September 18, 2018

POMPERAUG RIVER WATERSHED COALITION

Ms. Corinne Fitting
Department of Energy & Environmental Protection
Bureau of Water Protection and Land Reuse
79 Elm Street
Hartford, Connecticut 06106-5127

Subject: Pomperaug Basin Stream Flow Classification Comments
Submitted By: Pomperaug River Watershed Coalition

Dear Corinne,

The Pomperaug River Watershed Coalition (PRWC) is a 501c3 organization that was founded in 1999 in response to the increasing pressures that land development activities threatened to put on the local water supply. Since then, PRWC has evolved into a nationally recognized model for scientific investigation, municipal assistance, stakeholder collaboration, community education, and volunteer engagement. Today, PRWC's mission is to ensure the availability of high quality water in the Pomperaug River watershed communities in Litchfield and New Haven counties through the use of science and education. We share our knowledge and expertise with others committed to the protection of water resources for future generations.

PRWC commends the Department of Energy & Environmental Protection (DEEP) for the work that it has done to establish Connecticut's first stream flow classification rating. It has been tremendous effort on the part of DEEP professionals to manage the layers of data in an organized fashion to label the various stream segment classifications. PRWC applauds you and your colleagues for what has been presented to us for draft comment. We also thank you for your more recent assistance with providing us with the overlay maps that allowed us to complete our analysis.

PRWC has reviewed the proposed classifications within the Pomperaug Watershed (regional basin # 68) and have found most of them to be accurate based on our understanding of the rating system. We have identified several that by submission of these comments, we are requesting further study by DEEP. The basis for requesting your additional review is associated with our local knowledge and science-based familiarity with the watershed. These are either Class 3 or 2 segments that we believe may be able to be amended to a higher free flowing stream condition/classification.

To assist you with your review, PRWC's environmental analyst (Janel Chap) has developed the attached table with our comments. Please let us know if you have any questions. Once your review is complete, we would appreciate feedback on our comments.

Tel 203-263-0076 *www.pomperaug.org* *info@pomperaug.org*
39 Sherman Hill Road, Suite C-103, Woodbury, Connecticut 06798

Thank you once again for the work in preparing the stream classifications, for your assistance with our study of them, and for your receiving these comments.

Sincerely,

Len DeJong
Executive Director

C. Janel Chap, PRWC Environmental Analyst
Carol Haskins, PRWC Outreach Director

Additional Electronic Submittal to: deep.streamflowclass@ct.gov

Stream Segment ID	Name	DEEP Classification	Proposed Revised Classification	Reason
103,013,963	South Brook	Automatic 3	1	We question the dam metric value because the public water supply dam has been declassified.
103,013,934	South Brook	Automatic 3	Automatic 3 (Unchanged)	Needs a data correction. The public water supply dam has been declassified.
103,014,723	Transylvania Brook	3	3 (Unchanged)	Needs a data correction. The Training School waste water treatment plant no longer exists. Therefore, the return flow metric value should be a 1.
103,014,954	South branch of Bullet Hill Brook	2	1	We question the presence of a dam upstream of this segment, and, consequently, the dam metric value. We do not see a dam when we drive by this location. In aerial maps, it appears to be DOT stream engineering related to roadways.
103,014,784	South branch of Bullet Hill Brook	2	1	We question the presence of a dam upstream of this segment, and, consequently, the dam metric value. We do not see a dam when we drive by this location. In aerial maps, it appears to be DOT stream engineering related to roadways.
103,104,760 1030147607	Bullet Hill Brook	2	1	We question the presence of a dam upstream of this segment, and, consequently, the dam metric value. We do not see a dam when we drive by this location. In aerial maps, it appears to be DOT stream engineering related to roadways.
103,014,937	Pomperaug River	2	1	We question the presence of a dam upstream of this segment, and consequently, the dam metric value. We do not see a dam when we drive by this location. In aerial maps, it appears to be DOT stream engineering related to roadways. Also, there is a USGS Gage (#01204000) on this segment.
103,015,120	Pomperaug River	2	1	We question the presence of a dam upstream of this segment, and consequently, the dam metric value. We do not see a dam when we drive by this location. In aerial maps, it appears to be DOT stream engineering related to roadways.
103,015,217	Unnamed	2	1	We question whether the IBM dam upstream from this segment meets the requirements of a "large" dam and, consequently, the dam metric value.
103,015,232	Unnamed	2	1	We question whether the IBM dam upstream from this segment meets the requirements of a "large" dam and, consequently, the dam metric value.
103,015,182	Unnamed	2	1	We question whether the IBM dam upstream from this segment meets the requirements of a "large" dam and, consequently, the dam metric value.
103,015,254	Pomperaug River	2	1	We question (1) whether the southern IBM dam meets the requirements of a "large" dam; (2) the existence of the northern IBM dam because we do not see a dam when we drive by this location and in aerial maps, the structure appears to be DOT stream engineering related to roadways; and, (3) consequently, the dam metric value.
103,011,685	Unnamed	2	1	We question the impervious cover metric value because the upstream watershed is mostly agriculture and residential.
103,004,415	Unnamed	2	1	We question the impervious cover metric value because the upstream watershed is mostly agriculture and residential.
103,011,801	Unnamed	2	1	We question the impervious cover metric value because the upstream watershed is mostly agriculture, residential and undeveloped land.

Stream Segment ID	Name	DEEP Classification	Proposed Revised Classification	Reason
103,015,251	Pomperaug River	2	1	We question (1) whether the southern IBM dam meets the requirements of a "large" dam; (2) the existence of the northern IBM dam because we do not see a dam when we drive by this location and in aerial maps, the structure appears to be DOT stream engineering related to roadways; and, (3) consequently, the dam metric value.
103,015,173	Pomperaug River	2	1	We question (1) whether the southern IBM dam meets the requirements of a "large" dam; (2) the existence of the northern IBM dam because we do not see a dam when we drive by this location and in aerial maps, the structure appears to be DOT stream engineering related to roadways; and, (3) consequently, the dam metric value.
103,015,152	Pomperaug River	2	1	We question (1) whether the southern IBM dam meets the requirements of a "large" dam; (2) the existence of the northern IBM dam because we do not see a dam when we drive by this location and in aerial maps, the structure appears to be DOT stream engineering related to roadways; and, (3) consequently, the dam metric value.
103,015,056	Pomperaug River	2	1	We question (1) whether the southern IBM dam meets the requirements of a "large" dam; (2) the existence of the northern IBM dam because we do not see a dam when we drive by this location and in aerial maps, the structure appears to be DOT stream engineering related to roadways; and, (3) consequently, the dam metric value.
103,015,123	Pomperaug River	2	1	We question the impervious cover, return flow, and dam metric values. Regarding the impervious cover metric, the upstream watershed is mostly an Audubon center. With regard to the return flow metric, the Training School waste water treatment plant no longer exists. Therefore, this metric value should be a 1. Regarding the dam metric, we question (1) whether the southern IBM dam meets the requirements of a "large" dam and (2) the existence of the northern IBM dam. We do not see a dam when we drive by this location. In aerial maps, it appears to be DOT stream engineering related to roadways.
103,015,293	Pomperaug River	2	1	We question the impervious cover, return flow, and dam metric values. Regarding the impervious cover metric, the upstream watershed is mostly an Audubon center. With regard to the return flow metric, the Training School waste water treatment plant no longer exists. Therefore, this metric value should be a 1. Regarding the dam metric, we question (1) whether the southern IBM dam meets the requirements of a "large" dam and (2) the existence of the northern IBM dam. We do not see a dam when we drive by this location. In aerial maps, it appears to be DOT stream engineering related to roadways.
103,015,272	Pomperaug River	2	1	We question the impervious cover, return flow, and dam metric values. Regarding the impervious cover metric, the upstream watershed is mostly an Audubon center. With regard to the return flow metric, the Training School waste water treatment plant no longer exists. Therefore, this metric value should be a 1. Regarding the dam metric, we question (1) whether the southern IBM dam meets the requirements of a "large" dam and (2) the existence of the northern IBM dam. We do not see a dam when we drive by this location. In aerial maps, it appears to be DOT stream engineering related to roadways.

Stream Segment ID	Name	DEEP Classification	Proposed Revised Classification	Reason
103,015,799	Pomperaug River	2	1	We question the impervious cover, return flow, and dam metric values. Regarding the impervious cover metric, the upstream watershed is mostly an Audubon center. With regard to the return flow metric, the Training School waste water treatment plant no longer exists. Therefore, this metric value should be a 1. Regarding the dam metric, we question (1) whether the southern IBM dam meets the requirements of a "large" dam and (2) the existence of the northern IBM dam. We do not see a dam when we drive by this location. In aerial maps, it appears to be DOT stream engineering related to roadways.
103,015,050	Transylvania Brook	2	1	We question the return flow metric value because the Training School waste water treatment plant no longer exists.
103,015,005	Transylvania Brook	2	1	We question the return flow metric value because the Training School waste water treatment plant no longer exists.