



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: 6/26/2026
Name of Project/Action: Mount Pleasant Redevelopment
Project Address(es): 100 Richard Street, New Britain, CT 06053
Affected Municipalities: New Britain

Sponsoring Agency(ies): DOH
Agency Project Number, if applicable: DOH PROJECTS\DOH25-0235-089
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: Adverse effect to historic resources; Mitigation measures were suggested to resolve adverse effect.

☒ 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 portion of the project site run by the New Britain Housing Authority (NBHA) currently holds twenty-two (22) barrack-style residential buildings housing 251 dwelling units and two (2) additional free-standing buildings that accommodate NBHA administrative and maintenance offices. Originally constructed circa 1941, the Mount Pleasant Redevelopment intends to demolish the entire site in five separate phases, thus paving the way for new construction that is state-of-the-art, energy-efficient, aesthetically engaging, and safe. Approximately 350 residential units are planned, occupying a range of affordability and size. Consisting of 79 units, the first phase is slated to submit a funding application in 2025.

Description of the Proposed Action:

The site is a 22.7-acre property split between the existing Mount Pleasant and Bond Street Public Housing complex and the former Stanley Black plus Decker block nestled between Bond and Armistice Streets in central New Britain. No major environmental issue was noticed. But the buildings are historic. The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) reviewed the project and found that “The Subject Property, known as Mount Pleasant Housing Development (1941) is eligible for listing on the National Register as an intact example of a public housing complex constructed in response to the United States Housing Act of 1937 and the National Defense Act of 1940. Following review of the project scope, the proposed undertaking will have an adverse effect on historic resources, specifically the demolition of the complex. Following discussions with the Project Proponent, the Project Proponent and SHPO agree that the mitigation measures will resolve the adverse effect.

Alternatives Considered:

No Action Alternative.

Public concerns or controversy associated with the proposed action:

NA

PART III – Site Characteristics (Check all that apply)

The proposed action is non-site specific, or encompasses multiple sites;

☐

Current site ownership:

- ☐ N/A, ☐ State; ☐ Municipal, ☐ Private,
☐ Other: Please Explain.

Anticipated ownership upon project completion:

- ☐ N/A, ☐ State; ☐ Municipal, ☐ Private,
☐ Other: Please Explain.

Locational Guide Map Criteria:

<http://ctmaps.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=ba47efccdb304e02893b7b8e8cff556a>

Priority Funding Area factors:

- ☐ Designated as a Priority Funding Area, including ☐ Balanced, or ☐ Village PFA;
- ☐ Urban Area or Urban Cluster, as designated by the most recent US Census Data;
- ☐ Public Transit, defined as being within a ½ mile buffer surrounding existing or planned mass transit;
- ☐ Existing or planned sewer service from an adopted Wastewater Facility Plan;
- ☐ Existing or planned water service from an adopted Public Drinking Water Supply Plan;
- ☐ Existing local bus service provided 7 days a week.

Conservation Area factors:

- ☐ Core Forest Area(s), defined as greater than 250 acres based on the 2006 Land Cover Dataset;
- ☐ Existing or potential drinking water supply watershed(s);
- ☐ Aquifer Protection Area(s);
- ☐ Wetland Soils greater than 25 acres;
- ☐ Undeveloped Prime, Statewide Important and/or locally important agricultural soils greater than 25 acres;
- ☐ Category 1, 2, or 3 Hurricane Inundation Zone(s);
- ☐ 100 year Flood Zone(s);
- ☐ Critical Habitat;
- ☐ Locally Important Conservation Area(s),
- ☐ Protected Land (list type): Enter text.
- ☒ Local, State, or National Historic District(s).

PART IV - Assessment of Environmental Significance – Direct, Indirect, And Cumulative Effects

Required Factors for Consideration (Section 22a-1a-3 of the RCSA)	Agency's Assessment and Explanation
Effect on water quality, including surface water and groundwater;	The proposed action will not result in any impact on groundwater and surface water quality. There are no concerns related to the Aquifer Protection Area. Water Planning and Management Division, DEEP, commented: “The proposed project site is not located in an Aquifer Protection Area, a parcel prioritized for source water protection as shown on the Parcel Prioritization for Source Water Protection Viewer, or in an area of coarse-grained deposits as shown on the CT Surficial Aquifer Potential Map. 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.” “Following building demolitions, ensure that any sanitary sewer lines are properly removed, abandoned, or capped to ensure that no sources of extraneous water such as groundwater (infiltration) or stormwater (inflow) can enter the municipal sewer system. Extraneous water in municipal sewer systems reduces conveyance capacity and can lead to sanitary sewer overflows.” “If the proposed development requires more than 50,000 gallons of water per day for operational purposes, a Water Diversion Permit will be needed per Sec. 22a-377(c)-1. Should this be the case, the developer should reach out the DEEP's Consumptive Water Diversion Program staff per the contact provided.” “The proposed project site lies approximately 2 miles southeast of Piper Brook (CT4402-00_02). Stormwater at this location drains to Piper Brook, which is impaired due to bacteria, not supporting recreation, habitat for fish, other aquatic life and wildlife (CT Statewide Bacteria TMDL - Piper Brook). To reduce further impairment to Piper Brook, DEEP recommends considering the use of Green Infrastructure and/or Low Impact Development in the project design, to minimize/reduce the impact of polluted stormwater from reaching receiving surface waters. To minimize the water quality impacts during redevelopment, proper management measures for stormwater and sediment should be taken.”

	DOH encouraged the development team to follow DEEP's recommendations. According to development team: “Following building demolitions, sanitary sewer lines will be properly removed, abandoned, or capped to prevent extraneous water (groundwater infiltration or stormwater inflow) from entering the municipal sewer system and reducing conveyance capacity or causing sanitary sewer overflows; accordingly, sewer and water demolition and capping are planned to meet applicable requirements for capping and/or removal and to prevent illicit discharges. Should the proposed development require more than 50,000 gallons of water per day for operational purposes, Section 22a-377(c)-1, per the Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies, dictates that a Water Diversion Permit may be needed. However, because the project will connect to (and be served by) the existing municipal water system and will not draw from any surface or groundwater source, the civil engineer (Freeman Companies) has indicated that a Water Diversion Permit is not anticipated for the Project. Because the project drains to Piper Brook (CT4402-00_02), which is impaired by bacteria, the design incorporates measures consistent with DEEP's recommendation to use Green Infrastructure/Low Impact Development and to properly manage stormwater and sediment during redevelopment, including reducing impervious area, increasing sheet flow over vegetated areas, installing deep-sump structures and hoods on outlet pipes to reduce sediment and floatable, and implementing a maintenance program to clean onsite infrastructure before discharge to the roadway system.”
Effect on a public water supply system;	The project will not have any negative impact on the public water supply system.
Effect on flooding, in-stream flows, erosion or sedimentation;	No direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts as the location is not in any flood zone.
Disruption or alteration of an historic, archeological, cultural, or recreational building, object, district, site or its surroundings; A. Alteration of an historic building, district, structure, object, or its setting; OR B. Disruption of an archeological or sacred site;	No 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;	No direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts.
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: “In the absence of prior environmental data, it is reasonable to assume that historic urban fill may be present beneath portions of the site. The nature and extent of fill materials remain unknown. Therefore, any disturbance of the soil during redevelopment warrants a thorough soil characterization.” As per DOH review: A Phase I ESA done on March 2026 developed by Freeman for location 16 Armistice street, New Britain CT, did not identify any Recognized Environmental Condition (REC), no controlled RECs (CRECs), but one Historical RECs (historical pesticide use) were identified. Effective March 1, 2026, the Property Transfer Program (PTP) ended and was replaced by the Release Based Cleanup Program. In Freeman’s opinion, no information was identified to suggest that any reportable releases (Existing Releases, Significant Existing Releases, or Emergent Reportable Releases) are present on the Site. A Phase I ESA done on January 2026 and found No RECs, No CRECs, HREC-1: Historical pesticide use; and 3 Area of Concerns (AOCs) AOC-1: Historical pesticide use; AOC-2: Urban fill; AOC-3: Potential asbestos-containing steam supply/return lines. A Phase II ESA done on Mt. pleasant Phase 2 and 3 area by Freeman February 26, 2026. Based on the results of this Phase II environmental Site Assessment, Freeman is of the opinion that no further investigation of Phase 1 Demolition Area is required. Before these Payne developed a Phase I ESA on July 3, 2023, where a total of six (6) RECs/AOCs, CRECs, HRECs or de minimis conditions are potentially associated with the site; three (3) BERs were identified for the subject site. A Phase II ESA done on September 30, 2023 by Freeman on the phase I Demolition area found Pesticides did not exceed DEC-RES in any other samples. PAHs, Pesticides, Lead, Arsenic, Chromium, and Mercury were detected in the sample at concentrations well below applicable RSR criteria. Total Lead was detected in all the soil samples at concentrations well below DEC-RES. PCBs were not detected in any of the samples. ETPH was not detected above laboratory reporting limits in SB35. PCBs were not detected above laboratory reporting limits in either sample. Based on the results of the Phase

	II ESA, pesticides present in one small area at concentrations exceeding DEC-RES will require spot remediation. The source of the pesticides appears to be the result of spraying around the buildings and not historical agricultural use. As noted above, remediation of pesticide-impacted soil is required; however, the remediation will likely be focused in the areas surrounding the current and former buildings. Freeman recommends that these areas be evaluated during site preparation. Impacted fill, if discovered, can be excavated and stockpiled for disposal. A conceptual remedial action plan (RAP) developed by Freeman for the 100 Richard st (Phase I demolition area) on September 20, 2023. Freeman will prepare a Remedial Action Report following completion of the field work. The report will include a description of the field activities that were executed and will incorporate the supporting documentation described above. The documentation will also include a final survey of excavation extents and photographs. The purpose of this Conceptual RAP is to provide a soil remediation plan that is intended to be implemented as part of a Site redevelopment project. This Conceptual RAP provides details regarding preparation activities, soil remediation activities that will comply with applicable environmental regulations and documentation procedures to provide closure of environmental issues through a formal CT environmental regulatory program. The development team confirmed: “Based on the Phase II Environmental Site Assessment for the Mount Pleasant Redevelopment project, the presence of historic urban fill beneath portions of the site is considered likely, particularly in areas where former buildings once stood. However, the full extent and distribution of this fill remain uncertain due to limited subsurface access. Most attempted soil borings in these areas were obstructed by underlying pavement or concrete, restricting direct investigation of the fill materials. Where fill was accessible, specifically at boring SB31, a sample was collected and analyzed for a comprehensive suite of contaminants, including polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), pesticides, lead, arsenic, chromium, mercury, volatile organic compounds (VOCs), polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), and extractable total petroleum hydrocarbons (ETPH). The results indicated the presence of PAHs, pesticides, lead, arsenic, chromium, and mercury, but all detected concentrations were well below applicable Remediation Standard Regulations (RSR) criteria. No VOCs, PCBs, or ETPH were detected in the sample. In summary, while the available data suggest that the fill materials encountered are consistent with typical urban fill and do not currently exceed regulatory thresholds, the overall nature and extent of fill across the site remain incompletely defined. Further soil characterization is recommended during any
--	--

	future disturbance or redevelopment, especially in areas previously inaccessible due to pavement or concrete cover.” A Hazardous Building Materials Inspection Report for Mt. Pleasant Village/Bond Street Court Revitalization – Phase I Demolition (Buildings 3, 13, 21, 22, 23, 25 and S) September 18, 2023 was reviewed. Asbestos was found on various materials including, but not limited to floor tile and associated mastics, textured ceiling paint, window and door caulk, soffit material and assumed, based on historical documentation, underground pipe chases. In accordance with NESHAP regulations in 40 CFR Part 61 Subpart M, building owners must remove all ACM from a facility (or area of a facility) before any activity begins that would break up, dislodge, or similarly disturb the ACM. Disturbance of asbestos-containing material can only be done by trained and licensed individuals and contractors. Any material that was identified as negative for asbestos may be removed at will and disposed of as standard construction debris if it does not disturb any ACM or is not otherwise regulated. In addition, any new building materials that have not previously been identified shall be assumed to contain asbestos until the material has been properly tested. Because variable results were found within several of the same visibly indistinguishable groups of materials, such as black mastic and white textured ceiling paint, further testing to reduce cost of abatement is advisable. LBP was found only on one metal stairwell. DEEP requires lead waste characterization sampling for building materials containing lead-based paint that will become a waste material because of demolition or renovation activities. The waste may be combined with general construction debris, which will dilute the concentration of lead in the total waste stream. An exception is material with a metal substrate which may be recycled in a facility that accepts LBP. Because of this exception, no further action is required regarding lead-based paint in the waste stream. The varnished wood containing low levels of lead in paint also contained asbestos and so will be removed under full containment, with the appropriate personal protective equipment for both asbestos and lead. Four caulks were found to have the potential to contain PCBs. One of the caulks was also asbestos containing and must be removed from the building along with the adjacent substrate. As the materials may contain PCBs in concentrations greater than 1 mg/kg but less than 40 mg/kg, they are assumed to be Connecticut regulated waste. Transport and disposal of this type of waste in Connecticut requires a permit from DEEP. The fluorescent bulbs
--	--

	and lithium batteries inventoried must be disposed of as universal waste. Hazardous Building Materials Inspection Report Mt. Pleasant Village Revitalization – Phase II and III Demolition (Buildings 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 16, 17, 18, A) February 27, 2026. Freeman Companies, LLC (Freeman), conducted a pre-renovation asbestos inspection and lead-based paint screening, an inventory of caulks and glazings potentially containing PCBs, and an inventory of universal waste for Buildings 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 16, 17, 18 and A at Mt. Pleasant Village, located at 100 Richard Street in New Britain, Connecticut. Asbestos or vermiculite was found on various materials including, but not limited to floor tile and associated mastics, textured ceiling paint, window and door caulk, exterior soffit material, bathroom pipe insulation, tar between brick and foundation and assumed, based on historical documentation, underground pipe chases. Additional asbestos may be found in electrical wire housing, and interior furnace and water heater components. In accordance with NESHAP regulations in 40 CFR Part 61 Subpart M, building owners must remove all ACM from a facility (or area of a facility) before any activity begins that would break up, dislodge, or similarly disturb the ACM. Disturbance of asbestos-containing material can only be done by trained and licensed individuals and contractors. LBP was inventoried on only non-metal components, as metal components containing lead-based paint may be recycled at most metal recycling facilities. In the study, lead-based paint was found only on one set of plaster kitchen walls and two sets of wood trim components of the 24 units screened. Four window and door caulks were found to have the potential to contain PCBs. One of the caulks was also contained asbestos. All caulks must be removed from the building along with a portion of the adjacent substrate. The fluorescent bulbs and lithium batteries inventoried must be disposed of as universal 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. A noise study was done and found to be within HUD suggested limits.
Effect on existing land resources and landscapes, including coastal and inland wetlands;	No direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts.
Effect on agricultural resources;	Not any adverse impact on agricultural land is anticipated.
Adequacy of existing or proposed utilities and infrastructure;	Existing utilities are present on site and in the area.
Effect on greenhouse gas emissions as a direct or indirect result of the action;	Not any adverse impact is anticipated.
Effect of a changing climate on the action, including any resiliency measures incorporated into the action;	Based on the scope of the project, no climate change impacts are anticipated.

Any other substantial effects on natural, cultural, recreational, or scenic resources.	Not any adverse impact is anticipated.
Cumulative effects.	Based on the scope of the project, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in any cumulative impact on the environment. The project will provide additional affordable housing.

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

To our knowledge, there are no wetlands or watercourses on this site. No mapping or site visits suggest the existence of wetlands and/or watercourse on site. Per CT DEEP GIS Open Data Website's Soil Inland Wetland map of the Mount Pleasant Redevelopment, no part of the project is situated in a wetland. The Project's Civil Engineer suggests that neither the Federal Section 404 Clean Water Act, Inland, Water Quality Certification (WQC) nor State 401 Water Quality Permit are required. However, due to the Project's total acreage exceeding five acres, the development team will be submitting a Stormwater Pollution Control Plan (SWPCP) to DEEP, prior to construction, in pursuit of the General Permit for Stormwater from Construction Activities.

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.