

**Environmental Assessment  
Determinations and Compliance Findings  
for HUD-assisted Projects  
24 CFR Part 58**

**Project Information**

**Project Name:** East-Millinocket-Mill-Site-Renovations-and-Infrastructure

**HEROS Number:** 900000010417355

**Start Date:** 08/07/2024

**Responsible Entity (RE):** TOWN OF EAST MILLINOCKET, East Millinocket ME,

**RE Preparer:** Michael Michaud

**State / Local Identifier:**

**Certifying Officer:** Michael Michaud

**Grant Recipient (if different than Responsible Entity):**

**Point of Contact:**

**Consultant (if applicable):** Stillwater Environmental Engineering, Inc.

**Point of Contact:** Philip Ruck, P.E.

40 CFR 1506.5(b)(4): The lead agency or, where appropriate, a cooperating agency shall prepare a disclosure statement for the contractor's execution specifying that the contractor has no financial or other interest in the outcome of the action. Such statement need not include privileged or confidential trade secrets or other confidential business information.

- ✓ By checking this box, I attest that as a preparer, I have no financial or other interest in the outcome of the undertaking assessed in this environmental review.

**Project Location:** 50 Main St, East Millinocket, ME 04430

**Additional Location Information:**

N/A

**Direct Comments to:**

**Description of the Proposed Project [24 CFR 50.12 & 58.32; 40 CFR 1508.25]:**

The proposed project is part of Phase II of a larger initiative that is underway to repurpose the site of the former Great Northern Paper mill in East Millinocket, Maine. A complete Project Description is attached.

**Statement of Purpose and Need for the Proposal [40 CFR 1508.9(b)]:**

The Proposed Action is part of a broader effort to stimulate economic revitalization and job creation by repurposing the former Great Northern Paper (GNP) mill site in East Millinocket, Maine. The mill closed in 2014 during a period when regional unemployment reached 22%. Today, East Millinocket is a rural community with a declining population of 1,560 residents. A key component of the site's redevelopment involves infrastructure improvements to enhance safety and functionality for current and future businesses on the repurposed campus. The Proposed Action includes three key elements: 1) Renovating and securely enclosing some of the existing buildings; 2) Connecting the Training Center and Finishing Room/Store Room to municipal water and sewer utilities; 3) Repairing and reconnecting critical interior mechanical systems--including electrical, HVAC, air handling, and fire suppression--to support industrial and commercial use. These prioritized upgrades will provide secure, reliable, and accessible facilities, enabling the expansion of existing businesses and the attraction of new enterprises. The Town's strategy aligns with HUD's Economic Development Initiative by strengthening public industrial and commercial infrastructure to support sustained business growth and job creation in this rural community.

**Existing Conditions and Trends [24 CFR 58.40(a)]:**

In the absence of the proposed project, the former GNP mill site would remain largely unutilized and structures and infrastructure would continue to deteriorate, leading to potential access and safety issues. Interior systems would remain disconnected and unuseable in their current state of deferred maintenance, leading to additional safety

issues for current and future site tenants. Without critical structure and infrastructure upgrades, redevelopment of the former mill site would be restricted, limiting the Town's ability to attract new businesses and employment opportunities. Furthermore, regional comprehensive planning would not be supported.

**Maps, photographs, and other documentation of project location and description:**

[East Millinocket Project Description FY24.pdf](#)

[East Millinocket HUD CPF FY22-23 ERR.docx](#)

**Determination:**

✓	Finding of No Significant Impact [24 CFR 58.40(g)(1); 40 CFR 1508.13] The project will not result in a significant impact on the quality of human environment
	Finding of Significant Impact

**Approval Documents:**

**7015.15 certified by Certifying Officer  
on:**

**7015.16 certified by Authorizing Officer  
on:**

**Funding Information**

Grant / Project Identification Number	HUD Program	Program Name	Funding Amount
B-24-CP-ME-1107	Community Planning and Development (CPD)	Community Project Funding (CPF) Grants	\$5,000,000.00

**Estimated Total HUD Funded,                      \$5,000,000.00  
Assisted or Insured Amount:**

**Estimated Total Project Cost [24 CFR 58.2 (a)                      \$5,000,000.00  
(5)]:**

**Compliance with 24 CFR §50.4, §58.5 and §58.6 Laws and Authorities**

<b>Compliance Factors:</b> Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §50.4, §58.5, and §58.6	Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?	Compliance determination (See Appendix A for source determinations)
<b>STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR §50.4 &amp; § 58.6</b>		
<b>Airport Hazards</b> Clear Zones and Accident Potential Zones; 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart D	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	The proposed activities are not within 15,000 feet of a military airport or 2,500 feet of a civilian airport. The accompanying map shows the 15,000 foot radius around the project site ("X" label). The closest airport is a civilian airport, Millinocket Municipal Airport (gray polygon), which is outside of that radius. Information obtained on May 6, 2025 using the NEPAassist mapping tool. The project is in compliance with Airport Hazards requirements.
<b>Coastal Barrier Resources Act</b> Coastal Barrier Resources Act, as amended by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 [16 USC 3501]	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	The project is not located in a CBRS Unit as determined by using the U.S Fish & Wildlife Service Coastal Barrier Resources System Mapper, and documented using output from the CBRS Validation Tool. Therefore, this project has no potential to impact a CBRS Unit and is in compliance with the Coastal Barrier Resources Act.
<b>Flood Insurance</b> Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 and National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994 [42 USC 4001-4128 and 42 USC 5154a]	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	A floodplain assessment was conducted for the former GNP mill site using the best available data. This included FEMA FIRM and Q3 maps, state and local resources, and recent 2024 topographic survey data. This combined data was used to determine and map the floodplain boundary, and supporting information is found in the accompanying Appendix E of the Environmental Assessment for East Millinocket Mill Site Redevelopment Infrastructure Improvements (NBRC, 2024). Findings indicate a Base Flood Elevation (BFE) of approximately 297-298 feet. No permanent structures or proposed activities are located within

		the 100-year floodplain. The project complies with federal floodplain management requirements and avoids adverse impacts to flood hazard areas. The structure or insurable property is not located in a FEMA-designated Special Flood Hazard Area. While flood insurance may not be mandatory in this instance, HUD recommends that all insurable structures maintain flood insurance under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). The project is in compliance with flood insurance requirements.
<b>STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR §50.4 &amp; § 58.5</b>		
<b>Air Quality</b> Clean Air Act, as amended, particularly section 176(c) & (d); 40 CFR Parts 6, 51, 93	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	The Town of East Millinocket is in Penobscot County, which is outside of any non-attainment or maintenance areas, as determined using the EPA NEPAAssist tool on 5-6-25 to map Non-attainment areas. The project's county or air quality management district is in attainment status for all criteria pollutants. The project is in compliance with the Clean Air Act.
<b>Coastal Zone Management Act</b> Coastal Zone Management Act, sections 307(c) & (d)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	This project is not located in or does not affect a Coastal Zone as defined in the state Coastal Management Plan. The Maine Department of Marine Resources Coastal Zone Map (see accompanying output) and list of Towns and Townships in Maine's Coastal Zone online resource ( <a href="https://www.maine.gov/dmr/programs/maine-coastal-program/coastal-zone-map">https://www.maine.gov/dmr/programs/maine-coastal-program/coastal-zone-map</a> ) was consulted on 4-18-25. The project is in compliance with the Coastal Zone Management Act.
<b>Contamination and Toxic Substances</b> 24 CFR 50.3(i) & 58.5(i)(2)]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Site contamination was evaluated as follows: ASTM Phase I ESA, ASTM Phase II ESA, Remediation or clean-up plan. On-site or nearby toxic, hazardous, or radioactive substances were found that could affect the health and safety of project occupants or conflict with the

		<p>intended use of the property. The project is exempt from radon consideration. The adverse environmental impacts can be mitigated. With mitigation, identified in the mitigation section of this review, the project will be in compliance with contamination and toxic substances requirements. Proposed activities would take place within portions of the former Great Northern Paper mill site, a property that has been undergoing remediation assessments and actions under the EPA Brownfields and MDEP VRAP programs to address site contamination. These efforts have resulted in the identification of localized areas of contamination, potential contamination, and recognized environmental conditions (RECs) within various site Study Areas. These findings are outlined in the accompanying Contamination and Toxic Substances Review Supplement and also described in Section 3.4 and Section 4.5.2 of the provided Environmental Assessment for East Millinocket Mill Site Redevelopment Infrastructure Improvements (2024 NBRC EA). State level information about contaminated sites was found on the Maine Remediation Sites list (<a href="https://www.maine.gov/dep/gis/datamaps/brwm_remediation_sites/rpt_rem_site_list.pdf">https://www.maine.gov/dep/gis/datamaps/brwm_remediation_sites/rpt_rem_site_list.pdf</a>), a public record database that includes information regarding location, status, and any institutional controls in place at an affected property. Further information, including relevant certificates of completion (COCs), and Letters of No Further Action (NFAs), were accessed from the MDEP Online Remediation Site Documents Portal, a searchable online database of downloadable remediation documents.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Like the actions proposed and evaluated under NBRC, the current proposed activities involve limited ground disturbance in areas previously assessed for contamination under EPA and Maine DEP programs. The provided Area of Potential Effect (APE) map shows the approximate areas of proposed project activities and the broader area where activities could potentially have adverse environmental effects. While some site areas contain contaminants like arsenic, benzo(a)pyrene, and petroleum, the proposed activities would avoid the most contaminated zones and do not involve groundwater extraction, building construction, or residential use. Only incidental exposure risks to construction workers are relevant. All activities will follow the site-specific Environmental Media Management Plan (EMMP), which outlines procedures for safe soil handling, contamination screening, and regulatory compliance. Targeted Brownfield Assessments have been completed for Study Areas 2, 3, and 5, confirming the applicability and reliability of institutional controls, engineering controls, and EMMP protocols to provide effective risk mitigation. Overall, with adherence to EMMP measures and Federal and State agency oversight, the project is not expected to pose significant human or environmental risks.</p>
<p><b>Endangered Species Act</b> Endangered Species Act of 1973, particularly section 7; 50 CFR Part 402</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>This project May Affect, but is Not Likely to Adversely Affect, listed species, and informal consultation was conducted. With mitigation, identified in the mitigation section of this review, the project will be in compliance with the Endangered Species Act. The USFWS IPaC system was consulted on 4-30-25.</p>

		<p>A Species List (attached) was generated and identified three ESA-protected species (one threatened, one endangered, and one proposed threatened species) in the action area. No Critical Habitats were identified in the action area. Effects on the threatened Canada Lynx were evaluated using the Northeast Endangered Species Determination Key, resulting in a "not likely to adversely affect" (NLAA) determination. Correspondence with the USFWS Ecological Services (Maine Field Office) in July 2024, supported "no effect" determinations for previous site redevelopment activities that were funded by another federal entity, NBRC. NBRC determined that the proposed activities would have "no effect" on the listed species, including Canada Lynx and Atlantic Salmon, as well as migratory birds and Bald eagles. Due to the similarity in nature and scope of the proposed activities to the activities evaluated as part of the NBRC funded activities in 2024, the same ESA determinations are applicable. The determination is justified because the activities would not result in a take of any federally protected species or impact any critical habitats. The project area is already an industrial developed property and does not contain suitable habitat for the Bald Eagle, any federally listed species, or migratory birds other than the Chimney Swift. By following outlined mitigation measures, project-related disturbances would not significantly impact habitats or activities/behaviors of federally listed and protected species, migratory birds, or Bald Eagles. Documentation attached: a) USFWS Species List (generated 4-30-25) for the project area b) Associated Determination Key for</p>
--	--	--



		Canada Lynx (generated 4-30-25) c) Correspondence with USFWS (Maine Field Office) regarding effect determinations
<b>Explosive and Flammable Hazards</b> Above-Ground Tanks)[24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	There is a current or planned stationary aboveground storage container of concern within 1 mile of the project site. The Separation Distance from the project is acceptable. The project is in compliance with explosive and flammable hazard requirements. The proposed activities do not increase residential density because structures are industrial/commercial, not residential. However, because the mill redevelopment involves converting uninhabitable industrial buildings into habitable commercial/industrial buildings, an analysis of Explosive and Flammable hazards is appropriate. Stationary aboveground storage containers containing applicable common industrial fuels were identified within 1 mile of the project site, as determined by a thorough stepwise review of local/regional explosive and flammable hazards resources that was conducted in 2023 as part of an environmental review for Phase I redevelopment activities: First, Stillwater Environmental Engineering (SEE) accessed State online resources for information: The Maine Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) Registered Petroleum Tanks Database and the Maine DEP TankSmart database were consulted. One AST registered with the State of Maine as "planned," a 500 gallon diesel tank, was identified within the 1-mile project radius. This tank's planned location is 300 ft. from the project area, beyond the calculated ASDPPU of 207.20 ft. and ASDBPU of 36.50 ft. (see attached ASD tool

		<p>calculations). To identify permitted propane tanks, SEE consulted the State of Maine Regulatory Licensing &amp; Permitting online search. No permitted propane tanks were identified within 1 mile of the project site. Prior to the online searches, on 2/7/23, the Maine Fire Marshal's Office (FMO) was consulted to obtain information about the presence/absence of any permitted ASTs, and the Maine Fuel Board (MFB) was consulted regarding any registered propane tanks. The response from the FMO indicated that all registered ASTs are found on the TankSmart database, by doing a search for specific addresses/locations (as was completed in the previous step). The MFB confirmed that no permitted tanks were in the area and clarified that permitted sites are those with more than four 1,000 gallon propane tanks, or with one or more 2,000 gallon tanks on site. Email correspondence between SEE and these two agencies is attached. Third, SEE consulted the property/project manager by phone to ask about the presence of aboveground tanks. He mentioned recently installed propane tanks and an out of service aboveground "Bunker C" tank. Two 1,000 gallon propane tanks were installed in 2021 for heating the Paper Warehouse building. Tank sizes were confirmed during a site visit conducted by SEE on 3/2/23. Propane tanks of 1,000 gallons or less, such as those identified on site, are not covered by 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C requirements, because the State of Maine has adopted the NFPA 58: Liquefied Petroleum Gas Code (2020 Edition). The Bunker C (#6 fuel) tank is a 750,000 gallon AST located on site. This tank is out of service and stores residual amounts of</p>
--	--	--

		Bunker C, and is planned for removal as part of the EPA Brownfield site remediation program. Bunker C is not on the list of specific petroleum products and chemicals defined to be hazardous substances in Appendix I of 24 CFR part 51 subpart C, and for these reasons the tank does not constitute a thermal radiation nor blast overpressure hazard. Lastly, a review of the most recent Google Earth imagery (9/16/2022) revealed no additional visible aboveground tanks within 1 mile of the project site. Site visits on 3/2/23 and 5/20/24 identified no additional aboveground storage tanks visible from the project site, not already accounted for.
<b>Farmlands Protection</b> Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981, particularly sections 1504(b) and 1541; 7 CFR Part 658	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	The USDA NRCS online Web Soil Survey mapping tool was consulted in 2023 to determine the farmland classification for the project site. The mapped soil units associated with the site were not identified as prime farmland, farmland of statewide importance, farmland of local importance, or unique farmland. This project does not include any activities, including new construction, acquisition of undeveloped land, or conversion, that could potentially convert one land use to another, and is in compliance with the Farmland Protection Policy Act.
<b>Floodplain Management</b> Executive Order 11988, particularly section 2(a); 24 CFR Part 55	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	This project does not occur in the FFRMS floodplain. The project is in compliance with Executive Orders 11988 and 13690. Proposed activities are located near Zone A (area of 100-year flood, base flood elevations, and flood hazard factor not determined), as indicated on Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) No. 01-05 for Community Number 230163B, effective February 4, 1987, and Maine Flood Hazard Map

		<p>(MFHM) showing Maine Floodplain Program Q3 data. The FIRM map does not provide enough detail to determine the extent of the floodplain. The floodplain boundary was established using the Freeboard Value Approach (FVA), based on the best available data for the former GNP mill site where the proposed project activities will occur. These data included Q3 data, LiDAR topographical data, ground-truthing, and modeled flood elevations. The boundary mapping was used as part of the Floodplain Management 8-Step Decision-Making Process that was completed in 2024 for actions funded under the NBRC FY23 Catalyst Program. The findings and determinations of that analysis are considered applicable to activities proposed for funding under the HUD FY24 CPF program. Supporting documentation is provided in Appendix E of the Environmental Assessment for East Millinocket Mill Site Redevelopment Infrastructure Improvements (NBRC, 2024). All proposed activities would occur within the previously developed footprint of the former mill site and would not increase impervious surface area within the floodplain. Minor grade changes related to the installation of new water and sewer connections would be the only alterations to the floodplain. Impacts from ground disturbance would be mitigated through best practices in erosion and sedimentation control, reduction of runoff quantity and velocity, and pollution prevention. All construction activities would comply with applicable State and local floodplain development regulations and ordinances. These mitigation efforts and regulatory compliance measures will minimize both direct and indirect</p>
--	--	--

		adverse effects on the adjacent floodplain. Furthermore, ongoing and future improvements to stormwater infrastructure at the site are expected to have a positive impact on the floodplain by enhancing the management and control of runoff from existing impervious surfaces.
<b>Historic Preservation</b> National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, particularly sections 106 and 110; 36 CFR Part 800	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Based on Section 106 consultation there are No Historic Properties Affected because there are no historic properties present. Section 106 consultation with the Maine SHPO concurred that site redevelopment projects would have no direct or indirect adverse effect on historic districts, sites, structures or resources. Consultation with the Penobscot Nation Cultural and Historic Preservation Office (THPO) concurred that site work would result in no direct or indirect adverse impacts on tribal historic structures or cultural/archeological resources. The consultation package and resulting concurrence correspondence are attached. The project is in compliance with Section 106.
<b>Noise Abatement and Control</b> Noise Control Act of 1972, as amended by the Quiet Communities Act of 1978; 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart B	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Based on the project description, this project includes no activities that would require further evaluation under HUD's noise regulation. The project is in compliance with HUD's Noise regulation.
<b>Sole Source Aquifers</b> Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended, particularly section 1424(e); 40 CFR Part 149	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	The project is not located on a sole source aquifer area. The project site is not located on or near, nor will the project impact, any mapped sole source aquifer, significant sand and gravel aquifers, or source water protection areas. See attachments showing locations of sole source aquifers on islands off the Maine coast, locations of significant sand and gravel aquifers in the relevant portion of East Millinocket,

		and the nearest source water protection areas. The project is in compliance with Sole Source Aquifer requirements.
<b>Wetlands Protection</b> Executive Order 11990, particularly sections 2 and 5	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The proposed project location is adjacent to the West Branch Penobscot River, a riverine wetland feature with freshwater emergent and forested/shrub wetland islands. These features are depicted in the accompanying National Wetlands Inventory map generated in July 2024. Due to its continuous connection to a navigable waterway, the West Branch of the Penobscot River is classified as "jurisdictional" under the Clean Water Act (CWA), making it subject to permitting and regulatory requirements for water quality, pollution control, and wetland protection. No wetlands are located within the immediate footprint of the project area. The river lies approximately 500 feet south of the proposed ground disturbing activities. The project will be conducted under an existing Site Location of Development Act (SLODA) permit issued by the State of Maine (#L-16637), and all activities will adhere to applicable SLODA standards for stormwater management, groundwater protection, and flood risk reduction. No vegetation will be removed within the riverine wetland or its buffer zone. The project will not significantly alter soil conditions, structures, hydrology, or vegetation. Therefore, the proposed activities are not expected to have significant impacts on nearby wetlands. The project will not impact on- or off-site wetlands. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11990.</p>
<b>Wild and Scenic Rivers Act</b> Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968, particularly section 7(b) and (c)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<p>The project is not within proximity of a river or river segment designated Wild, Scenic, or Recreational River, and is in</p>

		compliance with this section. The nearest designated Wild and Scenic River is the Allagash River, more than 40 miles to the northwest of the project location. The accompanying map (Wild & Scenic Rivers - Maine) shows the project location and the nearest designated river. The project is in compliance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.
<b>HUD HOUSING ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARDS</b>		
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE</b>		
<b>Environmental Justice</b> Executive Order 12898	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Based on the U.S. Census Bureau's profile for East Millinocket ( <a href="https://data.census.gov/profile/East_Millinocket_CDP,_Maine?g=160XX00US2321065">https://data.census.gov/profile/East_Millinocket_CDP,_Maine?g=160XX00US2321065</a> ), the 2020 U.S. Decennial Census data show that 95% of the Town's population is White and 1.2% is Hispanic or Latino. As the minority population does not exceed 50%, East Millinocket is not considered to be a minority population. The median household income in East Millinocket is \$44,306 with a poverty rate of 18.5%. In comparison, the median household income for the State of Maine is \$73,733 and the poverty rate is 10.4%. As the median household income is less than 80% of the State's median household income, East Millinocket is considered a low-income population, and an environmental justice community. The Census Bureau profile, accessed in May 2025, is attached. Any environmental impacts resulting from the project activities would be minimal, short-term, and/or mitigated, and would not disproportionately affect the population. The Town and regional (County) populations would likely be equally affected by anticipated beneficial impacts of the mill's

		redevelopment. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 12898.
--	--	---

**Environmental Assessment Factors [24 CFR 58.40; Ref. 40 CFR 1508.8 &1508.27]**

**Impact Codes:** An impact code from the following list has been used to make the determination of impact for each factor.

- (1) Minor beneficial impact
- (2) No impact anticipated
- (3) Minor Adverse Impact – May require mitigation
- (4) Significant or potentially significant impact requiring avoidance or modification which may require an Environmental Impact Statement.

Environm ental Assessme nt Factor	Imp act Cod e	Impact Evaluation	Mitigati on
<b>LAND DEVELOPMENT</b>			
Conforman ce with Plans / Compatibl e Land Use and Zoning / Scale and Urban Design	2	The proposed project is part of an ongoing initiative to redevelop the former Great Northern Paper mill site located at 50 Main Street in East Millinocket. The site is located within the Town's Industrial District and partially within the Shoreland Protection District, as shown on the accompanying East Millinocket Zoning Map and East Millinocket Shoreland Zone map. The redevelopment activities conform with the Town's Land Use Ordinance, which establishes and defines development districts and associated development/redevelopment standards. The project is compliant with the Town's Shoreland zoning. Proposed activities would not result in conflicting land use or the introduction of new land use patterns. The proposed site redevelopment is compatible with the existing land use and scale/design of the industrial district, and contributes to regional economic development efforts that are outlined in the 2020 Katahdin Region Comprehensive Plan for Millinocket, East Millinocket, and Medway Maine.	
Soil Suitability / Slope/ Erosion / Drainage and Storm	3	The project location is adjacent to the West Branch of the Penobscot River, however, proposed project activities would not take place directly within the shoreland zone. The site is located 270 - 345 feet above sea level with a zero to twenty percent slope. The soil composition of the site is mostly Made Land (Md), composed of urban land and made land. Site soils are moderately well drained, inherent of the	Project ground disturbing activities will follow State of



Environm ental Assessme nt Factor	Imp act Cod e	Impact Evaluation	Mitigati on
Water Runoff		<p>glacial till that characterizes the site and much of the State's surficial geology. Accompanying maps (surficial geology, soils, and topography) illustrate these site characteristics. Proposed activities include ground disturbance, soil excavation, and grading within an industrial developed area where soils are already overlain by impervious surface and there is little existing vegetation. Soil erosion and sedimentation would likely result from disturbance, and soil compaction would likely result from the use of heavy equipment in these areas. Both erosion and compaction have the potential to contribute to increased sediment in runoff, which can have an adverse effect on water quality. Project ground disturbing activities will follow State of Maine rules under the Stormwater Management Law and the Site Location of Development Act (SLODA), as well as Town Land Use regulations for stormwater management and sediment and erosion control. An amendment to the site's existing SLODA permit (#L16637) would be required by the Maine Department of Environmental Protection (MDEP) prior to any groundwork associated with connecting structures to the existing subsurface water and wastewater utilities. To minimize or avoid erosion during ground disturbing activities, contractors would implement appropriate best management practices according to the most recent version of MDEP's Maine Erosion and Sediment Control BMP Manual. These BMPs may include, but not be limited to: minimizing disturbance, installing physical erosion control measures (silt fencing, erosion control berms, storm drain inlet protection), and avoiding ground disturbing activities during rain events. Because of the presence of contaminated soils in areas of the mill site, water quality may be impacted if these soils are disturbed and transported to surface waters by runoff. To mitigate the likelihood of contaminated soils reaching surface waters, all ground-disturbing activities on site are required to follow the sitewide EMMP, as described and referenced in the Contamination and Toxic Substances portion of this review. Adherence to the EMMP would mitigate the impacts of runoff on surface water quality.</p>	<p>Maine rules under the Stormwater Management Law and the Site Location of Development Act (SLODA), as well as Town Land Use regulations for stormwater management and sediment and erosion control. An amendment to the site's existing SLODA permit (#L16637) would be required by the Maine Department</p>

Environm ental Assessme nt Factor	Imp act Cod e	Impact Evaluation	Mitigati on
			nt of Environm ental Protectio n (MDEP) prior to any groundw ork associate d with connectin g structures to the existing subsurfac e water and wastewat er utilities. To minimize or avoid erosion during ground disturbing activities, contracto rs would implemen t appropria te best managem ent practices according

Environm ental Assessme nt Factor	Imp act Cod e	Impact Evaluation	Mitigati on
			to the most recent version of MDEP's Maine Erosion and Sediment Control BMP Manual. These BMPs may include, but not be limited to: minimizin g disturban ce, installing physical erosion control measures (silt fencing, erosion control berms, storm drain inlet protectio n), and avoiding ground

Environm ental Assessme nt Factor	Imp act Cod e	Impact Evaluation	Mitigati on
			disturbing activities during rain events.
Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety and Site-Generated Noise	2	Ground-disturbing activities associated with connecting site buildings to existing subsurface water and wastewater utilities, as well as the ongoing removal of demolition debris, have the potential to generate temporary construction-related noise. Equipment such as backhoes, graders, and dump trucks used for earthwork and material hauling typically generate noise levels ranging from 85 to 107 dBA at a distance of 50 feet, based on OSHA estimates. To minimize noise impacts, these activities will be limited to daytime/business hours in compliance with the Town Noise Ordinance and will occur over a defined period of approximately 3 to 4 months. Residential properties along Main Street are further protected from noise and safety concerns by existing site security fencing, physical distance, and a natural buffer of mature vegetation and trees. No significant natural hazards or air pollution sources are anticipated during project implementation or as part of future site use.	
<b>SOCIOECONOMIC</b>			
Employment and Income Patterns	1	Proposed activities support a larger redevelopment initiative which is anticipated to generate both short-term and long-term employment opportunities in East Millinocket, supporting broader economic revitalization goals in this federally designated Opportunity Zone. Construction and site development activities are expected to create short-term jobs. Over the long term, the project is expected to lead to the creation of permanent positions across a variety of industrial and commercial sectors. These employment opportunities are expected to benefit residents and contribute to reduced poverty rates (currently 18.5% for East Millinocket) and increased household income (median currently is \$44K for East Millinocket residents). Data are from the US Census Bureau, accessed May 2025 from: <a href="https://data.census.gov/profile/East_Millinocket_CDP,_Mai">https://data.census.gov/profile/East_Millinocket_CDP,_Mai</a>	

Environm ental Assessme nt Factor	Imp act Cod e	Impact Evaluation	Mitigati on
		ne?g=160XX00US2321065. By expanding access to stable, well-paying jobs, the project will help address economic distress in the community and support a more resilient and diversified local economy.	
Demograp hic Character Changes / Displacem ent	2	The East Millinocket and regional community's identity has historically been tied to the paper industry, which declined following the GNP mill's closure in 2014. The mill site redevelopment initiative, supported by the proposed activities, is intended to revitalize the local economy without significantly altering the Town's demographic character or causing residential displacement. East Millinocket has a small, predominantly white (94.5%), aging population (median age 45.79) and faces economic challenges, including an 18.5% poverty rate. The project is designed to benefit current residents by creating employment opportunities that align with existing workforce skills and needs. Located within a federally designated Opportunity Zone, the project focuses on job creation in sectors consistent with current employment patterns, such as private industry, nonprofit organizations, and small businesses. As a result, most new job opportunities are expected to be filled by local residents. While the project may lead to modest population diversification if new workers or entrepreneurs relocate to the area, such changes are expected to be gradual and aligned with the existing community character. Redevelopment will occur on previously developed or underutilized land, and no residential displacement is anticipated. Overall, the project supports demographic stability, economic inclusion, and long-term community resilience.	
Environme ntal Justice EA Factor	1	2020 U.S. Decennial Census Bureau data show that 95% of the Town's population is White and 1.2% is Hispanic or Latino. As the minority population does not exceed 50%, East Millinocket is not considered to be a minority population. The median household income in East Millinocket is \$44,306 with a poverty rate of 18.5%. In comparison, the median household income for the State of Maine is \$73,733 and the poverty rate is 10.4%. As the median household income is less than 80% of the State's	

Environm ental Assessme nt Factor	Imp act Cod e	Impact Evaluation	Mitigati on
		median household income, East Millinocket is considered a low-income population, and an environmental justice community. Any environmental impacts resulting from the project activities would be minimal, short-term, and/or mitigated, and would not disproportionately affect the population. The Town and regional (County) populations would likely be equally affected by anticipated beneficial impacts of the mill's redevelopment.	
<b>COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES</b>			
Educational and Cultural Facilities (Access and Capacity)	2	The proposed activities are not expected to significantly affect the population of school-aged children in East Millinocket or the surrounding region. The redevelopment of the former mill site is intended to support broader regional economic development, which may indirectly enhance local educational, cultural, and social resources over time. However, any such impacts are anticipated to be gradual and beneficial, with no adverse effects on existing community services or infrastructure.	
Commercial Facilities (Access and Proximity)	2	Since the closure of the GNP mill in 2014, East Millinocket has experienced a decline in local commerce. The proposed redevelopment of the mill site aims to revitalize the Town's economy by supporting the creation of new businesses and jobs. Strengthening the local and regional employment base is expected to enhance overall economic stability and provide indirect benefits to existing businesses through increased consumer activity and investment.	
Health Care / Social Services (Access and Capacity)	2	Proposed activities would not contribute to significant population increase that would breach the capacity of area health care services. Adequate health and social services are available. Millinocket Regional Hospital (MRH) and Katahdin Valley Health Center in Millinocket are within 6 miles of the project. East Millinocket has a MRH walk-in clinic, pharmacy, and emergency response within 1 mile of the project location.	
Solid Waste Disposal and Recycling (Feasibility)	2	Solid waste generated by the proposed activities would primarily be related to debris from previously demolished structures, and removal of outdated/non-functional mechanical systems during upgrades. Excavated soils resulting from groundwork for subsurface water/sewer connections would potentially be hazardous waste	

Environm ental Assessme nt Factor	Imp act Cod e	Impact Evaluation	Mitigati on
and Capacity)		<p>material, given the site's contamination history. Non-hazardous materials would be managed by the Town of East Millinocket through its transfer station, which is served by Casella Waste Systems. Non-reusable waste would be transported to the Juniper Ridge Landfill (JRL) in Old Town, Maine--a licensed, state-operated facility currently in compliance with Maine's landfill regulations, as confirmed by a 2023 inspection. The volume of waste generated by the project is not expected to exceed the capacity of existing solid waste management infrastructure. JRL currently has 10.28 million cubic yards of permitted capacity, with a proposed expansion under review that would add 11.9 million cubic yards. Where feasible, materials will be reused on-site or off-site in accordance with state waste management rules. As such, the proposed activities would not result in significant impacts related to solid waste disposal. Redevelopment of the mill site, including proposed activities, involves remediation actions under purview of both the EPA and MDEP remediation programs. Current Town zoning and property deed restrictions both restrict the site to industrial/commercial usage (the property cannot be used for residential purposes). Clean up actions follow Maine DEP's RAGs for commercial workers, and/or construction workers, as appropriate for the specific site location and the contaminant of concern. Ground disturbing activities are required to follow the EMMP, implementing the following measures as appropriate to reduce the risks of contaminated soil exposure to human health and release to the environment: worker safety, site preparation (erosion and sediment control, dust control), initial field screening of soil, sampling to characterize contaminants, stockpiling contaminated soils on an impermeable surface. There is potential that hazardous materials could be contained, used or stored as part of future site industrial/commercial uses. State and/or federal level processes would be implemented to ensure proper management of these materials.</p>	
Waste Water and	2	The proposed activities include connecting two repurposed industrial buildings to the Town's wastewater treatment	

<b>Environmental Assessment Factor</b>	<b>Impact Code</b>	<b>Impact Evaluation</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>
Sanitary Sewers (Feasibility and Capacity)		system by adding connections to the existing sanitary sewer subsurface conveyance. The municipal wastewater treatment facility (WWTF) is located on a property directly abutting the east side of the mill site property and will provide adequate service and capacity. Stormwater at the project site is and will continue to be collected by a separate system.	
Water Supply (Feasibility and Capacity)	2	The proposed activities include connecting two repurposed industrial buildings to the municipal water utility (East Millinocket Water Works) by adding connections to the subsurface potable water conveyance that already exist at the mill site. The municipal water sources are three gravel packed wells located approximately 1.5 miles from the project site. The Water Works facilities and infrastructure will provide adequate service and capacity for the project.	
Public Safety - Police, Fire and Emergency Medical	2	Millinocket Regional Hospital (MRH) in Millinocket offers emergency care and is within 10 miles of the project. East Millinocket Public Safety (Fire Department, Police Department and Ambulance services) is on Main Street, less than 0.5 mile from any part of the former mill site.	
Parks, Open Space and Recreation (Access and Capacity)	2	A regional Recreation Department serves the towns of East Millinocket, Medway, Millinocket and Woodville. The Katahdin Region is well-known for its multiple outdoor recreation areas and facilities, including Baxter State Park and Katahdin Woods and Waters National Monument.	
Transportation and Accessibility (Access and Capacity)	2	Public transportation options are limited in the Town of East Millinocket and surrounding region. A vehicle is typically necessary to access essential facilities. The project is not expected to significantly impact transportation and accessibility, nor be impacted by traffic or other modes of transportation.	
<b>NATURAL FEATURES</b>			
Unique Natural Features /Water Resources	2	The proposed activities have the potential to temporarily impact surface water quality of the West Branch of the Penobscot River through erosion, runoff, and potential disturbance of contaminated soils. However, these impacts would be minimized through strict adherence to state and	



Environm ental Assessme nt Factor	Imp act Cod e	Impact Evaluation	Mitigati on
		<p>local regulatory requirements, including the Maine Stormwater Management Law (Chapter 500), the Site Location of Development Act (SLODA), and the Town's Shoreland Zoning Ordinance. The project will also follow a site-wide Environmental Media Management Plan (EMMP), which provides protocols, under the purview of the EPA Brownfield and Maine DEP VRAP programs, to mitigate the risk of contaminated soil reaching surface waters. No activities will occur within the 75-foot river setback (Shoreland Zone), and stormwater infrastructure provides runoff management and reduces pollutant loads to the river. Ground disturbing activities will employ appropriate erosion and sedimentation control measures, as required by and enforced under Chapter 500 and SLODA regulations. Hazardous and non-hazardous construction waste will be properly characterized and managed in accordance with applicable regulations and the EMMP, avoiding contamination of water resources. As a result, the project would not degrade surface water quality, violate water quality standards, or affect groundwater availability or recharge patterns. Drinking water and wastewater will be adequately managed by municipal systems. Cumulatively, continued redevelopment projects at the site will be subject to the same environmental protections and oversight, with any future discharges regulated under the Clean Water Act via the Maine Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (MPDES). Therefore, no significant adverse impacts to water resources are anticipated.</p>	
Vegetation / Wildlife (Introduction, Modification, Removal, Disruption, etc.)	2	<p>Proposed project activities would occur on a previously developed, Town-owned industrial property adjacent to the West Branch of the Penobscot River. Ground disturbance would be minimal, and the project would not alter or fragment aquatic or shoreland habitats. Aquatic species of concern, such as freshwater mussels and non-native fish, could be affected by runoff or erosion during construction; however, adherence to State development standards (Chapter 500 Site Law) and the site-wide Environmental Media Management Plan (EMMP) would mitigate these potential impacts. No federally listed species would be taken as a result of the Proposed Action, nor would the</p>	

Environm ental Assessme nt Factor	Imp act Cod e	Impact Evaluation	Mitigati on
		project jeopardize the continued existence of any listed species or adversely modify critical habitat. Based on consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) via the Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) system, the Town determined that the Proposed Action would have no effect on the Canada Lynx or Atlantic Salmon. Canada Lynx are not expected to be present in this developed, non-forested area. Atlantic Salmon are highly unlikely to inhabit the adjacent section of the river, which lacks critical habitat and fish passage infrastructure. IPaC results are documented in the Endangered Species Act section of this EA. Project activities are not expected to impact migratory birds or Bald Eagles. The nearest known Bald Eagle nest (determined from the Bald Eagle Nests - Maine map viewer managed by the USFWS) is located more than 1,000 feet from the site--outside of the 660-foot protective buffer--and no tree removal or habitat disturbance is proposed. While Chimney Swifts may inhabit nearby structures, project timing will largely avoid the breeding season, and short-term excavation and other equipment noise is not anticipated to disrupt breeding or migration. Best management practices, such as minimizing noisy activities and turning off equipment when not in use, would further reduce any potential impacts.	
Other Factors 1			
Other Factors 2			
<b>CLIMATE AND ENERGY</b>			
Climate Change	2	It is not anticipated that the project or intended use of the project will be significantly affected by climate change, given that the potential for natural hazards related to climate are inherently low in this region (FEMA National Risk Index for Penobscot County). The main climate-related risk factors that could be affected are those related to water resources (flooding, drought) and extreme weather events (ice storms, winter weather). Stormwater infrastructure improvements that are part of the broader site redevelopment efforts are expected to provide sufficient stormwater management even under more	

Environm ental Assessme nt Factor	Imp act Cod e	Impact Evaluation	Mitigati on
		extreme precipitation scenarios and will contribute to mitigation of climate change impacts.	
Energy Efficiency	2	The current energy utility for the project area is electricity transmitted and delivered by Versant Power company, which serves more than 160,000 customers in northern and eastern Maine. The Town is in Versant's Bangor Hydro District. Additionally, behind the meter power/grid capacity for the site is potentially available directly from the adjacent Great Lakes Hydro America - Brookfield hydropower station. An adequate electricity supply exists to serve the site for redevelopment activities as well as current and future industrial/commercial operations. A short-term increase in energy consumption would result from proposed activities that require diesel powered equipment, including excavation equipment, dump trucks, and graders, during the active work period. This increase in energy consumption that would be required would be minor and would not result in a substantial increase in energy demand or wasteful, inefficient, excessive or unnecessary energy usage.	

#### Supporting documentation

[EM\\_Sig\\_Habitats.png](#)  
[EM\\_Eagle\\_nests.png](#)  
[EM\\_Critical\\_Hab\\_2.png](#)  
[East Millinocket USCB Profile May 2025\(1\).pdf](#)  
[C\\_OSHA\\_noise-in-construction-pocket-guide.pdf](#)  
[B\\_Surficial\\_geology\\_Maine.pdf](#)  
[B\\_EastMill\\_topo\\_map.jpg](#)  
[B\\_EastMill\\_Soils\\_map.jpg](#)  
[B\\_East Millinocket SLODA L16637YTZA.pdf](#)  
[A\\_Katahdin\\_Region\\_CompPlan\\_2020.pdf](#)  
[A\\_EastMill\\_ZoningMap+project area.pdf](#)  
[A\\_EastMill\\_SLZ Ordinance.pdf](#)  
[A\\_EastMill\\_Land Use Ordinance.pdf](#)  
[A\\_EastMil\\_SLZMap\\_project area.pdf](#)

#### Additional Studies Performed:

**Field Inspection [Optional]:** Date and completed

by:

Tiffany Wilson, Jeff Spaulding

5/15/2024 12:00:00 AM

**List of Sources, Agencies and Persons Consulted [40 CFR 1508.9(b)]:**

Maine State Historic Preservation Commission (SHPO); Penobscot Nation Tribal Historic Preservation Office (THPO); US Fish and Wildlife Service, Eastern Maine Field Office; TRC (Zack Bonin) regarding relevant site-specific EPA Brownfields and State VRAP actions; Online information, data and maps from: Federal Emergency Management Agency, Maine Floodplain Management Program, US Fish and Wildlife Service, US Census Bureau, US Environmental Protection Agency, Maine Department of Environmental Protection, Maine Geological Survey, Town of East Millinocket.

**List of Permits Obtained:**

An amendment to the site's existing Maine DEP Site Location of Development Act (SLODA) permit will be obtained prior to the start of relevant ground disturbing activities.

**Public Outreach [24 CFR 58.43]:**

The FONSI public notice for the Proposed Action will be posted on the Town of East Millinocket website and a copy of the draft EA will be made available to the public at the East Millinocket Town Office. The public will be provided with a 15-day public comment period. If no substantive comments are received, the draft EA will become final and this initial Public Notice will also serve as the final Public Notice. Substantive comments will be addressed as appropriate in the final EA document.

**Cumulative Impact Analysis [24 CFR 58.32]:**

The Town of East Millinocket has undertaken a phased, strategic approach to repurposing the former GNP mill site. To date, this redevelopment effort has focused on environmental investigation and remediation, evaluating the condition of existing infrastructure, conducting critical maintenance on serviceable structures, and demolishing non-serviceable buildings. These completed and ongoing efforts, while not part of the current proposed action, may contribute to the cumulative impacts of redevelopment activities at the site. Completed Projects Contributing to Cumulative Impacts: -Environmental Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessments (ESAs) have been completed for the entire property, with the most recent in 2020. Targeted

Phase II assessments of recognized environmental conditions (RECs) have been conducted in specific study areas (Study Area 2 North; Study Areas 3, 5, 6, & 7). - Environmental Remediation: Remediation efforts in Brownfields/VRAP-designated areas have included the removal of aboveground and underground storage tanks, as well as excavation, capping, and backfilling of localized PCB- and fuel-contaminated soils. -Demolition: Non-serviceable structures such as the Paper Machine Buildings, Recycle Fiber Plant, and Flotation Cell Building have been demolished. Ongoing Projects Contributing to Cumulative Impacts: -Continued Remediation: Environmental cleanup activities under the EPA Brownfields and Maine DEP Voluntary Response Action Program (VRAP) are ongoing, with various stages of investigation and remediation underway. -Hazardous Materials Removal: The EPA (Region 1) and Maine DEP are overseeing the removal and disposal of hazardous materials. - Infrastructure Assessments: A site-wide evaluation of stormwater management and fire suppression systems is in progress, with future corrective actions planned based on the findings. Future Operations and Redevelopment: The Proposed Action will support the Town's long-term vision for economic revitalization by facilitating future commercial and industrial uses on the site. Potential future uses include, but are not limited to: Storage and shipment of wood products; Sawmill operations; Wood pellet and construction materials manufacturing; Data warehousing; Solar energy production. These uses align with regional industry trends and are expected to generate new employment opportunities for commercial, industrial, and construction workers. The Proposed Action also supports broader planning goals outlined in the Katahdin Region Comprehensive Plan for Millinocket, East Millinocket, and Medway. In conclusion, the proposed action, when considered alongside past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future activities at the site, is not expected to result in significant adverse cumulative impacts on the quality of the human environment. The project complies with all applicable environmental regulations and contributes positively to the regional redevelopment strategy. A finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) is appropriate for the proposed project. Therefore, an Environmental Impact Statement under NEPA is not required.

**Alternatives [24 CFR 58.40(e); 40 CFR 1508.9]**

No action alternatives beyond the Proposed Action were identified. The property in question is already owned by the Town and contains substantial existing infrastructure that is either operational or suitable for repair. Alternative locations or modifications to the proposed course of action would not provide a comparable opportunity for industrial and commercial development or redevelopment. Given the site's existing assets and strategic potential, it presents the most viable and cost-effective option for achieving the project's objectives.

**No Action Alternative [24 CFR 58.40(e)]**

Under the No Action Alternative, no proposed activities would be implemented. Critical maintenance and rehabilitation of existing, serviceable structures and infrastructure would not occur, and non-serviceable structures would remain in disrepair. As a result, existing access and safety issues would likely persist and deteriorate further over time. The former GNP mill site would remain largely unused, with continued degradation of structures and infrastructure. Interior systems would remain disconnected and unusable due to deferred maintenance, exacerbating safety concerns for current and future tenants. Without necessary upgrades, redevelopment of the site would be severely limited, hindering the Town's ability to attract new businesses and jobs. Additionally, this inaction would not support broader regional comprehensive planning efforts.

**Summary of Findings and Conclusions:**

The environmental analysis for the East Millinocket Mill Site Redevelopment Infrastructure Improvements project found that the proposed work will have overall beneficial impacts, with limited and manageable adverse effects. The project will support economic revitalization by enabling reuse of a previously developed industrial site, encouraging job creation and improved infrastructure. Environmental benefits include upgrades to aging systems, beneficial re-use of existing infrastructure, and removal of debris. The project supports ongoing efforts to remediate residual site contamination by adhering to protocols under the EPA Brownfields program, Maine Voluntary Response Action Program (VRAP) and implementation of an Environmental Media Management Plan (EMMP). While potential adverse impacts include disturbance of potentially contaminated soils and possible effects on water resources and threatened/sensitive species, these concerns are being addressed through best management practices, state and federal permitting, and species-specific mitigation measures. Other environmental factors--including floodplains, air quality, historic resources, and farmland--were reviewed and found to pose no significant concerns. With appropriate mitigation in place, the project is expected to result in no significant adverse environmental impacts.

**Mitigation Measures and Conditions [CFR 1505.2(c)]:**

Summarized below are all mitigation measures adopted by the Responsible Entity to reduce, avoid or eliminate adverse environmental impacts and to avoid non-compliance or non-conformance with the above-listed authorities and factors. These measures/conditions must be incorporated into project contracts, development agreements and other relevant documents. The staff responsible for implementing and monitoring mitigation measures should be clearly identified in the mitigation plan.

Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure or Condition	Comments on Completed Measures	Mitigation Plan	Complete
Endangered Species Act	If any ESA-listed species or Bald Eagle nests were sited during construction, demolition, or ground disturbing (high-noise) activities, activities would be stopped, and the USFWS would be consulted. The following best management practices would be implemented to minimize potential effects to migratory birds from noise: as practicable, conducting high-noise activities during late August through mid-March, outside of the Chimney Swift breeding season, turning off vehicle engines and other equipment whenever possible and minimizing the number of noisy activities that coincide.	N/A	The project takes into account the potential presence of migratory birds and other protected wildlife by limiting construction activities to the non-breeding season, specifically from August to March, as practicable. This temporal restriction is designed to reduce noise and disruption during critical breeding periods. Additionally, efforts to reduce vehicle and equipment idling help lower noise and air pollution levels, which	

			may impact sensitive species. While no federally listed endangered species were identified as being directly impacted by the project, these precautionary measures demonstrate compliance with the spirit and intent of the Endangered Species Act to protect vulnerable wildlife populations.	
Contamination and Toxic Substances	The proposed activities are within an identified hazardous waste remediation site, the site of the former Great Northern Paper East Millinocket mill. The mill site is in the EPA Brownfields program and is an EPA Superfund non-NPL removal only site, as well as taking part in the Maine DEP Voluntary Response Action Program (VRAP) and	N/A	Mitigation measures under this category focus on minimizing human and environmental exposure to potentially hazardous materials remaining from the site's industrial past. The project includes strict adherence to	



	<p>Uncontrolled Sites program.</p> <p>The project will adhere to institutional controls (Environmental Covenants/Agreements associated with the property) that place restrictions on property use, excavations and groundwater use.</p> <p>The project will not breach any engineering controls that are in place within the project area. The project will follow any USEPA- and/or Maine DEP- approved Brownfield/VRAP remediation workplans developed for the site, including the Environmental Media Management Plan developed in 2024 (attached). If asbestos containing materials are to be impacted by project maintenance, repair, or demolition activities, abatement procedures will follow the requirements of the Maine DEP Lead &amp; Asbestos Hazard Prevention Program.</p>		<p>EPA Brownfields and Maine Department of Environmental Protection's (MDEP) Voluntary Response Action Program (VRAP) requirements. Measures include the implementation of an Environmental Media Management Plan (EMMP) to identify and manage contaminated soils during excavation, institutional controls (e.g., prohibition of groundwater extraction and restriction of site use to industrial purposes), and engineering controls (e.g., avoiding disturbance of capped PCB spill sites). Stormwater management</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			and erosion and sediment control BMPs will be implemented during ground disturbing activities, as part of Maine Stormwater Law (Chapter 500) and associated site-specific SLODA license requirements. If asbestos containing materials are encountered, abatement procedures will follow the requirements of the Maine DEP Lead & Asbestos Hazard Prevention Program. These actions help ensure that redevelopment activities do not exacerbate contamination risks.	
Soil Suitability / Slope/ Erosion / Drainage and Storm Water Runoff	Project ground disturbing activities will follow State of Maine rules under the Stormwater	N/A		

	<p>Management Law and the Site Location of Development Act (SLODA), as well as Town Land Use regulations for stormwater management and sediment and erosion control. An amendment to the site's existing SLODA permit (#L16637) would be required by the Maine Department of Environmental Protection (MDEP) prior to any groundwork associated with connecting structures to the existing subsurface water and wastewater utilities. To minimize or avoid erosion during ground disturbing activities, contractors would implement appropriate best management practices according to the most recent version of MDEP's Maine Erosion and Sediment Control BMP Manual. These BMPs may include, but not be limited to: minimizing disturbance, installing physical</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

	erosion control measures (silt fencing, erosion control berms, storm drain inlet protection), and avoiding ground disturbing activities during rain events.			
Erosion/Drainage/Stormwater Runoff	Proposed activities include ground disturbance, soil excavation, and grading within an industrial developed area where soils are already overlain by impervious surface and there is little existing vegetation. Soil erosion and sedimentation would likely result from disturbance, and soil compaction would likely result from the use of heavy equipment in these areas. Both erosion and compaction have the potential to contribute to increased sediment in runoff, which can have an adverse effect on water quality.	N/A	Project ground disturbing activities will follow State of Maine rules under the Stormwater Management Law and the Site Location of Development Act (SLODA), as well as Town Land Use regulations for stormwater management and sediment and erosion control. An amendment to the site's existing SLODA permit (#L16637) would be required by the Maine Department of Environmenta	

			I Protection (MDEP) prior to any groundwork associated with connecting structures to the existing subsurface water and wastewater utilities. To minimize or avoid erosion during ground disturbing activities, contractors would implement appropriate best management practices according to the most recent version of MDEP's Maine Erosion and Sediment Control BMP Manual. These BMPs may include, but not be limited to: minimizing disturbance, installing physical erosion control measures (silt fencing,	
--	--	--	---	--

			erosion control berms, storm drain inlet protection), and avoiding ground disturbing activities during rain events.	
--	--	--	---	--

**Project Mitigation Plan**

See attached Mitigation Plan

[Mitigation Plan 5-12-25.pdf](#)

**Supporting documentation on completed measures**

## APPENDIX A: Related Federal Laws and Authorities

### Airport Hazards

General policy	Legislation	Regulation
It is HUD's policy to apply standards to prevent incompatible development around civil airports and military airfields.		24 CFR Part 51 Subpart D

1. To ensure compatible land use development, you must determine your site's proximity to civil and military airports. Is your project within 15,000 feet of a military airport or 2,500 feet of a civilian airport?

✓ No

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload the map showing that the site is not within the applicable distances to a military or civilian airport below

Yes

### Screen Summary

#### Compliance Determination

The proposed activities are not within 15,000 feet of a military airport or 2,500 feet of a civilian airport. The accompanying map shows the 15,000 foot radius around the project site ("X" label). The closest airport is a civilian airport, Millinocket Municipal Airport (gray polygon), which is outside of that radius. Information obtained on May 6, 2025 using the NEPAassist mapping tool. The project is in compliance with Airport Hazards requirements.

#### Supporting documentation

[Airport-Hazards-EastMill Map 5-6-25.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No





## Coastal Barrier Resources

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
HUD financial assistance may not be used for most activities in units of the Coastal Barrier Resources System (CBRS). See 16 USC 3504 for limitations on federal expenditures affecting the CBRS.	Coastal Barrier Resources Act (CBRA) of 1982, as amended by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 (16 USC 3501)	

**1. Is the project located in a CBRS Unit?**

✓ No

Document and upload map and documentation below.

Yes

### Compliance Determination

The project is not located in a CBRS Unit as determined by using the U.S Fish & Wildlife Service Coastal Barrier Resources System Mapper, and documented using output from the CBRS Validation Tool. Therefore, this project has no potential to impact a CBRS Unit and is in compliance with the Coastal Barrier Resources Act.

### Supporting documentation

[CBR Validation-EastMill 5-6-25.pdf](#)

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

✓ No

## Flood Insurance

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
Certain types of federal financial assistance may not be used in floodplains unless the community participates in National Flood Insurance Program and flood insurance is both obtained and maintained.	Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 as amended (42 USC 4001-4128)	24 CFR 50.4(b)(1) and 24 CFR 58.6(a) and (b); 24 CFR 55.1(b).

**1. Does this project involve financial assistance for construction, rehabilitation, or acquisition of a mobile home, building, or insurable personal property?**

No. This project does not require flood insurance or is excepted from flood insurance.

✓ Yes

**2. Upload a FEMA/FIRM map showing the site here:**

[East Millinocket FIRM map.pdf](#)

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) designates floodplains. The [FEMA Map Service Center](#) provides this information in the form of FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs). For projects in areas not mapped by FEMA, use the best available information to determine floodplain information. Include documentation, including a discussion of why this is the best available information for the site. Provide FEMA/FIRM floodplain zone designation, panel number, and date within your documentation.

**Is the structure, part of the structure, or insurable property located in a FEMA-designated Special Flood Hazard Area?**

✓ No

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section.

Yes

**4. While flood insurance is not mandatory for this project, HUD strongly recommends that all insurable structures maintain flood insurance under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). Will flood insurance be required as a mitigation measure or condition?**

Yes

✓ No

### **Screen Summary**

#### **Compliance Determination**

A floodplain assessment was conducted for the former GNP mill site using the best available data. This included FEMA FIRM and Q3 maps, state and local resources, and recent 2024 topographic survey data. This combined data was used to determine and map the floodplain boundary, and supporting information is found in the accompanying Appendix E of the Environmental Assessment for East Millinocket Mill Site Redevelopment Infrastructure Improvements (NBRC, 2024). Findings indicate a Base Flood Elevation (BFE) of approximately 297-298 feet. No permanent structures or proposed activities are located within the 100-year floodplain. The project complies with federal floodplain management requirements and avoids adverse impacts to flood hazard areas. The structure or insurable property is not located in a FEMA-designated Special Flood Hazard Area. While flood insurance may not be mandatory in this instance, HUD recommends that all insurable structures maintain flood insurance under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). The project is in compliance with flood insurance requirements.

#### **Supporting documentation**

[2024 NBRC EA Appendix E - 8-Step FFRMS.pdf](#)

#### **Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

✓ No

## Air Quality

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
The Clean Air Act is administered by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), which sets national standards on ambient pollutants. In addition, the Clean Air Act is administered by States, which must develop State Implementation Plans (SIPs) to regulate their state air quality. Projects funded by HUD must demonstrate that they conform to the appropriate SIP.	Clean Air Act (42 USC 7401 et seq.) as amended particularly Section 176(c) and (d) (42 USC 7506(c) and (d))	40 CFR Parts 6, 51 and 93

**1. Does your project include new construction or conversion of land use facilitating the development of public, commercial, or industrial facilities OR five or more dwelling units?**

☒ Yes

☐ No

### Air Quality Attainment Status of Project's County or Air Quality Management District

**2. Is your project's air quality management district or county in non-attainment or maintenance status for any criteria pollutants?**

☒ No, project's county or air quality management district is in attainment status for all criteria pollutants.

Yes, project's management district or county is in non-attainment or maintenance status for the following criteria pollutants (check all that apply):

### Screen Summary

#### Compliance Determination

The Town of East Millinocket is in Penobscot County, which is outside of any non-attainment or maintenance areas, as determined using the EPA NEPAAssist tool on 5-6-25 to map Non-attainment areas. The project's county or air quality management

district is in attainment status for all criteria pollutants. The project is in compliance with the Clean Air Act.

**Supporting documentation**

[Air Quality Non-Attainment Map - East Mill 5-6-25.pdf](#)

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

✓ No

## Coastal Zone Management Act

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
Federal assistance to applicant agencies for activities affecting any coastal use or resource is granted only when such activities are consistent with federally approved State Coastal Zone Management Act Plans.	Coastal Zone Management Act (16 USC 1451-1464), particularly section 307(c) and (d) (16 USC 1456(c) and (d))	15 CFR Part 930

**1. Is the project located in, or does it affect, a Coastal Zone as defined in your state Coastal Management Plan?**

Yes

✓ No

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload all documents used to make your determination below.

### Screen Summary

#### Compliance Determination

This project is not located in or does not affect a Coastal Zone as defined in the state Coastal Management Plan. The Maine Department of Marine Resources Coastal Zone Map (see accompanying output) and list of Towns and Townships in Maine's Coastal Zone online resource (<https://www.maine.gov/dmr/programs/maine-coastal-program/coastal-zone-map>) was consulted on 4-18-25. The project is in compliance with the Coastal Zone Management Act.

#### Supporting documentation

[MaineCoastalZoneMap\\_EastMill\\_4-18-25.pdf](#)

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

✓ No



## Contamination and Toxic Substances

General Requirements	Legislation	Regulations
It is HUD policy that all properties that are being proposed for use in HUD programs be free of hazardous materials, contamination, toxic chemicals and gases, and radioactive substances, where a hazard could affect the health and safety of the occupants or conflict with the intended utilization of the property.		24 CFR 58.5(i)(2) 24 CFR 50.3(i)
Reference		
<a href="https://www.onecpd.info/environmental-review/site-contamination">https://www.onecpd.info/environmental-review/site-contamination</a>		

**1. How was site contamination evaluated?\* Select all that apply.**

- ✓ ASTM Phase I ESA
- ✓ ASTM Phase II ESA
- ✓ Remediation or clean-up plan

ASTM Vapor Encroachment Screening.

None of the above

\* HUD regulations at 24 CFR § 58.5(i)(2)(ii) require that the environmental review for multifamily housing with five or more dwelling units or non-residential property include the evaluation of previous uses of the site or other evidence of contamination on or near the site.

For acquisition and new construction of multifamily and nonresidential properties HUD strongly advises the review include an ASTM Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) to meet real estate transaction standards of due diligence and to help ensure compliance with HUD's toxic policy at 24 CFR §58.5(i) and 24 CFR §50.3(i). Also note that some HUD programs require an ASTM Phase I ESA.

**2. Were any on-site or nearby toxic, hazardous, or radioactive substances\* (excluding radon) found that could affect the health and safety of project occupants or conflict with the intended use of the property? (Were any recognized environmental conditions or RECs identified in a Phase I ESA and confirmed in a Phase II ESA?)**

Provide a map or other documentation of absence or presence of contamination\*\* and explain evaluation of site contamination in the Screen Summary at the bottom of this screen.



No

Explain:

✓ Yes

\* This question covers the presence of radioactive substances excluding radon. Radon is addressed in the Radon Exempt Question.

\*\* Utilize EPA's Enviromapper, NEPAAssist, or state/tribal databases to identify nearby dumps, junk yards, landfills, hazardous waste sites, and industrial sites, including EPA National Priorities List Sites (Superfund sites), CERCLA or state-equivalent sites, RCRA Corrective Action sites with release(s) or suspected release(s) requiring clean-up action and/or further investigation. Additional supporting documentation may include other inspections and reports.

**3. Evaluate the building(s) for radon. Do all buildings meet any of the exemptions\* from having to consider radon in the contamination analysis listed in CPD Notice [CPD-23-103](#)?**

✓ Yes

Explain:

Buildings are intended for industrial or commercial use rather than residential occupancy. Furthermore, future occupancy levels have not yet been determined. Many of the structures are currently undergoing maintenance, repair, or renovation, and several are not fully enclosed or weather-tight. These conditions render effective indoor radon testing impractical at this time. In lieu of site-specific testing, this analysis references data from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), National Environmental Public Health Tracking Program. According to this dataset, the mean pre-mitigation radon level in tested buildings in Penobscot County--where the proposed activities are to occur--was less than 4 pCi/L over a 10-year period (2008-2017). A radon data map illustrating these findings is included in the accompanying documentation.

No

\* Notes:

- Buildings with no enclosed areas having ground contact.
- Buildings containing crawlspaces, utility tunnels, or parking garages would not be exempt, however buildings built on piers would be exempt, provided that there is open air between the lowest floor of the building and the ground.

- Buildings that are not residential and will not be occupied for more than 4 hours per day.
- Buildings with existing radon mitigation systems - document radon levels are below 4 pCi/L with test results dated within two years of submitting the application for HUD assistance and document the system includes an ongoing maintenance plan that includes periodic testing to ensure the system continues to meet the current EPA recommended levels. If the project does not require an application, document test results dated within two years of the date the environmental review is certified. Refer to program office guidance to ensure compliance with program requirements.
- Buildings tested within five years of the submission of application for HUD assistance: test results document indoor radon levels are below current the EPA's recommended action levels of 4.0 pCi/L. For buildings with test data older than five years, any new environmental review must include a consideration of radon using one of the methods in Section A below.

## 8. Mitigation

Document the mitigation needed according to the requirements of the appropriate federal, state, tribal, or local oversight agency. If the adverse environmental impacts cannot be mitigated, then HUD assistance may not be used for the project at this site.

For instances where radon mitigation is required (i.e. where test results demonstrated radon levels at 4.0 pCi/L and above), then you must include a radon mitigation plan\*.

### Can all adverse environmental impacts be mitigated?

No, all adverse environmental impacts cannot feasibly be mitigated.  
Project cannot proceed at this location.

- ✓ Yes, all adverse environmental impacts can be eliminated through mitigation, and/or consideration of radon and radon mitigation, if needed, will occur following construction.  
Provide all mitigation requirements\*\* and documents in the Screen Summary at the bottom of this screen.

\* Refer to CPD Notice [CPD-23-103](#) for additional information on radon mitigation plans.

\*\* Mitigation requirements include all clean-up requirements required by applicable federal, state, tribal, or local law. Additionally, please upload, as applicable, the long-term operations and maintenance plan, Remedial Action Work Plan, and other equivalent documents.

9. Describe how compliance was achieved. Include any of the following that apply: State Voluntary Clean-up Program, a No Further Action letter, use of engineering controls\*, or use of institutional controls\*\*.

The proposed activities are within an identified hazardous waste remediation site, the site of the former Great Northern Paper East Millinocket mill. The mill site is in the EPA Brownfields program and is an EPA Superfund non-NPL removal only site, as well as taking part in the Maine DEP Voluntary Response Action Program (VRAP) and Uncontrolled Sites program. The project will adhere to institutional controls (Environmental Covenants/Agreements associated with the property) that place restrictions on property use, excavations and groundwater use. The project will not breach any engineering controls that are in place within the project area. The project will follow any USEPA- and/or Maine DEP-approved Brownfield/VRAP remediation workplans developed for the site, including the Environmental Media Management Plan developed in 2024 (attached). If asbestos containing materials are to be impacted by project maintenance, repair, or demolition activities, abatement procedures will follow the requirements of the Maine DEP Lead & Asbestos Hazard Prevention Program.

If a remediation plan or clean-up program was necessary, which standard does it follow?

Complete removal

✓ Risk-based corrective action (RBCA)

Other

\* Engineering controls are any physical mechanism used to contain or stabilize contamination or ensure the effectiveness of a remedial action. Engineering controls may include, caps, covers, dikes, trenches, leachate collection systems, radon mitigation systems, signs, fences, physical access controls, ground water monitoring systems and ground water containment systems including, slurry walls and ground water pumping systems.

\*\* Institutional controls are mechanisms used to limit human activities at or near a contaminated site, or to ensure the effectiveness of the remedial action over time, when contaminants remain at a site at levels above the applicable remediation standard which would allow for unrestricted use of the property. Institutional controls may include structure, land, and natural resource use restrictions, well restriction areas, classification exception areas, deed notices, and declarations of environmental restrictions.

#### **Screen Summary**

#### **Compliance Determination**

Site contamination was evaluated as follows: ASTM Phase I ESA, ASTM Phase II ESA, Remediation or clean-up plan. On-site or nearby toxic, hazardous, or radioactive substances were found that could affect the health and safety of project occupants or conflict with the intended use of the property. The project is exempt from radon consideration. The adverse environmental impacts can be mitigated. With mitigation, identified in the mitigation section of this review, the project will be in compliance with contamination and toxic substances requirements. Proposed activities would take place within portions of the former Great Northern Paper mill site, a property that has been undergoing remediation assessments and actions under the EPA Brownfields and MDEP VRAP programs to address site contamination. These efforts have resulted in the identification of localized areas of contamination, potential contamination, and recognized environmental conditions (RECs) within various site Study Areas. These findings are outlined in the accompanying Contamination and Toxic Substances Review Supplement and also described in Section 3.4 and Section 4.5.2 of the provided Environmental Assessment for East Millinocket Mill Site Redevelopment Infrastructure Improvements (2024 NBRC EA). State level information about contaminated sites was found on the Maine Remediation Sites list ([https://www.maine.gov/dep/gis/datamaps/brwm\\_remediation\\_sites/rpt\\_rem\\_site\\_list.pdf](https://www.maine.gov/dep/gis/datamaps/brwm_remediation_sites/rpt_rem_site_list.pdf)), a public record database that includes information regarding location, status, and any institutional controls in place at an affected property. Further information, including relevant certificates of completion (COCs), and Letters of No Further Action (NFAs), were accessed from the MDEP Online Remediation Site Documents Portal, a searchable online database of downloadable remediation documents. Like the actions proposed and evaluated under NBRC, the current proposed activities involve limited ground disturbance in areas previously assessed for contamination under EPA and Maine DEP programs. The provided Area of Potential Effect (APE) map shows the approximate areas of proposed project activities and the broader area where activities could potentially have adverse environmental effects. While some site areas contain contaminants like arsenic, benzo(a)pyrene, and petroleum, the proposed activities would avoid the most contaminated zones and do not involve groundwater extraction, building construction, or residential use. Only incidental exposure risks to construction workers are relevant. All activities will follow the site-specific Environmental Media Management Plan (EMMP), which outlines procedures for safe soil handling, contamination screening, and regulatory compliance. Targeted Brownfield Assessments have been completed for Study Areas 2, 3, and 5, confirming the applicability and reliability of institutional controls, engineering controls, and EMMP protocols to provide effective risk mitigation. Overall, with adherence to EMMP measures and Federal and State agency oversight, the project is not expected to pose significant human or environmental risks.

#### **Supporting documentation**

East-Millinocket-Mill-Site-  
Renovations-and-  
Infrastructure

East Millinocket, ME

900000010417355

[East\\_Millinocket\\_HUDFY24-APE-2025.pdf](#)

[Radon map PenobscotCo 5-5-25.pdf](#)

[Great Northern Paper EMMP Rev 2 092424.pdf](#)

[Contamination Review Supplement 5-5-25.pdf](#)

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

✓ Yes

No

## Endangered Species

General requirements	ESA Legislation	Regulations
Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) mandates that federal agencies ensure that actions that they authorize, fund, or carry out shall not jeopardize the continued existence of federally listed plants and animals or result in the adverse modification or destruction of designated critical habitat. Where their actions may affect resources protected by the ESA, agencies must consult with the Fish and Wildlife Service and/or the National Marine Fisheries Service ("FWS" and "NMFS" or "the Services").	The Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 <i>et seq.</i> ); particularly section 7 (16 USC 1536).	50 CFR Part 402

**1. Does the project involve any activities that have the potential to affect species or habitats?**

No, the project will have No Effect due to the nature of the activities involved in the project.

No, the project will have No Effect based on a letter of understanding, memorandum of agreement, programmatic agreement, or checklist provided by local HUD office

- ✓ Yes, the activities involved in the project have the potential to affect species and/or habitats.

**2. Are federally listed species or designated critical habitats present in the action area?**

No, the project will have No Effect due to the absence of federally listed species and designated critical habitat

- ✓ Yes, there are federally listed species or designated critical habitats present in the action area.

**3. What effects, if any, will your project have on federally listed species or designated critical habitat?**

No Effect: Based on the specifics of both the project and any federally listed species in the action area, you have determined that the project will have absolutely no effect on listed species or critical habitat. in the action area.

- ✓ May Affect, Not Likely to Adversely Affect: Any effects that the project may have on federally listed species or critical habitats would be beneficial, discountable, or insignificant.

Likely to Adversely Affect: The project may have negative effects on one or more listed species or critical habitat.

**4. Informal Consultation is required**

Section 7 of ESA (16 USC. 1536) mandates consultation to resolve potential impacts to endangered and threatened species and critical habitats. If a HUD-assisted project may affect any federally listed endangered or threatened species or critical habitat, then compliance is required with Section 7. See 50 CFR Part 402 Subpart B Consultation Procedures.

**Did the Service(s) concur with the finding that the project is Not Likely to Adversely Affect?**

- ✓ Yes, the Service(s) concurred with the finding.

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload the following below:

- (1) A biological evaluation or equivalent document
- (2) Concurrence(s) from FWS and/or NMFS
- (3) Any other documentation of informal consultation

Exception: If finding was made based on procedures provided by a letter of understanding, memorandum of agreement, programmatic agreement, or checklist provided by local HUD office, provide whatever documentation is mandated by that agreement.

No, the Service(s) did not concur with the finding.

**6. For the project to be brought into compliance with this section, all adverse impacts must be mitigated. Explain in detail the exact measures that must be implemented to mitigate for the impact or effect, including the timeline for implementation. This information will be automatically included in the Mitigation summary for the environmental review. If negative effects cannot be mitigated, cancel the project using the button at the bottom of this screen.**

✓ Mitigation as follows will be implemented:

If any ESA-listed species or Bald Eagle nests were sited during construction, demolition, or ground disturbing (high-noise) activities, activities would be stopped, and the USFWS would be consulted. The following best management practices would be implemented to minimize potential effects to migratory birds from noise: as practicable, conducting high-noise activities during late August through mid-March, outside of the Chimney Swift breeding season, turning off vehicle engines and other equipment whenever possible and minimizing the number of noisy activities that coincide.

No mitigation is necessary.

### **Screen Summary**

#### **Compliance Determination**

This project May Affect, but is Not Likely to Adversely Affect, listed species, and informal consultation was conducted. With mitigation, identified in the mitigation section of this review, the project will be in compliance with the Endangered Species Act. The USFWS IPaC system was consulted on 4-30-25. A Species List (attached) was generated and identified three ESA-protected species (one threatened, one endangered, and one proposed threatened species) in the action area. No Critical Habitats were identified in the action area. Effects on the threatened Canada Lynx were evaluated using the Northeast Endangered Species Determination Key, resulting in a "not likely to adversely affect" (NLAA) determination. Correspondence with the USFWS Ecological Services (Maine Field Office) in July 2024, supported "no effect" determinations for previous site redevelopment activities that were funded by another federal entity, NBRC. NBRC determined that the proposed activities would have "no effect" on the listed species, including Canada Lynx and Atlantic Salmon, as



well as migratory birds and Bald eagles. Due to the similarity in nature and scope of the proposed activities to the activities evaluated as part of the NBRC funded activities in 2024, the same ESA determinations are applicable. The determination is justified because the activities would not result in a take of any federally protected species or impact any critical habitats. The project area is already an industrial developed property and does not contain suitable habitat for the Bald Eagle, any federally listed species, or migratory birds other than the Chimney Swift. By following outlined mitigation measures, project-related disturbances would not significantly impact habitats or activities/behaviors of federally listed and protected species, migratory birds, or Bald Eagles. Documentation attached: a) USFWS Species List (generated 4-30-25) for the project area b) Associated Determination Key for Canada Lynx (generated 4-30-25) c) Correspondence with USFWS (Maine Field Office) regarding effect determinations

**Supporting documentation**

[c\) email - Section 7 consultation.pdf](#)

[b\) 20250430 NLAA TA NE\\_REGION\\_SA 4-30-25.pdf](#)

[a\) Species List\\_Maine Ecological Services Field Office 4-30-25.pdf](#)

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

✓ Yes

No

## Explosive and Flammable Hazards

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
HUD-assisted projects must meet Acceptable Separation Distance (ASD) requirements to protect them from explosive and flammable hazards.	N/A	24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C

**1. Is the proposed HUD-assisted project itself the development of a hazardous facility (a facility that mainly stores, handles or processes flammable or combustible chemicals such as bulk fuel storage facilities and refineries)?**

☒ No

☐ Yes

**2. Does this project include any of the following activities: development, construction, rehabilitation that will increase residential densities, or conversion?**

☐ No

☒ Yes

**3. Within 1 mile of the project site, are there any current or planned stationary aboveground storage containers that are covered by 24 CFR 51C? Containers that are NOT covered under the regulation include:**

- Containers 100 gallons or less in capacity, containing common liquid industrial fuels OR
- Containers of liquified petroleum gas (LPG) or propane with a water volume capacity of 1,000 gallons or less that meet the requirements of the 2017 or later version of National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) Code 58.

**If all containers within the search area fit the above criteria, answer "No." For any other type of aboveground storage container within the search area that holds one of the flammable or explosive materials listed in Appendix I of 24 CFR part 51 subpart C, answer "Yes."**

☐ No

☒ Yes

**4. Based on the analysis, is the proposed HUD-assisted project located at or beyond the required separation distance from all covered tanks?**

✓ Yes

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section.

No

**Screen Summary**

**Compliance Determination**

There is a current or planned stationary aboveground storage container of concern within 1 mile of the project site. The Separation Distance from the project is acceptable. The project is in compliance with explosive and flammable hazard requirements. The proposed activities do not increase residential density because structures are industrial/commercial, not residential. However, because the mill redevelopment involves converting uninhabitable industrial buildings into habitable commercial/industrial buildings, an analysis of Explosive and Flammable hazards is appropriate. Stationary aboveground storage containers containing applicable common industrial fuels were identified within 1 mile of the project site, as determined by a thorough stepwise review of local/regional explosive and flammable hazards resources that was conducted in 2023 as part of an environmental review for Phase I redevelopment activities: First, Stillwater Environmental Engineering (SEE) accessed State online resources for information: The Maine Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) Registered Petroleum Tanks Database and the Maine DEP TankSmart database were consulted. One AST registered with the State of Maine as "planned," a 500 gallon diesel tank, was identified within the 1-mile project radius. This tank's planned location is 300 ft. from the project area, beyond the calculated ASDPPU of 207.20 ft. and ASDBPU of 36.50 ft. (see attached ASD tool calculations). To identify permitted propane tanks, SEE consulted the State of Maine Regulatory Licensing & Permitting online search. No permitted propane tanks were identified within 1 mile of the project site. Prior to the online searches, on 2/7/23, the Maine Fire Marshal's Office (FMO) was consulted to obtain information about the presence/absence of any permitted ASTs, and the Maine Fuel Board (MFB) was consulted regarding any registered propane tanks. The response from the FMO indicated that all registered ASTs are found on the TankSmart database, by doing a

search for specific addresses/locations (as was completed in the previous step). The MFB confirmed that no permitted tanks were in the area and clarified that permitted sites are those with more than four 1,000 gallon propane tanks, or with one or more 2,000 gallon tanks on site. Email correspondence between SEE and these two agencies is attached. Third, SEE consulted the property/project manager by phone to ask about the presence of aboveground tanks. He mentioned recently installed propane tanks and an out of service aboveground "Bunker C" tank. Two 1,000 gallon propane tanks were installed in 2021 for heating the Paper Warehouse building. Tank sizes were confirmed during a site visit conducted by SEE on 3/2/23. Propane tanks of 1,000 gallons or less, such as those identified on site, are not covered by 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C requirements, because the State of Maine has adopted the NFPA 58: Liquefied Petroleum Gas Code (2020 Edition). The Bunker C (#6 fuel) tank is a 750,000 gallon AST located on site. This tank is out of service and stores residual amounts of Bunker C, and is planned for removal as part of the EPA Brownfield site remediation program. Bunker C is not on the list of specific petroleum products and chemicals defined to be hazardous substances in Appendix I of 24 CFR part 51 subpart C, and for these reasons the tank does not constitute a thermal radiation nor blast overpressure hazard. Lastly, a review of the most recent Google Earth imagery (9/16/2022) revealed no additional visible aboveground tanks within 1 mile of the project site. Site visits on 3/2/23 and 5/20/24 identified no additional aboveground storage tanks visible from the project site, not already accounted for.

#### **Supporting documentation**

[e\) ASD-KRHEC-emails re ASTs and propane.pdf](#)  
[d-2\) Propane-2 EastMill030223.jpg](#)  
[d-1\) Propane-1 EastMill030223.jpg](#)  
[c\) ASD tool calcs.pdf](#)  
[b\) EastMill Tank List 2-16-23.pdf](#)  
[a\) EastMill-FY24 AST 1-mile map.pdf](#)

#### **Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

✓ No

## Farmlands Protection

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
The Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) discourages federal activities that would convert farmland to nonagricultural purposes.	Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981 (7 U.S.C. 4201 et seq.)	<a href="#">7 CFR Part 658</a>

**1. Does your project include any activities, including new construction, acquisition of undeveloped land or conversion, that could convert agricultural land to a non-agricultural use?**

Yes

✓ No

If your project includes new construction, acquisition of undeveloped land or conversion, explain how you determined that agricultural land would not be converted:

The USDA NRCS online Web Soil Survey was consulted to determine the farmland classification of the project site. The mapped soil units associated with the site were not identified as prime farmland, farmland of statewide importance, farmland of local importance, or unique farmland.

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload all documents used to make your determination below.

### Screen Summary

#### **Compliance Determination**

The USDA NRCS online Web Soil Survey mapping tool was consulted in 2023 to determine the farmland classification for the project site. The mapped soil units associated with the site were not identified as prime farmland, farmland of statewide importance, farmland of local importance, or unique farmland. This project does not include any activities, including new construction, acquisition of undeveloped land, or conversion, that could potentially convert one land use to another, and is in compliance with the Farmland Protection Policy Act.

#### **Supporting documentation**

[Farmland Classification Map -EastMill 1-25-23.pdf](#)

East-Millinocket-Mill-Site-  
Renovations-and-  
Infrastructure

East Millinocket, ME

900000010417355

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

✓ No



## Floodplain Management

General Requirements	Legislation	Regulation
Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management, requires Federal activities to avoid impacts to floodplains and to avoid direct and indirect support of floodplain development to the extent practicable.	Executive Order 11988 * Executive Order 13690 * 42 USC 4001-4128 * 42 USC 5154a * only applies to screen 2047 and not 2046	24 CFR 55

**1. Does this project meet an exemption at 24 CFR 55.12 from compliance with HUD's floodplain management regulations in Part 55?**

Yes

(a) HUD-assisted activities described in 24 CFR 58.34 and 58.35(b).

(b) HUD-assisted activities described in 24 CFR 50.19, except as otherwise indicated in § 50.19.

(c) The approval of financial assistance for restoring and preserving the natural and beneficial functions and values of floodplains and wetlands, including through acquisition of such floodplain and wetland property, where a permanent covenant or comparable restriction is place on the property's continued use for flood control, wetland projection, open space, or park land, but only if:

(1) The property is cleared of all existing buildings and walled structures; and

(2) The property is cleared of related improvements except those which:

(i) Are directly related to flood control, wetland protection, open space, or park land (including playgrounds and recreation areas);

(ii) Do not modify existing wetland areas or involve fill, paving, or other ground disturbance beyond minimal trails or paths; and

(iii) Are designed to be compatible with the beneficial floodplain or wetland function of the property.

(d) An action involving a repossession, receivership, foreclosure, or similar acquisition of property to protect or enforce HUD's financial



interests under previously approved loans, grants, mortgage insurance, or other HUD assistance.

(e) Policy-level actions described at 24 CFR 50.16 that do not involve site-based decisions.

(f) A minor amendment to a previously approved action with no additional adverse impact on or from a floodplain or wetland.

(g) HUD's or the responsible entity's approval of a project site, an incidental portion of which is situated in the FFRMS floodplain (not including the floodway, LiMWA, or coastal high hazard area) but only if: (1) The proposed project site does not include any existing or proposed buildings or improvements that modify or occupy the FFRMS floodplain except de minimis improvements such as recreation areas and trails; and (2) the proposed project will not result in any new construction in or modifications of a wetland .

(h) Issuance or use of Housing Vouchers, or other forms of rental subsidy where HUD, the awarding community, or the public housing agency that administers the contract awards rental subsidies that are not project-based (i.e., do not involve site-specific subsidies).

(i) Special projects directed to the removal of material and architectural barriers that restrict the mobility of and accessibility to elderly and persons with disabilities.

Describe:

✓ No

**2. Does the project include a Critical Action? Examples of Critical Actions include projects involving hospitals, fire and police stations, nursing homes, hazardous chemical storage, storage of valuable records, and utility plants.**

Yes

Describe:

✓ No

**3. Determine the extent of the FFRMS floodplain and provide mapping documentation in support of that determination**

The extent of the FFRMS floodplain can be determined using a Climate Informed Science Approach (CISA), 0.2 percent flood approach (0.2 PFA), or freeboard value approach (FVA). For projects in areas without available CISA data or without FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs), Flood Insurance Studies (FISs) or Advisory Base Flood Elevations (ABFEs), use the best available information<sup>1</sup> to determine flood elevation. Include documentation and an explanation of why this is the best available information<sup>2</sup> for the site. Note that newly constructed and substantially improved<sup>3</sup> structures must be elevated to the FFRMS floodplain regardless of the approach chosen to determine the floodplain.

Select one of the following three options:

CISA for non-critical actions. If using a local tool , data, or resources, ensure that the FFRMS elevation is higher than would have been determined using the 0.2 PFA or the FVA.

0.2-PFA. Where FEMA has defined the 0.2-percent-annual-chance floodplain, the FFRMS floodplain is the area that FEMA has designated as within the 0.2-percent-annual-chance floodplain.

- ✓ FVA. If neither CISA nor 0.2-PFA is available, for non-critical actions, the FFRMS floodplain is the area that results from adding two feet to the base flood elevation as established by the effective FIRM or FIS or — if available — a FEMA-provided preliminary or pending FIRM or FIS or advisory base flood elevations, whether regulatory or informational in nature. However, an interim or preliminary FEMA map cannot be used if it is lower than the current FIRM or FIS.

<sup>1</sup> Sources which merit investigation include the files and studies of other federal agencies, such as the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Soil Conservation Service and the U. S. Geological Survey. These agencies have prepared flood hazard studies for several thousand localities and, through their technical assistance programs, hydrologic studies, soil surveys, and other investigations have collected or developed other floodplain information for numerous sites and areas. States and communities are also sources of information on past flood 'experiences within their boundaries and are particularly knowledgeable about areas subject to high-risk flood hazards such as alluvial fans, high velocity flows, mudflows and mudslides, ice jams, subsidence and liquefaction.

<sup>2</sup> If you are using best available information, select the FVA option below and provide supporting documentation in the screen summary. Contact your [local environmental officer](#) with additional compliance questions.

<sup>3</sup> Substantial improvement means any repair or improvement of a structure which costs at least 50 percent of the market value of the structure before repair or improvement or results in an increase of more than 20 percent of the number of dwelling units. The full definition can be found at [24 CFR 55.2\(b\)\(12\)](#).

5. Does your project occur in the FFRMS floodplain?

Yes

✓ No

### **Screen Summary**

#### **Compliance Determination**

This project does not occur in the FFRMS floodplain. The project is in compliance with Executive Orders 11988 and 13690. Proposed activities are located near Zone A (area of 100-year flood, base flood elevations, and flood hazard factor not determined), as indicated on Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) No. 01-05 for Community Number 230163B, effective February 4, 1987, and Maine Flood Hazard Map (MFHM) showing Maine Floodplain Program Q3 data. The FIRM map does not provide enough detail to determine the extent of the floodplain. The floodplain boundary was established using the Freeboard Value Approach (FVA), based on the best available data for the former GNP mill site where the proposed project activities will occur. These data included Q3 data, LiDAR topographical data, ground-truthing, and modeled flood elevations. The boundary mapping was used as part of the Floodplain Management 8-Step Decision-Making Process that was completed in 2024 for actions funded under the NBRC FY23 Catalyst Program. The findings and determinations of that analysis are considered applicable to activities proposed for funding under the HUD FY24 CPF program. Supporting documentation is provided in Appendix E of the Environmental Assessment for East Millinocket Mill Site Redevelopment Infrastructure Improvements (NBRC, 2024). All proposed activities would occur within the previously developed footprint of the former mill site and would not increase impervious surface area within the floodplain. Minor grade changes related to the installation of new water and sewer connections would be the only alterations to the floodplain. Impacts from ground disturbance would be mitigated through best practices in erosion and sedimentation control, reduction of runoff quantity and velocity, and pollution prevention. All construction activities would comply with applicable State and local floodplain development regulations and ordinances. These mitigation efforts and regulatory compliance measures will minimize both direct and indirect adverse effects on the adjacent floodplain. Furthermore, ongoing and future improvements to stormwater infrastructure at the

site are expected to have a positive impact on the floodplain by enhancing the management and control of runoff from existing impervious surfaces.

**Supporting documentation**

[2024 NBRC EA Appendix E - 8-Step FFRMS\(1\).pdf](#)

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

✓ No

## Historic Preservation

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
Regulations under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) require a consultative process to identify historic properties, assess project impacts on them, and avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects	Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470f)	36 CFR 800 "Protection of Historic Properties" <a href="https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CFR-2012-title36-vol3/pdf/CFR-2012-title36-vol3-part800.pdf">https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CFR-2012-title36-vol3/pdf/CFR-2012-title36-vol3-part800.pdf</a>

### **Threshold**

#### **Is Section 106 review required for your project?**

No, because the project consists solely of activities listed as exempt in a Programmatic Agreement (PA ). (See the PA Database to find applicable PAs.)

No, because the project consists solely of activities included in a No Potential to Cause Effects memo or other determination [36 CFR 800.3(a)(1)].

- ✓ Yes, because the project includes activities with potential to cause effects (direct or indirect).

### **Step 1 – Initiate Consultation**

#### **Select all consulting parties below (check all that apply):**

- ✓ State Historic Preservation Offer (SHPO) Completed
- ✓ Indian Tribes, including Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPOs) or Native Hawaiian Organizations (NHOs)
- ✓ Penobscot Nation THPO Completed

Other Consulting Parties

**Describe the process of selecting consulting parties and initiating consultation here:**

Section 106 consultations were initiated in 2024 by a representative of the Northern Border Regional Commission (NBRC) as part of an environmental assessment required for NBRC funded infrastructure improvements at the former mill site. The Maine Historic Preservation Commission (SHPO) was consulted to determine if site work would potentially adversely affect historic properties and/or resources. The Penobscot Nation Cultural and Historic Preservation Office (THPO) was consulted to determine if site work would potentially adversely affect tribal cultural or archeological resources. The consultation package and resulting concurrence correspondence are attached.

Document and upload all correspondence, notices and notes (including comments and objections received below).

**Was the Section 106 Lender Delegation Memo used for Section 106 consultation?**

Yes

No

***Step 2 – Identify and Evaluate Historic Properties***

- 1. Define the Area of Potential Effect (APE), either by entering the address(es) or uploading a map depicting the APE below:**

50 Main Street, East Millinocket, ME

**In the chart below, list historic properties identified and evaluated in the APE. Every historic property that may be affected by the project should be included in the chart.**

Upload the documentation (survey forms, Register nominations, concurrence(s) and/or objection(s), notes, and photos) that justify your National Register Status determination below.

Address / Location / District	National Register Status	SHPO Concurrence	Sensitive Information
----------------------------------	-----------------------------	------------------	--------------------------

**Additional Notes:**

**2. Was a survey of historic buildings and/or archeological sites done as part of the project?**

Yes

✓ No

***Step 3 –Assess Effects of the Project on Historic Properties***

Only properties that are listed on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places receive further consideration under Section 106. Assess the effect(s) of the project by applying the Criteria of Adverse Effect. (36 CFR 800.5)] Consider direct and indirect effects as applicable as per guidance on direct and indirect effects.

**Choose one of the findings below - No Historic Properties Affected, No Adverse Effect, or Adverse Effect; and seek concurrence from consulting parties.**

✓ No Historic Properties Affected

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload concurrence(s) or objection(s) below.

**Document reason for finding:**

✓ No historic properties present.

Historic properties present, but project will have no effect upon them.

No Adverse Effect

Adverse Effect

**Screen Summary**

**Compliance Determination**

Based on Section 106 consultation there are No Historic Properties Affected because there are no historic properties present. Section 106 consultation with the Maine SHPO concurred that site redevelopment projects would have no direct or indirect

adverse effect on historic districts, sites, structures or resources. Consultation with the Penobscot Nation Cultural and Historic Preservation Office (THPO) concurred that site work would result in no direct or indirect adverse impacts on tribal historic structures or cultural/archeological resources. The consultation package and resulting concurrence correspondence are attached. The project is in compliance with Section 106.

**Supporting documentation**

[NBRC23GME08 SHPO-THPO Consult Package 3-7-24.pdf](#)  
[EM NBRC SHPO-7-31-24.pdf](#)  
[East Mill THPO Concurrence 4-30-24.pdf](#)

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

✓ No



## Noise Abatement and Control

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
HUD's noise regulations protect residential properties from excessive noise exposure. HUD encourages mitigation as appropriate.	Noise Control Act of 1972  General Services Administration Federal Management Circular 75-2: "Compatible Land Uses at Federal Airfields"	Title 24 CFR 51 Subpart B

**1. What activities does your project involve? Check all that apply:**

New construction for residential use

Rehabilitation of an existing residential property

A research demonstration project which does not result in new construction or reconstruction

An interstate land sales registration

Any timely emergency assistance under disaster assistance provision or appropriations which are provided to save lives, protect property, protect public health and safety, remove debris and wreckage, or assistance that has the effect of restoring facilities substantially as they existed prior to the disaster

✓ None of the above

### Screen Summary

#### **Compliance Determination**

Based on the project description, this project includes no activities that would require further evaluation under HUD's noise regulation. The project is in compliance with HUD's Noise regulation.

#### **Supporting documentation**

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

East-Millinocket-Mill-Site-  
Renovations-and-  
Infrastructure

East Millinocket, ME

900000010417355

Yes

✓ No

### Sole Source Aquifers

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
<b>The Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974 protects drinking water systems which are the sole or principal drinking water source for an area and which, if contaminated, would create a significant hazard to public health.</b>	Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 201, 300f et seq., and 21 U.S.C. 349)	40 CFR Part 149

**1. Does the project consist solely of acquisition, leasing, or rehabilitation of an existing building(s)?**

Yes

✓ No

**2. Is the project located on a sole source aquifer (SSA)?**

A sole source aquifer is defined as an aquifer that supplies at least 50 percent of the drinking water consumed in the area overlying the aquifer. This includes streamflow source areas, which are upstream areas of losing streams that flow into the recharge area.

✓ No

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload documentation used to make your determination, such as a map of your project (or jurisdiction, if appropriate) in relation to the nearest SSA and its source area, below.

Yes

### Screen Summary

#### **Compliance Determination**

The project is not located on a sole source aquifer area. The project site is not located on or near, nor will the project impact, any mapped sole source aquifer, significant

sand and gravel aquifers, or source water protection areas. See attachments showing locations of sole source aquifers on islands off the Maine coast, locations of significant sand and gravel aquifers in the relevant portion of East Millinocket, and the nearest source water protection areas. The project is in compliance with Sole Source Aquifer requirements.

**Supporting documentation**

[Sourcewater Protection map EastMill.pdf](#)

[Sole-Source-Aquifers Map-EastMill 1-25-23.pdf](#)

[Significant sand and gravel aquifers Medunkeunk Lake quad.pdf](#)

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

✓ No

## Wetlands Protection

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
Executive Order 11990 discourages direct or indirect support of new construction impacting wetlands wherever there is a practicable alternative. The Fish and Wildlife Service's National Wetlands Inventory can be used as a primary screening tool, but observed or known wetlands not indicated on NWI maps must also be processed. Off-site impacts that result in draining, impounding, or destroying wetlands must also be processed.	Executive Order 11990	24 CFR 55.20 can be used for general guidance regarding the 8 Step Process.

**1. Does this project involve new construction as defined in Executive Order 11990, expansion of a building's footprint, or ground disturbance? The term "new construction" shall include draining, dredging, channelizing, filling, diking, impounding, and related activities and any structures or facilities begun or authorized after the effective date of the Order**

No

✓ Yes

**2. Will the new construction or other ground disturbance impact an on- or off-site wetland? The term "wetlands" means those areas that are inundated by surface or ground water with a frequency sufficient to support, and under normal circumstances does or would support, a prevalence of vegetative or aquatic life that requires saturated or seasonally saturated soil conditions for growth and reproduction. Wetlands generally include swamps, marshes, bogs, and similar areas such as sloughs, potholes, wet meadows, river overflows, mud flats, and natural ponds.**

**"Wetlands under E.O. 11990 include isolated and non-jurisdictional wetlands."**

✓ No, a wetland will not be impacted in terms of E.O. 11990's definition of new construction.

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload a map or any other relevant documentation below which explains your determination

Yes, there is a wetland that be impacted in terms of E.O. 11990's definition of new construction.

### **Screen Summary**

#### **Compliance Determination**

The proposed project location is adjacent to the West Branch Penobscot River, a riverine wetland feature with freshwater emergent and forested/shrub wetland islands. These features are depicted in the accompanying National Wetlands Inventory map generated in July 2024. Due to its continuous connection to a navigable waterway, the West Branch of the Penobscot River is classified as "jurisdictional" under the Clean Water Act (CWA), making it subject to permitting and regulatory requirements for water quality, pollution control, and wetland protection. No wetlands are located within the immediate footprint of the project area. The river lies approximately 500 feet south of the proposed ground disturbing activities. The project will be conducted under an existing Site Location of Development Act (SLODA) permit issued by the State of Maine (#L-16637), and all activities will adhere to applicable SLODA standards for stormwater management, groundwater protection, and flood risk reduction. No vegetation will be removed within the riverine wetland or its buffer zone. The project will not significantly alter soil conditions, structures, hydrology, or vegetation. Therefore, the proposed activities are not expected to have significant impacts on nearby wetlands. The project will not impact on- or off-site wetlands. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11990.

#### **Supporting documentation**

[Wetlands\\_Map\\_EastMill 7-3-24.pdf](#)

#### **Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

✓ No

## Wild and Scenic Rivers Act

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act provides federal protection for certain free-flowing, wild, scenic and recreational rivers designated as components or potential components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System (NWSRS) from the effects of construction or development.	The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1271-1287), particularly section 7(b) and (c) (16 U.S.C. 1278(b) and (c))	36 CFR Part 297

### 1. Is your project within proximity of a NWSRS river?

✓ No

Yes, the project is in proximity of a Designated Wild and Scenic River or Study Wild and Scenic River.

Yes, the project is in proximity of a Nationwide Rivers Inventory (NRI) River.

### Screen Summary

#### **Compliance Determination**

The project is not within proximity of a river or river segment designated Wild, Scenic, or Recreational River, and is in compliance with this section. The nearest designated Wild and Scenic River is the Allagash River, more than 40 miles to the northwest of the project location. The accompanying map (Wild & Scenic Rivers - Maine) shows the project location and the nearest designated river. The project is in compliance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

#### **Supporting documentation**

[WildScenicRivers - EastMill 1-30-23.pdf](#)

#### **Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

✓ No

## Environmental Justice

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
Determine if the project creates adverse environmental impacts upon a low-income or minority community. If it does, engage the community in meaningful participation about mitigating the impacts or move the project.	Executive Order 12898	

**HUD strongly encourages starting the Environmental Justice analysis only after all other laws and authorities, including Environmental Assessment factors if necessary, have been completed.**

**1. Were any adverse environmental impacts identified in any other compliance review portion of this project's total environmental review?**

Yes

✓ No

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section.

### Screen Summary

#### **Compliance Determination**

Based on the U.S. Census Bureau's profile for East Millinocket ([https://data.census.gov/profile/East\\_Millinocket\\_CDP,\\_Maine?g=160XX00US2321065](https://data.census.gov/profile/East_Millinocket_CDP,_Maine?g=160XX00US2321065)), the 2020 U.S. Decennial Census data show that 95% of the Town's population is White and 1.2% is Hispanic or Latino. As the minority population does not exceed 50%, East Millinocket is not considered to be a minority population. The median household income in East Millinocket is \$44,306 with a poverty rate of 18.5%. In comparison, the median household income for the State of Maine is \$73,733 and the poverty rate is 10.4%. As the median household income is less than 80% of the State's median household income, East Millinocket is considered a low-income population, and an environmental justice community. The Census Bureau profile, accessed in May 2025, is attached. Any environmental impacts resulting from the project activities would be minimal, short-term, and/or mitigated, and would not disproportionately affect the population. The Town and regional (County) populations would likely be



equally affected by anticipated beneficial impacts of the mill's redevelopment. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 12898.

**Supporting documentation**

[East Millinocket USCB Profile May 2025.pdf](#)

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

✓ No