



State of Connecticut

# Environmental Review Checklist

Last Updated 02/25/2020

## Instructions for Use:

The Environmental Review Checklist (ERC), as defined in Sec. 22a-1a-1(9) of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies (RCSA), is intended to assist state agencies in (1) determining whether a proposed action or category of actions requires public scoping, or (2) in recording an agency's initial assessment of the direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental effects of a proposed action at the completion of public scoping.

For the purposes of CEPA, an Action is defined in Sec 22a-1a-1(2) of the RCSA as an individual activity or a sequence of planned activities initiated or proposed to be undertaken by an agency or agencies, or funded in whole or in part by the state.

Completion of the ERC is only *required* as part of a sponsoring agency's post-scoping notice in which the agency has determined that it will not be preparing an EIE (Sec. 22a-1a-7(d) of the RCSA).

In all other instances, the sponsoring agency has the option to use this form or portions of it, in conjunction with the applicable Environmental Classification Document (ECD), as a tool to assist it in determining whether or not scoping is required and to document the agency's review. This can be especially useful for an agency administering a proposed action that is not specifically represented in the ECD or which may have additional factors and/or indirect or cumulative impacts requiring further consideration.

Even if an agency ultimately determines that public scoping is not necessary, as a matter of public record OPM highly recommends that the agency internally document its decision, and its justification.

In completing this form, include descriptions that are clear, concise, and understandable to the general public.

Note that prior to reviewing a proposed action under the Connecticut Environmental Policy Act (CEPA), Connecticut General Statutes (CGS), Section 16a-31 requires agencies to review any proposed actions for the acquisition, development or improvement of real properties, or the acquisition of public transportation equipment or facilities, and in excess of \$200,000, for consistency with the policies of the State Plan of Conservation and Development (State C&D Plan).



State of Connecticut

# Environmental Review Checklist

Last Updated 02/25/2020

## PART I – Initial Review and Determination

Date: December 13, 2021  
Name of Project/Action: Southbury Training School Farm Building Demolition  
Project Address(es): Corner of Spruce Brook Rd., Purchase Brook Rd. and Cassidy Rd. in Southbury  
Affected Municipalities: Southbury  
Sponsoring Agency(ies): Agriculture  
Agency Project Number, if applicable: NA  
Project Funding Source(s)/Program(s), if known: Unknown

Identify the Environmental Classification Document (ECD) being used in this review:

Generic, or  Agency-Specific

An environmental assessment or environmental impact statement is being prepared pursuant to NEPA, and shall be circulated in accordance with CEPA requirements.

The proposed action requires a written review by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and/or Nation Tribal Historic Preservation Office (NATHPO). Include SHPO/NATHPO reviews as an attachment, or indicate the status of those reviews: SHPO has provided a letter to the Department of Agriculture, dated September 21, 2021 stating they have no objection to the demolition of the buildings cited in the scoping notice.

Based on the analysis documented in this Environmental Review Checklist (ERC), and in consideration of public comments, this agency has determined that the preparation of an Environmental Impact Evaluation (EIE) for the proposed action is not warranted. Publication of this document to the Environmental Monitor shall satisfy the agency's responsibilities under [Section 22a-1a-7 of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies](#) (RCSA).

Completed by: Stephen Anderson, Supervising Environmental Analyst

*Note that prior to commencing a CEPA review, Connecticut General Statutes (CGS) Section 16a-31 requires state agencies to review certain actions for their consistency with the policies of the State Plan of Conservation and Development (State C&D Plan). Completion of this ERC assumes the agency has determined this proposed action to be consistent with the State C&D Plan.*

## **PART II – Detailed Project Information**

### **Description of the Purpose & Need of the Proposed Action:**

The project would involve demolition of deteriorated structures. This is necessary due to safety and vandalism concerns, prohibitive restoration costs, and because farmers leasing land for production agriculture have no agricultural use for the subject buildings and structures.

### **Description of the Proposed Action:**

Demolition and clean-up of the buildings and structures.

### **Alternatives Considered:**

The Department considered adaptive re-use for some of the buildings but costs were prohibitive.

### **Public concerns or controversy associated with the proposed action:**

None

**PART III – Site Characteristics (Check all that apply)**

- The proposed action is non-site specific, or encompasses multiple sites;
- Current site ownership:  N/A,  State;  Municipal,  Private,  Other: Please Explain.
- Anticipated ownership upon project completion:  N/A,  State;  Municipal,  Private,  Other: Please Explain.

**Locational Guide Map Criteria:**

<http://ctmaps.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=ba47efccdb304e02893b7b8e8cff556a>

**Priority Funding Area factors:**

- Designated as a Priority Funding Area, including  Balanced, or  Village PFA;
- Urban Area or Urban Cluster, as designated by the most recent US Census Data;
- Public Transit, defined as being within a ½ mile buffer surrounding existing or planned mass transit;
- Existing or planned sewer service from an adopted Wastewater Facility Plan;
- Existing or planned water service from an adopted Public Drinking Water Supply Plan;
- Existing local bus service provided 7 days a week.

**Conservation Area factors:**

- Core Forest Area(s), defined as greater than 250 acres based on the 2006 Land Cover Dataset;
- Existing or potential drinking water supply watershed(s);
- Aquifer Protection Area(s);
- Wetland Soils greater than 25 acres;
- Undeveloped Prime, Statewide Important and/or locally important agricultural soils greater than 25 acres;
- Category 1, 2, or 3 Hurricane Inundation Zone(s);
- 100 year Flood Zone(s);
- Critical Habitat;
- Locally Important Conservation Area(s),
- Protected Land (list type): The land is under an agricultural easement.
- Local, State, or National Historic District(s).

**PART IV - Assessment of Environmental Significance – Direct, Indirect, And Cumulative Effects**

<b>Required Factors for Consideration (Section 22a-1a-3 of the RCSA)</b>	<b>Agency’s Assessment and Explanation</b>
Effect on water quality, including surface water and groundwater;	None, would be an improvement over what exists. Current state of structures allows for run off and pollution from structures and contents, also fosters habitat for rodents and pests.
Effect on a public water supply system;	None, would be an improvement over existing.
Effect on flooding, in-stream flows, erosion or sedimentation;	None, would be an improvement over what exists.
Disruption or alteration of an historic, archeological, cultural, or recreational building, object, district, site or its surroundings; A. Alteration of an historic building, district, structure, object, or its setting; OR B. Disruption of an archeological or sacred site;	This has been addressed with SHPO (see the September 21, 2021 letter included with the Scoping Notice).
Effect on natural communities and upon critical plant and animal species and their habitat; interference with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species;	If anything, this would be an improvement by removing the deteriorated structures.
Use of pesticides, toxic or hazardous materials or any other substance in such quantities as to cause unreasonable adverse effects on the environment;	None would be used, however, Department of Construction Services has performed hazardous abatement on all of the subject buildings to allow for re-use or demolition. Therefore, the demolition project will result in an improvement in this area.
Substantial aesthetic or visual effects;	Aesthetically, removal of the deteriorated structures will result in an improvement from a visual standpoint.
Inconsistency with: (A) the policies of the State C&D Plan, developed in accordance with section 16a-30 of the CGS; (B) other relevant state agency plans; and (C) applicable	None

regional or municipal land use plans;	
Disruption or division of an established community or inconsistency with adopted municipal and regional plans, including impacts on existing housing where sections 22a- 1b(c) and 8-37t of the CGS require additional analysis;	None
Displacement or addition of substantial numbers of people;	None
Substantial increase in congestion (traffic, recreational, other);	None
A substantial increase in the type or rate of energy use as a direct or indirect result of the action;	None
The creation of a hazard to human health or safety;	No, the project is intended to remove or reduce hazards to human health & safety.
Effect on air quality;	None
Effect on ambient noise levels;	None
Effect on existing land resources and landscapes, including coastal and inland wetlands;	Would be an improvement by removing the deteriorated buildings.
Effect on agricultural resources;	The project will result in an improvement to agricultural resources, by creating more open space around the ongoing production agriculture being conducted. For example, there would be room for parking for pick your own or farmer sales, hay rides or other activities that would benefit agriculture.
Adequacy of existing or proposed utilities and infrastructure;	There should be no effects on existing or proposed utilities or infrastructure.
Effect on greenhouse gas emissions as a direct or indirect result of the action;	This may be an improvement by having more opens space. Should the land be restored completely to its natural state, there would be an improvement.
Effect of a changing climate on the action, including any resiliency	None, may be an improvement given severe and more frequent storms causing more damage to structures and buildings.

measures incorporated into the action;	
Any other substantial effects on natural, cultural, recreational, or scenic resources.	None
Cumulative effects.	Would be an improvement overall by removing unsightly and unsafe structures and moving more toward a natural state.

**PART V - List of Required Permits, Approvals and/or Certifications Identified at the Time of this Review**

None

**PART VI – Sponsoring Agency Comments and Recommendations**

Based on the Department of Agriculture’s assessment, and input from SHPO in the September 21, 2021 letter included with the Scoping Notice, the agency has determined that the project does not require an Environmental Impact Evaluation (EIE) under CEPA.

**PART VII - Public Comments and Sponsoring Agency Responses:**

There was one public comment on the Scoping Notice, from DEEP. The DEEP comments and best practices identified will be followed for the demolition project.