



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: 7/14/2026
Name of Project/Action: Oak Woods
Project Address(es): 9 Scott Road, 431 Main Street, 435 Main Street, Terryville, CT 06786
Affected Municipalities: Terryville
Sponsoring Agency(ies): DOH
Agency Project Number, if applicable: DOH24-0288-111
Project Funding Source(s)/Program(s), if known: State fund

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: “Based on the information provided to this office, no historic properties will be affected”

☒ 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: Mithila Chakraborty, Ph.D., Environmental Analyst II

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:

Oak Woods-located in Terryville, town of Plymouth, Litchfield County, Connecticut, is vacant land, a portion of which is improved with a dirt road and sewer infrastructure; the remainder is undeveloped woodlands. The subject property consists of three parcels:037-068-019A: a 25.93-acre parcel identified as 9 Scott Road and accessed from an onsite driveway from Scott Road (adjoining to the west), 038-068-017A: a 1.72-acre parcel identified as 431 Main Street, located approximately 475 feet south of Main Street, 038-068-019: a 5.53-acre parcel identified as 435 Main Street, accessed from Main Street (adjoining to the north).

The majority of the project location is shown on historical records as consisting of undeveloped, forested land from the early 1900s, with some small areas of cleared land. What appear to be residential structures were present on the 431 Main Street parcel from the 1930s to the 1950s and on the 435 Main Street parcel from the 1940s to an unknown time before the 1990s. By September 2010, a large section of the subject property running diagonally from the northwestern to southeastern sections of the subject property has been cleared of forest and appears to contain unpaved dirt roads, earth moving equipment and stockpiles of soil material.

Description of the Proposed Action:

The proposed 59-unit development will be located at 9 Scott Road. The other two parcels at 431 and 435 main street will remain undeveloped. There are no floodplain encroachments on the proposed site locations. There are wetlands, on the site - the site has received wetland approvals from the Town. Utility infrastructure, including the access road off Scott Road, has been installed to the site. The neighborhood for the proposed Oak Woods is within walking distance to a high concentration of residential related services, including, but not limited to, recreational areas, green spaces, medical facilities, banks, schools, grocery stores, sports facilities, library.

Alternatives Considered:

No Action Alternative.

Public concerns or controversy associated with the proposed action:

NA

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): Enter text.
- ☐ Local, State, or National Historic District(s).

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

Required Factors for Consideration (Section 22a-1a-3 of the RCSA)	Agency's Assessment and Explanation
Effect on water quality, including surface water and groundwater;	The proposed action will not result in any impact on groundwater and surface water quality. The project location is not in any Aquifer protection area. DEEP commented "The site is the headwaters of an unnamed tributary to the Pequabuck River. The Pequabuck River Watershed has a pollutant reduction analysis for bacteria (Total Maximum Daily Load (https://portal.ct.gov/-/media/DEEP/water/tmdl/CTFinalTMDL/pequabucktmdl) and a Watershed Based Plan: (https://portal.ct.gov//media/DEEP/water/watershed_management/wm_plans/pequabuck/pequabuckwbppdf.pdf). Due to the impairment, appropriate management measures for stormwater and sediment should be taken as to minimize impacts to downstream surface waters, including the Pequabuck River." DOH advised clients to adopt best management practices to reduce potential water quality impacts.
Effect on a public water supply system;	The project will not have any negative impact on the public water supply system.
Effect on flooding, in-stream flows, erosion or sedimentation;	No direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts as the location is not in any flood zone.
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;	SHPO letter of "no historic properties will be affected" available. Phase IA Cultural Resources Survey was done on Oak Woods Residential Development. The 9 Scott Road Area of Potential Effect has a low sensitivity for precontact archaeological resources. The lack of site integrity is well documented. No archaeological testing for precontact period resources is recommended. HPI concludes that the 9 Scott Road project site has a low sensitivity for historic period archaeological resources. No archaeological testing for historic period resources is recommended.
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;	Initially, DEEP commented "This project location may be close to a Natural Diversity Database area. The applicant should submit an application and all required attachments to the NDDDB for further review. The Natural Diversity Database is a record of state or federal listed species maintained by the Wildlife Division that may be found in the project area. Please submit a formal application to the Wildlife Division prior to submitting permit applications.

	Additional information for utilizing DEEP's ezFile portal form may be found a Requests for Natural Diversity Data Base Reviews." The project location is not in the NDDDB area. NDDDB representative Robin Blum confirmed through email that "this project is not required to submit for a Natural Diversity Data Base (NDDDB) review; none of the 3 statutory triggers are applicable to your project (no state authorizations/permits are required, this is not a state agency action, there is no use of state funds)." According to DEEP "The site is upstream of the unnamed tributary to the Pequabuck River and of trout management areas and dams. Heavy development and accompanying impervious surfaces within the Pequabuck River watershed have led to the impairment of the river. Concerns over the impairment led to the development of the Pequabuck River Watershed Management Plan. The increase in impervious cover in the project area is perhaps the most concerning issue of this development. The introduction of additional pollutants through runoff is another. Innovative solutions to reduce the effects of impervious surfaces and prevent pollution through runoff are encouraged. Proper stormwater management BMPs, incorporation of green infrastructure if feasible, and consideration of features such as rooftop and rain gardens would help address these concerns."
Use of pesticides, toxic or hazardous materials or any other substance in such quantities as to cause unreasonable adverse effects on the environment;	The Phase I ESA mentioned "SHOOTING RANGE" LEAD impacted soil and identified it as REC which will become HREC after Remediation. Langans report on 10th October, 2023 Lead Remediation Update, "Based on the results of the lead PMC investigation at the "shooting range" area, exceedances of the PMC have been successfully delineated horizontally and vertically. Previous remediation activities have already addressed exceedances of the SEH and RDEC and no further action is necessary to address the SEH condition and RDEC exceedance area. Based on the presence of lead at concentrations exceeding the GA PMC, Langan has recommended excavation and offsite disposal of soil containing lead at concentrations exceeding the GA PMC up to the "clean" endpoints identified during this investigation. Remedial excavation is anticipated to be completed in the fall of 2023 and an updated remediation report will be provided upon completion."
Substantial aesthetic or visual effects;	The project is not expected to cause substantial aesthetic or visual impacts in the area.
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	Proposed project is consistent with the State C&D Plan Growth Management principles #1 (Redevelop and Revitalize Regional Centers and Areas with Existing or Currently Planned Physical Infrastructure); Growth Management Principle #2 (Expand Housing Opportunities and Design Choices to Accommodate a variety of

agency plans; and (C) applicable regional or municipal land use plans;	Household Types and Needs); and Growth Management Principle #3 (Concentrate Development around Transportation Nodes and Along Major Transportation Corridors to Support the Viability of Transportation Options).
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;	No direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts.
Displacement or addition of substantial numbers of people;	OPM commented “The updated scoping notice indicates the developer has acquired additional property connecting the project to Main Street, though the Project Description states: The proposed 59-unit development will be located at 9 Scott Road. The other two parcels at 431 and 435 main street will remain undeveloped The Project Description and Project Map also suggest that the only access point for the development will be connected to Scott Road. Creating an access point to Main Street, through the 431 and 435 Main Street parcels may reduce walking distance to the businesses and other services further east by as much as a ½ mile. Are there any plans to include direct access from Oak Woods to Main Street?” According to current development teams response there will be 47 units at nine scott road and there is no plan at this time to include direct access.
Substantial increase in congestion (traffic, recreational, other);	OPM commented “The revised scoping notice’s Project Description states the following: The neighborhood for the proposed Oak Woods is within walking distance to a high concentration of residential related services, including, but not limited to, recreational areas, green spaces, medical facilities, banks, schools, grocery stores, sports facilities, library. Access to services is often a challenge for low-income residents, but it does not appear that the proposed project is within walking distance of the services described. Many of those services are >1 mile from 9 Scott Road. Further, there are noticeable gaps in sidewalks between the proposed development and places that would be within walking distance. Does the town have plans to fill such gaps or encourage greater non-motorized mobility? While OPM believes the walkability of the area is overstated by this scoping notice, accessibility issues are further amplified by the lack of transit serving the Terryville / Plymouth area. A state-funded

	housing project – especially one intended to serve those who earn below the area median income – should prioritize connections to transit and local services.” A notice of planned Scott Road improvements for June, 2026 is shared by Development team. The Town of Plymouth will conduct a chip seal roadway maintenance program starting the week of July 6, 2026 (weather permitting). This program is managed by the Department of Public Works and aims to extend the service life of local roads, improve driving surfaces, and protect pavement from weather-related deterioration. Roads Included: Scott Road, Cross Road, Town Hill Road, Magnolia Lane, Knollwood Lane, South Eagle Street, Washington Road.
A substantial increase in the type or rate of energy use as a direct or indirect result of the action;	No direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts.
The creation of a hazard to human health or safety;	No direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts.
Effect on air quality;	The proposed project is not a commercial or industrial facility. The proposed project is residential apartments. During construction there can be a little air dust issue, but no direct, indirect or cumulative impacts are anticipated. DOH advised clients to adopt best management practices to reduce potential air quality impacts.
Effect on ambient noise levels;	No direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts. A noise study was done and found to be within HUD suggested limits.
Effect on existing land resources and landscapes, including coastal and inland wetlands;	No direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts.
Effect on agricultural resources;	Not any adverse impact on agricultural land is anticipated.
Adequacy of existing or proposed utilities and infrastructure;	Existing utilities are present on site and in the area.
Effect on greenhouse gas emissions as a direct or indirect result of the action;	Not any adverse impact is anticipated.
Effect of a changing climate on the action, including any resiliency measures incorporated into the action;	Based on the scope of the project, no climate change impacts are anticipated.

Any other substantial effects on natural, cultural, recreational, or scenic resources.	Not any adverse impact is anticipated.
Cumulative effects.	Based on the scope of the project, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in any cumulative impact on the environment. The project will provide additional affordable housing.

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

Stormwater pollution prevention and erosion control measures shall be implemented as specified in the project construction documents and in accordance with local, state, and federal regulations

PART VI – Sponsoring Agency Comments and Recommendations

Based on the environmental assessment of the proposed project, DOH recommends that the project proceed as proposed and preparation of an Environmental Impact Evaluation (EIE) is not warranted.

PART VII - Public Comments and Sponsoring Agency Responses:

DEEP and OPM comments are responded in this ERC.