Meeting Minutes

Meeting Date: January 20, 2004

Meeting Time: 10 a.m.

Meeting Place: SHA Fairland Shop

Attendees:

Name	Representing
Raja Veeramachaneni	SHA/HHD
Rob Shreeve	SHA/EPD
Heather Amick	SHA/PPD
Steve Elinsky	USACOE
Dan O'Leary	SHA/HHD/NMP
Greg Golden	DNR
Candy Bunnag	MNCPPC
Bill Schultz	USFWS
Doug Marshall	MCDEP
Roger Windschitl	SHA/KCI
Richard Heimbach	SHA/Skelly & Loy
Sarah Williamson	SHA/CRI

Today's Date: May 13, 2004

Subject: ICC Brown Trout Meeting

Minutes:

The purpose of the meeting was to further discuss Brown Trout issues, begin to review some of the designs being developed to address these issues, and receive comments on the designs and overall approach as they are developed.

Discussion:

1. Work group guidelines
    a. Would like to meet whenever there may be new information to present for review and comment.

b. SHA (R.V.) would like to expand scope of group somewhat to get feedback on other watersheds as SHA works to customize SWM for each watershed. This will also be addressed in other forums, but this group would have valuable insight.

c. MDNR (G.G.) suggested there may be areas of Use III waters where temperature is not the primary issue and trade offs for water quality might provide greater benefit to the stream, e.g. the lowest portions of the North Branch Rock Creek Use III stream reaches. Further interagency discussion, especially with local jurisdictions, is required to gain consensus on this approach within the work group.

d. Group would still benefit from participation from MWCOG (J. Galli). A letter is being drafted specifically asking for MWCOG's participation. It was suggested that MDE also be invited to the meetings so they were aware of any negotiations that affect the SWM package that will ultimately be reviewed by their office. They will be invited or at least provided with copies of all the minutes of the meetings.

e. MNCPPC (C.B.) suggested that copies of Brown Trout Meeting Agendas and Invitations be sent to Leo Galanko of MDPS. Leo coordinates SPA reviews for MCDPS.

f. SHA handed out a written draft of SHA's "Stormwater Management Approach to Water Resource Protection in the ICC Study Area".

2. ICC update (H.A.)

a. Public meetings were held in November. Two in Montgomery and one in PG. Over 900 total in attendance in Montgomery and over 100 in Prince George's. Comments seemed to center on natural resources, concerns by citizens along Alt. 2 that they had purchased homes with the understanding that ICC would follow Alt. 1, requests for bicycle trail for the length of the alignment and concerns over cost.

b. Schedule continues to move towards document hearings in November.

c. The Alternatives Retained for Detailed Study (ARDS) have been sent out to agencies for comment. Comments are due back this week with a final copy expected to be circulated by the 26th.

d. Tech reports will go to agencies in April/May.

e. More detailed design by Section Engineers is beginning this week.

f. Should be noted that the Brown Trout resource has been mentioned numerous times as an important issue by the Governor and the media. This group will be important in helping achieve the least impact practicable and will need to "think outside the box" to make this happen.

3. Typical Sections and SWM (R.V.)

a. Looking at two main typical sections: one with 26' median and one with a 50 foot median. In sensitive areas that do not lend themselves to traditional SWM

approaches, SHA is investigating the use of linear stormwater treatment that puts SWM along shoulders and within the median. The overall difference in the roadway footprint between the 26 foot and 50 foot median when linear stormwater treatment is included is less than 12 feet, which is negligible when considering the overall width of roadway.

b. SHA presented the SWM approaches for the Paint Branch watershed that are currently being developed. They rely primarily on linear infiltration practices including bioretention, sand filters and dry swales with an additional system to capture extra stormwater not infiltrated that will then be stored and/or routed away from temperature sensitive resources. SHA will look at the needs at each individual drainage point and choose the best type of facility for that site. A more traditional SWM approach will most likely be used in other watersheds with a few exceptions.

c. In general, ICC SWM strategy is to provide water quality treatment for 1-1/2 inches of runoff and detain the 1-year storm (2.6" rainfall) for slow release using MDE manual procedures for channel protection volume (Cpv). Result is expected to be reductions in the 10 and 100 year discharge rates as well.

d. Because drainage from bridge decks should bypass GH and GS, the bridges will likely have to be wider than usual (=> more impervious area) to accommodate storm flows on the shoulders without flooding the travel lanes.

e. DNR (G.G.) asked if medians (26 or 50 foot) could be transitioned back to "0" feet for the stream crossings. The answer is yes, but stormwater management becomes more challenging in those areas.

f. Details of the proposed infiltration system that were presented will be summarized by SHA (D.O.) in writing and provided to the NEPA team and this group.

g. MDNR asked which median design provides the most redundancy. Answer: wider median does, but this also has much higher construction and maintenance costs.

4. Alternatives for runoff treatment at Good Hope (GH) and Gum Springs (GS) (D.O. & R.V.): Looking at best way to deal with flows not infiltrated in the linear treatment facilities. They will be piped, but still looking at where they will discharge.

   a. Option 1: Water not infiltrated in GH watershed moved through trunk lines (perhaps a half-pipe across bridge) to discharge beyond lower Gum Springs into Paint Branch mainstem. Will look into options for modifying existing GS bypass pipe and the possibility of providing treatment of some of the runoff by enlarging two existing ponds between GH and GS.

   b. Option 2: Run ICC runoff away from GH to the west through deep pipe to discharge to NW Branch watershed. This pipe would have to be 50' in the ground to buck natural grade. For numerous reasons this does not appear to be a viable option because of required disturbance to bury pipe, long-term maintenance of the

pipe, and cost. Additionally, MDEP (Dan Harper/K. Van Ness) raised concerns about potential impacts to NW Branch tributary and downstream stream restoration plans. Impacts of concern would result from increased stream flows resulting from a drainage area diversion. Further discussion is required to resolve benefits and disbenefits of creating a drainage area diversion from Paint Branch to NW Branch.

c. Options 3: Pumping station to pump runoff away from GH to the west to NW Branch. At least three large pumps would be required to handle large stormflows. This option may have too many moving parts that could fail when they are most crucial. SHA is currently putting one in Frederick in a sinkhole situation because there are no other viable options. There they also have a large holding pond to facilitate the system, which couldn't be accommodated here without additional impacts. Cost of the Frederick system is 10 million.

d. Notes / Comments on Options

   i. USFWS (B.S.) noted that pumping seems too risky, as failure of could potentially mean a large release of stormwater that could wipe out the trout.

   ii. MDEP (D.M.) was concerned that piping runoff out of watershed might negatively affect streamflow. Particularly in the small tributary between MD 650 and GH where the road will impact a wetland that provides the primary baseflow to that small stream. Suggested that increasing infiltration at the MC Maintenance Depot might help maintain hydrology for the stream. SHA noted that the flow from the wetland would still be captured in a spring box and piped to maintain flow of the stream.

   iii. SHA (R.V.) stated that the goal of the proposed linear infiltration system is to replace the recharge that the impervious roadway removes at a minimum, so that the overall water budget for the watersheds is not changed.

   iv. USFWS (B.S.) stated that they would prefer that the hillsides north of the proposed road not be allowed to drain directly to GH because there were a number of areas that were acting as sediment sources. SHA should try to convey off-site water from those areas along with ICC drainage to discharge below GH and GS.

   v. MNCPPC (C.B.) noted that the open area where equipment and gravel is stored below Cavendish Drive will be restabilized as mitigation for Briggs Chaney Intersection and will also be planted so that it will no longer cause sedimentation. It may be possible to use some of this site for additional infiltration along with the plantings that are already planned. SHA will keep this in mind.

   vi. MDNR (G.G.) suggested that SHA look at the possibility for retrofitting the pond at Countryside (perhaps as ES) to improve treatment and/or

minimize thermal impacts there. SHA (D.O.) will contact MDPS to obtain any available information on Countryside pond.

vii. SHA (D.O.) said that SHA was looking in to the possibility of doing something on the tributary to Gum Springs to potentially bypass stormwater to lower Gum Springs. MDEP (D.M.) noted that Dan Harper has already identified that area for a retrofit and may already have a design there. D.O. said he would talk to D.H.

5. DEIS will include language about linear and traditional approaches to SWM.
6. Linear approach to SWM should be pursued in SPA along the Corridor 2.
7. North Branch of Rock Creek wetland system is a DNR Biodiversity Area and MCouncil will be voting on whether or not it should be a SPA soon.
8. Summary:
    a. In Upper Paint Branch SHA is proposing to go with this linear infiltration approach unless something new and even more effective is developed.
    b. For the entire ICC, will assess importance of temperature parameters and may use it elsewhere if needed. The remainder of the corridor would receive more conventional treatment.
    c. Where there are baseflow issues and wetland hydrology concerns, infiltration could be targeted if necessary or as stewardship.
9. Future Meetings:
    a. Fairland location is an improvement and acceptable to all.
    b. Will meet in two months (March) when more information should be available and sooner if there is something to be discussed.

Action Items:

- Send Meeting Minutes to MDE. Also include Leo Galanko MNCPPC Department of Permitting (240-777-6242).
- Develop written summary of linear infiltration approach for use in NEPA document and for those that did not attend.
- Talk to Dan Harper about Gum Springs retrofit plans.
- Get plans for Countryside pond.

Meeting adjourned.