STATE OF CONNECTICUT OFFICE OF POLICY AND MANAGEMENT



# ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REVIEW

This Environmental Assessment Review (EAR) is intended to provide the sponsoring agency and the project team with

on the environment. This review The EAR may be used to assess p EAR, however, does not replace	on and to assist in determining what effects, if any, the proposed project/action may have is conducted using readily available information and is based on qualitative assessments, otential issues that may or may not require additional environmental review or study. This a any A/E Consultant's obligation to continually assess what permits, certifications, or as the project progresses or from submitting OPM's Checklist for Permits, Certifications, and project.
ls this a revised EAR ☐ Yes ☑ Are multiple sites involved? ☐	No If yes, date of previous EAR: Yes 📝 No If yes, how many:
S	ECTION A: PROJECT/ACTION INFORMATION
Project Title:	Parking Improvements, Pratt & Whitney Stadium at Rentschler Field .
Project Address:	615 Silver Lane< East Hartford
Sponsoring Agency:	Office of Policy & Management
Agency Contact:	Phil McLellan
OPM Project Manager.	Phil McLellan
PROPOSED ACTION/ACTIVITY See attached.	IY DESCRIPTION:
SITE INFORMATION:	
Existing land use: Former indu	New Site Located in Coastal Boundary  Yes No If yes, date conducted: Multiple dates is 2015.  Strial site, currently vacant.  Isse stadium, former industrial airfield undergoing retail development; industrial, residential,
STATE CONSERVATION AND	DEVELOPMENT POLICIES PLAN LOCATIONAL GUIDE MAP CRITERIA:
Urban Area Sewer Service Water Service Near Transit Local Bus Service Local Conservation Factor Aquifer Protection Area	Present  Critical Habitat  100-yr Flood  Hurricane Inundation Zone  Wetland Soils  Potential Water Source  Water Supply Source Area  Core Forest  Ag Lands

SECTION BY POTENTIALLY IMPACTED RES	OURC.	ES			
Check all resource categories to determine if the proint indirectly affect the following resources:			:t/action may	y or may not have the potenti	ial to directly or
	Pote	ential I	mpacts		l
Resources	Yes/	No	Unknown	Comments	
Wetlands	V			See attached discussion	
Waterbodies	一	T			-
Waterquality	শি	一		See attached discussion.	
Groundwater resources (Aquifer Protection Areas & wells)					
Flood plains (100-year)*	V			See attached discussion	
Floodways*		Ī		Base flood elevation is	ft. (NGVD).
Stream channel encroachment		Ī			t. (NGVD).
Fish habitats	一			,	,
Wildlife habitats	一	Ī			
Endangered, threatened, and special concem species and habitats (NDDB)				See attached discussion	
Air quality		回			
Coastal resources		<u>D</u>	<u> </u>		
Agricultural lands and/or soils		Image: Control of the con			
Historic sites and districts					
Archeologically sensitive areas					
Aesthetic / scenic resources					
Designated open space and recreational uses		<u> </u>			
Surrounding land uses / neighborhood				See attached discussion.	
Transportation		<u></u>			
Utilities and Services		V			
*Based on the community's Flood Insurance Study					
Comments or remarks:					

Page z of o

#### SECTION C: DETERMINATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE Using the information in Sections A and B as a guide in determining environmental significance, qualitatively assess the potential level of significance of the proposed project/action taking into account the direct and indirect effect on the environment. Potentially No Signific ant Not **Anticipated** Effects **Undetermined** Significant with Significant with Potential or Actual Consequences Mitigation Mitigation **Effects** at this time ག Impact on air quality Impact on ambient noise levels Impact public water supply system V Serious effects on groundwater V Serious effects on flooding W Serious effects on erosion or sedimentation $\overline{\mathbf{v}}$ Effects on natural land resources and formations Effects on tidal wetlands or other coastal resources 귝 Effects on inland wetlands Effects on maintenance of in-stream flows Disruption or alteration of an historic, archeological, N cultural, or recreational building, object, district, site or its surroundings Effects on natural communities and critical species of П animal or plant and their habitats V Interference with fish and wildlife movement Use of pesticides, toxic or hazardous materials or any $\square$ substance in such quantities as to create extensive detrimental environmental impact M Substantial aesthetic or visual effects Inconsistency with the State Conservation and W Development Policies Plan's Growth Management Principles and associated policies Disruption or division of an established community or W inconsistency with adopted municipal and regional plans Substantial increase in congestion (traffic, recreational, W Substantial increase in the type or rate of energy use as a П $\square$ direct or indirect result of the action 돠 Create a hazard to human health or safety Any other substantial impact on natural, cultural, P recreational or scenic resources No **Anticipated** Potentia I **Undetermined** Impacts at this time Impacts M Cumulative Impacts (RSCA Section 22a-1a-3[b]) MITIGATION MEASURES:

### SECTION D: POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL PERMITS, CERTIFICATIONS, OR APPROVALS In the absence of detailed project information, such as a developed site layout, detailed plans, field verification of resources, etc., the following is a preliminary assessment of potential environmental permits, certifications, or approvals for the proposed project. This assessment does not replace or eliminate the A/E consultant's obligation to identify and obtain any applicable permits, certifications, or approvals necessary as the project progresses. Potentia lly Not Undetermined. Agency and Permit Name at this time Applicable Applicable DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION **Air Management** Title V Operating Permit New Source Review Permit Limit Potential to Emit From Major Stationary Sources of Air Pollution (Title V TH General Permit) Radiation Division W X-Ray and lonizing Radiation Source Registration Water Protection and Land Reuse Discharge of Domestic Sewage Permit (GP) Discharge of Food Preparation Establishment Wastewater (GP) Discharge of Food Processing Wastewater (GP) Discharge of Groundwater Remediation Wastewater Directly to Surface Water W. (GP) 7 Discharge of Groundwater Remediation Wastewater to Sanitary Sewer (GP) Ţ Discharge of Hydrostatic Pressure Testing Wastewater (GP) Discharge of Minor Boiler Blowdown Wastewater (GP) ᅵ N Discharge of Minor Non-Contact Cooling and Heat Pump Water (GP) ¥ Discharge of Minor Photographic Processing Wastewater (GP) Discharge of Minor Printing and Publishing Wastewater (GP) Discharge of Minor Tumbling or Cleaning of Parts Wastewater (GP) 7 Miscellaneous Discharges of Sewer Compatible (MISC) Wastewater (GP) Discharge of Stormwater and Dewatering Wastewater Associated with 따 Construction Activities (GP) 다 Discharge of Stormwater Associated with Commercial Activity (GP) V Discharge of Stormwater Associated with Industrial Activity (GP) S Discharge of Swimming Pool Wastewater From a Public Pool (GP) Discharge of Vehicle Maintenance Wastewater (GP) Discharge of Water Treatment Wastewater (GP) Inland Water Resources Inland Wetlands & Watercourses Permit Stream Channel Encroachment Permit Water Diversion Permit (Detention/Retention Ponds) 귝 귝 Inland 401 Water Quality Certification Dam Construction Permit Flood Management Certification 귝 De/Retention Pond Review V Authorization for Diversion of Water for Consumptive Use (GP) Dam Safety Repair and Alteration (GP) И Habitat Conservation (GP) Lake, Pond and Basin Dredging (GP) Minor Grading (GP)

Minor Structures (GP)
Utilities and Drainage (GP)

Authorization for Diversion of Remediation Groundwater (GP)

Agency and Permit Name (continued)	Potentially Applicable	Not Applicable	Undetermined at this time
Office of Long Island Sound Programs			
Structures, Dredging & Filling Permit		면 <sup>*</sup>	
Tidal Wetlands Permit		<b>₽</b>	
Coastal 401 Water Quality Certification	П	F4	
Certificate of Permission (Short Permit Process)	<u> </u>	দি	
Consistency with the Coastal Management Act		₩ T	
Materials Management and Compliance Assurance			<u> </u>
Wastewater Discharge: Ground Water Discharge Permit	П	u	П
Wastewater Discharge: Surface Water Discharge Permit (NPDES)		<u> </u>	
Wastewater Discharge: Pre-treatment Permit (Sewer Permit) for Discharges to Publicly Owned Treatment Works		······································	
Hazardous Waste Treatment, Storage, & Disposal Facilities		·	
Solid Waste Facilities		TH TH	
CGSSection 22a-454 Waste Facility		<u> </u>	
Special Waste or Asbestos Disposal Authorization	一一	7	
Underground Storage Tank Registration		귝	Ħ
Aerial Pesticide Application	H	- <del> </del>	
Aquatic Pesticide Application		파	
Contaminated Soil and/or Sediment Management (GP)	븅		<u>L</u>
Natural Diversity Database (Endangered Species) Review			
NDDB Review Request (endangered, threatened, and special concem species and habitats)		ď	
COMMISSION ON CULTURE AND TOURISM / STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATIO	N OFFICE		
Art in Public Spaces Program		- F	·
Impact to Cultural Resources (three part review: new construction [site work/archeological], rehabilitation, and demolition)		<u> </u>	
V I			
DEPARTMENT OF CONSTRUCTION SERVICES			
Acquisitions/ Takings/ Municipal Negotiations		<u> </u>	
Easements		<u></u>	
Environmental Ste Assessment Phase I		<u> </u>	
Environmental Ste Assessment Phase II, III, RAP		ᅜ	
Connecticut Environmental Policy Act		<u> </u>	
National Environmental Policy Act		나	
Life Cycle Cost Analysis (LCCA)		<b>□</b>	
Transfer Act Ste Assessment (TASA)		Image: section of the	
Underground Gorage Tanks		나	
Hazardous Material Inspection/Abatement Request (asbestos, lead, or indoor air quality)		D	
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION			
Sate Traffic Commission Review Determination	[7]	Ū∤	
State Traffic Commission Major Traffic Generator Certificate		Ĭ ·	
U. S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS			
Individual Permit	П	W .	
For new fill/excavation discharges greater than 1 acre	<u></u>		Ш
Programmatic General Permit * with review (5,000 SF-1 acre)	г	다	
* with review (5,000 SF – 1 acre ) * without review (less than 5,000 SF)	<u></u>	FA	<u> </u>
U. S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY			
Sole Source Aquifer Review		W	

Comments or remarks:	
SECTION E SIGN	IATURE
THIS ENVIRONMENTALASSESSMENT REVIEW WAS CO	NDUCTED BY:
SIGNATURE OF THE REVIEWER	2/25/16
Phillip D. Mc Lellan	DATE
NAME AND TITLE OF REVIEWER Planwing Specialist	

# STATE OF CONNECTICUT OFFICE OF POLICY AND MANAGEMENT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REVIEW

Date: February 25, 2016

Project Name: Parking Improvements, Pratt & Whitney Stadium at Rentschler Field

Municipality: East Hartford Staff Contact: Phil McLellan

### **Project Description:**

The Office of Policy and Management (OPM) and the Capital Region Development Authority (CRDA) are proposing to develop grass parking lots and internal gravel roadways on a 10-acre parcel that was recently contributed to the State of Connecticut by United Technologies Corporation (UTC). The site previously housed operations of Pratt & Whitney Aircraft Company (P&W), and roadways, parking areas and foundations from those operations remain in place. Some portions are fully wooded with the balance being successional tree and shrub growth. The parcel adjoins existing stadium grass parking lots that were developed in 2011 on other former P&W land. Work will consist of clearing and grubbing of most existing vegetation, demolition of pavement and structure remains, regrading to achieve proper drainage, installation of piped storm drainage, replacement of exiting roadways with gravel drive lanes and seeding with a durable, drought-tolerant grass mix suitable for parking use. Fencing and barriers will be installed for patron safety and to protect certain resource areas. The work will be contracted by CRDA, which operates Pratt & Whitney Stadium on behalf of OPM. The property will be used for patron and/or employee parking for major events at the stadium, and may be used occasionally for other events, such as charity walks.

Most of the parcel was included in the areas studied for proposed stadium parking in the 2006 "Environmental Impact Evaluation for Proposed Infrastructure Improvement and Rentschler Field Development" prepared by the Department of Economic and Community Development, with OPM as a participating agency. The final boundaries of the contributed parcel include an area of slightly more than 2 acres that lies outside the limits of the prior study of parking lands. However, this acreage was studied in the EIE as part of the proposed area of later phase development of Rentschler Field.

Access to and egress from the parcel will be via existing roadways within the current parking lots. No new roadway construction is planned other than internal circulation.

This project was the subject of a Notice of Scoping posted on December 8, 2015. Comments were received from the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP) and OPM's Intergovernmental Policy Division (OPM-IGP). This assessment takes those comments into consideration and where appropriate provides supporting information in response to them.

## **Project Purpose and Need**

OPM-IGP submitted several questions regarding the purpose and need for the proposed action and possible alternatives. The following discussion responds to those.

Rentschler Field is a former airfield that was developed and used by P&W for operations related to aircraft engine manufacturing. Its last operations were in1996 and it was subsequently targeted for economic development by UTC and the Town of East Hartford. UTC donated 75 acres to the State for construction of the stadium in 1999 and donated another 71 acres in 2009 for development of permanent parking. The 10-acre project site was part of an agreement that extended UTC's naming rights for the stadium for 15 years.

Parking has been a significant issue for stadium operations since its opening in 2003. The original donation provided for about 4,000 parking spaces on site, with the balance needed provided through a long term lease from UTC elsewhere on its property. The lease contemplated the availability of 6,500 offsite spaces for major stadium events, based on a consultant's estimate of parking demand.

Experience quickly demonstrated that the number of spaces available through the lease was not sufficient for events where the attendance exceeded about 28,000. There ensued an additional series of short-term parking lease agreements with UTC that resulted both from concerns about the space count and the progress of development activities on the UTC property. The 2009 donation that supplanted the long term lease was an effort to provide a permanent solution for a significant portion of the parking demand. Agreements for use of additional UTC land were still in effect until 2013, when UTC announced it would no longer enter into such agreements for the football season. However, it has entertained single-event agreements for high-attendance events as long as land was readily available and accessible on the airfield or the P&W campus.

In 2015, UTC agreed to donate the additional 10 acres and to enter into a 10 year lease for 15 acres located south of the portion of the former airfield likely to be developed in the near future. The 10 acre donation when developed will lead to a total of about 9500 spaces on State owned land. This number will accommodate the average crowd for a UCONN football game of about 26,000, based on attendance at all such events since 2003. The 10 year lease provides 1,500 additional spaces, thereby accommodating a crowd of approximately 30,000. For a sellout event with attendance of 38,000, this leaves a deficit of more than 3,000 spaces, which is currently made up through single-event agreements with UTC. For a sellout event with added temporary seating for 3,000, this number rises to nearly 4,000 spaces. These numbers all assume that at least 1,000 patrons will arrive via buses. They also assume that approximately 1,000 spaces that are provided in informal lots at the P&W Aircraft Club and other locations on Silver Lane will continue to be available for most events, even though this is not currently a permitted use in the Town of East Hartford.

Bus transportation for stadium events largely consists of charters and student busses operated by the University. The latter are reasonably successful and ridership for certain major games has approached 2000. Public transit use for stadium events is minimal, consisting mainly of event staff. CT FASTRAK operated shuttles from downtown Hartford as an experiment for part of the 2015 football season. While the announcement of the service was greeted warmly in social media, the ridership was low, about 50 for the most heavily attended game, with a total of 144 for the season. Coordinated marketing could improve these numbers, but significant increases are unlikely. With full expansion of CT FASTRAK east of the Connecticut River, regular use may become more common, especially as Rentschler Field development intensifies. It remains to be seen whether this will help with stadium parking issues.

Prior to the 2015 contribution and lease, OPM, CRDA and the stadium managers examined other options for event parking within a reasonable distance of the stadium, including possible shuttle lots. No areas that were potentially available were found to be suitable for such use. It is apparent that temporary solutions will continue to be part of the stadium's future, even with development of the new spaces. In the long term, shuttles from downtown Hartford garages may even be part of the solution.

Shared parking with businesses that locate on the airfield in the future may be a possibility, though there are significant limitations on such arrangements (retail spaces will certainly not be available for a UCONN game on the Saturday after Thanksgiving, for example). If such arrangements do evolve they will have to be negotiated by the stadium managers on a case-by case basis reflecting the needs of the individual businesses.

### **Potential Environmental Impacts**

The following section addresses potential impacts on environmental resources that exist on the project site, as identified by the project team and in scoping comments provided by DEEP.

Wetlands: DEEP noted that 2 small wetland areas previously identified in the 2007 EIE may lie within the project area, as well as the drainage ditch along the western edge. The drainage ditch is off-property and does not fall within the project area. The two small isolated wetlands do fall within the project area but will not be impacted by the work. Appropriate buffers will be created in the design process and no work will take place within these areas. Fencing or barriers may be added to further protect the areas in the final design, depending on lot layout and the evidence of need for such. A wetland permit will not be required.

<u>Water Quality</u>: Both construction and operation of the lot can potentially impact surface water quality. The project will require registration under the DEEP General Permit for Discharge of Stormwater and Dewatering Wastewater Associated with Construction Activities, and will adhere to the requirements of that General Permit, thereby minimizing the potential for impacts. Upon completion of the work, OPM will amend the

stadium's existing registration under the General Permit for Discharge of Stormwater Associated with Commercial Activity to incorporate the new lot. Measures typically required under both General Permits will be incorporated into the design of the project. As a grass and gravel surface like most other existing stadium parking, the lot provides for infiltration of most stormwater. Drainage will be installed only to handle short-term flows that exceed infiltration capacities.

<u>Floodplains</u>: A portion of the project area lies within the 100-year floodplain associated with backwater flooding from Pewterpot Brook, which flows to the south of the site. OPM will submit a Flood Management Certification to DEEP that demonstrated compliance with statutory and regulatory flood management requirements. While some grading is likely to take place within the floodplain, storage and runoff volumes will be maintained.

Endangered, Threatened and Special Concern Species Habitat: The project area does not include critical habitat for listed species, but it adjoins areas used by listed species. DEEP noted that long-eared owls were found to be using conifers in the vicinity of the project area as winter roosts, and requested that a qualified ornithologist survey the area if clearing operations were planned to start prior to May 1 so that appropriate mitigation measures could be developed. While the start date for clearing has not be finalized, a survey was conducted earlier this month. No evidence of owl roosts was found. However, almost all the conifers in question are located on private property adjacent to the project site. Should owls subsequently be found to be using the area, consideration will be given to an appropriate buffer and clearing sequence to be developed in coordination with DEEP to minimize disturbance.

DEEP also noted that Eastern box turtles had been found in the wetland area east of the project site and recommended that mitigation measures recommended in the 2007 EIE be applied to this project. Those included surveys of the work area prior to installation of controls and the start of work to confirm no turtles are present, and leaving a scarified area on a part of the site closest to the offsite wetland as a potential nesting area. The preconstruction survey will be conducted and consideration will be given in the design process to an appropriate location for such a nesting area.

Site Remediation: DEEP's Remediation Division requested that appropriate documentation be submitted to establish the suitability of the site for the proposed uses. Under the terms of the 2015 contribution agreement, responsibility for environmental remediation of the site remains with UTC. UTC has conducted extensive studies of the area and has made relevant data available to OPM. UTC has also developed remedial action plans for the property that are in various stages of review and approval. Under a protocol that was developed in 2009 for previous lot construction, design and construction will be closely coordinated with UTC and its consultants to ensure that all activities are consistent with those plans. Copies of the design will be provided to DEEP for review, with supporting documentation. The project bid documents will include special excavation and handling instructions applicable to soils and groundwater in portions of the site that may be contaminated.

<u>Neighborhood</u>: One residential property abuts the project area on 2 sides. Because of potential impacts, project staff have met with the resident and discussed his preferences with regard to buffering and security. Mitigation measures he requested will be incorporated into the project design. Limits of clearing may also be adjusted slightly to provide a greater buffer close to the residence.