State of Connecticut

Environmental Review Checklist

Last Updated 02/25/2020

Instructions for Use:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

State of Connecticut

Environmental Review Checklist

Last Updated 02/25/2020

PART I – Initial Review and Determination

Date:	6/30/2026
Name of Project/Action:	Wellington at Madison, Multifamily Housing
Project Address(es):	131 Cottage Road, Madison, CT
Affected Municipalities:	Madison
Sponsoring Agency(ies):	DOH
Agency Project Number, if applicable:	DOH23-0118-076
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 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 proposed project is multifamily residential for 31 housing units in six structures on a 2.86 acre site at 131 Cottage Road in Madison. Providing high quality rental housing to families with a range of incomes (80% affordable, 20% market rate) is the goal of the non-profit developer. The site design aims to create a neighborhood feel by incorporating the renovation of a historic home and barn and newly constructed condominium-style buildings centered around a village green area.

Description of the Proposed Action: The property is in a transitional zoned district and a high opportunity area within walking distance to neighborhood amenities including retail and commercial facilities and public transportation. The site plan includes a community center, parking, landscaping, and stone walkways and sidewalks. The project includes the renovation of the historic Henry Josiah Meigs House c1808-1810 which is listed on the State Registry of historic places. The State Historic Preservation Office has reviewed the work and has determined that there will be no adverse effects to historic resources. A property easement has been entered at the north edge of the site. The project will include on-site septic systems engineered to meet all local and state public health requirements. All other services will be provided by public utilities. The development has received local planning and zoning approvals from the town of Madison.

Although a portion of the site is currently in the 500 year flood plain, the actual ground elevations are above the 500 year flood elevation of 11.5 feet. Because of this discrepancy, an application has been filed for a FEMA Letter of Map Amendment. Obtaining a flood management certification from CT Department of Energy & Environmental Protection will be a secondary measure of flood safety if required. The ground floor finished floor elevations will be more than two feet above the 500 year flood plain and all new housing units will have dry and safe egress from the flood plain limits.

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.
Effect on a public water supply system;	The project will not have any negative impact on the public water supply system.
Effect on flooding, in-stream flows, erosion or sedimentation;	The site is partially located within a FEMA-designated floodplain. LOMA of removal from floodzone available.
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;	Natural Diversity Database (NDDB) letter available saying no negative impact.
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 is available from 2021 and found 4 Area of Concern. ASTs, lead in soil, pesticides in soil, septic leaching system. Lead and pesticides were remediated. ASTs were not identified from any historical record nor any release. No improper discharge to septic leaching system was identified. No further investigation was warranted.
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	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

regional or municipal land use plans;	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;	No direct, indirect or cumulative impacts are anticipated.
Effect on ambient noise levels;	No direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts.
Effect on existing land resources and landscapes, including coastal and inland wetlands;	No direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts.
Effect on agricultural resources;	Not any adverse impact on agricultural land is anticipated.
Adequacy of existing or proposed utilities and infrastructure;	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:

NA