



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: 6/17/2026
Name of Project/Action: Parcel B
Project Address(es): 0 Maple Street, Naugatuck CT 06770
Affected Municipalities: Naugatuck

Sponsoring Agency(ies): DOH
Agency Project Number, if applicable: DOH 25-0087-088
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 adverse impact

☒ 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:

Parcel B is a proposed mixed-use, mixed-income residential development that will leverage upon the Borough's existing efforts to create a vibrant, pedestrian-friendly center. Parcel B is a 180-unit, three-phase redevelopment of a former manufacturing site. Each phase will be ~60 units, with a mix of one and two bedrooms.

Description of the Proposed Action:

The Borough is undertaking remediation of the site prior to sale of property to Pennrose, which will occur in phases. The entire site (for all 3 phases is 7.75 acres) and there are no existing structures aside from a pump house that will be removed by the Borough. Tailored to meet the diverse needs of the neighborhood, the proposed residential units will seek to serve a range of individuals and families that will support local businesses and take advantage of the benefits of living adjacent to commuter rail access. No negative impact on human health or the environment is anticipated because of this project. Parcel B Phase I development incorporates appropriate residential density and retail in a mixed-use format, walkable to a historic downtown, and multiple recreation and public facilities. The proposed use is critical to bringing vibrancy and community back to an important neighborhood in Naugatuck. The Site is an ideal choice for redevelopment as a mixed-use product, and has the roadway and pedestrian facilities network, as well as the public utilities all in place to serve the proposed use. No alternative site locations are available in the neighborhood would provide the same quality of life for the residents, and the same positive impact on downtown Naugatuck. The project location is in 500-year floodzone and Flood Management Certification (FMC) is available.

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 construction site is not located in an Aquifer Protection Area nor is it located in a parcel prioritized for source water protection as shown on the Parcel Prioritization for Source Water Protection Viewer, indicating that the property is not in a surface water or groundwater protection area. However, the site is located in an area of fines over coarse-grained deposits with a thickness of 50-100 feet per the CT Surficial Aquifer Potential Map. Coarse-grained deposits of thickness greater than 50' are considered to have the greatest long term potential ground water yields and should be considered a future source area that should be protected. To ensure protection of this future groundwater source, it is recommended that the construction company implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) from Connecticut's Aquifer Protection Area Program Municipal Manual entitled BMPs for Temporary Construction Operations in Aquifer Protection Areas. This can be found in Section 14.4.8 of the Appendices of the Municipal Manual.” “The entirety of Naugatuck is within the Connecticut Water Company's Naugatuck Region-Central System exclusive service area. It is unlikely that new sources for drinking water will need to be developed to serve the needs of the proposed project. Regardless of the public water supply availability, it is unlikely that the proposed demand will cause the system to exceed the usage of 50,000 gallons per day, the jurisdictional threshold for the Diversion Program.” “The Naugatuck River runs directly to the east of the project site, and Long Meadow Pond Brook, a tributary to the Naugatuck River, runs just to the south of the proposed project site. Both waterbodies are impaired, and there is a Naugatuck River Regional Basin E. coli TMDL (2008) due to Nonpoint Source (NPS) pollution from stormwater runoff and other unknown sources which covers both rivers. To reduce further impairment of these waterbodies, DEEP recommends incorporating the use of Green Infrastructure and/or Low Impact Development in this project to reduce the

	impact of polluted stormwater from reaching receiving surface waters. To minimize the water quality impacts of the development, proper management measures for stormwater and sediment should be taken.” DOH encouraged the development team to follow DEEP’s recommendations. The general contractor will strive to implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) from Connecticut’s Aquifer Protection Area Program Municipal Manual to the extent applicable and/or viable. This development includes several Low Impact Development (LID) Site Planning and Design Strategies consistent with Chapter 5 of the 2024 Connecticut Stormwater Quality Manual. Since the site has previously been fully disturbed, restoring soils by converting impervious areas into pervious areas within portions of the site where feasible and planting new trees and understory plants will improve infiltration, minimize runoff, and assist in cycling nutrients through the soil. These planting areas are consistent with Low Maintenance Landscaping practices detailed in the manual. By providing additional plantings this also reduces the area of mowed lawn which in turn reduces overall maintenance and the use of fertilizers.
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 Parcel B site is located within a FEMA-designated floodplain. The applicant has coordinated with DEEP’s Land and Water Resources Division and has obtained a Flood Management Certification and Exemption for the project (202400895-FME, 202411549-FME).
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	No direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts.

any resident or migratory fish or wildlife species;	
Use of pesticides, toxic or hazardous materials or any other substance in such quantities as to cause unreasonable adverse effects on the environment;	According to DEEP Remediation Division “This site is enrolled in the Brownfield Remediation & Revitalization Program (BRRP) and should continue remediation under that program.” According to DEEP Corrective Action Division “The DEEP’s PCB Program’s most recent record for this area is an EPA Approval for Areas 5 and 6 dated January 25, 2024. This work was approved to clean the PCBs in these two areas to <1ppm. There are no enforcement actions for this area with the PCB Program.”
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;	As per DEEP Land resource division “The site does not appear to contain any wetlands. A wetlands permit would not be required unless fill is proposed in a wetland or watercourse.” The project site does not contain mapped inland wetlands. As such, no inland or coastal wetland permits are required.
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:

DEEP comments are received and addressed in the ERC.