



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: 6/10/2026  
Name of Project/Action: Hanover Street Residences  
Project Address(es): 344, 350, and 354 Hanover Street, Bridgeport, CT 06605  
Affected Municipalities: Bridgeport

Sponsoring Agency(ies): DOH  
Agency Project Number, if applicable: DOH 24-0200-015  
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: No historic properties will be affected letter available from SHPO.

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:**

This project is a nine-unit affordable housing development for low-income families in Bridgeport, CT. This development encompasses three adjacent three-family homes located at 344, 350 and 354 Hanover Street, Bridgeport, CT. The combined site area is 0.21 acres.

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

Each dwelling unit will have three bedrooms. One unit in each building will be American Disability Act (ADA) compliant. Buildings will utilize EnergyStar heating/cooling and appliances, as well as solar arrays on roofing to supplement energy demand. The buildings will have a slab on grade-foundation and wood-frame structure. The exterior will have vinyl siding and double hung windows, and the roof will have architectural fiberglass shingles. The interior will have luxury vinyl plank floors. The project location is in hurricane inundation (storm surge) zone and within priority and balanced priority funding area. Phase 1 ESA didn't find any Recognized Environmental Condition (REC) for the site except an offsite property at 332 Hanover Street. No other Environmental concerns were identified.

### **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**

<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;	<p>The proposed action will not result in any impact on groundwater and surface water quality. The proposed construction site is not located in an Aquifer Protection Area. Not in any 100- or 500-year floodzone.</p> <p>DEEP’s comments mentioned the proposed site development lies north of the Cedar Creek Reach within Cedar Creek Harbor. This is an impaired waterbody with a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) not supporting aquatic life, shellfish, and recreation. The TMDL indicates waterbody segments “exceed the water quality standards for fecal coliform during wet weather, which indicates that stormwater runoff is likely contributing to the bacterial concentration in the Bridgeport Estuary”. To reduce further impairment of this waterbody, CT DEEP recommends the use of Green Infrastructure throughout the development to reduce the impact of polluted stormwater from reaching receiving waters. To minimize the water quality impacts of the development, proper management measures for stormwater and sediment should be taken.</p> <p>DOH encouraged the development team to follow DEEP’s recommendations.</p>
Effect on a public water supply system;	The project will not have any impact on the public water supply system. The location of this project is not in an aquifer protection area.
Effect on flooding, in-stream flows, erosion or sedimentation;	The project site is not located in 100- or 500-year flood zone as per FEMA flood map <a href="#">FEMA Flood Map Service Center   Welcome!</a> .
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;	Judd Homestead is not eligible for listing in National register of historic places. The SHPO letter mentioned “no historic properties will be affected.”
Effect on natural communities and upon critical plant and animal species and their habitat;	The project is not located in any Natural Diversity Database area.

interference with the movement of any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species;	According to DEEP too “No work is proposed in or near any waterbodies, therefore no impacts to fisheries resources are expected and no further consultation with Fisheries is required.” “No impacts to listed species are anticipated and no further consultation with the Natural Diversity Database is required.”
Use of pesticides, toxic or hazardous materials or any other substance in such quantities as to cause unreasonable adverse effects on the environment;	Based on the type and the nature of the development, the use of pesticides, toxic or hazardous materials are not anticipated.
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 agency plans; and (C) applicable regional or municipal land use plans;	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 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;	Temporary disruption is expected during site work but the long-term effect will be positive to the site and neighborhood.
Displacement or addition of substantial numbers of people;	No direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts.
Substantial increase in congestion (traffic, recreational, other);	No direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts.
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

	<p>there can be a little air dust issue, but no direct, indirect or cumulative impacts are anticipated.</p> <p>DOH advised clients to adopt best management practices to reduce potential air quality impacts.</p>
Effect on ambient noise levels;	No direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts.
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**

NA

**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 comments are received and addressed in the ERC.