

Maine State Library

Digital Maine

Transportation Documents

Transportation

2-25-2002

Aroostook County Transportation Study : Draft Environmental Impact Statement, 2002

Maine Department of Transportation

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalmaine.com/mdot_docs

AROOSTOOK COUNTY TRANSPORTATION STUDY
AROOSTOOK COUNTY, MAINE

Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Submitted Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 4332 (2)(c) and 49 U.S.C. § 303

by the

U.S. Department of Transportation

Federal Highway Administration

and the

Maine Department of Transportation

Cooperating/Coordinating Agencies

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Maine Department of Environmental Protection

Abstract: This statement concerns the potential environmental impacts associated with transportation improvement corridors designed to improve mobility and efficiency within northeastern Aroostook County and to improve connections between this area and other portions of the U.S. and Canada in order to support regional economic growth. The purpose of the Aroostook County Transportation Study Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is to identify a Preferred Corridor that will satisfy the study Purpose and Need. The Study Area extends from I-95 at Island Falls to I-95 at Houlton, and north to Fort Kent and Hamlin. Corridors considered include the No-Action Alternative; Corridor H modified, a new location highway corridor extending from I-95 at Smyrna Mills to Madawaska; Corridor K modified, a new location highway corridor extending from Houlton to Madawaska; Composite Corridor 1, an upgrade corridor extending from Houlton to Fort Kent and to Van Buren; and Composite Corridor 2, a corridor that includes a new location highway from I-95 at Smyrna Mills to Presque Isle and upgrade corridors from Presque Isle to Fort Kent and to Van Buren. Each corridor was evaluated for potential impacts to the transportation system, existing land use, economic concerns, community resources, cultural resources, physical and biological resources, and atmospheric resources. After a Preferred Corridor is selected, supplemental studies and NEPA documentation may be required for developing alignment alternatives within the corridor to avoid and minimize impacts to social, economic, cultural, and natural resources.

February 14, 2002
Date of Approval for Circulation

Paul Lariviere
Paul Lariviere, P.E., Division Administrator
For Federal Highway Administration

The following persons may be contacted for additional information concerning this document:

Paul Lariviere, P.E.
Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration
Room 614, Federal Building
Augusta ME 04330
207-622-8355

Raymond Faucher, P.E.
Maine Department of Transportation
Bureau of Planning
State House Station 16
Augusta ME 04333 - 0016
207-624-3300

Comments on this Draft Environmental Impact Statement are due by April 30, 2002 and should be sent to either of the addresses above.

Contents

ISSUES AND OBJECTIVES TRACKING MATRIX

TERMS

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

SUMMARY	S-1
STUDY OVERVIEW	S-1
PURPOSE OF THE STUDY	S-2
ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED	S-3
No-Action Alternative	S-4
Corridor Hm – Smyrna Mills to Madawaska	S-5
Corridor Km – Houlton to Madawaska	S-5
Composite Corridor 1 – Houlton to Fort Kent and Van Buren	S-6
Composite Corridor 2 – Smyrna Mills to Fort Kent and Van Buren	S-6
POTENTIAL MAJOR IMPACTS	S-7
Transportation Effects	S-7
Economic Effects	S-8
Land Use and Community Effects	S-9
Cultural Resources	S-9
Floodplains	S-10
Wetlands	S-10
Wildlife Habitats	S-11
Atmospheric Resources	S-11
POTENTIAL MITIGATION MEASURES	S-12
Land Use and Farmland	S-12
Surface and Groundwater Quality	S-13
Aquatic Habitats	S-14
Floodplains	S-14
Wetlands	S-15
Wildlife and Fisheries	S-15
Air Quality and Noise	S-16
APPLICABLE REGULATIONS, REQUIRED COORDINATION AND PERMITS	S-16

1.0 PURPOSE OF AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION.....	1-1
1.1 INTRODUCTION	1-1
1.1.1 Study Area.....	1-1
1.1.2 Study History.....	1-2
1.2 PURPOSE AND NEED	1-3
1.2.1 Purpose and Need Statement	1-4
1.2.2 Study Area Economic and Transportation System Needs and Deficiencies.....	1-5
1.3 SCOPE OF THIS ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT	1-10
1.3.1 Scoping Process.....	1-10
1.3.2 Relevant Issues	1-11
1.4 FEDERAL AND STATE DECISIONS AND ACTIONS.....	1-11
1.5 APPLICABLE REGULATIONS, REQUIRED COORDINATION AND PERMITS	1-12
 2.0 DESCRIPTION OF CORRIDORS	2-1
2.1 OVERVIEW OF CORRIDOR SELECTION PROCESS	2-1
2.2 SENSIBLE TRANSPORTATION POLICY ACT ANALYSIS.....	2-2
2.2.1 Transportation Systems Management (TSM) Options	2-3
2.2.2 Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Options	2-3
2.3 PRELIMINARY SCREENING ANALYSIS.....	2-4
2.3.1 Corridors Considered	2-4
2.3.2 Screening Process.....	2-5
2.3.3 Results of Preliminary Screening Analysis	2-10
2.4 INTERMEDIATE SCREENING ANALYSIS	2-14
2.4.1 Corridors Considered	2-14
2.4.2 Intermediate Screening Process.....	2-14
2.4.3 Results of the Intermediate Screening Analysis.....	2-17
2.4.4 Summary of Intermediate Screening Analysis	2-21
2.5 DEVELOPMENT OF COMPOSITE CORRIDORS	2-22
2.5.1 Regional Corridors Considered.....	2-22
2.5.2 Results of Regional Corridor Analysis.....	2-23
2.6 POTENTIAL ACTIONS.....	2-28
2.6.1 No-Action Alternative	2-30
2.6.2 Corridor Hm – Smyrna Mills to Madawaska.....	2-31
2.6.3 Corridor Km – Houlton to Madawaska	2-32
2.6.4 Composite Corridor 1 – Houlton to Fort Kent and Van Buren.....	2-33
2.6.5 Composite Corridor 2 – Smyrna Mills to Fort Kent and Van Buren	2-34
2.7 SUMMARY OF PREDICTED EFFECTS.....	2-35
2.7.1 Summary of Transportation Effects.....	2-35
2.7.2 Matrix of Land Use, Economic, and Cultural Effects	2-37
2.7.3 Matrix of Impacts to the Physical and Biological Environment.....	2-39
2.7.4 Preliminary Cost Estimate	2-41

3.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT	3-1
3.1 INTRODUCTION	3-1
3.2 TRANSPORTATION ENVIRONMENT.....	3-2
3.2.1 The Transportation System	3-3
3.2.2 Existing Traffic Conditions.....	3-4
3.2.3 Geometric and Safety Deficiencies	3-17
3.2.4 System Continuity and Mobility.....	3-25
3.3 LAND USE, ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL ENVIRONMENT.....	3-28
3.3.1 Land Use.....	3-29
3.3.2 Agricultural Land.....	3-35
3.3.3 Economic Environment	3-38
3.3.4 Minority and Disadvantaged Populations	3-52
3.3.5 Uncontrolled Petroleum and Hazardous Wastes	3-57
3.3.6 Cultural Resources	3-58
3.3.7 Public Parks and Recreation Lands	3-62
3.4 PHYSICAL AND BIOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT	3-63
3.4.1 Physical Geography, Geology and Soils	3-64
3.4.2 Aquatic Resources and Wetlands.....	3-67
3.4.3 Vegetation	3-76
3.4.4 Wildlife	3-81
3.4.5 Endangered, Threatened and Other Protected Species.....	3-87
3.5 ATMOSPHERIC ENVIRONMENT.....	3-92
3.5.1 Air Quality.....	3-92
3.5.2 Noise.....	3-93
4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES AND MITIGATION.....	4-1
4.1 INTRODUCTION	4-1
4.2 TRANSPORTATION ENVIRONMENT.....	4-2
4.2.1 Projected Demands	4-3
4.2.2 Safety and Geometric Deficiencies	4-13
4.2.3 System Continuity, Compatibility, and Mobility	4-22
4.2.4 Summary.....	4-30
4.3 LAND USE, ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL ENVIRONMENT.....	4-34
4.3.1 Land Use.....	4-34
4.3.2 Agricultural Land.....	4-42
4.3.3 Economic Environment	4-46
4.3.4 Minority and Disadvantaged Populations	4-63
4.3.5 Uncontrolled Petroleum and Hazardous Wastes	4-64
4.3.6 Cultural Resources	4-65
4.3.7 Public Parks, Recreation Areas, and Wildlife Refuges.....	4-72
4.4 PHYSICAL AND BIOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT	4-77
4.4.1 Physical Geography, Geology and Soils	4-75

4.4.2	Aquatic Resources and Wetlands.....	4-75
4.4.3	Vegetation	4-89
4.4.4	Wildlife	4-91
4.4.5	Endangered, Threatened and Other Protected Species.....	4-99
4.5	ATMOSPHERIC ENVIRONMENT.....	4-100
4.5.1	Air Quality.....	4-100
4.5.2	Noise.....	4-102
4.6	CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS AND MITIGATION	4-104
4.6.1	Water Quality and Wetlands.....	4-104
4.6.2	Wildlife	4-105
4.6.3	Air Quality.....	4-105
4.6.4	Noise Impacts.....	4-105
4.6.5	Traffic Management and Control	4-106
4.6.6	Utilities	4-106
4.7	RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SHORT-TERM USES OF THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT AND ENHANCEMENT OF LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY	4-107
4.8	IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES	4-109
4.9	SECONDARY AND CUMULATIVE IMPACTS	4-110
4.9.1	Secondary Impacts	4-110
4.9.2	Cumulative Impacts	4-111
4.10	SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL STUDY COMMITMENTS.....	4-114
4.10.1	Land Use.....	4-114
4.10.2	Farmlands	4-114
4.10.3	Cultural Resources (Historical and Archaeological)	4-115
4.10.4	Public Parks, Recreation Areas, and Wildlife Refuges.....	4-115
4.10.5	Surface and Groundwater Quality.....	4-115
4.10.6	Aquatic Habitats.....	4-116
4.10.7	Floodplains.....	4-117
4.10.8	Wetlands	4-117
4.10.9	Wildlife and Fisheries	4-117
4.10.10	Exemplary Natural Communities.....	4-118
4.10.11	Air Quality and Noise	4-118
4.10.12	Construction Traffic Impacts.....	4-119
4.10.13	Utility Impacts.....	4-119

5.0 SECTION 4(F) EVALUATION	5-1
5.1 INTRODUCTION	5-1
5.2 STUDY DESCRIPTION	5-2
5.3 PURPOSE AND NEED	5-2
5.4 CORRIDORS EVALUATED	5-2
5.5 SECTION 4(F) PROPERTIES	5-3
5.6 POTENTIAL USE OF SECTION 4(F) PROPERTIES	5-4
5.6.1 Potential Use of Historic and Archaeological Resources.....	5-4
5.6.2 Public Parks, Recreation Areas, and Wildlife Refuges	5-5
5.7 SUMMARY	5-6
 6.0 COORDINATION AND CONSULTATION.....	6-1
6.1 FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL AGENCY COORDINATION	6-1
6.1.1 Scoping Process.....	6-1
6.1.2 Interagency Coordination	6-2
6.2 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT.....	6-2
6.2.1 Public Advisory Committee.....	6-2
6.2.2 Public Information Meetings	6-3
6.2.3 Coordination with the Local Communities and Organizations.....	6-4
6.2.4 Study Web Site.....	6-4
6.2.5 Other Media.....	6-5
 7.0 LIST OF PREPARERS.....	7-1
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION	7-1
MAINE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION.....	7-1
VANASSE, HANGEN, BRUSTLIN, INC.....	7-3
FITZGERALD & HALLIDAY	7-5
MICHAEL BAKER CORPORATION	7-5
RKG ASSOCIATES.....	7-5
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MAINE	7-6
LANGILLE AROOSTOOK ENGINEERING GROUP	7-6
 8.0 CIRCULATION LIST	8-1
FEDERAL	8-1
STATE.....	8-1
ELECTED OFFICIALS AT THE COMPLETION OF THE DEIS	8-2
REGIONAL AGENCIES	8-2
LOCAL COMMUNITIES	8-3
PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS.....	8-4
OTHER INTERESTED PARTIES.....	8-4

9.0 REFERENCES

10.0 INDEX

VOLUME II – FIGURES

VOLUME III – APPENDICES

Appendix 1 – Travel Time Savings Matrix

Appendix 2 – VMT/VHT Distribution by Highway Functional Classification

Appendix 3 – Transportation Screening Memorandum

Appendix 4 – Business Survey Results

Appendix 5 – Economic Screening Memorandum