



State of Connecticut

Environmental Review Checklist

Last Updated 02/25/2020

Instructions for Use:

The Environmental Review Checklist (ERC), as defined in Sec. 22a-1a-1(9) of the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies (RCSA), is intended to assist state agencies in (1) determining whether a proposed action or category of actions requires public scoping, or (2) in recording an agency's initial assessment of the direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental effects of a proposed action at the completion of public scoping.

For the purposes of CEPA, an Action is defined in Sec 22a-1a-1(2) of the RCSA as an individual activity or a sequence of planned activities initiated or proposed to be undertaken by an agency or agencies, or funded in whole or in part by the state.

Completion of the ERC is only *required* as part of a sponsoring agency's post-scoping notice in which the agency has determined that it will not be preparing an EIE (Sec. 22a-1a-7(d) of the RCSA).

In all other instances, the sponsoring agency has the option to use this form or portions of it, in conjunction with the applicable Environmental Classification Document (ECD), as a tool to assist it in determining whether or not scoping is required and to document the agency's review. This can be especially useful for an agency administering a proposed action that is not specifically represented in the ECD or which may have additional factors and/or indirect or cumulative impacts requiring further consideration.

Even if an agency ultimately determines that public scoping is not necessary, as a matter of public record OPM highly recommends that the agency internally document its decision, and its justification.

In completing this form, include descriptions that are clear, concise, and understandable to the general public.

Note that prior to reviewing a proposed action under the Connecticut Environmental Policy Act (CEPA), Connecticut General Statutes (CGS), Section 16a-31 requires agencies to review any proposed actions for the acquisition, development or improvement of real properties, or the acquisition of public transportation equipment or facilities, and in excess of \$200,000, for consistency with the policies of the State Plan of Conservation and Development (State C&D Plan).



State of Connecticut

Environmental Review Checklist

Last Updated 02/25/2020

PART I – Initial Review and Determination

Date: 8/18/2026
Name of Project/Action: Hopp Brook Estates
Project Address(es): 22 Oakwood Drive, Beacon falls, CT
Affected Municipalities: Beacon falls

Sponsoring Agency(ies): DOH
Agency Project Number, if applicable: DOH25-0187-006
Project Funding Source(s)/Program(s), if known: State fund

Identify the Environmental Classification Document (ECD) being used in this review:

☒ Generic, or ☐ Agency-Specific

☐ An environmental assessment or environmental impact statement is being prepared pursuant to NEPA and shall be circulated in accordance with CEPA requirements.

☒ The proposed action requires a written review by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and/or Nation Tribal Historic Preservation Office (NATHPO). Include SHPO/NATHPO reviews as an attachment or indicate the status of those reviews: The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) has reviewed the technical report titled Phase IA-IB Cultural Resources Assessment and Reconnaissance Survey of the Proposed Hopp Brook Estates Housing Development Project at 22 Oakwood Drive in Beacon Falls, Connecticut prepared by Heritage Consultants, LLC (Heritage), dated June 2026. Based on the information submitted to this office, it is the opinion of SHPO that no historic properties will be affected by the project, and no additional archaeological investigation is warranted.

☒ 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:

Hopp Brook Developers, LLC has retained Guerrera Construction Inc to perform the site work on a 59-acre parcel of land known as lot 1 a/k/a 22 Oakwood Drive Beacon Falls, CT. The project is approved as a special exception for 94 single family homes.

Description of the Proposed Action:

The project is a planned community under the Common Ownership Act where a starter home and approximately 134x84 parcels of land will be a unit owned as a starter home. The homes will be approximately 1900 SF with either a 1 or 2 car garage. The roads will be private and maintained by a homeowners' association. The site work involves the construction of 2 detention ponds on site for storm drainage. There will be city water, and each unit has its own septic system approved by Naugatuck Valley Health. There is a community pickle ball and play fields, there is 40 acres of open space mostly on the adjoining undeveloped lot 2. The homes will be built in 6 phases with approximately 16 homes per phase. The starter homes will be listed for sale at \$499,000 and lower. It will take 4-5 years to complete the project.

The Subject Property is currently wooded and undeveloped and has been since at least 1934. Recent tree clearing along proposed roadways has been completed to allow for "perc" testing for planned septic systems. The surrounding area to the north of the Subject Property (Oakwood Drive and Timber Ridge Lane) was also historically wooded and undeveloped until around 2008 when construction of Oakwood Drive, followed by the construction of Timber Ridge Lane and the subsequent residential development through 2021. The area to the east and south has also been historically (and remains) wooded and undeveloped. The inactive Beacon Heights Landfill is located west of the Subject Property and is a Superfund Hazardous Waste site which reportedly received municipal and industrial wastes from the 1920s to 1979. A small portion (~6-acres) of the site operated as "Betkoski's Dump" from the 1920s until 1970. In 1970, new owners (Beacon Heights, Inc.) expanded the landfill area to approximately 34-acres and placed wastes directly onto bedrock and covered them with soil. Open burning and waste disposal directly onto bedrock was discontinued around 1973 and the landfill was closed in 1979. The landfill is currently capped and municipal water supply was extended to neighboring residential developments as part of the site cleanup in 1989. The EPA performed a final inspection of the site in 1998 and determined all remedial action activities were completed.

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. <u>Water Planning and Management Division, Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP), CT commented on the Scoping notice of the project. DOH and Development teams responses are included in this ERC as well as separate response letters.</u> “The proposed construction site is not located in an Aquifer Protection Area nor is it located in an area of coarse-grained deposits as shown on the CT Surficial Aquifer Potential Map indicating that it is not a current or future source for groundwater. There are no concerns related to the Aquifer Protection Area Program.” “The proposed development is located approximately 1 mile south-east of Hockanum Brook (CT6900-28_01) which subsequently drains to the Naugatuck River (CT6900-00_02). These two waterways are both impaired, not supporting recreation and habitat for fish, other aquatic life and wildlife, respectively. Additionally, both waterways have Bacteria Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs); Hockanum Brook Bacteria TMDL & Naugatuck River Bacteria TMDL. The proposed project will create a significant amount of new impervious cover in the form of 94 single family homes across a 59-acre forested area. Studies have shown a link between increasing impervious cover and degrading water quality conditions in a watershed (CWP, 2003). CT DEEP recognizes the proposed 2 detention ponds for storm drainage and encourages additional use of Green Infrastructure and/or Low Impact Development where feasible in this project to minimize/reduce the impact of polluted stormwater from reaching the nearby impaired waterways. Furthermore, CT DEEP recommends environmentally friendly lawn care and landscaping practices, such as reducing or eliminating fertilizer and pesticide use, as well as encouraging residents to properly dispose of pet waste, as recommended in the Connecticut NPS Management Program Plan (2024).”

	<u>DOH encouraged the development team to follow DEEP's recommendations. Development team confirmation is included in this ERC as well as separate response letter:</u> "The Project's water usage is 28,200 gallons per day, assuming a standard state average of 300 gallons per day per household. Which is less than 50,000 gallons per day." "Impervious area has been minimized with the current proposal by clustering the units in the northern portion of the property. The property is located at the divide of two watersheds. The majority of the proposed development is located on the northern watershed, which discharges to a wetlands area along the Beacon Heights landfill and then on to a tributary of the Hackanum Brook. A Smaller portion of the development discharges south towards a wetland area, which then flows into a tributary of Hopp Brook. The project avoids developing near wetland areas and limits its disturbance to the northern portion of the property, and preserves the sensitive wetlands areas and watersheds to the south. The project includes best management practices, including a storm water treatment train that includes deep sump catch basins, 4-hydrodynamic separators, 2 wet bottom retention ponds, and 2 level spreaders to promote groundwater recharge and water quality from the proposed site. Pollution control plan and Engineering report as is in Appendix A of letter addressed in a separate letter for DEEP comments".
Effect on a public water supply system;	The project will not have any negative impact on the public water supply system. <u>Water Planning and Management Division, DEEP, commented:</u> "The entirety of the project site is within the Aquarion Water Company – Valley System service area, so public water supply will be available to the development if needed. It is unlikely that the development will require more than 50,000 gallons of water per day, the jurisdictional threshold of the Consumptive Water Diversion Program. However, if in the future, the development requires an excess of 50,000 gallons of water per day to support its operation, Consumptive Water Diversion Program staff should be contacted to inquire whether a permit will be needed." <u>DOH encouraged the development team to follow DEEP's recommendations Development team confirmation is included in this ERC as well as separate response letter:</u> "The Project's water usage is 28,200 gallons per day, assuming a standard state average of 300 gallons per day per household. Which is less than 50,000 gallons per day."

	<u>Department of Public Health (DPH), CT commented</u> “DPH reviewed the approximately 65-acre parcel proposed for the Project location (Site) which indicated that the Site currently: • Has less than 0.3% impervious cover; • Is over 97% is forested, of which approximately 78.5% (52 acres) is core forest; • Features potential terrain and shallow-soil construction constraints, and that; • Includes approximately 24 acres is within the watershed of the Hopp Brook Diversion (Diversion), a source of public drinking water supply for the South Central Connecticut Regional Water Authority (RWA) public water system. Any manipulation of land within the Watershed has the potential to impact the quality and/or quantity of RWA’s public water supply. Therefore, DPH provides the following comments to the Connecticut Department of Housing for consideration prior to Project finalization to ensure long-term protection of public drinking water. Forested areas are the ideal land cover for drinking water source filtration and storage. Clearing of forested areas within the Watershed could present potential adverse impacts, including increased stormwater runoff, reduced natural filtration of contaminants, and destabilization of soils leading to contaminant mobility. Introduction of impervious surface areas, 94 subsurface septic systems, and stormwater infrastructure would significantly decrease the existing protective qualities of the Watershed and Diversion. As such, DPH recommends the Applicant consider alternatives that: • Reduce the amount of land converted from forest, such as through fewer and/or larger building lots with mandatory forest buffers separating each lot; • Minimize impervious cover and septic density, and; • Avoid developing the most hydrologically sensitive portions of the Site.” <u>DOH encouraged the development team to follow DPH’s recommendations. Development team confirmation is included in this ERC as well as separate response letter:</u> “This project has received specific approval from the local health dept. for phase 1, and the test hole data has been approved for the other phases. A Stormwater pollution control plan has also been prepared for the Stormwater general permit for construction activities per the DEEP requirements.
--	--

	• The development is a compact or cluster development of 94 single-family homes on 135 acres, with a development impervious area of only 13.89 acres or 10.3%. All the proposed houses are located on Lot 1, which is 59.46 acres, and the remaining Lot 2 will have 76.35 acres, of which 40.27 acres are being deeded as public space. The project, as proposed, is a much less impactful alternative to the original proposal of 295 townhouses and single-family units known as Chatfield Farms II (see Chapfield-II.pdf in the letter for DPH), which had a proposed impervious area of 25.2 acres or 18.6%. • Impervious area has been minimized with the current proposal by clustering the units in the northern portion of the property. The septic systems are small individual systems located near each unit throughout the developed area, versus a large community system consolidating all the flow in one location. • The property is located at the divide of two watersheds. The majority of the proposed development is located on the northern watershed, which discharges to a wetlands area along the Beacon Heights landfill and then on to a tributary of the Hackanum Brook. A Smaller portion of the development discharges south towards a wetland area, which then flows into a tributary of Hopp Brook. The project avoids developing near wetland areas and limits its disturbance to the northern portion of the property, and preserves the sensitive wetlands areas and watersheds to the south. The project includes best management practices, including a storm water treatment train that includes deep sump catch basins, 4- hydrodynamic separators, 2 wet bottom retention ponds, and 2 level spreaders to promote groundwater recharge and water quality from the proposed site. Please see attached Engineering report as Appendix A of letter to DPH." All other comments were considered, and developments teams response is available as separate letter.
Effect on flooding, in-stream flows, erosion or sedimentation;	The site is not located 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,	No direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts. The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) has reviewed the technical report titled Phase IA-IB Cultural Resources Assessment and Reconnaissance Survey of the Proposed Hopp Brook Estates Housing Development Project at 22 Oakwood Drive in Beacon Falls, Connecticut prepared by Heritage Consultants, LLC (Heritage), dated June 2026. Based

district, structure, object, or its setting; OR B. Disruption of an archeological or sacred site;	on the information submitted to this office, it is the opinion of SHPO that no historic properties will be affected by the project, and no additional archaeological investigation is warranted.
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;	<u>DEEP NDDDB Program, Wildlife Division commented:</u> “This project was recently submitted to NDDDB. Review work is currently initiated but is not yet complete. Upon completion, a determination letter will be issued to address potential impacts to listed species.” <u>DOH encouraged the development team to follow DEEP’s recommendations. Development team confirmation is included in this ERC as well as separate response letter:</u> “NDDDB Letter has been received and its recommendations, the Recommended protection measures which will be strictly implemented to ensure no impacts to listed species. As state funding, a New NDDDB Application has been filed as App ID 3016088”
Use of pesticides, toxic or hazardous materials or any other substance in such quantities as to cause unreasonable adverse effects on the environment;	A Phase I ESA was done, and it didn’t find any Recognized Environmental Condition (REC).
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;	<u>DEEP LWRD commented</u> “Details about on-site wetlands and any proposed fill placed in wetlands have not been provided. Any wetland permitting requirements would likely be handled at the local and/or federal level.” <u>DOH encouraged the development team to follow DEEP’s recommendations. Development team confirmation is included in this ERC as well as separate response letter</u> “No filling or activity within 100 feet of wetlands is proposed, approval from the local inland wetlands agency in Beacon Falls has been received for the project as proposed.”
Effect on agricultural resources;	Not any adverse impact on agricultural land is anticipated.
Adequacy of existing or proposed utilities and infrastructure;	<u>The Regional Water Authority (RWA), CT commented on the Scoping notice of the project. DOH and Development teams responses are included in this ERC as well as separate response letter:</u> “The Regional Water Authority (RWA) has reviewed the above referenced application. Approximately 68 percent of the 135 acre property is within the watershed of Hopp Brook, which is a reserve public water supply source for the RWA. The applicant is proposing the development of 94 single family residences within the Hopp Brook Village District. The site is currently forested. RWA property borders the development to the east. The residents will be served by public water and on-site septic systems. 64 of the 94 septic systems are located on the public water supply watershed portion of the property. Storm water will be directed to two retention basins, one of which is located on the public water supply watershed portion of the property. There is a proposed open

	space set-aside of 40 acres. Wetlands are located on the southern portion of the property.” “The RWA’s concerns regarding this application are related to the lack of information in the site plan regarding septic systems. The majority of septic system effluent will be directed to the public water supply watershed portion of the property. The site plan does not show septic tanks, a connection to the leaching fields, or a reserve leaching field. There is no information regarding percolation testing or test pits. The proposed septic systems do not appear to be individual systems and may be considered a community septic system under the jurisdiction of the CT Department of Public Health or the CT Department of Energy and Environmental Protection, depending on design flows. Concentrating the septic system effluent into small areas close to the RWA property line could pose a threat to groundwater quality, specifically bacteria and nitrogen pollution. The application also contains conflicting information relating to connecting the residences to a municipal sanitary sewer system.” “There was no information provided regarding the design, inspection and maintenance of the storm water management system. Storm water treatment systems require regular maintenance to be effective. An inspection and maintenance plan should be developed and included in the site plan. The party responsible for inspecting and maintaining the system should be identified. We recommend storm water systems be inspected at least twice per year, and that an annual report documenting inspections and maintenance be submitted to the town. The RWA would like to receive a copy of such reports.” <u>DOH encouraged the development team to follow best management practices. Development team confirmation is included in this ERC as well as separate response letter:</u> “The Majority of the site is constructed and directs water to the north west watershed, only a small portion of the development is within the south eastern water shed, both water sheds have a treatment train and storm water controls to insure good water quality and promote filtration and infiltration of the storm water. Only 19 septic systems are proposed in the Hopp Brook water shed. The southerly water shed has a dedicated 40.27 acre open space buffer and wetland areas before leaving the site to the south east. Also refer to Appendix B the Phase 1 Environmental report section 3.2 &3.3 of responses to RWA letter”. “The development is a compact or cluster development of 94 single family homes on 135 acres. The project proposes 94
--	---

	individual septic systems near each house for a 3- bedroom house. The project has been divided into 6 phases or sites. A test hole investigation has been conducted and witnessed by the Naugatuck Valley Health Department (NVHD) for all 94 proposed homes. These system locations are shown on Sp-1 of the Site plan set and Detailed septic designs for Phase 1 are shown on plans PSP-1.1, PSP-1.2 & PSP-1.3 (Letter to RWA as Separate Attachment). This includes soil and percolation test data and are part of the plan set. NVHD has determined that all the test holes are suitable for septic systems and has approved the detailed design of Phase 1 for construction (Approval letter attached in separate attachment of RWA letter).” “The Storm Water Pollution Control Plan is attached as Appendix C of RWA letter, which includes the Responsible parties, reporting forms, and inspection requirements during construction, and the Storm Water Maintenance Plans are attached as Appendix D of RWA letter, which includes the monitoring and inspection requirements after construction is completed. A spill prevention plan has also been attached as Appendix E of RWA letter .”
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;	Not any adverse impact is 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

Local Town Permits:

Inland Wetlands Agency Approval
Stormwater Permit (local) Approval
Planning and Zoning Approval

State permits:

Naugatuck Valley Dept. Septic permit

DEEP NPDES Construction Stormwater General Permit #CTR100332

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, RWA and DPH comments are received and addressed in the ERC as well as in individual letters.