



2988 Solomons Island Road
Edgewater, MD 21037
410-956-9000
410-956-0566 (Fax)

MEETING MINUTES

Date: September 7, 2004
To: Attendees
From: Sarah Williamson
Subject: ICC Small Drainage Crossings

On August 19, 2004, representatives from MDNR, MCDEP, MNCPPC, and SHA met at the MCDEP offices to discuss resident fish passage through proposed small drainage crossings along the ICC Corridors. The purpose of the meeting was to review the location of the proposed culverts in relation to stream channel and fish community characteristics and determine where fish passage was of particular concern. The following were in attendance at the meeting:

Lonnie Darr	MCDEP	
Greg Golden	MDNR	410-260-8334
Dan O'Leary	SHA-HHD/NMP	410-545-8431
Doug Redmond	MNCPPC	301-650-4367
Matt Smith	Skelly & Loy	301-766-4236
Keith Van Ness	MCDEP	240-777-7726
Chuck Weinkam	CRI	410-956-9000
Sarah Williamson	CRI	410-956-9000
Alicia Youmans	MCDEP	240-777-7738

The group reviewed the GIS overlays of the SHA culvert and right-of-way information with the stream features and fish data from MCDEP. Prior to the meeting, both CRI and MCDEP had performed an initial review of these data layers and identified which culverts would most likely be a priority for fish passage. The group worked with these initial efforts and came to consensus on any discrepancies between the MCDEP and CRI efforts. In general, the group used four categories to identify the fish passage needs at each culvert as follows:

- **Not Applicable** - these culverts were proposed in areas with no stream channel or only small ephemeral channels and would therefore not require any fish passage considerations;
- **Standard MDE Protocol** – these culverts generally occur on streams with drainage areas smaller than 100 acres and/or with limited upstream habitat that would be available for fish after construction of an ICC Corridor. At these culverts, it is assumed that compliance with standard MDE requirements for burying of culvert bottoms wherever possible would meet the fish passage requirements at these sites;
- **Further Investigation Needed** – these culverts occur on streams where fish data, stream drainage area or design information provided for the crossing does not clearly indicate whether fish passage will be a priority. A field review of these sites will be set up to investigate the needs at these locations.

- **Fish Passage Needed** - these culverts occur on streams where fish data and/or stream drainage area indicate that passage of resident fish populations would be a priority for maintaining the biologic integrity of the stream. Standard MDE protocols for burying culverts at these locations would be investigated, but further design considerations may be needed if the buried bottom requirements could not be met or might not provide adequate fish passage due to the length of the culvert required.

The category assigned to each culvert during the meeting is provided in the “Current Status” column of the attached spreadsheet.

In addition to the crossings reviewed in the attached table, the group noted a few other crossings where culverts appear to be proposed that do not show up in this culvert data table. The first of these is at Station 151 on Corridors 1 and 2 on Mill Creek just west of Shady Grove Road. The group determined that this crossing would fall into the “**Standard MDE Protocol**” category as upstream habitat is limited by an existing SWM pond. The crossing of Buckhorn Branch by Corridor 2 at Layhill Road (Station 518) was categorized as “**Fish Passage Needed**” for any culvert extensions for the ICC. It was assumed that the Corridor 2 crossing of Northwest Branch would include an extension of the existing bridge, effectively retaining the existing fish passage at this location.

Based on the work completed at the meeting, ten sites were determined to require fish passage or further investigation. The group decided that they would meet again for a field review of these ten sites to provide additional information on these crossings to SHA. Due to the volume of project work in August and early September, it was decided that a date to meet would be determined at a later time; most likely late September or early October.

cc: Rob Shreeve, SHA EPD
Heather Lowe, SHA PPD