



United States Department of Agriculture



28 North Main Street
Randolph, VT 05060



Minutes
First Public Meeting

**Farm Brook Watershed Sites 1, 2A and 2B
Supplemented Watershed Plan and Environmental Document
Hamden, New Haven County, Connecticut
Task Order 12SPEC18F0051**

Date: July 18, 2019
Start Time: 6:30 PM
End Time: 8:30 PM
Location: Clarion Hotel and Suites
2260 Whitney Avenue
Hamden, CT 06518

NRCS, DDK Engineering, and Sponsor Participants	
Kristin Walker	NRCS
Ben Smith	NRCS
Arthur Ramthun	NRCS
Jeffrey Tucker	DDK Engineering
Robert Shusko	DDK Engineering
Charlotte Brodie	DDK Engineering
Chris Sargent	DDK Engineering
Dan Biron	CT-DEEP
Charles Lee	CT-DEEP
Ramona Goode	CT-DEEP

Please see the attached Sign-In Sheet for listing of the public participants

The following items are attached to these minutes and are incorporated herein:

- Sign-in sheet
- NRCS presentation materials
- DDK Engineering presentation materials

1. Ms. Kristin Walker of the NRCS gave an introductory presentation regarding the following general topics:
 - a. The Public Law that resulted in the construction of the Farm Brook Flood Control Structures
 - b. History of flooding issues in the Hamden, CT area and the importance of the Farm Brook Flood Control Structures
 - c. Description of the NRCS Small Watershed Program
 - d. Brief history of the Farm Brook Watershed

- e. Explanation of changes that have occurred within the watershed and associated regulations that now require rehabilitation of the Flood Control Structures at Sites 1, 2A and 2B.
 - f. Introduction of Sponsors, CT-DEEP (Mr. Dan Biron and Mr. Charles Lee) and DDK Engineering
 - g. See attached presentation for additional details
2. Mr. Robert Shusko of DDK Engineering delivers a presentation including additional details concerning the process of developing a Supplemental Watershed Plan and Environmental Documents, and information on the three sites (Sites 1, 2A and 2B) as follows:
- a. Description of the Public Meeting Objectives
 - b. Rehabilitation planning and implementation process
 - c. Description of flood retarding structures (Site 1 vs Sites 2A and 2B)
 - d. Summary of Dam Assessment Results
 - i. Auxiliary Spillway crests are lower than 100-year, 24-hour flood elevation
 - ii. Site 1 dam overtops during 6-hour freeboard hydrograph design storm
 - iii. If the dam at Site 1 breaches, the dams at Sites 2A and 2B potentially overtop
 - iv. Potential for erosion of auxiliary spillways exists at Sites 1, 2A, and 2B
 - e. Project needs and purpose
 - i. Needs – Dams at Sites 1, 2A and 2B do not meet current NRCS design criteria and standards, and rehabilitation is needed to bring the dams into compliance with NRCS design criteria
 - ii. Purpose – Perform rehabilitation to reduce risks to life and property and maintain flood protection
 - f. Explanation of resource inventory results and associated evaluations, engineering evaluations, and data collection involved in the planning process
 - g. Descriptions and presentation of, pertinent data, resources and photos of Sites 1, 2A and 2B
 - h. Description of rehabilitation alternatives considered with assessment of the dams
 - i. Overtopping protection of dam at Site 1 (typically not supported by NRCS)
 - ii. Raising crest elevation of dams, may only need to be performed at Site 1
 - iii. Lower recreation pool at Site 1
 - i. Description of other rehabilitation alternatives under consideration
 - i. Increasing capacities of auxiliary spillways (enlargement or labyrinth weir)
 - ii. Armoring of auxiliary spillways (articulated concrete blocks – ACBs)
 - iii. Decommissioning of dams, which is not a likely option
 - j. Review of overall rehabilitation schedule that is subject to change
 - i. Collection and analyses of data to be completed at end of Summer of 2019
 - ii. Formulation and evaluation of alternatives to be completed by Summer of 2020
 - iii. Draft plan to be completed at end of Summer of 2020
 - iv. Second public meeting at the Fall of 2020
 - v. Final plan completed by Winter 2020
 - k. Summary of Future Actions
 - i. DEEP and NRCS will manage process moving forward

- ii. Additional public input will be requested once alternatives have been fully developed and a preferred option is identified
 - iii. Federal and State agencies will perform reviews of plan and environmental documents
 - iv. Once authorized by NRCS Chief, funds for design and construction will be requested
 - l. Public is encouraged to provide information and data to assist with the planning process
 - m. Contact NRCS or CT DEEP for additional questions
 - n. See attached presentation for additional details
3. The following issues, questions and comments were received and noted as follows:
- a. Erosion of the stream bank and stream migration is occurring upstream of Site 2A in Wilmot Brook near Goebel Road, noticed over the last 10-years. In some cases this has resulted in up to 75' of perceived property loss at some residences and destruction of a swimming pool from flooding.
 - b. Accumulation of Sediment at Site 2A is a concern, especially in the upstream portion of the reservoir, which may be attributed to erosion occurring near Goebel Road. Residents are concerned how this project may impact the duck pond sediment removal project.
 - c. Multiple residents expressed that decommissioning of the dams is not preferred or desired
 - d. A large tree was removed from a location west of the reservoir at Site 1, and it is requested to be replaced
 - e. A concern exists that the existing reservoirs and streams associated with the Sites 1, 2A and 2B are not being operated and maintained appropriately
 - f. The culvert near Howard Drive that connects the watersheds of Farm Brook and Wilmot Brook may not be large enough to convey storm flows
 - g. Concerns exist that groundwater levels may rise adjacent to the Site 1 reservoir as a result of pool level modifications, especially considering that some residents in the area have issues with basement flooding
 - h. Some of the public feels that issues and updates are not being communicated to the public in an effective manner. There is concern that not everyone received a letter announcing the public meeting.
 - i. Considering the limited depth at the reservoir at Site 1 (approximately 6 feet), the lowering of the recreation pool may have an adverse impact on aquatic life and recreation use. The pool supports a community of large mouth bass.
 - j. One resident mentioned perhaps the Site-1 pond could be excavated deeper, if coupled with a lower normal pool, it could result in additional flood capacity while still maintaining/improving habitat & water quality.
 - k. The alignment of the access road to Site 1 on Mountain Road negatively impacts one of the and consideration should be given to a realignment if this is to be used during rehabilitation
 - l. The former borrow area at Site 1 is indicated to be in poor condition and consideration should be given in improving conditions. Invasive control in these areas is desired

- m. Blooms of green algae reportedly occurs that maybe impacting water quality at Site 1. The reservoir emits a foul odor during summer months and fish kills have been observed.
- n. Tree trunks and an excavator are supposedly buried in the Site-1 normal pool.
- o. The west Rock Advisory Council would like to be included in discussions.
- p. Multiple local flooding concerns were brought up that are not directly affected by nor affect this project.