



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: 7/7/2026
Name of Project/Action: 55 Kondracki Lane
Project Address(es): 55 Kondracki Lane, Wallingford, CT 06492
Affected Municipalities: Wallingford

Sponsoring Agency(ies): DOH
Agency Project Number, if applicable: DOH25-0034-148
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

☒ 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:

The 55 Kondracki Lane Development is the adaptive reuse of a former skilled nursing facility and is situated on a 11.59 acre parcel located at 55 Kondracki Lane, Wallingford, CT. The site is served by both public water and sewer, and prior use was a skilled nursing facility and fully developed site with parking, sidewalks and outdoor recreational space for tenants.

Description of the Proposed Action:

The area around 55 Kondracki Lane in Wallingford is a predominantly residential neighborhood with nearby commercial uses along the main corridors, and it is part of a middle-income, largely Caucasian, but gradually diversifying community. It reflects Wallingford's broader pattern of established single-family neighborhoods, some multifamily and institutional uses, and convenient access to services and employment in the town center and along arterial roads.

The median age in Wallingford is in the low- to mid-40s, reflecting a mix of families with children, working-age adults, and older residents. Wallingford has between 44,000 and 45,000 residents with a median household income in the low \$100,000s.

Site Work- Modifications to existing utilities onsite will be undertaken (Electrical, Storm/Sewer, natural gas). The site will also be modified to add some additional parking spaces and the entire existing parking area will be milled, overlaid and re-stripped. New landscaping and hardscaping will be provided throughout the site.

Construction: This is the adaptive reuse of a former skilled nursing facility. The building has been gutted, but some selective demolition will need to occur to allow for the upfit of the building. The property is of the non-combustible building type, and will be kept in that classification. Metal studs will be used for framing, and the building will be insulated with spray foam, rigid and bat insulation. The building was designed to comply with state and local building/energy codes, and will provide a very energy efficient end result. This is a full gut renovation, and includes new roof, windows, building skin, and systems.

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. Water Planning and Management Division, DEEP, commented: “The proposed project site is not located in an Aquifer Protection Area, a parcel prioritized for source water protection as shown on the Parcel Prioritization for Source Water Protection Viewer, or in an area of coarse-grained deposits as shown on the CT Surficial Aquifer Potential Map. This area is not a current source and is not likely a future source for groundwater. There are no concerns related to the Aquifer Protection Area Program.” “The proposed project is located within the Wallingford Water Department’s service area, so public water supply will be available for the development site if needed. Otherwise, it is unlikely that the site will require more than 50,000 gallons of water per day, the jurisdictional threshold of the Water Diversion Program, therefore no new sources will need to be developed.” “The proposed redevelopment site has “Unnamed Tributary to Wharton Brook” (CT5207-01_01) running through the property, subsequently draining to Wharton Brook (CT5207-00_01). Both waterbodies are listed as impaired and as not supporting habitat for fish, other aquatic life, or wildlife. Furthermore, Wharton Brook drains to the Quinnipiac River (CT5200-00_01) and finally empties in the Long Island Sound via the New Haven Estuary (CT-C1_013-SB). The Quinnipiac River and the New Haven Estuary have Bacteria Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDL). These TMDLs identify stormwater runoff from impervious surfaces as a potential source of water quality degradation to receiving waterbodies. To reduce further impairment to these receiving waters, DEEP recommends incorporating the use of Green Infrastructure and/or Low Impact Development during any new development to minimize/reduce the impact of polluted stormwater from reaching receiving surface waters, as recommended in the Quinnipiac River Watershed Based Plan. In the Long Island Sound Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan (2025), objectives in the Clean Waters and Healthy Watersheds section also focus on improving water quality to Long Island Sound by implementing nature-based solutions. To minimize the water quality impacts of

	the development, proper management measures for stormwater and sediment should be taken.” DOH encouraged the development team to follow DEEP’s recommendations. Development team confirmed: Proper management measures for stormwater and sediment will be taken.
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;	The site is not located within a FEMA-designated floodplain.
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;	No direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts.
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;	DEEP fisheries division commented: “The “Unnamed Tributary to Wharton Brook” has an upstream drainage area of approximately 0.85 square miles and flow appears to be seasonally intermittent. This tributary does not support any significant aquatic resources, but to protect downstream resources any work done near the watercourse should employ all best management practices for erosion and sediment control.” DOH encouraged the development team to follow DEEP’s recommendations. The development team confirmed: Any work done near the watercourse will employ all best management practices for erosion and sediment control.
Use of pesticides, toxic or hazardous materials or any other substance in such quantities as to cause unreasonable adverse effects on the environment;	In January of 2026, GeoQuest conducted a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, which identified no AOCs, RECs, controlled RECs (CRECs), or historical RECs (HRECs) associated with the site. During the GeoQuest Phase I ESA, a 2024 Phase I ESA, conducted by Eagle was reviewed. The following recognized environmental conditions (RECs) and areas of concern (AOCs) were identified in the 2024 Eagle Phase I: REC-1/AOC-1 - Former 5,000/8,000-gallon Heating Oil USTs (data gaps cited), REC-2/AOC-2 - Hydraulic Reservoirs for Elevators and Apparent Hydraulic Leak • AOC-3 - Pad-mounted Transformer • AOC-4 - Former Trash Compactor

	• AOC-5 - Historic Fill Material • AOC-6 - Generator and Former Furnace Area Staining • AOC-7 - Historical Agricultural Soils Although the above RECs/AOCs were identified by Eagle, it was GeoQuest's opinion that they were de minimis conditions and are not likely to significantly affect the environmental condition of the site. However, in order to ensure that Eagle's RECs/AOCs are in fact de minimis and/or to fill in any potential data gaps associated with the UST removals, GeoQuest completed the limited Phase II Subsurface Investigation. Low concentrations of PAHs and one VOC were identified well below the RSR criteria in select soil samples collected on the site. The PAH concentrations identified appear to be the result of incidental sources associated with the parking lot (particularly asphalt fragments [GQ-5]). Low concentrations of select total metals were identified in two of the soil samples analyzed for metals. The metals concentrations were consistent with naturally occurring background conditions and do not appear to be indicative of a release. No evidence of a release associated with the RECs/AOCs was identified anywhere on the site. Limited Hazardous Building Materials Renovation Impact Inspection Report by Eagle and the reports for the post-abatement re-occupancy testing of the areas on the first floor of the site. The majority of the asbestos abatement (sheet rock/joint compound, flooring, and glue daubs) appears to have been previously completed on the ground, first, and second floors of the building, while no lead-based paint was identified in the building, elevated lead-dust levels were identified in some areas.
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,	No direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts.

including impacts on existing housing where sections 22a- 1b(c) and 8-37t of the CGS require additional analysis;	
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 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.
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;	No direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts.
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;	No direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts.
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.