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

ast Updated 02/25/2020

PART I – Initial Review and Determination

Date:	01/08/2021	
Name of Project/Action:	Roraback Pond Dam Removal	
Project Address(es):	410 South Road	
Affected Municipalities:	Harwinton	
Sponsoring Agency(ies): Agency Project Number, if applicable: Project Funding Source(s)/Program(s), if known:	CT Department of Energy and Environmental Protection CT DEEP Dam # 6609 An Allocation and Bond Authorization from Sec. 2(j)(1) Bond Commission Meeting on May 27, 2016 Item # 5	
Identify the Environmental Classification Document (ECD) being used in this review: \boxtimes Generic, or \square Agency-Specific		
\square 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: Indicate status of SHPO and/or NATHPO review.		

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 <u>Section 22a-1a-7 of the</u> <u>Regulations of Connecticut State Agencies</u> (RCSA).

Completed by: Daniel Biron, Senior Environmental Analyst

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:

Roraback Pond Dam is one of 264 state owned dams that CT DEEP is responsible to inspect and maintain. The removal of this dam and restoration to its original condition (pre-1940's) takes the dam off of DEEP's list and those limited resources can be directed to higher hazard dams around the state.

Description of the Proposed Action:

Remove earthen dam that was created to hold back water for a 1940's sportsman camp. The removal will return the area to its original condition and flow from intermittent streams into original wetland habitat.

Alternatives Considered:

Do nothing and continue funding maintenance and inspection of failing infrastructure.

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.	
Australia at a di accompania compania at a a consulatione		
Anticipated ownership upon project completion:	□ N/A, ⊠ State; □Municipal, □ Private,	
	☐ Other: Please Explain.	
Locational Guide Map Criteria:		
http://ctmaps.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/ii	ndex.html?id=ba47efccdb304e02893b7b8e8cff556a	
Priority Funding Area factors:		
☐ Designated as a Priority Funding Area, including	g □ Balanced, or □ Village PFA;	
☐ Urban Area or Urban Cluster, as designated by		
-	buffer surrounding existing or planned mass transit;	
☐ Existing or planned sewer service from an ado		
☐ Existing or planned water service from an ado	•	
☐ Existing local bus service provided 7 days a we	_ ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	
Conservation Area factors:		
☐ Core Forest Area(s), defined as greater than 25	50 acres based on the 2006 Land Cover Dataset;	
Existing or potential drinking water supply wat		
☐ Aquifer Protection Area(s);		
☐ Wetland Soils greater than 25 acres;		
☐ Undeveloped Prime, Statewide Important and/or locally important agricultural soils greater than 25		
acres;	, or rocarry important agricultural sons greater than 25	
☐ 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).		
Local, State, of 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;	There is a positive effect on water quality because it will allow the water to flow continuously and improve water chemistry. There would be no effect to ground water, but surface water is affected, because there is no more ponding of water behind the dam, which is a positive effect as well.
Effect on a public water supply system;	None
Effect on flooding, in-stream flows, erosion or sedimentation;	The impact on flooding is a positive one. The removal will prevent potential flooding issues by removing a neglected dam which may fail, that isn't entirely holding back water but isn't fully breached. Removing the dam will provide a regular flow of water to the downstream areas and result in natural sedimentation deposits, as opposed to the artificial deposits that a dam creates. No erosion issues associated with the dam removal.
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;	Roraback Pond dam was constructed in the early 1940's. The earthen berm that created the pond will be removed and any existing masonry will be left untouched. Prior to and as part of the creation of the fishing pond in the 1940's, Henry Roraback had demolished an existing structure in the foot print of where the pond now exists. CT DEEP obtained the property in 1981 as part of the Roraback Wildlife Management Area. In February of 1995 the building known as Roraback Lodge was destroyed by fire and demolished.
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;	Positive impact since freely flowing intermittent stream is likely to discourage algae blooms and aquatic invasive plants.
Use of pesticides, toxic or hazardous materials or any other substance in such quantities as to cause unreasonable adverse effects on the environment;	Not Applicable
Substantial aesthetic or visual effects;	None

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;	Not Applicable
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;	Not Applicable
Displacement or addition of substantial numbers of people;	Not Applicable
Substantial increase in congestion (traffic, recreational, other);	Not Applicable
A substantial increase in the type or rate of energy use as a direct or indirect result of the action;	Not Applicable
The creation of a hazard to human health or safety;	Not Applicable
Effect on air quality;	Not Applicable
Effect on ambient noise levels;	Not Applicable
Effect on existing land resources and landscapes, including coastal and inland wetlands;	The removal of this dam will restore the wetland area that was cut off by the installation of the soil berm to impound water for the purposes of creating the fishing pond.
Effect on agricultural resources;	Not Applicable
Adequacy of existing or proposed utilities and infrastructure;	Not Applicable
Effect on greenhouse gas emissions as a direct or indirect result of the action;	Not Applicable
Effect of a changing climate on the action, including any resiliency	Not Applicable

measures incorporated into the action;	
Any other substantial effects on natural, cultural, recreational, or scenic resources.	None
Cumulative effects.	Removal of a potential safety hazard.

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

CT DEEP Dam Safety Permit, 401 WQC and USACE Self Verification

PART VI – Sponsoring Agency Comments and Recommendations

The removal of this dam will benefit the community from an environmental and safety perspective.

PART VII - Public Comments and Sponsoring Agency Responses:

None