



STATE OF CONNECTICUT
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
OFFICE OF LONG ISLAND SOUND PROGRAMS



September 16, 1996

Mr. Joseph L. Alberti
Kasper Group, Inc.
968 Fairfield Ave.
Bridgeport, CT 06605

RE: Allied Signal Inc. - Stratford Army Engine Plant
Coastal Permit Application #199501267-DS

Dear Mr. Alberti,

Following review of additional information received May 28, 1996 some additional materials and information will be necessary before further review of your proposal can continue.

Please note that although it appears that the proposed repair work to the approximate 2,100 linear feet of riprap slope is justified it will be necessary to provide further justification and proof of the necessity for the proposed approximate 200 linear feet of riprap flood dike extension. Our approval of structural solutions to flood and erosion problems are statutorily limited to instances where structural alternatives are unavoidable and necessary to protect existing inhabited structures, infrastructural facilities or water dependent uses. Thus, in other situations, non-structural erosion control measures need to be considered (see section 22a-92 (b)(2)). It is incumbent upon the applicant to demonstrate that the proposed activity complies with statutory policies and standards. This office can't issue a permit if the proposal is inconsistent with state policies and standards.

To assist you in obtaining the authorization you seek, we have evaluated a couple of options. First, you may continue with the processing of the currently pending application. In order to fully evaluate your project and its impacts, the need for shoreline protection needs to be backed by documentation and demonstrations of the actual harm threatened to statutorily recognized uses and the lack of alternative means to address that threat. It is necessary to know the cause of flooding, erosion history, and the resultant danger from such flooding and erosion before any further review of this proposal can continue.

Alternatively, since the original submission of your application, statutory amendments have been adopted which extend eligibility under our abbreviated Certificate of Permission (COP) process to specified activities within tidal wetlands, including substantial maintenance of permitted structures. Rehabilitation of the 2,100 linear feet of riprap slope to its prior configuration would qualify as "substantial maintenance" as defined in section 22a-363a. Thus, you may wish to consider the possibility of dividing your pending application into two parts - a Certificate of Permission application for the 2,100 linear feet of riprap slope rehabilitation work and revising

the currently pending application to address only the proposed extension and any new spillway work and deleting all references to the rehabilitation work. This will allow expeditious authorization of the repair work.

Additionally, please be aware that a coastal site plan review for any shoreline and flood and erosion structures must be filed with the town pursuant to section 22a - 109(d) with a mandatory referral from the Town to this office. The policies articulated herein are applicable through the local board's review process in addition to all municipal criterion. Municipal evaluation must ensure that a proposed activity is consistent with all applicable goals and policies set forth in section 22a-92.

For your convenience, I have enclosed Certificate of Permission application materials for your review and use, should you decide to proceed with a COP application. Attached is a list of information which would be required to complete your pending application. Under either option detailed plans with revision dates which show all the tidal wetland vegetation on site as well as all tidal elevations must be provided to review your proposal. Please indicate to us in writing by October 16, how you want to proceed. If you are interesting in setting up a meeting to discuss your options or have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (860)424-3034.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Deborah Simon".

Deborah Simon
Environmental Analyst

enclosures
DS:lv

cc: Michael G. Flach

**MATERIALS REQUIRED TO REVIEW PERMIT APPLICATION
#199501267-DS, Stratford**

Items 1-6 must be submitted to pursue a permit for the new dike extension.

1. Please provide clarification of spillway work to be done. Will two new spillways be constructed as indicated on revised plans received by this office May 28, 1996? Please provide an estimate of materials required to complete this work. Plans were provided with your submission received May 28, 1996 but the plans did not indicate for which spillway the plans portrayed. If both spillways will be identical please label plans as such. Be advised that if the spillways are to be repaired to prior dimensions then work would qualify as substantial maintenance and could be authorized via the C.O.P. process is a change in dimensions will occur the spillway work must be authorized pursuant to the permit process.
2. Please provide in a chart or summary format a total of all materials to be used for this project. If the application is to contain both the new and old portions of the riprap areas please describe the materials for the new portion and the existing portion separately.
3. Please provide proof and justification of the necessity for the new riprap extension to the existing riprap slope. Examples of information that can and should be provided to prove the necessity for the extension includes: historic survey information that clearly indicates that flooding and/or erosion has occurred in the area of riprap extension, photographic evidence of any ongoing flooding or erosion, as well as an analysis of aerial photos depicting areas of flooding and erosion.
4. What inhabited structures, infrastructural or water dependent uses will the riprap serve to protect? How near are any structures to be protected to the riprap slope?
5. What storm event is the riprap structure designed for? What alternatives to this design have been considered?
6. Please revise sheet 9A of 10 to indicate where the cross-section on page 10 was taken from. Please provide an additional cross-section at the other end of the riprap slope. Clearly indicate the toe of the existing bank and also clearly indicate the toe of the proposed riprap slope. Indicate any structures in the vicinity of the proposed riprap slope.