Meeting Minutes

Meeting Date: March 19, 2004

Meeting Time: 1 p.m.

Meeting Place: SHA Fairland Shop

Attendees:

Name	Initials	Representing	Phone
Raja Veeramachaneni	R.V.	SHA/HHD	410 545 0412
Steve Elinsky	S.E.	USACOE	410 962 4503
Dan O'Leary	D.O.	SHA/HHD/NMP	410 545 8431
Greg Golden	G.G.	DNR	410 260 8334
Charlie Gougeon	C.G.	DNR	301 854 6060
Candy Bunnag	C.B.	MNCPPC	301 495 4543
Leo Galanko	L.G.	MCDPS	240 777 6242
Doug Marshall	D.M.	MCDEP	240 777 7740
Keith Van Ness	K.V.N.	MCDEP	240 777 7726
Barbara Rudnick	B.R.	US EPA	215 814 3322
Chuck Weinkam	C.W.	SHA/CRI	410 956 9000

Today's Date: March 24, 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. The question was raised from previous meeting minutes about how SHA would know where temperature is a concern, versus where water quality concerns may supercede temperature concerns, etc.
    a. G.G. responded by saying that in Upper Paint Branch (UPB) the concern is definitely temperature, whereas in North branch Rock Creek (NBRC) in the

"lower portion" concern for water quality may override temperature concerns (because there is not much stream length between where the ICC impacts would be and where the Use III designation downstream boundary is located).

b. K.V.N. mentioned that the DNR Biodiversity Area is just south of the ICC alignment in NBRC so minimizing impacts in that area should be high priority. Limits of Biodiversity Area can be obtained from Brian Bernstein.

2. Median Width Update (D.O.)

   a. D.O. informed the group that median widths being used in the engineering studies included 26 feet, 36 feet and 50 feet. The 26 foot median was being studied for use only in tightly constrained corridors such as neighborhoods, and the 50 foot was studied in all Special Protection Areas (SPAs). The 36 foot median was being studied everywhere else. The SPAs now include the Upper Rock Creek SPA, assuming that the Olney Master Plan is adopted.

3. Update on alignment studies in Good Hope:

   a. Infiltration is paramount, both from SHA and resource agency perspectives, however, given the design life of infiltration facilities, a stormwater management approach having a longer design life, less rigorous maintenance and higher pollutant removal efficiency may be preferable. SHA will include groundwater recharge and infiltration in stormwater management designs within SPAs.

   b. D.O. described the vertical alignments being studied, including one that places the roadway high point just west of the ICC bridge over Good Hope Tributary, causing about 2,000 linear feet of mainline roadway and ramps to NH Avenue to drain toward Northwest Branch. D.O. Asked if the change in drainage area caused by the highpoint location would affect the SPA boundary. C.B. answered that the SPA boundary would remain the same, and infiltration should be pursued in the area diverted so as not to remove groundwater recharge from the watershed.

   c. D.O. explained about the typical spring box that SHA uses to handle groundwater upwelling on roadway projects. The spring box was discussed as a means for addressing the spring on the south side of the MCDPW&T Maintenance Depot (Depot). MCDEP (D.M.) commented that the spring box outlet should be shaded and should not include riprap that may cause discharge temperatures to increase. Additionally, MCDEP has retrofitted the Forester Pond to mitigate thermal problems it caused on the same tributary. MCDEP has been monitoring temperature, biology and chemical data in this tributary for years.

   d. A project goal should be to replicate the groundwater recharge from the diverted drainage area even though the surface runoff from the same area would be diverted.

   e. MCDEP recommended that any spring box outlet be constructed underground in a stone trench so as to discharge via upwelling through the stone.

   f. C.B. asked if Depot impervious could be reduced and infiltration added. R.V. answered by saying that stormwater changes to the Depot would be viewed as

Environmental Stewardship. D.M. added that maybe some impervious surface at the Depot could be removed. C.B. commented that any impervious removal would be applied to the 10% impervious cap.

g. Should the Depot stormwater discharges cross the ICC into the Good Hope Tributary or should they be conveyed to Northwest Branch with the roadway stormwater?

   i. Keeping the outfall the same: Pro: maintenance of baseflow in trib. Con: Surface discharge that may have chlorides gets discharged to trib, infrequent storm flows (Q10, etc.) may affect stream stability.

   ii. Discharging to NW Branch: Pro: Surface discharge that may have chlorides bypass trib and Good Hope. Con: Baseflow may be reduced.

This topic needs more discussion in a future BTWG Meeting, after review of the MCDEP monitoring data and a field visit to the Depot.

4. Environmental Stewardship

   a. Piping Rock Road:

      i. Discharge entering mainstem is discolored. May be a result of runoff from construction near Safeway on MD 650: Needs water quantity and quality control.

      ii. Peachwood Park: Small park with parking area, tennis courts, basketball court, sitting right on a significant uncontrolled tributary. C.W. and others at Coastal Resources (CRI) are investigating.

   b. CRI staff is looking at Good Hope mainstem and tributaries throughout the watershed in effort to identify stream restaoration and stormwater retrofit projects, in concert with MCDEP efforts (past and on-going).

   c. K.V.N.: GIS from early Upper Paint Branch (UPB) studies shows uncontrolled paved areas. Schools and other areas may be uncontrolled or “under-controlled”.

   d. Reforestation of buffer areas could be considered as ES in Left Fork (LF), UPB.

   e. Thermal spikes occur upstream from Twin Ponds on LF, below trib confluence.

   f. Trout habitat areas (Good Hope, Gum Springs) should get higher ranking priority than others (Left Fork, Right Fork).

   g. ES Opportunities may include trout habitat improvements, e.g. removing blockages that inhibit or prevent access for spawning.

   h. K.V.N.: Is SHA planning to monitor to determine effectiveness of ES? May need to focus on monitoring needs in future meetings.

5. SPA Coordination.

   a. L.G., the SPA Coordinator for MCDPS attended this BTWG meeting to participate and determine if these meetings would suffice as SPA Preapplication or Coordination Meetings as required under the SPA process. L.G. stated that, like

other SHA planning projects, it is difficult to establish goals for a project that has multiple alignments still under consideration.

b. R.V.: All alignments and alternatives are being studied to equal depths at this time, so would broader water quality goals be more appropriate for this project than specific goals typically envisioned for development projects?

c. L.G.: The BTWG meetings are an acceptable means at present for documenting the process that SHA has undertaken to address stormwater concerns in the SPA watersheds. Additionally, the treatment train approach described for treating stormwater in the SPA should be documented.

Action Items and Disposition from Last Meeting:

- **AI:** Send Meeting Minutes to MDE. Also include Leo Galanko MNCPPC Department of Permitting (240-777-6242). **Disposition:** L.G. invited and in attendance at the 03/19/04 meeting. Minutes from previous meetings distributed for L.G. and all participants to review and comment.
- **AI:** Develop written summary of linear infiltration approach for use in NEPA document and for those that did not attend. **Disposition:** D.O. prepared a written description of the linear stormwater treatment approach for inclusion in the Natural Environment Technical Report (NETR) that was due in draft form to SHA reviewers on March 19, 2004. Once reviewed and approved by SHA, the NETR will be available for public comment.
- **AI:** Talk to Dan Harper about Gum Springs retrofit plans. Disposition: D.O. and C.W. have to meet with D.H. in the near future about ES opportunities in general, and Gum Springs will be on the agenda.
- **AI:** Get plans for Countryside pond. **Disposition:** K.V.N. suggested that we look at the temperature data from the vicinity of Countryside Pond to determine if discharge from it truly is a thermal impact on UPB mainstem before trying to retrofit. D.O. will follow up with Dan Harper and K.V. N on this.

Action Items This Meeting:

- **AI:** D.O. to get biodiversity area boundary from Brian Bernstein at KCI and pass on to Section Engineers.
- **AI:** SHA to obtain and review biological and chemical monitoring from downstream of the MCDPW&T Maintenance Depot and prepare to report to BTWG on findings.
- **AI:** SHA to organize a field trip for BTWG members to visit UPB watershed and discuss spring on Depot trib and ES opportunities.

Meeting adjourned.