further investigations are considered.
EXHIBIT 1
USGS TOPOGRAPHIC LOCATION MAP
EXHIBIT 2

AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHIC LOCATION MAP
EXHIBIT 3

NRCS SOILS LOCATION MAP
The soil surveys that comprise your AOI were mapped at 1:24,000.

Warning: Soil Map may not be valid at this scale.

Enlargement of maps beyond the scale of mapping can cause misunderstanding of the detail of mapping and accuracy of soil line placement. The maps do not show the small areas of contrasting soils that could have been shown at a more detailed scale.

Please rely on the bar scale on each map sheet for map measurements.

Source of Map: Natural Resources Conservation Service
Coordinate System: Web Mercator (EPSG:3857)

Maps from the Web Soil Survey are based on the Web Mercator projection, which preserves direction and shape but distorts distance and area. A projection that preserves area, such as the Albers equal-area conic projection, should be used if more accurate calculations of distance or area are required.

This product is generated from the USDA-NRCS certified data as of the version date(s) listed below.

Soil Survey Area: Washington County Area, Maine
Survey Area Data: Version 15, Sep 14, 2014

Soil map units are labeled (as space allows) for map scales 1:50,000 or larger.

Date(s) aerial images were photographed: Jul 29, 2010—Aug 21, 2010

The orthophoto or other base map on which the soil lines were compiled and digitized probably differs from the background imagery displayed on these maps. As a result, some minor shifting of map unit boundaries may be evident.
## Map Unit Legend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Unit Symbol</th>
<th>Map Unit Name</th>
<th>Acres in AOI</th>
<th>Percent of AOI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A6C</td>
<td>Adams loamy sand, 8 to 15 percent slopes</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoA</td>
<td>Colton gravelly sandy loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoB</td>
<td>Colton gravelly sandy loam, 3 to 8 percent slopes</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoC</td>
<td>Colton gravelly sandy loam, 8 to 15 percent slopes</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRC</td>
<td>Colton-Adams complex, 3 to 15 percent slopes</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCB</td>
<td>Lamoine-Buxton-Scantic complex, 0 to 15 percent slopes</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Medomak and Wonequask soils, frequently flooded</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGB</td>
<td>Nicholville-Croghan complex, 0 to 5 percent slopes</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pg</td>
<td>Pits, sand and gravel</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals for Area of Interest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>203.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Soil Map—Washington County Area, Maine
EXHIBIT 4

MAINE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION REVIEW
July 6, 2015

Maine Historic Preservation Commission
Attn: Robin Reed
55 Capitol Street
65 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333.

Re: Historic and Archeology Site Inquiry | Parcel 5 | Jonesboro, Maine

Dear Robin:

We are currently preparing an initial cultural resource impact prediction report for a project in Jonesboro, Maine. The project will consist of construction of a new Veterans cemetery located on US Route 1. The attached location map shows the approximate location of the proposed project area. The property includes approximately 885 feet of frontage on Route 1 and extends approximately 450 feet off the road.

The site has an existing gravel access road and the majority of land cover includes old blueberry fields. Wooded areas do exist along Route 1 and adjacent lands to the west.

At your earliest convenience, please provide us with any information we should be aware of from your office.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Tim Brochu, Project Manager
Senior Vice President

Based on the information submitted, I have concluded that there will be no historic properties affected by the proposed undertaking, as defined by Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Consequently, pursuant to 36 CFR 800.4(d)(1), no further Section 106 consultation is required unless additional resources are discovered during project implementation pursuant to 36 CFR 800.13.

Kirk F. Moloney,
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer
Maine Historic Preservation Commission

Robin Reed | 07.05.2015 | 10747.002

466 South Main Street
PO Box 639
Brewer, Maine 04412
T 207.989.4824
F 207.999.4601

Six Locations in Maine | www.ces-maine.com
July 6, 2015

Passamaquoddy Tribe of Indians
Pleasant Point Reservation
Attn: Mr. Donald Soctomah, THPO
P.O. Box 343
Perry, Maine 04667

Re: Historic and Archeology Site Inquiry

Dear Mr. Soctomah:

We are currently assisting the Veterans Administration with investigations for a new Veterans cemetery to be located in the Machias area. They currently have selected a site in Jonesboro off US Route 1. The property currently consists of blueberry fields and woods. There are no buildings/structures on the property. The site consists of approximately 885 feet of frontage on Route 1 and approximately 450 feet off the road.

At your earliest convenience, can you provide us with any information and/or concerns the Passamaquoddy Tribe may have with this project.

We are particularly interested in any historic or cultural resources that may be in this area which we should address.

Sincerely,
CES, Inc.

[Signature]

Tim Brochu, Project Manager
Senior Vice President

Enc.

No response to this request has been received as of the time of this report preparation.
EXHIBIT 6

SITE PHOTOGRAPHS
Photo No. 1
Photo Date: July 10, 2015
Site Location: Portion of Parcel 5 Range 3 US Route 1 Jonesboro, Maine
Description: Existing statue recently erected by current landowner.

Photo By: TRB

Photo No. 2
Photo Date: July 10, 2015
Site Location: Portion of Parcel 5 Range 3 US Route 1 Jonesboro, Maine
Description: View of existing mowed field from approximate center of site looking south.

Photo By: TRB
Photo No. 3

Photo Date: July 10, 2015

Site Location: Portion of Parcel 5 Range 3 US Route 1 Jonesboro, Maine

Description: View of access road from approximate northwesterly boundary looking south.

Photo By: TRB

Photo No. 4

Photo Date: July 10, 2015

Site Location: Portion of Parcel 5 Range 3 US Route 1 Jonesboro, Maine

Description: View of existing mowed field from gravel road looking east.

Photo By: TRB
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photo No.</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Photo Date:</strong></td>
<td>July 10, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location:</strong></td>
<td>Portion of Parcel 5 Range 3 US Route 1 Jonesboro, Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong></td>
<td>View of proposed site frontage on US Route 1 from easterly corner looking west.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Photo By:</strong></td>
<td>TRB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photo No.</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Photo Date:</strong></td>
<td>July 10, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site Location:</strong></td>
<td>Portion of Parcel 5 Range 3 US Route 1 Jonesboro, Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description:</strong></td>
<td>View of existing gravel access road as it leaves northerly boundary of proposed site, looking northwest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Photo By:</strong></td>
<td>TRB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo No.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo Date:</td>
<td>July 10, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Location:</td>
<td>Portion of Parcel 5 Range 3 US Route 1 Jonesboro, Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description:</td>
<td>View of entrance road to site from US Route 1 looking north.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo By:</td>
<td>TRB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXHIBIT 7

1881 – FLOYD PROPERTY DEED
due. I do further covenant to the said Andrew Begg by
this writing to be the good, faithful and true
servant, to the best of my power. I am to
have the use of this land, and to enjoy the
fruit of it. I will also have the use of the
buildings and improvements on the said
land, and to enjoy the same. The said
Andrew Begg is my servant for life.
EXHIBIT 8

1881 – JONESBORO ATLAS MAP
EXHIBIT 9

HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES
FOR
PORTION OF PARCEL 5, RANGE 3
US ROUTE 1, JONESBORO, MAINE

Machias Historical Society
Attn: Betsy Fitzgerald
85 Court Street
Machias, ME 04654
207-255-4432

Town of Jonesboro
Station Road
P.O. Box 86
Jonesboro, ME
207-434-5141

Maine Historical Society
480 Congress Street
Portland, ME 04101
207-774-1822

Maine Historic Preservation Commission
65 State House Station
Augusta, ME 04333-0014
207-287-2132

University of Maine at Machias
Karen Kimball, Assoc. Prof. of History
2 Kimball hall
116 O’Brien Hall
Machias, ME 04654

Passamaquoddy Tribe of Indians
Indian Township Reservation
Attn: Donald Soctomah, THPO
P.O. Box 301
Princeton, ME 04668
207-796-2301
APPENDIX E

Public Notices and Comments
NOTICE OF QUIET TITLE

Notice is hereby given that pursuant to 14 M.R.S.A. §4651 an action to quiet title entitled Steven Kneizys v. JP Morgan Chase Bank has been filed in the Maine Superior Court, Machias, and has been assigned Docket No. RS-210520. JP Morgan Chase Bank is successor in interest, the property was in the possession of Washington Mutual Bank before a Purchase and Assumption agreement between the FDIC and JP Morgan Chase Bank. Title to Real Estate is involved.

The parcel, which is in the Town of Baileyville, is: A STRIP OF LAND TEN (10) FEET IN WIDTH, RUNNING FROM FIRST AVENUE ACROSS THE REAR OF LOTS 29 AND 31, MAKING SAVD WASHINGTON COUNTY REGISTRY OF DEEDS IN BOOK 714, PAGE 193, DATED SEPTEMBER 29, 1972. The lot numbers refer to the Plan of the Village of Woodland made by Warren C. Lord, Surveyor, and filed in the Washington County Registry of Deeds in Book 3, Page 66.

The action by Steven Kneizys, 2 Munifield Lane, Lebanon, NJ 08831, especially alleged that pursuant to a previous order of Foreclosure and Sale Docket No. KE-06-008 in the same court, First Avenue, Tax Map 20, Lot 60, was sold to Washington Mutual Bank on January 24, 2006. The above described property is one of the four parcels that comprised of Top Map 30, Lot 60, in the time of that sale. When WaMu subsequently sold the property (see Book 3215, Page 29), the bank neglected to specifically include this parcel in the deed despite the lot number and other requirements of the Baileyville, ME. Land Use Regulation Ordinance (enacted Oct 1, 1997).

NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS
Proposed Acquisition, Development, and Operation of the National Veterans Burial Ground
Harrington Road
Jonesboro, Washington County, Maine

The Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) announces the preparation and availability of a Draft Environmental Assessment (DEA) for the proposed acquisition, development, and operation of a National Veterans Burial Ground located on Harrington Road in Jonesboro, Washington County, Maine. The DEA has been prepared in accordance with the regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), (Public Law 91-190, 42 USC 4321-4347 January 1, 1970), amendments, and VA's Implementing Regulations (38 CFR Part 26). VA intends to issue a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) following a public comment period in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for Implementing NEPA, Section 1508.13, provided there are no substantive comments which warrant further evaluation. The 30-day public comment period will end on January 22, 2016.

A copy of the DEA will be available for review at the Porter Memorial Library located at 92 Court Street in Machias, Maine 04654. A copy of the DEA is also available for review on the following website: www.ong.va.gov/ceem/EA.pdf. Please submit comments to the following:

Department of Veterans Affairs
Attn: Ms. Almaira Garcia
425 I Street, NW, Room 6W21A
Washington, DC 20021
Email: mg@va.gov (please put "Washington County Maine EA" in subject line)

Merry Christmas

Have you been in an accident that wasn't your fault? We can help you.
Leen and Emery, P.A.
Call (207) 990-2020 or (800) 499-7020
You need a top-notch accident attorney. Call Leen and Emery, P.A. As experts in Personal Injury and Workers Compensation claims, we can help you get the justice you deserve. Our initial consultation is always free, so there is no reason to wait to get the answers you need.
We help accident victims get justice.
Leen and Emery, P.A.
David Leen info@leenemery.com
www.leenemery.com
77 Exchange Street, Suite 316, Bangor, Maine
Telephone (207) 990-7020 or (800) 499-7020
Local Lawyers for the People of Maine for Over 40 Years
NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS
Proposed Acquisition, Development, and Operation of the National Veterans Burial Ground
Harrington Road
Jonesboro, Washington County, Maine

The Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) announces the preparation and availability of a Draft Environmental Assessment (DEA) for the proposed acquisition, development, and operation of a National Veterans Burial Ground located on Harrington Road in Jonesboro, Washington County, Maine. The DEA has been prepared in accordance with the regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), (Public Law 91-190, 42 USC 4321-4347 January 1, 1970), amendments, and VA’s Implementing Regulations (38 C.F.R Part 26). VA intends to issue a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) allowing the public comment period in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for Implementing NEPA, Section 1508.13, provided there are no substantive comments which warrant further evaluation. The 30-day public comment period will end on January 22, 2016.

A copy of the DEA will be available for review at the Porter Memorial Library located at 92 Court Street in Machias, Maine 04654. A copy of the DEA is also available for review on the following website: www.cern.va.gov/cem/EA.asp. Please submit comments to the following:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS
Attn: Ms. Almaira Garza
425 I Street, NW, Room 6W21A
Washington, DC 20001

Email: rpsd@va.gov (please put “Washington County Maine EA” in subject line).

Property Bid Notice
The Town of Addison is accepting bids for the following Property:

Map 1 Lot 24-ON: 1960 Mobile Home 12x60 Located at 3489 Ridge Road - Bidding Starts at $3200.00
Map 2 Lot 47-ON: 1970 Mobile Home 12x60 Located at 3480 Ridge Road - Bidding Starts at $3200.00
Map 3 Lot 43: 2.25 Acres Located at 1419 Indian River Road Bidding Starts at $1950.00
Map 10 Lot 19: 2.8 Acres Located off East Side Road - Bidding Starts at $3,575.00

Please submit sealed bid marked “Addison Property Bid” with Map and Lot # to: Town of Addison, P.O. Box 142, Addison, ME 04606 no later than January 11, 2016 at 4:00 PM. Faxed bids will not be accepted. Each bid must include the bidder’s name, mailing address and phone number. Bids must be accompanied by a deposit in the form of a certified check or money order, in an amount of $100.00. The successful bidder’s deposit will be credited to the total purchase price. Deposits will be returned to the unsuccessful bidders. Any bid which does not contain the proper deposit will be rejected.

The Town has the right to accept or reject any or all bids. Each successful bidder shall have 30 days from the date of the bid acceptance in which to complete the purchase either by cash or certified funds and the Town of Addison will deliver a duly executed Quit Claim Deed without covenant subject to any and all encumbrances to title. In the event that a successful bidder fails, for any reason, to complete the purchase in the time stated, the bid acceptance is void and the bidder’s deposit shall be forfeited to the Town. The Board of Selectmen may thereafter negotiate a sale of the property with any or all unsuccessful bidders.

All bidders are invited to inspect the property and the public records prior to making a bid. No warranties, guarantees or representations of any kind are made and all warranties are disclaimed with respect to the location and/or boundaries of the property or improvements thereon, title to the premises, environmental conditions, or compliance of the property with any applicable zoning or land use regulations, laws or ordinances. The buyer will assume any risk of defects and each bidder expressly acknowledges and agrees that the amount bid reflects the “as is” condition of the property and the assumption of all risks.

*Mobile home is occupied. Buyer is responsible for dealing with the occupant(s).

PROBATE COURT
Washington, SS.

STATE OF MAINE

PROBATE NOTICES
TO ALL PERSONS INTERESTED IN ANY OF THE ESTATES LISTED BELOW:

Notice is hereby given by the respective personal representatives that they have filed the following proceedings. These matters will be heard on 18 Jan, 2016 at 2:00 PM in the above court, at the Court House, Jonesboro, ME, on January 19, 2016. The appointed acting personal representatives may be appointed on or after the hearing date if no sufficient objection be heard. This notice complies with the requirements of 18-A MRSA Section 1701, 5-306, 5-307, 5-308, 5-310, 5-403, 3-316 and Probate Rule 4.

ESTATE OF ISAIAH ROBINSON, MINOR OF JONESBORO
Petition for Appointment of Marie B. Johnson as Guardian for said minor child of said minor child of said deceased minor child, deceased by Marie B. Johnson

Adopted by the court, THIS NOTICE IS PARTICULARLY DIRECTED TO: ALISHA HARMON, mother whose address is unknown and cannot be ascertained by reasonable diligence, whose last known address was Jonesboro, Maine, as well as to any other interested parties. Marie B. Johnson, Petitioner, P.O. Box 342, Jonesboro, ME 04606. Dated December 23, 2015

Catherine M. Holmes
Register of Probate

Publication dates: December 30 & January 6, 2016

Troop J
continued from page 22

in Franklin for loud exhaust. As a result of the stop Troy Higgins (41) of Franklin was summoned for OAS. Sgt. Jeffrey LePage and Trooper Chad Lindsey responded to the residence and it was found that he had been bitten by dogs and had threatening the dog’s owner. Griss was arrested for criminal threatening and also summoned for failure to submit to arrest. Grass was also summoned for leaving the scene of a crash that had been investigated earlier that night by Trooper Kim Swyers. B你在脚B also Assisted.

12-27-15 Corporal Chris Smith assisted Richard Shattuck (11) of Ellsworth for operating under the influence and criminal speed as the result of a traffic stop in Hancock.

Falls. The operator, Ricky Jordan, (56) of Jonesboro was suspected of impaired driving. Trooper Taylor conducted SFST’s and arrested Ricky for Operating Under the Influence of Alcohol. Ricky was taken to the hospital in Machias where a blood sample was taken and result pending. 12-
Trooper J

12-26-15

Trooper Bryan Creaser investigated a two-vehicle accident involving two vehicles from the Farmington General Store and Ellsworth Market Place. As a result of the investigation, Jessica Blacklock, 27, of Sidney was summoned for Theft.

12-29-15

Corporal Mitch Perkins responded to a fatal crash on Topfield Road that was called at 1:38 p.m. on December 29th where a 2001 CMC Janney had been involved in a three-wheeler crash on Route 1. After checking on the snow-covered roadway, the vehicle crashed into the car. The accident was then declared a two-vehicle accident and additional traffic was involved.

12-30-15

Trooper Kim Sawyer responded to a fatal crash on Route 1 that was called at 1:38 p.m. on December 30th where a 2001 CMC Janney had been involved in a three-wheeler crash on Route 1. After checking on the snow-covered roadway, the vehicle crashed into the car. The accident was then declared a two-vehicle accident and additional traffic was involved.

12-31-15

The person involved in the accident was transported to the hospital and charged with theft.

Notices / Legals

Notice of Quiet Title

Notice is hereby given that pursuant to 14 M.R.S.A. § 6651 an action to quiet title entitled Steven Knezegy v. JP Morgan Chase Bank has been filed in the Maine Superior Court, Machias, and has been assigned Docket No. RE-2015-20. JP Morgan Chase Bank is successor in interest, the property was in the possession of Washington Mutual Bank before a Purchase and Assumption agreement between the FDIC and JP Morgan Chase Bank. Title to Real Estate is involved.

The parcel, which is in the Town of Baileyville, is: A STRIP OF LAND TEN (10) FEET IN WIDTH, RUNNING FROM FIRST AVENUE ACROSS THE REAR OF LOTS 29 AND 31, MAKING SAID STRIP 100 FEET IN LENGTH AND DECREASING LOTS 29 AND 31 TO A DEPTH OF NINETY FEET MEASURED BACK FROM BROADWAY. SAID CREATION OF THE STRIP AND CONVEYANCE OF THE REMAINDER OF LOTS 29 AND 31 IS RECORDED IN THE WASHINGTON COUNTY REGISTRY OF DEEDS IN BOOK 774, PAGE 193, DATED SEPTEMBER 29, 1972. The lot numbers refer to the Plan of the Village of Woodland made by Warren C. Loud, Surveyor, and filed in the Washington County Registry of Deed in Plan Book 3, Insert 60.

The action by Steven Knezevy, 3, Mifflin Road, Lebanon, NH 03862, specifically alleges that pursuant to a previous order of Foreclosure and Sale Deed No. RE-05-006 in the same court, a First Avenue, Tax Map 26, Lot 50, was sold to Washington Mutual Bank on January 24, 2006. The above described property is one of the four parcels that comprised Tax Map 26, Lot 50, at the time of that sale. When Wamu subsequently sold the property (see Book 3215, Page 29), the bank neglected to specifically include the parcel in the deed despite the lot merger and other requirements of the Baileyville, ME, Land Use Regulation Ordinance (adopted Oct 1, 1997).

State of Maine

Notice of availability

Draft Environmental Assessment

U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs

Proposed Acquisition, Development, and Operation of the National Veterans Burial Ground

Harrington Road

Jonesboro, Washington County, Maine

The Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) announces the preparation and availability of a Draft Environmental Assessment (DEA) for the proposed acquisition, development, and operation of a National Veterans Burial Ground located on Harrington Road in Jonesboro, Washington County, Maine. The DEA has been prepared in accordance with the regulations for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), (Public Law 91-190, 42 USC 4321-4347 January 1, 1970), amendments, and VA's implementing regulations (38 CFR Part 62). VA intends to issue a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) following a public comment period in accordance with the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for Implementing NEPA, Section 1505.13, provided there are no substantive comments which warrant further evaluation. The 30-day public comment period will end on January 22, 2016.

A copy of the DEA will be available for review at the Portor Memorial Library located at 32 Court Street in Machias, Maine 04654. A copy of the DEA is also available for review on the following website: www.cem.va.gov/cem/EA.asp. Please submit comments to the following:

Department of Veterans Affairs
Attn: Ms. Almairra Garcia
425 I Street, NW, Room 6W21A
Washington, DC 20001

Email: rps@va.gov (please put “Washington County Maine EA” in subject line)
Machias Valley News Observer
P.O. Box 357 41 Broadway
Machias, ME 04654-0357

Tel: (207) 255-6561 Fax (207) 255-4058

Date: January 7 2016

Account: Department of veterans Affairs
Attn: TTL Associates, Inc
Paul Jackson
44265 Plymouth Oaks BLVD
Plymouth MI 48170

Affidavit of Publication

This is to certify that the advertising of Notice of Availability re: Draft Environmental Assessment, Proposed acquisition, Development, and operation of the National Veterans Burial Ground Harrington Road Jonesboro, Washington County, Maine ran in the Machias Valley New Observer for three weeks in the December 23, December 30, 2015 and January 6, 2016 editions. The cost per week was $146.25 with a total cost of $438.75.

Jackelyn A Mills, Reception/Administration

Subscribed and sworn before me

DONNA L. SPRAGUE
Notary Public - Maine
My Commission Expires July 25, 2021