



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: Judd Homestead
Project Address(es): 980 high street, Fairfield, CT
Affected Municipalities: Fairfield

Sponsoring Agency(ies): DOH
Agency Project Number, if applicable: DOH 25-0324-041
Project Funding Source(s)/Program(s), if known: FLEX, Urban Act, DDS

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 development effort proposes the new construction of 40 multifamily dwelling units in five (5) buildings on 2.48 acres as well as the adaptively reused existing circa 1890's farmhouse into a community room and management offices. The project is 100% affordable with projected household incomes ranging from 30% to 80% AMI in 18 one bedroom, 16 two bedroom and 6 three-bedroom dwelling units. All first floor apartments will be fully accessible units.

Description of the Proposed Action:

Judd Homestead at Russo Estates is currently a single family farmhouse located at 980 High Street on 2.48 acres of land in Fairfield CT. The property was owned by the Judd family as their family home and hay farm in past years. Within the last few decades, the property had fallen into disrepair and was just being maintained to keep Mrs Judd in her home and conform with the aesthetics of the surrounding neighborhood. The neighborhood consists of single-family homes, built circa the 1950s and 1960s and is located just west of Black Rock turnpike intersection with Tunix Hill Road. The site is located in a pedestrian friendly neighborhood and is an 8 minute walk to Holland Hill elementary school, and many retail and medical establishments on Black Rock Turnpike, and a bus stop. The proposed bedroom mix 1, 2 and 3 bedroom mix, with income ranges from 30% AMI to 80% AMI. The mix in sizes are 18 one bdr units, 16 two bdr units, and 6 three-bedroom units.

Alternatives Considered:

No Action Alternative.

Public concerns or controversy associated with the proposed action:

Public comments were received on possibility of the project being in Wetland, in Rooster River watershed, the project will cause increase in flooding, increase in Traffic near school area, project will impact the wildlife present etc.

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;	<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 also mentioned same “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 a likely future source for groundwater. There are no concerns related to the Aquifer Protection Area Program.”</p> <p>Moreover, DEEP also found “The project does not appear to affect any wetlands or watercourses. If wetlands or watercourse impact occurs permitting from Land and Water Resources Division (LWRD) may be required.” Local Inland-wetland permit is available.</p> <p>The project is greater than one acre in size but is less than five acres in size. Therefore, a registration for the “General Permit for Stormwater and Dewatering Wastewaters from Construction Activities” will not be submitted. Disturbance of less than 5 acres and local municipal approvals have been obtained.</p>
Effect on a public water supply system;	<p>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.</p> <p>DEEP commented: “The proposed project is located within the Aquarion Water Company’s service area, so public water supply will be available for the development site if needed. 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.”</p>
Effect on flooding, in-stream flows, erosion or sedimentation;	<p>The project site is not located in 100- or 500-year flood zone as per FEMA flood map FEMA Flood Map Service Center Welcome!.</p>
Disruption or alteration of an historic, archeological, cultural, or recreational building, object,	<p>Judd Homestead is not eligible for listing in National register of historic places. The SHPO letter mentioned “The property located at 980 High Street does not appear eligible for listing on the</p>

<p>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;</p>	<p>National Register of Historic Places. Portions of the soil series descriptions reported for the project area are noted to be urban land, characterized by periods of filling, cutting, and other ground disturbing activities. Review of historic aerials show a period of rapid development around the project area between 1934 and 1949. These conditions indicate that the project area has a low potential to yield intact archaeological deposits. Based on the information provided, no historic properties will be affected.</p>
<p>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;</p>	<p>The project is not located in any Natural Diversity Database area.</p> <p>According to DEEP too “The project site is not in a Natural Diversity Data Base (NDDDB) area, and no known listed species are documented in the vicinity. No further consultation with the NDDDB program is required.” “No impacts to fisheries resources are expected and no further consultation with the Fisheries Division is required.”</p>
<p>Use of pesticides, toxic or hazardous materials or any other substance in such quantities as to cause unreasonable adverse effects on the environment;</p>	<p>Based on the type and the nature of the development, the use of pesticides, toxic or hazardous materials are not anticipated. But the pesticides and metals detected in the vicinity of the buildings (historically a farmhouse) are considered a recognized environmental condition/area of concern (REC/AOC). A Soil Management Plan has been developed to address this contamination. According to the Phase I ESA developed by GeoQuest (October 28, 2025), Soil sampling conducted in 2018 and 2019, by GeoQuest, identified lead, arsenic, and multiple pesticides above Remediation Standard Regulations (RSR) criteria in samples collected in the vicinity of the buildings. Minor concentrations of pesticides were detected in soil samples collected from the open field area to the rear of the buildings; however, the detections were below the Residential Direct Exposure Criteria (RES DEC). Additional soil sampling was conducted in 2024 around the perimeter of the dwelling, which identified lead in soil above RSR criteria. A Soil Management Plan was developed by GeoQuest in September of 2019, to address the pesticide and metals contamination identified in 2019. Excavation and off-site disposal was selected as the most effective remedial strategy. The Soil Management Plan called for excavating an 18-inch layer of soil a minimum of 15 feet from the perimeter of the dwelling, barn, garage, and shed structures. The lead identified in soil in 2024 is in the same location as the pesticide-containing soil, and therefore, both the lead and the pesticides are addressed by the Soil Management Plan.</p>
<p>Substantial aesthetic or visual effects;</p>	<p>The project is not expected to cause substantial aesthetic or visual impacts in the area.</p>
<p>Inconsistency with: (A) the policies of the State C&D Plan, developed in accordance with section 16a-30 of</p>	<p>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</p>

the CGS; (B) other relevant state agency plans; and (C) applicable regional or municipal land use plans;	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. With a very low inventory of available land and development opportunities in the town of Fairfield, affordable housing opportunities to benefit low- and moderate-income families in Fairfield County, Connecticut is the goal.
Displacement or addition of substantial numbers of people;	No direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts. The project received planning and zoning approval.
Substantial increase in congestion (traffic, recreational, other);	The project is having 50 Parking spaces within the development (within site) so it's unlikely that roadside parking will increase. Existing Bit mac sidewalk to be replaced by 6-foot-wide concrete sidewalk, making this safer for pedestrians in front of the project site. New driveway has a stop sign and stops bar to be installed per approved plans.
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. According to Conservation Easement several safety steps are being taken like, 0.8 acres of conservation easement area will be established over wetland and adjacent upland areas, emergent stormwater basin will be established, proper signage and fence will be posted marking the conservation area, native trees will be planted, stormwater runoff management will be enhanced

	through creation and maintenance of stormwater basin and a professional wetland scientist will be involved too.
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:

Public comments were received, and agency responses are attached.

CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING
Report of Public Scoping Meeting

Judds Homestead
980 High Street, Fairfield, CT 06824

December 18, 2025, 4-5 PM

[CEPA Public Scoping Meeting for Judd's Homestead \(980 High Street, Fairfield, CT 06824\) | Meeting Chat | Microsoft Teams](#)

ATTENDANCE:

CT DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING

Mithila Chakraborty Ph.D.

Joseph Vazquez MPA

Miguel Rivera

Paul Jorgensen AIA

Environmental Analyst II, Organizer and Presenter

Housing specialist I, Organizer

Housing and Community Development Manager, Organizer

Architectural & Technical Services Manager, Organizer

ATTENDEE:

Barbara Pace (Unverified)

Erin G (Unverified)

Jen Svelnys (External)

Carol Antrum (Unverified)

Carol Martin (Unverified)

James Leask (External)

Margaret (Unverified)

112 Judd St (Unverified)

Pamela (Unverified)

Marshall, Gary (External)

Ron (Unverified)

Margaret (Unverified)

Purpose:

The CEPA public scoping meeting was arranged as part of the CEPA review of Judd Homestead at 980 high street, Fairfield, CT on request of more than 25 people. This meeting was arranged virtually on Microsoft Teams.

Presentation:

The CEPA public scoping meeting started at 4 PM with a technical presentation on Microsoft Teams. Approximately, 16 people attended the meeting including residents, project development team and DOH organizers.

The presentation covered:

1. **Connecticut Environmental Policy Act (CEPA):** Connecticut Environmental Policy Act (CEPA) is a process by which state agencies must identify and review their proposed “actions which may significantly affect the environment”. A key component of the assessment process is the public’s opportunity to review the proposed state action and provide feedback. The CEPA Resource considerations were discussed too: [eRegulations - Browse Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies revised-generic-eed_03022021.pdf](#)

2. **CEPA Public Scoping Process:**

- Involves providing Initial and basic information on the project (Proposed Action)
- Happens at the early stage of project
- Provide a Place for agency and public input
- Solicit written comments to be addressed (via public meeting, email, mail, or fax) in the CEPA process

Along with the above the CEPA process timeline was also discussed.

3. **Project Overview & Schedule:**

The project Judd Homestead is located at 980 high street, Fairfield, CT. The project includes a new construction of 40 Multifamily units in 5 buildings (2.48 acres); 16.1 units/acre area. The project involves Adaptive Reuse of 1890’s Farmhouse as community room and management office. There will be 50 Parking spaces within the development (within site). Existing Bit mac sidewalk to be replaced by 6-foot-wide concrete sidewalk, making this safer for pedestrians in front of the project site. New driveway has a stop sign and stop bar to be installed per approved plans.

Environmental Review Summary (CEPA):

The project area is:

1. In Area of minimal flood hazard according to FEMA FIRM map.
2. Not in any Prime farmland/Statewide important farmland.
3. In urban areas.
4. State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) found ‘No historic properties will be affected’ by this project.
5. No State/federal identified endangered species were identified. No critical habitat was found using NDDDB map.
6. Not located in any wetland as per NWI map. Even No Inland Wetland soil was found.
7. Not in Hurricane Surge Inundation Zone,
8. Not in any Core forest area.
9. The Phase I ESA report found one REC. The pesticides and metals detected in the vicinity of the buildings are considered a recognized environmental condition/area of concern (REC/AOC). A Soil Management Plan has been developed to address this contamination.

The purpose and need of the project: Creating affordable housing opportunities to benefit low- and moderate-income families in Fairfield County, Connecticut.

List of potential sites for the proposed action and their limitation: With a very low inventory of available land and development opportunities in the town of Fairfield not many potential sites were available. This proposed site was chosen as it was available for purchase and the site acquisition aligns with the Fairfield Housing Corporation's mission which is to create affordable housing opportunities to benefit low- and moderate-income families in Fairfield County, Connecticut.

Potential alternatives to the proposed action: No potential alternative as it will reduce affordable housing.

4. Public Comments:

Discussion on Public Comments/questions are summarized below.

Discussions (Questions and Concerns):

After the presentation, attendees posted their concerns, comments, questions and feedback to the DOH and development project team on the Chat section, and those were answered mostly verbally. Some understood the need for the project and recognized the effort, some expressed concern and opposed.

The summary of questions with answers were:

- Many concerns were regarding the Effect on Flooding including flood map update, high ground water table, Rooster River water sheds impact, wetlands presence, vernal pool in project area, footings depth in ground water etc.
 - ✓ **Response:** The DOH team explained that the project is not located in any special flood hazard area of concern. The watershed is far from the project area. The project also received town planning and zoning approval.
According to Conservation Easement several safety steps are being taken like, 0.8 acres of conservation easement area will be established over wetland and adjacent upland areas, emergent stormwater basin will be established, proper signage and fence will be posted marking the conservation area, native trees will be planted, stormwater runoff management will be enhanced through creation and maintenance of stormwater basin and a professional wetland scientist will be involved too.
According to Geotech report, "The Water Table, where evident in the boreholes, was at 9 to 12.5 feet below the existing grades at the completion of the borings. In general, the water table in the borings was just above, or within the weathered rock. The natural soils have low permeabilities and low voids ratio. It should be assumed that the water table can be within 6 feet of the existing grades during wet periods. The capillary in the natural soils water can be 2 feet above the static groundwater levels. The natural soils are very restricted as regards the infiltration of storm water."

- Some concern was raised regarding density of the project, over-development, impact to traffic with on-street parking and the school.
 - ✓ **Response:** The DOH team explained that CEPA review doesn't deal with the density of the project. The Town (local zoning and planning approval) is already obtained. The project might experience temporary traffic during construction, but the project has parking space inside. The on-street parking isn't expected.

- Some concern was regarding what type of contaminants were found there and how the Soil management plan will be handling them.
 - ✓ **Response:** According to the Phase I ESA developed by GeoQuest (October 28, 2025), Soil sampling conducted in 2018 and 2019, by GeoQuest, identified lead, arsenic, and multiple pesticides above Remediation Standard Regulations (RSR) criteria in samples collected in the vicinity of the buildings. Minor concentrations of pesticides were detected in soil samples collected from the open field area to the rear of the buildings; however, the detections were below the Residential Direct Exposure Criteria (RES DEC). Additional soil sampling was conducted in 2024 around the perimeter of the dwelling, which identified lead in soil above RSR criteria. A Soil Management Plan was developed by GeoQuest in September of 2019, to address the pesticide and metals contamination identified in 2019. Excavation and off-site disposal was selected as the most effective remedial strategy. The Soil Management Plan called for excavating an 18-inch layer of soil a minimum of 15 feet from the perimeter of the dwelling, barn, garage, and shed structures. The lead identified in soil in 2024 is in the same location as the pesticide-containing soil, and therefore, both the lead and the pesticides are addressed by the Soil Management Plan.

- Some concern was raised whether the project is in Aquifer protection area or any other cause like high ground water table that is causing flooding.
 - ✓ **Response:** DOH explained that a thorough technical review was done and no major concern was identified. The project area is not in any Aquifer protection area. In previous response the additional safety measures were also explained.

- A site visit request was made as part of the environmental review to verify the presence of environmental hazard.
 - ✓ **Response:** DOH explained that though under CEPA review Site visit isn't included but if any major concern is identified through review or comments a site visit will be made. No major issue identified, or major concern received from other expert agency through the CEPA scoping process.

- A comment was raised on construction start time. More specifically, If it can happen before post-scoping notice period of 6 months.

- ✓ **Response:** The tentative time was shared as mid-February based on all other factors. DOH explained given that local permitting planning and zoning approvals are in place, Construction could begin.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:13 PM. DOH organizers reminded everyone to send any additional comments/concerns until the scoping process ends by January 2nd, 2026 with sharing the contact information.

CONNECTICUT DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING
Report of Public Comments Received Through Email

Judds Homestead
980 High Street, Fairfield, CT 06824

- **Concern Received:** Environmental and flooding
 - ✓ **Response:** The project area is not in any special flood hazard area (floodway, 100- or 500-year floodzone) of concern as per The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) FIRM map [Home | FEMA.gov](#)
- **Concern Received:** Scoping meeting
 - ✓ **Response:** A scoping meeting was organized December 18, 2025.
- **Concern Received:** Wetlands impact, scoping meeting
 - ✓ **Response:** A scoping meeting was organized December 18, 2025. The project area isn't in a Wetland as per National Wetland Inventory (NWI) [National Wetlands Inventory](#).
- **Concern Received:** Located in an underground watershed area, the property has been a safe haven for a multitude of wildlife which will be displaced. The impact with the total units being built within a school zone.
 - ✓ **Response:** Within 1 mile of project area there is no Aquifer protection area, sole source aquifer, wild and scenic river present as per EPA's NEPAAssist Tool [NEPAAssist](#). The nearby watershed is Rooster River watershed which is out of the project assessment area (>1 mile). According to both NEPAAssist and Natural Diversity DataBase (NDDDB) mapping tool no endangered species or critical habitat are in the vicinity. Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP) NDDDB division mentions in their letter that the project site is not in a Natural Diversity Data Base (NDDDB) area, and no known listed species are documented in the vicinity. Moreover, no impacts on fisheries resources are expected as per DEEP. Town planning and zoning commission approval permits are available for project.
- **Concern Received:** Scoping meeting. This is not because the community thinks it's an eyesore or that it will inconvenience us. This will be detrimental to the area both in environmental and safety issues. As well as causing harm to many homes. Not potential, but actual harm. Flooding, water pressure and loss of electricity have been just a small ongoing problem that will tax the area worse than it already is. And this is not even including traffic and parking issues and safety as well as school occupancy.
 - ✓ **Response:** A scoping meeting was organized December 18, 2025. As described above The project area is not in any special flood hazard area (floodway, 100- or 500- year floodzone) of concern as per The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) FIRM map [Home | FEMA.gov](#).

50 Parking spaces will be within the development (within site). Existing Bit mac sidewalk to be replaced by 6-foot-wide concrete sidewalk, making this safer for pedestrians in front of the project site. New driveway has a stop sign and stop bar to be installed per approved plans.

- **Concern Received:** A scoping meeting is essential to clearly define project goals, assess community and environmental needs, and identify potential challenges at the outset. Both this meeting and subsequent discussions will be critical for gathering input on potential impacts and evaluating reasonable alternatives. This development poses significant concerns for wetlands, the surrounding environment, and flooding risks. Additionally, it would create a hazardous situation with cars parked along High Street. As this is a primary walking route to Holland Hill, increased roadside parking will severely reduce visibility and compromise safety for children and pedestrians.
 - ✓ **Response:** A scoping meeting was organized December 18, 2025. As described above The project area is not in any special flood hazard area (floodway, 100- or 500- year floodzone) of concern as per The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) FIRM map [Home | FEMA.gov](#). 50 Parking spaces will be within the development (within site). Existing Bit mac sidewalk to be replaced by 6-foot-wide concrete sidewalk, making this safer for pedestrians in front of the project site. New driveway has a stop sign and stop bar to be installed per approved plans.

- **Concern Received:** Please set up a scoping meeting to define project goals, assess needs, and identify potential challenges early on. This meeting and follow up meetings will be crucial for gathering input on potential impacts and alternatives. This development will have huge impact on wet lands , environment , flooding as well as a disastrous , dangerous situation with parking up and down high street. This is a walking route to holland hill that will become very unsafe with vehicles parked up and down high street blocking visibility
 - ✓ **Response:** A scoping meeting was organized December 18, 2025. In the above discussions it was mentioned that the project area is not in any flood zone, wetland, parking will be within the development.

- **Concern Received:** This development will have huge impact on wet lands , environment , flooding as well as a disastrous , dangerous situation with parking up and down high street. This is a walking route to holland hill that will become very unsafe with vehicles parked up and down high street blocking visibility.
 - ✓ **Response:** In the above discussions it was mentioned that the project area is not in any flood zone, wetland, parking will be within the development. Existing Bit mac sidewalk to be replaced by 6-foot-wide concrete sidewalk, making this safer for pedestrians in front of the project site. New driveway has a stop sign and stop bar to be installed per approved plans.

- **Concern Received:** I would like to request a scoping meeting for the project at the historic Judd estate. There is no room to add 5 buildings with multiple apartments to an already very crowded and dangerous street. It's a risk for our children and our entire neighborhood.

- ✓ **Response:** A scoping meeting was organized December 18, 2025.

- **Concern Received:** Residents are very concerned about flooding and the environmental impact of 40 additional units.
 - ✓ **Response:** The project area is not in any special flood hazard area (floodway, 100- or 500-year floodzone) of concern as per The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) FIRM map Home | FEMA.gov

- **Concern Received:** Please set up a scoping meeting to define project goals, assess needs, and identify potential challenges early on. This is a walking route to holland hill (where many families including my own walk to school) that will become very unsafe with vehicles parked up and down high street blocking visibility.
 - ✓ **Response:** A scoping meeting was organized December 18, 2025. In the above discussions it was mentioned that the project area is not in any flood zone, wetland, parking will be within the development. Existing Bit mac sidewalk to be replaced by 6-foot-wide concrete sidewalk, making this safer for pedestrians in front of the project site. New driveway has a stop sign and stop bar to be installed per approved plans.

- **Concern Received:** I am writing to ask for a scoping meeting regarding the 980 High Street project. As someone who has lived on High Street for over 20 years, this project will be a disaster and hazard for Holland Hill school and local and surround neighborhood. Many local children in surrounding blocks walk and bike to school and adding the additional headcount is a disaster waiting to happen.
 - ✓ **Response:** A scoping meeting was organized December 18, 2025. In the above discussions it was mentioned that the project area is not in any flood zone, wetland, parking will be within the development. Existing Bit mac sidewalk to be replaced by 6-foot-wide concrete sidewalk, making this safer for pedestrians in front of the project site. New driveway has a stop sign and stop bar to be installed per approved plans.

- **Concern Received:** I just found an article that mentioned a potential scoping meeting for 980 High Street. No one I know of in the High St neighborhood or who has been fighting against the environmental impacts of this massive development knew about this option so I've spread the word and I PRAY you get 25 emails today.

Please consider a scoping meeting. This project has been denied twice by our conservation committee due to wetlands impacts. The developer has deep pockets and kept pushing forward. We in the neighborhood paid our own money to hire an attorney and an engineer to fight back proving an overbuild on that property will cause 1) a negative impact on wetlands and 2) lead to worse flooding as we are part of the Rooster River watershed. There were over 100 emails sent a month or so ago from Fairfield citizens in opposition of the town (Board of Selectmen) funding a dollar toward this build but they didn't listen. We neighbors have fought for years for what's right and government and greed has won. Please please please have a scoping meeting so our voices can be heard and there is another set of eyes on the massively oversized scope of this development before it's too late and the damage has been done.

 - ✓ **Response:** A scoping meeting was organized December 18, 2025. Agency responses on other issues are answered above in comments.

