



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: 09/2/2026
Name of Project/Action: Edge 400 (All 3 Phases)
Project Address(es): 332-336, 338-342, and 344-348 New Park Avenue, Hartford, Connecticut
Affected Municipalities: Hartford
Sponsoring Agency(ies): DOH
Agency Project Number, if applicable: DOH25-0384-064
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: 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 property consists of 1.96 acres of abandoned parking lot which are mostly paved. The property was previously used as parking for an abandoned cinema.

Description of the Proposed Action:

This neighborhood consists of a mix of densely developed commercial and residential uses. Most neighborhood growth has been commercial. Depressed housing values have limited the volume of residential growth. Community demographics indicate families with incomes slightly below the state average. The property is surrounded by the abandoned cinema, residential, commuter rail and fastrack track lane and an auto dealership which is also soon to be vacated. In total, the Edge affordable component will consist of a three-phase project totaling approximately 190 units within three buildings. Building 1 (Phase I) consists of 64 units in a single building. Located on the Hartford-West Hartford line, this is a TOD project located within walking distance of a CTfastrak station. In addition to the 64 residential units, the project contains ground floor community space and offices for management and supportive services. The site consists of the northern parking lot of a vacant cinema complex (Bow Tie Cinema). Approximately 4.94 acres of land has been subdivided into three lots and utilized for the total affordable project. Phase I will utilize approximately 1.96 acres. The Cinema will be re-purposed as an entertainment complex which requires significantly less parking than the full screened operating cinema. There will also be a market rate apartment project developed on the northern parking lot. Buildings 1 and 3 are being financed as a 4%/9% hybrid. In addition to the attached application for the 9% component of the project (Building 1), a 4% application is also being filed for Building 3.

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 site is not located in an Aquifer Protection Area or a parcel prioritized for source water protection as shown on the Parcel Prioritization for Source Water Protection Viewer. The site is located in an area of glacial meltwater deposits as shown on the CT Surficial Aquifer Potential Map, but these fine-grained deposits have a low potential yield. 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.” “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.” “As is mentioned, the property is almost entirely paved. CT DEEP recommends incorporating green spaces and Green Stormwater Infrastructure/Low Impact Development to manage stormwater runoff onsite to minimize/reduce the impact of polluted stormwater from reaching receiving surface waters, including the South Branch Park River, which is less than 0.25 miles from this site, and which has impaired water quality due to high levels of bacteria (Park River TMDL). A Complete Streets approach to this area can also help incorporate greenspace into the multimodal transportation network and its connectivity to this property.” DOH encouraged the development team to follow DEEP’s recommendations. According to development team: “Project is significantly reducing site imperviousness by adding significant grassed areas. Additionally, all islands have pervious pavers (green infrastructure) on both sides.”
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;	No Historic properties will be affected.
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;	The project is not in any NDDDB area. According to DEEP: “The nearest aquatic resources to this site are approximately 1000 feet away in the South Branch Park River. The Fisheries Division does not have sampling data for the South Branch after 1988. Sampling in 1988 indicated the presence of American Eel, Banded Killifish, Blacknose Dace, Bluegill, Common Carp, Largemouth Bass, Pumpkinseed, Redfin Pickerel, Rock Bass, Spottail Shiner, Tessellated Darter, and White Sucker. This section is impaired due to elevated bacteria levels and a TMDL has been established (CT Statewide Bacteria TMDL). The Park River watershed consists of 87% urban area and impervious coverage is high. As impervious surfaces (such as rooftops, roads, and sidewalks) increase within the watershed landscape from commercial, residential, and industrial development, the amount of stormwater runoff to surface waters also increases. These waters are negatively affected as increased pollutants from nutrients and bacteria from failing and insufficient septic systems, oil and grease from automobiles, and sediment from construction activities become entrained in this runoff (CT DEEP 2012). Proper stormwater management BMPs, incorporation of green infrastructure where feasible, and considering features such as rooftop and rain gardens, vegetated swales, or detention basins are strongly encouraged and would benefit the area. Ideally, impervious cover should be less upon the completion of this project than it was before. CT DEEP. 2012. FINAL Park River Watershed Summary. https://portal.ct.gov/-/media/DEEP/water/tmdl/CTFinalTMDL/parkriver4400” DOH encouraged the development team to follow DEEP’s recommendations. According to development team: “Site

	imperviousness is being significantly reduced due to large grass area (and pervious pavers), which also serve as DEEP and MDC approved BMPs.”
Use of pesticides, toxic or hazardous materials or any other substance in such quantities as to cause unreasonable adverse effects on the environment;	Remediation Division, DEEP commented: “The vacant building on the north end of the property at 320 New Park Avenue is a former Property Transfer Site in the Remediation Division and was Verified as of 2024. Remediation of soils occurred in the late 1990s removing soil containing arsenic and ETHP, with compliance groundwater monitoring occurring in the mid 2000’s. Groundwater historically had concentrations of VOCs and SVOCs and reached compliance in 2012, with water levels ranging from 4 to 10 feet below ground surface. There is also documentation of urban fill containing SVOCs and VOCs at low concentrations found beneath the building and parking lot. It is reasonable to assume that historic urban fill may be present beneath the other portions of the site as well. Therefore, any disturbance of the soil during redevelopment warrants a thorough soil characterization especially if any historical fill or impacts are encountered.” ERSPD commented: “The DEEP’s PCB Program has a PCB spill location of New Park Ave in 1992 by CLP and Royal Typewriters. PCB Spill location was New Park Ave in 1995 by CLP it was 103ppm. Royal Park Limited Partnership inspection located on New Park Ave in Hartford. This received an NOV that is now closed.” Down To Earth has prepared a Phase I ESA (February 2026) of the proposed area of the Edge 400 development Buildings 1 through 3 (Site) in general accordance with ASTM E1527-21 and CTDEEP’s Site Characterization Guidance Document. Our objective was to obtain information on historic and previous Site uses, in accordance with prevailing standards, and to identify RECs at the Site. For the purpose of this report, RECs are considered the same as AOCs. Several environmental site assessments have been completed by other firms over the years. Significant remediation of the Site occurred in 1999. The remediation was overseen by Loureiro Engineering Associates (LEA) and was reported to have been completed as required by the state’s Property Transfer Act. On July 27, 2020, LEA filed a Verification Report with the CTDEEP which states that the Site meets risk-based clean-up standards for soil and groundwater under the state Remediation Standard Regulations (RCSA Section 22a-133k). One conclusion of the Verification Report is that the Site does not need to be restricted from residential use in the future. On May 22, 2024, Atlas Technical Consultants (Atlas) submitted a Form III Final Verification

	Report for the former Heublein property to the CTDEEP. Both Verifications received “no-audit” determinations from the CTDEEP, signifying the Site has achieved regulatory closure in relation to Site activities prior to May 22, 2024 (applicable date of the Form III Verification). Based on Down to Earth’s findings and the prior verifications, the following Historic Recognized Environmental Conditions (HRECs) and Controlled Recognized Environmental Condition (CREC) were identified: HREC-1 (Area 2.1 per LEA): A 1,000-gallon gasoline tank and a 2,000-gallon No. 2 fuel oil tank were removed from the east-central portion of the Site in 1999. According to LEA, soil removal addressed remedial exceedances for arsenic and total petroleum hydrocarbons. Approximately 105 cubic yards of soil were removed. Closure verification of this REC was included in LEA’s 2020 Verification which received a “no-audit” determination by CTDEEP. CREC-2: Based on the industrial history of the Site, miscellaneous contaminated fill materials may have been rendered inaccessible by capping below pavement during redevelopment in 2000. The extent to which latent contaminated soils might be encountered during future development is not known. Such materials likely include asphalt fragments which are currently under the existing asphalt paved parking area. HREC-3: Fay Cleaners and Dyers operated at the Site from approximately 1946 to 1956. The cleaning and dyeing building was located near the southeastern corner of the Site along New Park Avenue (current 344-348 New Park Avenue). This use of the Site is considered a HREC due to LEA’s Verification of the Site in 2020 which received a “noaudit” determination by CTDEEP.
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.
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

The project will disturb less than 5 acres and have been approved at the local level. Therefore, no permit is required.

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.