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:	03/08/2024
Name of Project/Action:	80 South Road
Project Address(es):	80 South Road, Farmington, CT
Affected Municipalities:	Farmington
Sponsoring Agency(ies):	DOH
Agency Project Number, if applicable:	DOH – Project Number FX/NHTF2405201; CHFA – Dev. Number - 23-902
Project Funding Source(s)/Program(s), if known:	CHFA Loan (Taxable Bonds), DOH Loan Funding (FLEX), DOH HTF, CHFA Opportunity Funds, Deferred Developer Fee, GP Loan

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 end of fieldwork memorandum titled Archaeological Assessment and Reconnaissance Survey: Proposed Affordable Housing Development, 80 South Road, Farmington, Connecticut. The consultant determined that the identified deposits and historic house foundation were not eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places. No further archeological investigation was recommended prior to construction. Based on the information submitted to this office, it is the opinion of SHPO that no historic properties will be affected by the proposed development 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 1

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:

80 South Road is a proposed 65-unit affordable multifamily development located on South Road in Farmington, CT. 15 of these 65 units will qualify as supportive housing units, set aside for adults with developmental disabilities.

Description of the Proposed Action:

The site of the proposed development is 2.92 acres and was assembled from three former parcels - 62 South Road (0.48 acres), 8864 South Road (1.04 acres), and 8880 South Road (1.408 acres). 62 South Road was previously occupied by a single-family home constructed in 1965 that was demolished in the late winter of 2022. Both 8864 and 8880 South Road were formerly vacant land. There are no known environmental issues on the site. There are, however, wetlands located on the 8864 and 8880 South Road parcels. The site studied for vernal pool habitats, of which there were none.

The proposed development will be comprised of (2) buildings. The first, Building A, will feature (36) units, community recreation space (both interior and exterior), an office for our social service provider and will be serviced by an elevator. The second, Building B, will feature (29) units and a leasing office. Across the development there will be a total of (6) studio apartments, (20) one-bedroom apartments, and (39) two-bedroom apartments. (15) of these apartments will be designated for use by our supportive population. Building A will occupy a building footprint of approximately 11,360 sf including 3,600 sf of outdoor amenity space and Building B will occupy a building footprint of approximately 10,400 sf. In addition to utilizing biofiltration and bioretention systems, the buildings landscape plan features all native plant species and minimizes use of turf grass to reduce outdoor water usage. Porous pavement has also been utilized in both parking areas and the buildings proposed amenity space.

Alternatives Considered:

No Action Alternative.

Public concerns or controversy associated with the proposed action:
None.

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 to groundwater and surface water quality. DEEP commented on water quality permitting. The project description mentions that wetlands are present on the site. If any work is to be conducted within wetlands such as filling portions or requiring a pipe or culvert, permitting may be required. If these activities are taking place, the applicant is advised to contact the Army Corps of Engineers first, to determine if the activities are in federally regulated wetlands or watercourses. If the area is under the federal jurisdiction, determined by soil types, hydrology, and wetland vegetation, then the Corps will require a Section 404 Water Quality permit under the Clean Water Act. This permit triggers the state 401 Water Quality permit, which is administrated by DEEP's Land and water resources division. DEEP comments indicated the applicability of Stormwater and Dewatering Wastewaters from Construction Activities depending on the size of the disturbance regardless of phasing. This general permit applies to discharges of stormwater and dewatering wastewater from construction activities where the activity disturbs more than an acre. On December 14, 2020, SLR International Corporation (SLR) wetland scientist Megan Raymond and soil scientist in training Aidan Barry investigated 62, 8864, and 8880 South Road in Farmington, Connecticut to determine the presence or absence of wetlands and/or watercourses, to demarcate (flag) the boundaries of wetlands and watercourses identified, and to identify onsite soil types in the vicinity of the project area. A forested depressional wetland was delineated in the eastern portion of 8864 South Road and the ordinary high-water mark of a perennial drainage corridor was delineated on 8880 South Road. No wetlands were delineated on 62 South Road. A vernal pool study was completed in spring 2021 and no vernal pool habitat was identified on any of the three parcels. The results of the seasonal investigation reveal that no vernal pool habitat exists on 8864 and 8880 South Road. The surficial hydrology does not provide a sufficient water column to support breeding and development of vernal pool dependent amphibians. In addition, the landscape position of the wetland,

	adjacent to the highway and abutting developed parcels and roadways does not demonstrate adjacent populations of vernal pool species. The design team has established a 25' area of non-disturbance outside of each of the (2) wetland bodies. No work will be conducted in this area and it will be a no touch zone. The measures regarding protections and permits necessary if work will take place in the wetlands is N/A as no work will be taking place here. The stormwater approval is governed under the local IWC approvals. The site is under 5 acres, (it is 2.92 acres) so a permit through DEEP is not required.
Effect on a public water supply system;	The project will not have any impact on public water supply system. Staff from DEEP reviewed the location of this project and found that it is not in an aquifer protection area.
Effect on flooding, in-stream flows, erosion or sedimentation;	The project site is not located in 100- or 500-year flood zone. DEEP commented as in reviewing the watershed for this project site. DEEP suggested some techniques that DOH also advised to incorporate and will be incorporated as below: (1) **The use of pervious pavement or grid:** The civil engineering team, Bohler Engineers worked diligently with Senior Wetlands Engineer, Megan Raymond of SLR, the Town Engineers at the Town of Farmington, and Magrann Associates as an Environmental and Sustainability consultant to incorporate numerous design measures within the site design that were sensitive to the site ecology and local systems. At areas in the site were advised by the aforementioned team; development team have integrated pervious pavement (all parking along the southern boundary of the site) that is redirected using a system of underground chambers. The site plan documents prepared by Bohler Engineers and Drainage Report have further detail and information. (2) **The use of vegetated swales, tree box filters:** The design team designed vegetated swales along the northern boundary of the site to infiltrate and treat stormwater runoff. Site plan documents include more information. (3) **The minimization of access road widths and parking lot areas:** The design team to the greatest degree possible has minimized the width of the access roads and parking lot areas to comply with both the parking standards permissible by local zoning and the requests of the

	Department of Transportation. The traffic engineer, Marc Vertucci of Fuss & O'Neill worked diligently with the Department of Transportation to satisfy their egress and site safety standards while keeping a mindful eye on minimizing impervious surfaces. Please also note, the development team have met the requirements of LEED Gold relating to the amount of impervious surface on site as well as the use of native species while minimizing turf and any high-water demanding plants. (4) **If soil conditions permit, the use of dry wells to manage runoff from the building roofs:** The Wetlands Engineer did not recommend the use of dry wells to manage runoff on our site, thus this have not integrated into our site design documents. (5) **The use of vegetated roofs (green roofs) to reduce the runoff from buildings:** The design team did not integrate green roofs into building design. The development team could not meet the density requirements of development while staying within the permissible height allowed by the Town of Farmington. (6) **Incorporation of proper physical barriers:** The design of dumpster locations includes screening by arbor vitae trees and pavement that is of increased thickness to minimize impact by sanitation trucks and reduce the likelihood of infiltration of waste maters. Trash collection will be compliant with LEED Gold standards and only household trash will be collected, there will be no on-site disposal of any type of hazardous or industrial materials. (7) **The installation of rainwater harvesting:** To comply with LEED Gold, the site has minimal turf and does not require a formal irrigation system.
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;	The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) has reviewed the end of fieldwork memorandum titled Archaeological Assessment and Reconnaissance Survey: Proposed Affordable Housing Development, 80 South Road, Farmington, Connecticut prepared by Marc L Banks, Ph.D., LLC (Consultant), dated May 22, 2023. The fieldwork was completed at the request of SHPO office in a letter dated October 18, 2022, in support of a Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) managed by the Connecticut Housing and Finance Authority (CHFA) on behalf of the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). As a result of federal funding, the proposed activities are subject to review by this office pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended. Based on the information submitted to our office, the fieldwork appears to meet the standards set forth in the Environmental Review Primer for Connecticut's Archaeological Resources. The consultant determined that the identified deposits and historic house foundation were not eligible for inclusion on

	the National Register of Historic Places. No further archeological investigation was recommended prior to construction. Based on the information submitted to this office, it is the opinion of SHPO that no historic properties will be affected by the proposed development 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;	The project is not located in any Natural Diversity Database area. According to DEEP too it was not in a Natural Diversity Database Area. So, this project will not have any effect on natural communities of critical habitat. There is no floodzone so the project will not affect any fish or aquatic animal. Wetlands will not be impacted through construction as described above.
Use of pesticides, toxic or hazardous materials or any other substance in such quantities as to cause unreasonable adverse effects on the environment;	Based on the type and the nature of the development, the use of pesticides, toxic or hazardous materials are not anticipated.
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;	Temporary disruption is expected during construction, but the long-term affect will be positive to the site and neighborhood.
Displacement or addition of substantial numbers of people;	No direct, indirect or cumulative impacts.
Substantial increase in congestion (traffic, recreational, other);	During work there can be some temporary traffic but best management practice can be adopted to reduce the impact.

A substantial increase in the type or rate of energy use as a direct or indirect result of the action;	Some increase may occur as the building will be residential.
The creation of a hazard to human health or safety;	No impact anticipated.
Effect on air quality;	During construction there can be a little air dust issue but no direct, indirect or cumulative impacts are anticipated from reuse work. DEEP Bureau of Air Management typically recommends the use of newer off-road construction equipment that meets the latest EPA or California Air Resources Board (CARB) standards. If newer equipment cannot be used, equipment with the best available controls on diesel emissions including retrofitting with diesel oxidation catalysts or particulate filters in addition to the use of ultra-low sulfur fuel would be the second choice that can be effective in reducing exhaust emissions. The use of newer equipment that meets EPA standards would obviate the need for retrofits. DEEP also recommends the use of newer on-road vehicles that meet either the latest EPA or California Air Resources Board (CARB) standards for construction projects. These on-road vehicles include dump trucks, fuel delivery trucks and other vehicles typically found at construction sites. On-road vehicles older than the 2007-model year typically should be retrofitted with diesel oxidation catalysts or diesel particulate filters for projects. Again, the use of newer vehicles that meet EPA standards would eliminate the need for retrofits. DOH advised client to adopt best management practices including those from DEEP to reduce potential air quality impacts.
Effect on ambient noise levels;	No noise issue is anticipated.
Effect on existing land resources and landscapes, including coastal and inland wetlands;	Not any adverse impact on coastal or inland wetland are anticipated.
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;	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.	Positive cumulative impact increasing housing opportunity for people.

PART V - List of Required Permits, Approvals and/or Certifications Identified at the Time of this Review

DEEP has made recommendations in their review letter dated September 1, 2023 (attached). On request of DOH, Developer/Consultant confirmed that all comments were considered.

(1) Water Quality Permitting, Army Corps of Engineers and DEEP: The design team has established a 25' area of non-disturbance outside of each of the (2) wetland bodies. No work will be conducted in this area, and it will be a no touch zone. The measures regarding protections and permits necessary if work will take place in the wetlands is N/A as no work will be taking place here.

Stormwater Management during Construction: The stormwater approval is governed under the local IWC approvals. The site is under 5 acres, (it is 2.92 acres) so a permit through DEEP is not required.

(2) Watersheds Program, Water Planning and Management: DEEP recommended the techniques were incorporated as describe before.

(3) Air Management: DOH suggested DEEP recommendations to be maintained.

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 and Environmental Impact Evaluation (EIE) is not warranted.

PART VII - Public Comments and Sponsoring Agency Responses:

No public comments provided during scoping notice period.