



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: 8/28/2026
Name of Project/Action: Hartford Trade School
Project Address(es): 110 Washington Street, Hartford, CT
Affected Municipalities: Hartford

Sponsoring Agency(ies): DOH
Agency Project Number, if applicable: DOH25-0204-064
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: The Hartford Trade School building will be listed on the State and Federal Historic Register to qualify for state and federal historic tax credits. The CT State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) has reviewed the Part 1 application, "Determination of Historic Structure Status," for the above-listed building and has determined that: The building appears to meet the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and will likely be listed in the National Register of Historic Places if nominated by the State Historic Preservation Officer according to the procedures set forth in 36 CFR Part 60. The CT State Historic Preservation Office has reviewed the Part 2 application, "Request for Approval of Proposed Rehabilitation Plan," for the above-listed building and has determined that: The proposed rehabilitation plan described herein meets the Standard's provided conditions are met. On July 10, 2025, SHPO letter mentioned, Contingent on the following all requirements of the above-mentioned programs, including the approval conditions listed below, the undertaking will have a conditional no adverse effect to historic resources. The project has received SHPO Part 3 Approval as well as the state historic tax credit reservation. SHPO Part 4 and 5 Approvals will come post construction.

☒ 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:

Project sponsors Arch Communities LLC and Boston Communities LLC seek to redevelop the former Hartford Trade School into approximately 57 affordable and workforce housing units. Straddling the border between the historic South Green and Frog Hollow neighborhoods, the State Trade School was constructed in 1928 in an art deco style during a period when Connecticut was a national leader in vocational training. The school was subsequently used as a school for several private school uses and adult education courses. In the past several years, Hartford Public Schools transferred ownership of the building to the City of Hartford, who has been using the facility as a warming center for vulnerable residents during winter months.

The existing building is 4-story on an approximately 68,947 square foot lot. The site is adjacent to a vacant office building to the south east and a Connecticut judicial building and Hartford state police building to the north west. The surrounding area is zoned MX-2 for multi-use and contains both residential and office buildings. Hartford is approximately 34% Black or African American, 23.5% Hispanic, 14.9% White, and 19.7% other.

Description of the Proposed Action:

This proposal seeks to redevelop the 4-story structure into mixed-income housing for households ranging from 30% AMI - 80% AMI. The former school building will be adaptively reused in a historically sensitive manner, maintaining the original look and feel of the school building. Classrooms will be converted into units, and central circulation elements, include corridors with lockers and a double entry stair, will be preserved and reused. The project is anticipated to have 6 studios, 37 1-bedroom units, and 14 2-bedroom units, and will feature on site property management and on-site amenities such as a community room and fitness room.

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. There are no concerns related to the Aquifer Protection Area. Water Planning and Management Division, DEEP, commented: “The proposed project is located within The Metropolitan District Commission’s (MDC) 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, so no new sources will need to be developed.” “The proposed construction 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.”
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;	The Hartford Trade School building will be listed on the State and Federal Historic Register to qualify for state and federal historic tax credits. The CT State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) has reviewed the Part 1 application, “Determination of Historic Structure Status,” for the above-listed building and has determined that: The building appears to meet the National Register Criteria for Evaluation and will likely be listed in the National Register of Historic Places if nominated by the State Historic Preservation Officer according to the procedures set forth in 36 CFR Part 60. The CT State Historic Preservation Office has reviewed the Part 2 application, “Request for Approval of Proposed Rehabilitation Plan,” for the above-listed building and has determined that: The proposed rehabilitation plan described herein meets the Standard’s provided conditions are met. On July 10, 2025, SHPO letter mentioned, Contingent on the following all requirements of the above-mentioned programs, including the

	approval conditions listed below, the undertaking will have a conditional no adverse effect to historic resources. The project has received the SHPO Part 3 Approval (attached) as well as the state historic tax credit reservation. SHPO Part 4 and 5 Approvals will come post construction.
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;	According to DEEP: “Any incorporation of green infrastructure that reduces the amount of impervious surfaces present and the negative effects of such is strongly encouraged. This can include using pervious surfaces where appropriate, rooftop gardens, a green roof, rain gardens, vegetated swales and underground stormwater infiltration system, etc.” DOH encouraged the development team to follow DEEP’s recommendations. According to development team: “The project is removing approximately 8,000 SF of impervious asphalt and replacing it with pervious lawn area to improve stormwater runoff. The site is mainly impervious with no wooded area or watercourse onsite. Per the Natural Diversity Database Map, the site does not contain any State and/or federally listed species or critical habitat areas.”
Use of pesticides, toxic or hazardous materials or any other substance in such quantities as to cause unreasonable adverse effects on the environment;	A Phase I ESA was done June 2026. Lightship Engineering has performed a Phase I environmental assessment in general Conformance with the scope and limitations of ASTM Practice E 1527 of the Subject Property. This assessment revealed no evidence of RECs in connection with the Subject Property with the exception of the following: An existing UST was observed in the alleyway on the north side of the Subject Property. The UST was apparently installed in 2000, but Lightship Engineering obtained no additional information regarding the condition of the UST and associated piping. Therefore, the existing UST is considered a REC. This assessment has revealed no evidence of Controlled RECs in connection with the Subject Property. Before another Phase I Environmental Site Assessment prepared by Lightship Engineering (Lightship), dated September 6, 2024 (cover letter dated June 19, 2025) found four Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs). Two underground storage tanks (USTs), An existing 5,000-gallon UST, Two aged electrical transformers, Floor drains and a sump. Transformer Room Assessment Report prepared by Partner Engineering and Science, Inc., dated November 11, 2025: PCBs were detected at concentrations of 0.399 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg) and 0.61 mg/kg, both of which are below the regulatory limit of 1 mg/kg. Partner concluded, based on the analytical results, that no reporting to the regulatory agencies or remediation was necessary. As part of their November 2025 report, Partner recommended that if/when the transformers are

	removed, they be evaluated for PCBs for proper handling in accordance with environmental regulations. They went on to recommend that the concrete flooring underlying the transformers be inspected and potentially cleaned in accordance with EPA guidance prior to reuse or occupancy. Partner also noted that if the concrete flooring is to be removed as part of a future redevelopment activity, it should be properly managed. Limited Subsurface Investigation Letter Report; Prepared by Lightship Engineering, LLC, dated February 06, 2026. In order to investigate an REC identified in Lightship's Phase I ESA dated September 6, 2024 (cover letter dated June 19, 2025), a limited subsurface investigation (LSI) was conducted in January 2026. Lightship concluded that, based on the findings of the geophysical surveys and LSI, the tanks are confirmed to be no longer present and a significant release of petroleum has not occurred in connection with these former USTs. Lightship further concluded that the USTs are no longer considered an REC. Two RECs were eliminated based on investigation. A proposal for removal of the UST is provided. The floor drains have been removed as a REC based on investigation. A limited HAZMAT survey report from September 20, 2024 was reviewed where scope was: • Limited pre-renovation asbestos containing building material survey. Sample and inventory via selective, semi-destructive methods for Suspect Asbestos Containing Building Materials (SACBM) throughout all accessible areas. • Lead-Based Paint. Limited Lead Based Paint (LBP) Survey conducted with X-Ray Fluorescence (XRF) technology. • Lead in Drinking Water Survey conducted on primary drinking sources throughout the building. • Radon in air survey carried out with short-term charcoal canisters • Visual identification of suspect polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) containing caulk, glazing, and sealant survey. Observe and inventory suspect PCB containing materials throughout all accessible areas. • Mold and water damage survey. Visual inspection for areas with suspect mold and water damage. • Inventory of universal waste components In summary of investigation: Asbestos containing materials (ACM) have been identified on site. Lead-based paint has been identified. Lead-paint Hazards have been identified. Lead in drinking water hazards have been identified. All radon samples were below US
--	---

	EPA's remedial action level of 4.0 pCi/L. The Subject Sites average radon concentration is 0.94 pCi/L. Suspect PCB containing building material and components have been identified on site. The possibility for PCB containing caulks does exist in older door and window systems beneath multiple layers of caulk and/ or glazing. No visible suspect microbial growth was observed during the course of this survey. The report conclusion included: 1. Asbestos containing materials have been identified on site during the limited asbestos survey. Any of these materials that will be impacted by renovation and/ or demolition activities shall be removed by a CT licensed asbestos abatement contractor in accordance with CGS 19a-332a-1-12 prior to any disturbance of those materials. Suspect materials not tested shall be assumed as asbestos containing materials (ACM) until proven negative by laboratory analysis. Rough coat plaster containing <1% asbestos has also been identified. OSHA worker protection regulations apply to materials containing any amount of asbestos. 2. Lead-based paint has been identified on site. Currently, the Site is not child-occupied facility. The EPA's RRP rule applies to target housing, residential homes built prior to 1978, and child occupied facilities. The subject site does not currently fall into these categories. If the project is receiving >\$25,000 in federal HUD funding, lead abatement may be required on the LBP components identified in this report. Renovation activities shall be conducted by a RRP certified contractor. In addition, the US EPA Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) and the CT DEEP regulate the disposal of lead-containing waste. Building materials that will be demolished or impacted during renovation activities shall be analyzed via TCLP methods to determine their leachable lead content and disposal pathways. 3. Lead in drinking water hazards have been identified. Additional testing as well as a plan to remove and/or remediate all sources of lead in water must be a part of the scope of work for future renovations. 4. The radon in air survey found that all radon test kits were at concentrations below the US EPA action level. Big East recommends that a passive radon mitigation system is incorporated into the design of the renovated structure and that a follow-up radon survey is completed prior to occupancy of the Site building.
--	--

	5. Suspect PCB containing materials have been identified in window and door systems. The Subject Site was constructed, according to publicly available records, in 1900. Dates of any renovations were not provided to Big East or readily available in public records. Big East recommends a prerenovation PCB building materials survey is carried out if it is determined that any renovations have taken place at the Subject Site between 1950 and 1979. In addition to the identification of source materials containing PCBs, if PCBs are present above certain concentrations, additional sampling and analysis of adjacent substrate surfaces or surfaces that may have been contaminated from a source of PCBs (e.g. soil), must also be performed. 6. Suspect visible microbial growth was not observed during the course of this survey. Evidence of water damage was present on several building materials (vinyl floor tiles, plaster, ceiling tiles), however field collected data found that moisture content and relative humidity readings were at acceptable concentrations. 7. The universal waste inventory has identified approximately 925 light ballasts; 2,275 fluorescent light tubes; 33 thermostats, 42 smoke detectors, and 23 exit signs. PCB Assessment Summary Report prepared by Partner Engineering and Science, Inc, dated February 6, 2026. Total of eight (8) bulk samples of caulking compounds were collected to evaluate PCB concentrations associated with windows and doors at the site. As noted in the hazmat survey report prepared by Big East Environmental, black window glazing and fire stop were also identified as suspect PCB-containing material. These materials were not tested and should be presumed to contain PCBs at regulated concentrations as previously documented. In addition, reference to Big East Environmental notes, multiple layers of caulking/glazing compound may exist. It appears, that subsequent testing performed by Partner Engineering and Science, Inc. did not properly characterize each individual homogenous suspect PCB-containing material. A report entitled PCB Assessment Review by Partner on July 21, 2026. "Partner Engineering and Science, Inc. (Partner) is providing this letter in response to your request and a review of additional assessment work performed subsequent to Partner's assessment activities. The review of building permits and the Facility Condition Assessment, dated May 28, 2015 by EMG of Hunt Balley, MD noted the replacement of all windows in 2004. Excerpts are included below. Observation of the windows and doors found all
--	---

	were consistent with newer construction and the noted permit and FCA statement, and as such, the materials of construction, including green exterior caulking and black window glazing, are deemed not suspect PCB-containing. The doors and windows perimeter caulking on the interior and exterior of doors and windows, including older caulking, were assessed by Partner and presented in the February 6, 2025 summary letter. All results of laboratory analysis found no evidence of PCBs. The fire stop mentioned by BigEast was not observed by Partner and was not tested. The photograph depicting the fire stop shows the material surrounding an exposed electric conduit passing through an acoustic ceiling tile. A fire stop sample collected and analyzed by BigEast was found to be non-asbestos containing. On July 17, 2026, Mr. Eric Gelhaus of BigEast was interviewed about the fire stop observations. Mr. Gelhaus indicated the fire stop was noted as described above and no other fire stop was observed. Mr. Gelhaus indicated there may be other firestop around electric conduit passing through wall or ceiling penetrations but no further assessment or inspection was conducted. Based upon a review of the BigEast summary and available information, sampling and laboratory analysis of a representative sample of fire stop should be conducted prior to disturbance to determine if it contains PCBs. The sampling can be conducted at any time prior to disturbance and, based upon the known conditions, the presence of fire stop does not appear to be extensive or widespread.” Another report on Domestic Water at Historical School Conversion mentioned: “On request of CHFA the sources of lead in the drinking water and testing is required to remove/remediate all sources of lead. However, please note that since all domestic water piping on this project is new - from the fixtures to the street - and we are not re-using any of the existing infrastructure, this should be a non-issue.” Client drops off asbestos sample analysis report from August 11, 2025 did not found any Asbestos on the roof or floor. The contractor will engage a licensed hazmat & demo subcontractor to properly dispose of all suspect materials. The subcontractors will be responsible for all notifications per state law. According to DEEP ERSPD: “While this address is not listed in the PCB Program database, due to the age of the buildings, there is a potential that building materials may be PCB-impacted. While testing of building materials is not a requirement under the regulations, it is suggested to ensure that whatever material is removed and disposed of during renovations is handled properly.”
--	---

	According to DEEP Remediation Division: “In the absence of prior environmental data, it is reasonable to assume that historic urban fill may be present beneath portions of the site. The nature and extent of fill materials remain unknown. Therefore, any disturbance of the soil during redevelopment warrants a thorough soil characterization.” The development team confirmed: “The building has been investigated for hazardous materials, including PCBs. The testing has not found any PCB containing materials above DEEP allowable thresholds. All encountered hazardous materials will be abated and/or removed and disposed of in the appropriate manner during renovations. Regarding soils, the project involves minimal disturbance to the site. The development team does not plan to export any soils during the redevelopment, therefore a soil characterization report is not applicable.”
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;	No direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts.
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;	Existing utilities are present on site and in the area. According to DEEP “The former Hartford Trade School is likely located in a combined sewer area. Any new connection or an existing connection from the site which will increase flows to the combined sewer (due to redevelopment) will require approval from the MDC. The project planners/designers should request MDC’s guidelines to determine the availability and capacity of the combined sewer in that area. With other redevelopment projects, the Department understands that MDC has authorized connections of domestic wastewater (i.e. sewage) but has had concerns related to the acceptance of new or increased discharges of stormwater from a redeveloped property. DEEP recommends that discussions with the MDC related to the management of the domestic sewage and stormwater discharges from the redeveloped site begin early in the planning and design process. Additionally, the Department recommends that the redevelopment design consider an onsite stormwater management system to meet applicable state stormwater permits (see stormwater section below for more information) and in lieu of connection into a combined sewer system the evaluation of the installation of a new and dedicated storm drain that connects to an existing, separate storm sewer system with the City or that discharges directly to a watercourse. If it is infeasible to manage the redeveloped site’s stormwater discharge separate from the combined sewer system, the project planners/designers should coordinate with MDC and discuss strategies to mitigate the impacts of new or increased flows due to development within the combined sewer system. Such strategies may include controlling post-development total stormwater runoff volumes and peak discharge rates to at least pre-development discharge rates and

	corresponding total runoff volumes, and/or offsetting the new or increased flows from redevelopment by reducing flows into the combined sewer system at other sites within the same sewer-shed. The Department notes that in other combined sewer system areas, when flow offsets are used as a mitigation strategy, a ratio of at 4:1 of offset has been used in the past.” The development team confirmed “The development design team has been working in collaboration with MDC. MDC has an active combined sewer line that the project will tie into with separate sanitary and stormwater connections. MDC is currently working on a neighborhood sewer separation project and will work with the project to move the stormwater connection to the new separated stormwater sewer when the larger neighborhood-wide project has been completed. MDC has provided a capacity analysis regarding water and sewer for 110 Washington and determined there is sufficient availability and capacity for the development.”
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

110 Washington is between one and five acres of disturbance and has been approved at the local level, therefore it is not required to register with DEEP.

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.