



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

---

## MEETING MINUTES

**Date:** September 20, 2005  
**To:** Attendees  
**From:** Sarah Williamson  
**Subject:** ICC Small Drainage Crossings Field Meeting – Revised Meeting Minutes

---

On August 08, 2005, representatives from MDNR, MCDEP, MNCPPC, and consultants for SHA and MdTA met to follow up on an August 2004 meeting. The following were in attendance at the meeting:

Greg Golden	MDNR	410-260-8334
Doug Redmond	MNCPPC	301-650-4367
Tina Schneider	MNCPPC	
Matt Smith	Skelly & Loy	301-766-4236
Keith Van Ness	MCDEP	240-777-7726
Sarah Williamson	CRI	410-956-9000
Megan Roberts	CRI	410-956-9000

At the meeting in 2004, the group had reviewed the location of proposed culverts on Corridors 1 and 2 in relation to stream channel and fish community characteristics using GIS and County fish data and determined where fish passage was of particular concern. 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 purpose of the current meeting was to conduct a field visit to the sites categorized as “Fish Passage Needed” or “Further Investigation Needed” to either confirm the determination made in the 2004 GIS analysis or gather the additional information needed to place the crossing in one of the above categories.

The group visited the location of culverts 1 and 17 which are located in close proximity to each other on a tributary of Mill Creek. It was the opinion of the group that these culvert crossings should receive the Standard MDE Protocol and that additional measures would not necessarily be called for to meet a greater measure of passage design. This was based on the fact that the two culverts would be placed so close together, and the culverts are each proposed to be approximately 300 feet in length (based on updated information from the engineering team, culvert 1 would be 315’ long and culvert 17 would be 300 feet long). The stream is a headwater system and is likely to support mostly pioneer species. The culvert lengths are likely to diminish upstream passage and there would be little upstream habitat that would be accessible even with additional passage measures on the culverts.

The group then noted that all the remaining sites to be reviewed were located on Corridor 2, with the exception of two on Indian Creek in Prince George’s County. Because the state’s preferred alternative has been announced as Corridor 1, it was decided that it was not necessary to visit the Corridor 2 sites at this time. The primary meeting was then adjourned, though MDNR was still interested in reviewing the two sites in Indian Creek., which are outside of Montgomery County jurisdiction.

Upon review, culvert 136, which carries Bear Branch beneath I-95, was found to have an existing fish blockage at the downstream end. The concrete apron is cracked and falling into the stream which is three to four feet below the culvert invert. The stream runs through old mining land and is very entrenched and unstable. In addition, there is an in-line pond upstream of I-95, and Laurel Lake is located a relatively short distance downstream. MDNR asked that the crossing be listed as Standard MDE Protocol, but recognized that the further engineering analysis may determine that this protocol is not feasible given the existing conditions. With the existing impediments to fish passage just upstream, MDNR would not oppose the interagency consideration of a potential waiver. However, it was noted that extension of the culvert should include measures to stabilize the outfall and improve the unstable nature of the stream.

At culvert 140, MDNR requested Standard MDE Protocol, though it was noted that the culvert downstream at Muirkirk Rd. and the intermittent nature of portions of the stream might limit existing fish movement enough that if the culvert could not be buried to MDE guidelines, these conditions might preclude it as a priority for further measures.

cc: Rob Shreeve, SHA EPD  
Heather Lowe, SHA PPD  
Dan O’Leary, SHA HHD