



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: 6/30/2026
Name of Project/Action: Mary Shepard Place (Phases 1 and 2)
Project Address(es): 88 Wooster Street, Hartford, CT 06120
Affected Municipalities: Hartford

Sponsoring Agency(ies): DOH
Agency Project Number, if applicable: DOH19-0125-064
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 Mary Shepard Place (“MSP”) Redevelopment is a co-developer partnership between an affiliate of Boston-based Trinity Financial (“Trinity”) and the Housing Authority of the City of Hartford (“HACH”). This two-phase project, including an 81-unit first phase and a 78-unit second phase, involves the demolition of all existing site improvements, including the development’s 127 residential units, and the construction of 159 new apartments. The program for MSP includes a mix of 18 one-bedroom units, 89 two-bedroom units and 52 three-bedroom units in three-story townhome-style buildings, consistent with the residential buildings in the surrounding area. The buildings will be wood-framed structures supported on concrete spread footing foundations and slab on grade. The first phase project includes the construction of a roughly 3,500 square-foot, stand-alone community building that will serve all residents of MSP. There are approximately 20 homeownership units planned as a separate and distinct third phase. The MSP Redevelopment seeks to improve the vehicular and pedestrian circulation within the site and to reconnect the property to the surrounding street network. Streetscapes will be created with parallel parking, a furnishings zone, public sidewalks, and front yards leading to the building entrances.

Description of the Proposed Action:

The MSP site is located at 88 Wooster Street in Hartford and is bounded by Pavilion Street to the north, Wooster Street to the west, Canton Street to the south, and Windsor Street to the east (the “Site”). The Site is a 12-acre rectangular-shaped parcel that has been owned and occupied by HACH since approximately 1942. Structures located on the Site include nine, three-story apartment buildings consisting of 127 residential living units, one single-story, multi-purpose community center building that includes office space, community space, facility/maintenance space, and parking. The MSP Project is located within close walking distance of several CT transit routes, including bus lines 40 and 42, and approximately two blocks from lines 32 and 36. The Mary Shepard Place project involves the demolition of all existing site improvements, including 127 residential units across nine buildings, and the new construction of 159 newly constructed units in 23 buildings, a community building, multiple parking areas, new streets, and shared community green spaces with walking paths.

A former 560-gallon gasoline UST was located in the northwestern portion of the site and concentrations of petroleum indicates there could be a hotspot in this area. Soil excavated from this area will be segregated and sampled for characterization and disposal. Urban fill material was found on the site that may contain elevated levels of petroleum, metals and hydrocarbons. Existing underground tunnels, which contain asbestos, must be abated and demolished. Asbestos has also been detected within the existing residential buildings and must be abated prior to demolition. A Soil Management Plan has also been prepared, and will guide the project’s site remediation work..

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 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.” “Beyond the “green spaces” mentioned in the project description, CT DEEP recommends incorporating 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 Connecticut River, which is 0.65 miles from this site, and which has impaired water quality due to high levels of bacteria (CT River TMDL). The Connecticut Nonpoint Source Management Program Plan identifies that Underground Storage Tanks leaks or exposure to precipitation or runoff may lead to contamination of water; the Soil Management should consider impacts to nearby ground and surface waters.” DOH encouraged the development team to follow DEEP’s recommendations. Development team confirmed: “The overall drainage patterns of the site will remain unchanged by the project. The area to be redeveloped currently slopes from the northwestern corner to the southeastern corner of the site.

	The majority of stormwater runoff is captured on-site in an existing stormwater drainage conveyance network and then ultimately discharges to the existing drainage network in Canton Street. There are no existing water-quality measures on site. Stormwater quality from the developed site will be improved using Best Management Practices (BMP's), including deep-sump catch basins and hydrodynamic separators to help achieve the removal of approximately 80% of Total Suspended Solids, rain gardens, subsurface detention systems, and a shallow stormwater pond/infiltration area. The stormwater design is consistent with the Connecticut Stormwater Quality Manual. The project will also comply with the Connecticut General Permit for the Discharge of Stormwater and Dewatering Wastewaters from Construction Activities and the stormwater requirements of the City of Hartford. When compared to existing conditions, proposed watershed modeling indicates the development will decrease peak flowrates and runoff volumes at the existing discharge point on Canton Street for all design storm events (1-yr, 2-yr, 10-yr, 25-yr, and 100-yr). Green infrastructure has been incorporated into the design through the use of two rain gardens and a shallow pond/infiltration area. Stormwater treatment and site design measures incorporated into the project will enhance water quality relative to existing conditions"
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. According to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) Panel 09003C0366G (Effective 9/16/2011), the project area is not located within a FEMA designated Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) or floodway. Although the project will utilize state funding sources (DOH Bond Funds, CHFA Opportunity Funds, CHFA Permanent and Construction Financing, DECD Community Investment Funds, DECD Urban Act Funds, CHFA 4% and 9% Low-Income Housing Tax Credit Programs and DECD Brownfield Remediation Funds), the project does not trigger Flood Management Certification requirements, as it is not situated 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: “There are no aquatic resources at this site, however, the CT River is roughly 0.5 miles away and the project is located within the CT River watershed. There is a TMDL established for this portion of the CT River portal.ct.gov/DEEP (from Mass border to Cromwell) due to elevated bacteria levels. Roughly ⅓ of the CT River watershed at the subregional scale within CT consists of a land use characterized as urban (CT DEEP 2012), and impervious surface coverage is high in the project area. 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 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. Connecticut River Watershed TMDL. CT Statewide Bacteria TMDL” DOH encouraged the development team to follow DEEP’s recommendations. The development team confirmed: Stormwater quality from the developed site will be improved using Best Management Practices (BMP’s), including deep-sump catch basins and hydrodynamic separators to help achieve the removal of approximately 80% of Total Suspended Solids, rain gardens, subsurface detention systems, and a shallow stormwater pond/infiltration area. The stormwater design is consistent with the Connecticut Stormwater Quality Manual. The project will also comply with the Connecticut General Permit for the Discharge of Stormwater and Dewatering Wastewaters from Construction Activities and the stormwater requirements of the City of Hartford. When compared to existing conditions, proposed watershed modeling indicates the development will decrease peak flowrates and runoff volumes at the existing discharge point on Canton Street for all design storm events (1-yr, 2-yr, 10-yr, 25-yr, and 100-yr). Green infrastructure has been incorporated into the design through the use of two rain gardens and a shallow pond/infiltration area. Stormwater treatment and site design measures incorporated into the project will enhance water quality relative to existing conditions.”
Use of pesticides, toxic or hazardous materials or any other	According to DEEP Remediation Division “Any comments/requests the Remediation Division would have made

substance in such quantities as to cause unreasonable adverse effects on the environment;	are already being addressed with the proposed Soil Management Plan and known site conditions”. A Phase I ESA was done by FUSS&O’NEILL in February 2026, found two Area of concern/Recognized Environmental Condition (REC) like Urban Fill Materials and historical garage operation. As with any Site located in a heavily urbanized area where former structures have been razed, the potential exists for fill containing ash, coal, and asphalt fragments to be present. Previous Site investigations conducted in 2016, 2019, 2022, and 2024 identified the presence of fill materials (containing ash, brick and concrete fragments) in soil samples across the Site. Analytical results from samples of this material indicated elevated concentrations of heavy metals, PAHs and ETPH in select locations above state cleanup criteria. Given the Site and surrounding area history, it is likely this urban fill material could extend across the entire property. This AOC is also considered REC. A 1922 Sanborn map indicated that a garage was located in the north central portion of the Site. Environmental investigations within this area found petroleum impacted soil that was not associated with urban fill materials. A release could have occurred during historical activities and remains in subsurface soil. If future Site redevelopment activities include disturbance or generation of excess, special handling and management fill and petroleum impacted soil may be required. In March 2022 found three recognized environmental conditions (RECs) associated with the Site. Former UST/ Temporary heating plant, Potentially impacted groundwater, Urban Fill Materials. An historical REC was identified too Former heating plant. A Limited Phase II ESA was done by FUSS&O’NEILL in October 2022. Prior to conducting subsurface investigations at the Site, a Fuss & O’Neill Scientist oversaw Corbuilt, LLC in the completion of a Ground-Penetrating Radar (GPR) survey. The purpose of the GPR survey was to verify that no utilities were present in the proposed boring soil locations. The proposed sampling locations were moved in instances where utilities were identified in proximity to the borings. Note that this investigation did not include the collection of groundwater samples. In Soil analytical result: VOCs were not detected above the specified laboratory reporting limits within any of the analyzed samples. Except for the detection of lead and/or barium at borings FOSB-02, FOSB-03, FOSB-04, FOSB-05, FOSB-09, and FOSB-18, metal concentrations were detected within typical background concentrations found in Connecticut soil. Lead concentrations in boring FOSB-18 exceeded the Res DEC at a depth of 5 to 7 feet below grade. Since this location had the highest concentrations of
--	---

	total lead identified during this investigation and the only location with an exceedance of baseline regulatory criteria, this soil sample was also analyzed for lead using TCLP and SPLP methods. The TCLP analysis indicated that the lead results were below the hazardous waste threshold. The SPLP results exceeded the baseline GB PMC value of 0.15 milligrams per liter (mg/L) indicating that lead at this location could leach to underlying groundwater at the Site. We note that there is an exemption for fill material that is polluted solely due to the presence of ash asphalt or coal. Since no evidence of a release other than the presence of fill material was observed where elevated concentrations of heavy metals were detected, compliance with the GB PMC would not be required. ETPH: ETPH was not detected in the submitted soil samples except for soil boring FOSB-09 that exceeded the DEC and the PMC. Note that this soil boring is in an area where a historical petroleum release was identified from a former gasoline underground storage tank (UST). PAHs: As is typical with urban fill materials containing ash, asphalt, and coal, concentrations of PAHs were detected in 11 of the 14 soil samples analyzed. Of the 11 soil samples, 9 samples contained one or more constituent exceeding baseline numerical criteria. Soil Management Recommendations included Soil excavated from areas should be segregated from other material and sampled for characterization and disposal purposes, Urban Fill Impacted Soil for on-site reuse and off-site disposal, native material at the Site can be reused on-Site without limitation, If encountered, hazardous soils shall be disposed at a facility licensed to manage hazardous materials. A Soil Management Plan was developed by FUSS&O'NEILL in March 2024. A limited supplemental Hazardous Building Materials Inspection was done in March 2024 which included the following: Limited asbestos-containing material (ACM) inspection; Lead-based paint (LBP) determination; and Polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB)-containing light ballasts and mercury-containing equipment inventory. Based on visual observations, sample collection, and laboratory analysis, asbestos has been identified in some of the materials sampled at the Site. Fuss & O'Neill will develop a comprehensive scope of work and technical specification as part of demolition plans for the Site under separate cover. LBP is present on coated building components located on or in the building that were tested by XRF as part of this limited inspection. Fluorescent lamps must be either recycled, or disposed of as hazardous waste.
--	---

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;	Alycia D. Jenkins, Organizer of Sierra Club Connecticut commented, “The intersection between affordability, health, comfort, climate resilience and climate mitigation has never been more important. This project is an opportunity to improve access to affordable housing, lower energy burden, reduce indoor and outdoor air pollution and increase access to clean and renewable energy for the residents of Mary Shepard Place. High-performance, energy efficient housing is the most cost effective and healthy choice for new buildings. They have lower lifetime costs, using significantly less energy than conventionally constructed buildings and by supplying their own renewable energy. Upfront costs will pay off over time, and will minimize the energy burden on residents as electric rates increase. We urge the highest efficiency standards for these new buildings, as well on-site solar, electric appliances, and heat pumps for heating and cooling. We believe that the project could be suitable for a thermal energy network/geothermal system, the most efficient type of heating and cooling system. The health benefits of all-electric construction is important in Hartford, where poor air quality and high asthma rates are a serious concern for the community. The combustion of gas in buildings produces a range of air pollutants with both acute and chronic health effects. Health-related costs and high utility rates are some of the next highest expenditures for low-income individuals after rent/mortgage payments. Controlling these expenses with healthier buildings is an important component of maintaining affordability in Hartford, Connecticut.” On request of DOH, development team confirmed, “Housing Affordability, Energy Burden, and Climate Benefits: The MSP Phase 1 project is being developed as affordable housing intended to serve households with significant economic vulnerability, including those at risk of housing instability. The project recognizes that housing affordability is closely tied not only to rent levels, but also to ongoing utility costs and household energy burden. Accordingly, the project’s design prioritizes long-term operational affordability through significant reductions in energy use and associated utility expenses. By integrating high-performance building systems and electrified energy infrastructure, the project is intended to reduce both greenhouse gas emissions and household energy consumption over time, supporting broader climate mitigation and resilience objectives. Energy Efficient Design: Consistent with the priorities outlined in your letter, the project is being developed to meet rigorous high-performance building
---	---

	standards. The design incorporates a highly efficient building envelope with enhanced insulation and airtight construction strategies, supported by energy recovery ventilation systems to ensure balanced indoor air exchange. Energy modeling for the project indicates projected HERS Index scores ranging from approximately 39 to 46, reflecting a level of performance significantly better than typical baseline standards for new construction. The project is also targeting certification under Energy Star Multifamily New Construction Version 1.2 and Enterprise Green Communities 2020, both of which require stringent energy efficiency and sustainability measures. These combined strategies are intended to substantially reduce energy demand, improve building durability, and enhance long-term affordability for residents. Electrification and Renewable Energy Systems: The project is designed as an all-electric development, with no on-site combustion of fossil fuels. Heating and cooling will be provided through high-efficiency air-source heat pump systems, which are widely recognized as a key strategy for building decarbonization and improved operational efficiency. The development team has also evaluated on-site renewable energy potential. Preliminary analysis conducted in coordination with the Connecticut Green Bank indicates the site may support an approximately 165 kW rooftop solar photovoltaic system. The project intends to pursue implementation through a third-party ownership/lease structure, subject to final feasibility, financing timelines, and program availability at the time of construction. The project team also appreciates the suggestion regarding geothermal or thermal energy network systems. While these alternative systems were evaluated, they were not supported by the project's development budget, so an air-source heat pump-based system was selected because it was both financially feasible and aligned with the project's energy efficiency goals. Health, Indoor Air Quality, and Community Benefits: Indoor air quality and resident health are central considerations in the project's design approach. The all-electric building design eliminates on-site combustion, thereby reducing exposure to pollutants associated with fossil fuel combustion in buildings. In combination with continuous ventilation systems designed to meet ASHRAE standards, these measures are intended to support healthier indoor environments for residents, including populations that may be particularly vulnerable to respiratory illness and environmental health impacts.
--	---

	The project recognizes the broader relationship between energy burden, health outcomes, and affordability, and seeks to address these issues through an integrated building design approach that reduces both energy costs and exposure to indoor and outdoor air pollution. Workforce Participation and Local Engagement: The project acknowledges the importance of local workforce participation and economic opportunity. The development team will coordinate with our general contractor to support workforce participation consistent with applicable program requirements and our own longstanding commitment to equitable contracting and workforce practices.”
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;	People’s Action for Clean Energy (PACE) commented “Our organization is particularly interested in potential community and environmental benefits for the MSP redevelopment. This includes energy affordability and reliability, reducing GHG emissions, improving air quality and promoting sustainable practices. Over the past four decades, PACE has worked with cities, towns and communities across Connecticut to accelerate the transition to clean, renewable energy. Of particular interest to us in this project is to explore the potential use of a Thermal Energy Network (TEN) for the redevelopment and the energy savings and life cycle cost benefits that this utility approach provides. This would include evaluation of energy alternatives for MSP such as geothermal ground source energy, geothermal heat pumps, and potentially wastewater energy recovery for use in the redevelopment.” The development team responded: “Electrification and Renewable Energy Systems: The project is designed as an all-electric development, with no on-site combustion of fossil fuels. Heating and cooling will be provided through high-efficiency air-source heat pump systems, which are widely recognized as a key strategy for building decarbonization and improved operational efficiency. The development team has also evaluated on-site renewable energy potential. Preliminary analysis conducted in coordination with the Connecticut Green Bank indicates the site may support an approximately 165 kW rooftop solar photovoltaic system. The project intends to pursue implementation through a third-party ownership/lease structure, subject to final feasibility, financing timelines, and program availability at the time of construction. The project team also appreciates the suggestion regarding geothermal or thermal energy network systems. While these

	alternative systems were evaluated, they were not supported by the project's development budget, so an air-source heat pump-based system was selected because it was both financially feasible and aligned with the project's energy efficiency goals."
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

There will be no activity in Waters of the U.S and there are no wetlands on the subject property. The proposed work involves rehabilitation of existing infrastructure, with no new fill in open waters or channel modifications proposed. Temporary measures will be employed as needed during construction to manage flows and prevent sediment transport, consistent with best management practices. All activities are designed to maintain existing culvert capacity and avoid upstream or downstream impacts, and erosion and stormwater controls consistent with CT Stormwater Quality Manual guidance will be implemented.

The area of disturbance is over five acres and the project was locally approved by the City of Hartford Planning and Zoning Commission. Master Plan Approval for the full site buildout was received on February 13, 2026 and Phase 1 received Administrative Site Plan Approval on March 3, 2026. An application form and Stormwater Pollution Control Plan will be submitted to DEEP at least 60 days prior to initiation of construction

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, PACE and SIERRA Club comments are received and addressed in the ERC.