

APPENDIX P: PHASE II MITIGATION PLANS (UNDER SEPARATE COVER)



I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study

CA-5 STREAM RESTORATION DRAFT PHASE II MITIGATION PLAN April 2022



Federal Highway Administration MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Prepared By:





TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTE	RODUCTION1
	1.1	Overview1
	1.2	Study Corridors and the Preferred Alternative1
	1.3	Description of the Preferred Alternative
2	SITE	DESCRIPTION
3	TWE	ELVE MITIGATION PLAN COMPONENTS4
	3.0	Project Objectives
	3.1	Site Selection
	3.2	Site Protection Instrument5
	3.3	Baseline Information
	3.4	Determination of Credits14
	3.5	Mitigation Work Plan14
	3.6	Maintenance Plan19
	3.7	Performance Standards19
	3.8	Monitoring Requirements
	3.8.2	1 Visual Inspection/Photographic Documentation21
	3.8.2	2 Physical Stream Monitoring22
	3.8.3	3 Functional Uplift Stream Monitoring
	3.8.4	4 Stream Habitat Assessment
	3.8.5	5 Invasive Species Assessments
	3.8.0	6 Wetland Monitoring
	3.8.	7 Annual Report
	3.8.8	8 Agency Site Visit
	3.9	Long-term Management Plan
	3.10	Adaptive Management Plan
	3.11	Financial Assurance
	3.12	Advance Mitigation
4	REFI	ERENCES



LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Wetland Impacts	9
Table 2: CA-5 Stream Restoration Mainstem 1 & Mainstem 2 Riffle Dimensions	17
Table 3: Performance Standards and Methods for CA-5 Stream Restoration Goals	20
Table 4: Monitoring Summary/Timeline	21
Table 5: Structures to be Assessed	23
Table 6: Function Based Scores and Ratings	24
Table 7: Bank Height Ratio Performance Standards	25
Table 8: Entrenchment Ratio Performance Standards	25
Table 9: Riparian Vegetation Performance Standards	26
Table 10: Lateral Stability Performance Standards	28
Table 11: Bedform Diversity Performance Standards	29
Table 12: RBP Habitat Ranking Criteria	30

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 : I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study Corridors – Preferred Alternative	2
Figure 2: Preferred Alternative Typical Sections (HOT Managed lanes Shown in Yellow)	3

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix I	Attachment A	Rare Threatened and Endangered Species (RTE) Coordination
	Attachment B	Maryland Historic Trust (MHT) Coordination
Appendix II	Attachment A	Vicinity Map
	Attachment B	Stream Design Report (Under Separate Cover)
	Attachment C	Geoprobe Map and Logs
	Attachment D	Right of Entry Permits
Appendix III	Attachment A	Functional Assessment
	Attachment B	Mitigation Credit Report
	Attachment C	Mitigation Map
Appendix IV	Attachment A	Photo Station Locations
	Attachment B	Long Term Management Plan
Appendix V	Attachment A	Design Plans (Under Separate Cover)



1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Overview

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), as the Lead Federal Agency, and the Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Administration (MDOT SHA), as the Local Project Sponsor, are preparing a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for the I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study (Study). The I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study (Study) is the first environmental study under the broader I-495 & I-270 Public-Private Partnership (P3) Program.

This Final CA-5 Stream Restoration Draft Final Mitigation Plan has been prepared to support the FEIS and focuses on the analysis of the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative, also referred to as Alternative 9 – Phase 1 South, includes building a new American Legion Bridge and delivering two high-occupancy toll (HOT) managed lanes in each direction on I-495 from the George Washington Memorial Parkway in Virginia to east of MD 187 on I-495, and on I-270 from I-495 to north of I-370 and on the I-270 eastern spur from east of MD 187 to I-270. Refer to **Figure 1**. This Preferred Alternative was identified after extensive coordination with agencies, the public and stakeholders to respond directly to feedback received on the DEIS to avoid displacements and impacts to significant environmental resources, and to align the NEPA approval with the planned project phased delivery and permitting approach.

The purpose of the Final CA-5 Stream Restoration Draft Final Mitigation Plan is to present the existing conditions, an assessment of potential direct impacts of the Preferred Alternative to the Permitting Agencies and final mitigation, if applicable, for unavoidable impacts. This Final CA-5 Stream Restoration Draft Final Mitigation Plan builds upon the analysis in the Draft CA-5 Stream Restoration Draft Final Mitigation Plan, DEIS and Supplemental DEIS (SDEIS), and has been prepared to support and inform the FEIS.

1.2 Study Corridors and the Preferred Alternative

In the SDEIS, published on October 1, 2021, FHWA and MDOT SHA identified the Preferred Alternative: Alternative 9 – Phase 1 South to be consistent with the previously determined phased delivery and permitting approach, which focuses on Phase 1 South. As a result, Alternative 9 – Phase 1 South includes the same improvements proposed as part of Alternative 9 in the DEIS but focuses the build improvements within the Phase 1 South limits only. The limits of Phase 1 South are along I-495 from the George Washington Memorial Parkway to east of MD 187 and along I-270 from I-495 to north of I-370 and on the I-270 east and west spurs as shown in **dark blue** in **Figure 1**. The improvements include two new HOT managed lanes in each direction along I-495 and I-270 within the Phase 1 South limits. There is no action, or no improvements included at this time on I-495 east of the I-270 east spur to MD 5 (shown in **light blue** in **Figure 1**). While the Preferred Alternative does not include improvements to the remaining parts of I-495 within the Study limits, improvements on the remainder of the interstate system may still be needed in the future. Any such improvements would advance separately and would be subject to additional environmental studies and analysis and collaboration with the public, stakeholders and agencies.

The 48-mile corridor Study limits remain unchanged: I-495 from south of the George Washington Memorial Parkway in Fairfax County, Virginia, to west of MD 5 and along I-270 from I-495 to north of I-



370, including the east and west I-270 spurs in Montgomery and Prince George's Counties, Maryland (shown in both dark and light blue in **Figure 1**).



Figure 1 : I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study Corridors – Preferred Alternative

1.3 Description of the Preferred Alternative

The Preferred Alternative includes a two-lane HOT managed lanes network on I-495 and I-270 within the limits of Phase 1 South only (**Figure 2**). On I-495, the Preferred Alternative consists of adding two, new HOT managed lanes in each direction from the George Washington Memorial Parkway to east of MD 187. On I-270, the Preferred Alternative consists of converting the one existing HOV lane in each direction to a HOT managed lane and adding one new HOT managed lane in each direction on I-270 from I-495 to north of I-370 and on the I-270 east and west spurs. There is no action, or no improvements included at this time on I-495 east of the I-270 east spur to MD 5. Along I-270, the existing collector-distributor (C-D) lanes from Montrose Road to I-370 would be removed as part of the proposed improvements. The managed lanes would be separated from the general purpose lanes using pylons placed within a four-foot wide buffer. Transit buses and HOV 3+ vehicles would be permitted to use the managed lanes toll-free.



Figure 2: Preferred Alternative Typical Sections (HOT Managed lanes Shown in Yellow)

I-495 from the George Washington Memorial Parkway to east of MD 187





2 SITE DESCRIPTION

The Unnamed Tributary to Great Seneca Creek (referred to in this report as CA-5) stream restoration design project is located in Montgomery County, Maryland within Quince Orchard Valley Neighborhood Park. The Park is owned by Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC). This site known as CA-5 stream restoration site, is being used to fulfill partial compensatory mitigation for the I-495 & I-270 Merged Lane Study (MLS) under the I-495 & I-270 Public-Private Partnership (P3) Program. The Managed Lanes Study (MLS) is evaluating potential transportation improvements to portions of the I-495 and I-270 corridors in Montgomery and Prince George's County, Maryland, and Fairfax County, Virginia. "The purpose of the MLS is to develop a travel demand management solution(s) that addresses congestion and improves trip reliability on I-495 and I-270 within the study limits and enhances existing and planned multimodal mobility and connectivity. Efforts have been made throughout the planning process to avoid and minimize impacts to wetlands and waterways to the greatest extent practicable, while still achieving the goals of the MLS (CMP, 2020)." The CA-5 mitigation site includes the restoration of the CA-5 Mainstem 1 (WC7), Mainstem 2 (WC6) and two tributaries (WC9 and WC2) to Mainstem 1. The overall stream restoration of this site is 3,868 LF, with 3,637 LF suitable for mitigation credits, providing 721 functional feet in stream mitigation credit. Outlined below are the components of mitigation plan for the CA-5 Restoration site.

3 TWELVE MITIGATION PLAN COMPONENTS

1-495 & 1-270 Managed Lanes Study

In accordance with 33 CFR part 322 Compensatory Mitigation for Losses of Aquatic Resources dated April 10, 2008, and Maryland's required Phase II Wetland Mitigation Plan Checklist (January 23, 2020), the following section discusses the fundamental components that apply to the CA-5 stream restoration site. Site specific fundamental components (objectives, baseline information, determination of credits, mitigation work plan, maintenance plan, and monitoring requirements) are described below and supporting data is provided in the Appendices.

3.0 Project Objectives

The project objectives are to provide partial compensatory mitigation for the Maryland Department of Transportation (MDOT) State Highway Administration (SHA) I-495/270 MLS through stream restoration at CA-5 stream restoration site. The stream restoration goal will focus on achieving long-term stability throughout the mitigation reach. Because the Unnamed Tributary to Great Seneca Creek is Use Class I-P (Water Contact Recreation, Protect of Aquatic Life and Public Water Supply), the design will focus on improving habitat for fish and aquatic insects, in addition to providing overall functional uplift.

The primary objectives of this project are to:

- 1. Provide 3,079 LF of stream mitigation, providing 721 functional feet of mitigation credit
- 2. Increase floodplain connection
- 3. Provide a stable channel design
- 4. Increase bank stability
- 5. Stabilize groundwater seep and tributary headcut channels
- 6. Minimize the impact to adjacent trees and other natural resources
- 7. Provide consistent unit stream power to convey sediment through the stream reach

I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study



- 8. Stabilize the existing pond outlet and lower the overall pond elevation to create a functioning wetland habitat.
- 9. Provide diverse habitat for wildlife and other aquatic species

To achieve the goals and objectives of the stream mitigation, the design is proposing to repair and stabilize the eroding stream banks and alter the size and shape of the channel to minimize erosion. Reconnecting the stream to the floodplain will allow storm flows to be shifted to the riparian zone and slow water velocities within the channel, thus reducing erosive forces in the active channel. Instream structures are proposed to direct storm flows away from vulnerable banks and to provide grade control. Evidence-based hydraulic models and computations are used to verify the proposed design is stable. The stream banks and floodplain are proposed to be planted with native trees, shrubs, and grasses, which would provide shade and a variety of habitats for wildlife. The roots of these plants will provide stability to the restored streambanks and floodplain. These design elements are proposed to provide a stable, healthy stream and riparian zone that supports a diversity of wildlife and a sustainable ecosystem.

3.1 Site Selection

Site selection for mitigation sites located on publicly owned land was based on the traditional mitigation site search that is discussed in Section 5.4.1 of the Compensatory Mitigation Plan (CMP) (Final CMP, 2021).

Based on feedback from the regulatory agencies, the CA-5 stream restoration site was selected for restoration under the Public-Private Partnership (P3) Program as a site for partial compensatory mitigation for the I-495/270 MLS. The CA-5 stream restoration site is located in the federal Middle Potomac-Catoctin watershed (Federal HUC- 02070008). The proposed roadwork related to the I-495/270 MLS transects the Middle Potomac-Catoctin watershed. The CA-5 stream restoration site is located in the Maryland Seneca Creek watershed (8-digit watershed 02140208), which has been identified in the MDOT SHA TMDL Implementation Plan (Appendix I, Attachment A). As indicated in the TMDL Implantation Plan, Seneca Creek watershed was found to have impairments related to Ammonia (Total), Chlorides, Mercury in Fish Tissue, Phosphorus (Total), Sedimentation/siltation, Temperature, and Total Suspended Solids (TSS). Approximately 15,835 linear feet of stream was identified in Seneca Creek watershed as suitable for future restoration. The CA-5 stream restoration site was also chosen for its location on public land, located on Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) property. Upon site inspection approximately 3,927 linear feet of existing stream located within the identified CA-5 stream restoration site, was found in need of restoration and suitable for construction. However, approximately 600 linear feet of stream is located on property owned by The Potomac Electric Power Company (PEPCO) and will not be counted towards mitigation credit.

3.2 Site Protection Instrument

Pursuant to the Maryland Nontidal Wetlands Protection Act Rules (COMAR 26.23.04), and the Federal Clean Water Act, plus its implementing regulations at 33 CFR Part 332.7(a), the CA-5 stream restoration site will be protected to ensure conservation in perpetuity. The majority of the property for CA-5 stream restoration site is owned by M-NCPPC. M-NCPPC has signed a right of entry agreement on August 2, 2018 and extended it through November 2021. Once the design is approved a park permit will be obtained prior to construction, to allow access to the site and construction of the project. M-NCPPC and MDOT SHA have



developed a long-term agreement that will allow MDOT SHA future access to monitor and maintain the restored stream segment. After the completion of the monitoring period M-NCPPC will maintain the site in perpetuity. A small portion of the project area is on property owned by PEPCO, under a current utility easement. This portion of the project will be included as part of the stream restoration project but will not be included in the mitigation credit for the site, since the property cannot be placed under an easement to preserve conservation for perpetuity. An initial Right of Entry Permit was obtained to assess the PEPCO site. The site will only be granted temporary construction and post-construction monitoring access and will not specifically be included in the site protection instrument. Current access permits are provided in Appendix II.

M-NCPPC

Montgomery County M-NCPPC mitigation sites are already considered protected by park policies and M-NCPPC does not encumber properties with deed restrictions on parkland mitigation sites. M-NCPPC mitigation sites will be protected in accordance with M-NCPPC Montgomery County's integrated natural resource management plan, Natural Resource Management Plan for Natural Areas in M-NCPPC Parkland in Montgomery County, Maryland. This plan published in February 2013 requires preservation and conservation of natural areas and wetlands like the proposed mitigation sites. This protection has been successfully used and accepted by USACE and MDE to preserve M-NCPPC mitigation sites on past projects.

The proposed mitigation sites would be considered environmentally sensitive areas in Natural Resource Management Plan for Natural Areas in M-NCPPC Parkland in Montgomery County, Maryland and are protected park resources. The following goals, visions and legal protection are identified in the plan.

- 1. M-NCPPC Montgomery County Mission: Protect and interpret our valuable natural and cultural resources; balance the demand for recreation with the need for conservation; offer a variety of enjoyable recreational activities that encourage healthy lifestyles; and provide clean, safe, and accessible places for leisure-time activities.
- Goal 11 of the Vision 2030 Strategic Plan: Inventory, conserve, and enhance ecologically healthy and biologically diverse natural areas with a focus on Park Best Natural Areas, Biodiversity Areas, and Environmentally Sensitive Areas as defined in the Land Preservation, Parks, and Recreation Plan (M-NCPPC, 2005).
- 3. Environmental Guidelines for Management and Development in Montgomery County Parks: "...the Montgomery County General Plan and local area master plans articulate County-wide and planning area-wide goals, objectives, principles, and policies to protect sensitive areas from the adverse effects of development, as required by the Annotated Code of Maryland Article 66B.

3.3 Baseline Information

The CA-5 stream restoration site is located in the Quince Orchard Valley Neighborhood Park. The Project Area Vicinity/Location Map is included in Appendix II, Attachment A. The existing conditions of the proposed mitigation area are briefly described below. Further detailed information is included in the Semi-Final Design Report, wetland delineation memo, and forest stand delineations and specimen tree survey memo in Appendix II (Attachments B-D).



The study area on CA-5 stream restoration site extends from where stream enters the eastern edge of M-NCPPC property in Quince Orchard Terrace Neighborhood Park to the confluence of the CA-5 stream restoration site and another unnamed tributary to Great Seneca Creek, near the western edge of M-NCPPC property, spanning between Suffolk Terrace and Sioux Lane. Photo documentation and existing on-site resources of the study area can be found in the Semi-Final Design Report (3/2021).

The CA-5 stream restoration site consists of three tributaries to Great Seneca Creek within the Seneca Creek Watershed (Maryland 8-digit watershed 02140208), which outlets to the Potomac River and eventually to the Chesapeake Bay. Great Seneca Creek is 21.5 miles long and travels through Montgomery County, Maryland. Great Seneca Creek begins in Damascus, roughly forty miles west of Baltimore City.

The river flows southwest through Germantown, Gaithersburg, and Seneca Creek State Park before converging with Little Seneca Creek to form Seneca Creek. The CA-5 stream restoration site joins Great Seneca Creek approximately 1,500 LF downstream of the study area, in Gaithersburg.

The watershed is characterized by runoff and sediment deposition from historical land clearing for agricultural production and current residential communities. With increased runoff due to land clearing and development the study reach receives increased flashier flows events. These events over time have caused severe erosion in portions of the site. Additionally, the runoff from the surrounding residential area brings nutrients and other pollution that ultimately decrease water quality and harm the aquatic species. The surrounding neighborhoods were constructed in the 1970's and 1980's prior to the adaptation of SWM requirements in Maryland.

The CA-5 stream restoration site is designated under the Maryland Stream Classification system as a Use I-P stream, prohibiting instream construction between March 1 and June 15, inclusive, during any year. The Seneca Creek Watershed is listed as impaired for several parameters including total suspended solids (TSS), nitrogen, phosphorus, chloride, and ammonia (MDE, 2018). The CA-5 stream restoration site watershed has approved TMDLs for Phosphorus (2010) and Total Suspended Solids (TSS; 2010 and 2011). In 2010 there was an approved Category 5 impairment for Chloride in CA-5 stream restoration site watershed (2018 Integrated Report).

The total drainage area to the downstream end of the CA-5 stream restoration site is 0.25 square miles (160 acres). The land use throughout the watershed varies, but the majority is mixed forest, mediumdensity residential, and institutional. Based on the 2010 Maryland Department of Planning (MDP) Land Use data (MDP, 2010) most common land use in the watershed is medium-density residential, which accounts for 76% of the total area. Forest land cover accounts for approximately 13% of the watershed, with industrial covering 9% and high-density residential the remaining 2%. Impervious area accounts for 35% of the watershed (GISHydro, 2010), which is much higher than the 15% threshold required for classification as an impaired urban watershed (Maryland Hydrology Panel, 2016).

The study reach is located within the Piedmont physiographic province of middle Montgomery County. The Piedmont physiographic province is comprised of mostly clay covered by a thin layer of rocky surface soil (MDP, 2010). The overall drainage area to the site is characterized predominately by Glenelg and Gaila silt loams, both well drained soils, and Travilah silt loam, a somewhat poorly drained soil. The study watershed is composed of B, C, and C/D soils (USDA, 2017). Hydrologic Soil Group map are included in the Semi-Final Design Report, Appendix II, Attachment B.



During the geomorphic assessment, the CA-5 stream restoration site was split into Reaches 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5/Mainstem 2. Two tributaries were also evaluated. A reach map has been included in Appendix II, Attachment A. Reach 1 extends from the M-NCPPC property line downstream to the confluence with the first tributary. Reach 2 extends from the first tributary to a significant change in valley slope where the valley gets steeper, and the stream drops over a bedrock control and gets significantly more incised. Reach 3 extends from the bedrock control to just upstream of the confluence with the second tributary, where the channel sinuosity increases significantly, and the slope decreases significantly. Reach 4 extends to the end of the study reach at the confluence with the unnamed tributary to Great Seneca Creek. Reach 5/Mainstem 2 begins just downstream of a Montgomery County DEP SWM facility outfall, continues through PEPCO ROW, and ends at Reach 4. The Tributary 1 begins at the outlet of a 36" RCP and extends to the confluence of Reach 1 and 2). The Tributary 2 begins at the southern boundary of M-NCPPC property and extends to Reach 4.

The overall slope (Reaches 1-4) of the channel is 2.1% however, the existing longitudinal profile is concave. There are steep slopes in Reach 1 that slowly gets less steep as you go downstream. The varying slopes appear to be the result of historic downcutting that has reached an equilibrium in the upper reaches where the stream has cut down to boulder and bedrock. The three upstream reaches have higher slopes and are able to effectively move sediment from the eroding banks through the reaches. The bank heights are lowest in the upper reaches, and highest in Reach 3 where the greatest downcutting has occurred. The slope flattens out significantly at the top of Reach 4, where additional excess sediment from Tributary 2 is also added to the stream. The change in slope along with the additional bedload has caused significant instability within this area. Reach 5/Mainstem 2 has an overall slope of 0.97% and is characterized by large floodplain terraces and defined channel benches. The existing channel is comprised mainly of medium sized gravels with the addition of small cobbles present. A small outfall protection area is present at the start of the reach protecting the downstream channel from outflows from the SWM facility.

Maryland Stream Waders volunteer stream monitoring program, site 857-5-2001 is located 0.31 miles downstream of the confluence of the CA-5 stream restoration site study reach within a tributary to Great Seneca Creek. In 2001, this site received a Benthic Index of Biotic Integrity (BIBI) Rating of Poor (1.57). Twelve different taxa of macroinvertebrates were found at this site, including three EPT taxa. EPT are the generally intolerant insect orders of Ephemeroptera (mayflies), Plecoptera (stoneflies), and Trichoptera (caddisflies). This value summarizes taxa richness with macroinvertebrates that are considered to be sensitive to pollution and therefore, a lower number of taxa within the sample suggests poor water quality conditions (Stribling, *et al.* 1998).

There are three MBSS monitoring sites along different tributaries within approximately a two mile radius from the CA-5 stream restoration site. In order to report biological data that could closely compare to what may be found in the study reach, a site with a similar watershed size, land use, and soils was selected. MBSS site SENE-101-R-2001 is located along an unnamed tributary to Great Seneca Creek, about two miles northwest of the CA-5 stream restoration site. The drainage area for this site is 0.15 square miles. Site SENE-101-R-2001 received a Fish Index of Biotic Integrity (FIBI) score of Poor (1.3). The sample included 68 Eastern Blacknose Daces (*Rhinichthys atratulus*); a species tolerant to pollution. No other fish species was collected. SENE-101-R-2001 also received a Poor BIBI rating (2.0).



Physical habitat was assessed at this site during the 2001 study using MBSS protocols, which included visual assessments of various parameters. Aquatic habitat assessment methods are based on the Environmental Protection Agency's Rapid Bioassessment Protocol (RBP) (Barbour *et al.* 1999) and modified for use in Maryland streams. This protocol assigns a value out of 20 to each parameter. At site SENE-101-R-2001 instream habitat received a score of 9 (marginal), epifaunal substrate was scored at 14 (suboptimal), velocity/depth diversity a 6 (marginal), pool quality a 4 (poor), and riffle run quality a 7 (marginal). Shading for this site was 92% with an embeddedness of 10%. A more detailed description of the evaluation reaches, pre-construction photos documentation, and a site sketch is included in the Semi-Final Design Report, Appendix II, Attachment B.

A wetland delineation was conducted on March 24th, March 27th, and November 10th, 2020. During the field investigations, 18 waters of the U.S., including wetlands, were identified within the study area. The Wetland Delineation Memo is provided in Appendix II Attachment B, Appendix C.

There are four wetlands that will be permanently impacted and three wetlands that will be temporarily impacted by the project. Wetland impacts are noted in **Table 1** below.

Wetland	Туре	Wetland Impact (SF)	Wetland Impact (AC)
WL-4	PFO	177	<.01
WL-6	PFO	995	0.02
WL-7	PEM	349	0.01
WL-8	PEM	2,029	0.05
Total		3,550	0.08

Table 1: Wetland Impacts

Permanent Wetland Impacts

Wetland	Туре	Wetland Impact (SF)	Wetland Impact (AC)
WL-2	PFO	618	0.01
WL-3	PFO	1,042	0.02
WL-6	PEM	683	0.02
	Total	2,343	0.05

Impacted wetlands are described below.

Wetland 2 (WL2) is a floodplain wetland located in the eastern portion of the study area that abuts WC3. Test plot WTP-2 characterizes this system, which is classified as a PFO1B wetland. Primary hydrologic indicators observed during the site visit included surface water, drift deposits, and water-stained leaves. Based on the dominance test for hydrophytic vegetation, 67 percent of the dominant species within the test plot were considered OBL, FACW, or FAC. Dominant species within the sampling plot included ash-

leaf maple, red maple, wine raspberry (Rubus phoenicolasius), rambler rose (Rosa multiflora), Japanese stilt grass, and small-spike false nettle (Boehmeria cylindrica). Soils in the wetland are mapped as Brinklow-Blocktown channery silt loam, which is considered predominantly hydric by NRCS. Soil samples met the Redox Dark Surface (F6) hydric soil indicator. Potential functions and values provided by this wetland include floodflow alteration, sediment/toxicant retention, nutrient removal, wildlife habitat, recreation, education/scientific value, and uniqueness/heritage.

Wetland 3 (WL3) is a floodplain wetland located in the western portion of the study area that abuts WC4 and WC5. Test plot WTP-3 characterizes this system, which is classified as a palustrine forest wetland with a temporarily flooded water regime (PFO1A). Primary hydrologic indicators observed during the site visit included surface water, a high-water table, saturation, and water-stained leaves. Based on the dominance test for hydrophytic vegetation, 67 percent of the dominant species within the test plot were considered OBL, FACW, or FAC. Dominant species within the sampling plot included river birch (Betula nigra), eastern cottonwood (Populus deltoides), rambler rose, Japanese barberry (Berberis thunbergii), Japanese stilt grass, and small-spike false nettle. Soils in the wetland are mapped as Codorus silt loam, which is considered predominantly non-hydric by NRCS. However, soil samples met the Depleted Matrix (F3) hydric soil indicator. Potential functions and values provided by this wetland include floodflow alteration, wildlife habitat, recreation, education/scientific value, and uniqueness/heritage

Wetland 4 (WL4) is an oxbow wetland located in the western portion of the study area that abuts WC6. Test plot WTP-4 characterizes this system, which is classified as a PFO1A wetland because it is an emergent wetland within a forested setting with approximately 60 percent canopy cover. Primary hydrologic indicators observed during the visit included a high-water table, saturation, and water-stained leaves. Based on the dominance test for hydrophytic vegetation, 100 percent of the dominant species within the test plot were considered OBL, FACW, or FAC. The dominant species within the sampling plot was sweet wood-reed (Cinna arundinacea). Soils in the wetland are mapped as Codorus silt loam, which is considered predominantly non-hydric by NRCS. However, soil samples met the Depleted Matrix (F3) hydric soil indicator. Potential functions and values provided by this wetland include floodflow alteration, sediment/shoreline stabilization, wildlife habitat, recreation, educational/scientific value, and uniqueness/heritage.

Wetland 6 (WL6) is a floodplain wetland located in the eastern portion of the study area adjacent to WC7. Test plot WTP-6 characterizes this system, which is classified as a PFO1A wetland. Primary hydrologic indicators observed during the visit included saturation and water-stained leaves. Based on the dominance test for hydrophytic vegetation, 100 percent of the dominant species within the test plot were considered OBL, FACW, or FAC. Dominant species within the sampling plot included red maple, ash-leaf maple, and Japanese stilt grass. Soils in the wetland are mapped as Baile silt loam, which is considered predominantly hydric by NRCS. Soil samples met the Redox Dark Surface (F6) hydric soil indicator. Potential functions and values provided by this wetland include floodflow alteration, sediment/toxicant retention, nutrient removal, sediment/shoreline stabilization, wildlife habitat, recreation, educational/scientific value, and uniqueness/heritage.

Wetland 7 (WL7) is a wetland bench located in the southwestern portion of the study area abutting WC6. Test plot WTP-7 characterizes this system, which is classified as a palustrine emergent wetland with a seasonally saturated water regime (PEM1B). Primary hydrologic indicators observed during the visit



included high water table, saturation, geomorphic position, and the FAC Neutral test. Based on the dominance test for hydrophytic vegetation, 100 percent of the dominant species within the test plot were considered OBL, FACW, or FAC. Dominant species within the sampling plot included leafy bulrush (Scirpus polyphyllus), Japanese stilt grass, rice cut grass (Leersia oryzoides), and small carp grass (Arthraxon hispidus). Soils in the wetland are mapped as Codorus silt loam, which is considered predominantly hydric by NRCS. Soil samples met the Depleted Matrix (F3) hydric soil indicator. Potential functions and values provided by this wetland include groundwater recharge/discharge, floodflow alteration, and wildlife habitat.

Wetland 8 (WL8) is a wetland bench and oxbow located in the southwestern portion of the study area abutting WC6. Test plot WTP-8 characterizes this system, which is classified as a PEM1A. Primary hydrologic indicators observed during the visit included drainage patterns and geomorphic position. Based on the dominance test for hydrophytic vegetation, 100 percent of the dominant species within the test plot were considered OBL, FACW, or FAC. Dominant species within the sampling plot included Japanese stilt grass. Soils in the wetland are mapped as Codorus silt loam, which is considered predominantly hydric by NRCS. Soil samples met the Depleted Matrix (F3) hydric soil indicator. Potential functions and values provided by this wetland include groundwater recharge/discharge, floodflow alteration, and wildlife habitat, recreation, education/scientific value, and uniqueness/heritage.

Eight waters of the US will be restored for this project. The approximate restored area is 3,927 LF (68,121 SF).

Watercourse 2 (WC2) is an ephemeral and perennial tributary to Watercourse 7 (WC7) with a cobble, gravel, and sand substrate (R3UB1/2). WC2 is located in the eastern portion of the study area and flows south from a culvert into WC7. The average channel width is four feet and channel depth ranges from one to three feet, respectively. During the site visit, the average water depth was variable throughout the reach, ranging from one to six inches. Habitat complexity was considered poor due to a general lack of stable habitat and having primarily shallow runs. Overall, bank erosion was considered minor with a small area of scour downstream of the foot bridge. Approximately 90 percent of the channel was shaded by woody species.

Watercourse 3 (WC3) is an intermittent tributary to WC7 with a cobble, gravel, and sand substrate (R4SB3/4). WC3 is located in the eastern portion of the study area and flows southwest from Wetland 2 (WL2) into WC7. The average channel width and depth are six and three feet, respectively. During the site visit, the average water depth was two inches. Habitat complexity was considered poor, as instream habitat was lacking. Overall, bank erosion was severe as the banks are actively eroding. Approximately 70 percent of the channel was shaded by woody species.

Watercourse 5 (WC5) is an intermittent tributary to WC7 with a gravel and sand substrate (R4SB3/4). WC5 is located in the western portion of the study area and flows west from Wetland 3 (WL3) to WC7 outside the study area. The average channel width and depth are three feet and one foot, respectively. During the site visit, the average water depth was three inches. Habitat complexity was considered marginal as there were shallow flows, but the stream had some root wads and leaf packs throughout. Overall, bank erosion was moderate as there was some scour throughout. Approximately 60 percent of the channel was shaded by woody species.

OP LANES



Watercourse 6 (WC6) is a perennial tributary to WC7 with a cobble, gravel, and sand substrate (R3UB1/2). WC6 is located in the western portion of the study area and flows northwest from outside the study area into WC7. The average channel width ranges from eight to 20 feet and the channel depth is four feet. During the site visit, the average water depth ranged from one to 10 inches. Habitat complexity was considered marginal as there was some stable woody debris and undercut banks, however the substrate within the riffles was mostly gravel. Overall, bank erosion was moderate but severe along meanders. Approximately 60 percent of the channel was shaded by woody species.

Watercourse 7 (WC7) is an unnamed, perennial tributary to Great Seneca Creek with a cobble, gravel, and sand substrate (R3UB1/2). WC7 enters the study area at the eastern end and flows west through the study area. The average channel width ranges from eight to 20 feet and the channel depth is four feet. During the site visit, the average water depth ranged from one to 12 inches. Habitat complexity was considered marginal as there was limited flow diversity, short riffles with mostly gravel substrate, and some large woody debris. Overall, bank erosion was moderate throughout most of the stream, however severe erosion was present along meanders and at some confluences with tributaries. Approximately 75 percent of the channel was shaded by woody species.

Watercourse 8 (WC8) is an intermittent tributary to WC7 with boulder, cobble, and gravel substrate (R4SB3/4). WC8 flows northwest from an old farm pond (WC10) into WC7. The average channel width and depth ranges from one to two feet. During the site visit, the average water depth was two inches. Habitat complexity was considered marginal as there was some larger boulders however the stream is subject to intermittent flows and lacked other stable habitat. Overall, bank erosion was minor with slight erosion present at the confluence with WC7. Approximately 75 percent of the channel was shaded by woody species.

Watercourse 9 (WC9) is an ephemeral and intermittent tributary to WC7 with cobble, gravel, and sand substrate (R4SB3/4). WC9 flows north from outside the study area into WC7. The average channel width ranges from four to 15 feet and the channel depth ranges from one to seven feet. During the site visit, the average water depth ranged from zero to three inches. Habitat complexity was considered poor as the stream was lacking stable habitat and is subject to ephemeral and intermittent flows. Overall, bank erosion was severe in the intermittent portion of the stream and minor to moderate in the ephemeral portion. In addition, a water or sewer line was exposed within the intermittent portion of the stream. Approximately 75 percent of the channel was shaded by woody species.

Watercourse 10 (WC10) is an old farm pond that is classified as palustrine open water (POW) by USACE and as a perennial waterway by MDE. This pond is in the southern floodplain of WC7 and drains north to WC8.

A forest stand delineation and specimen tree survey were conducted on March 27th, April 9th, and November 10, 2020. A total of four upland forest stands (A, B, C and D) and 49 specimen trees were identified within the study area, which includes the wetland buffers and the 100 year floodplain.

Stand A is a tuliptree – Eastern cottonwood forest occurring along the western floodplain of the CA-5 study area. The canopy of this early-mid successional forest is primarily in the 6-11.9" DBH size class and is dominated by tuliptree (*Liriodendron tulipifera*), ranging from 6-20" DBH and Eastern cottonwood (*Populus deltoides*), ranging from 10-18" DBH. Co-dominant species include red maple (*Acer rubrum*), American sycamore (Platanus occidentalis), ash-leaf maple (*Acer negundo*), and black cherry (Prunus



serotina). Sixteen (16) specimen trees occur within this stand and canopy closure is approximately 70 percent. The understory contains saplings of red maple and ash-leaf maple, in addition to Japanese barberry (*Berberis thunbergii*), Autumn-olive (*Elaeagnus umbellata*), Japanese honeysuckle (Lonicera japonica), wine raspberry (*Rubus phoenicolasius*), rambler rose (*Rosa multiflora*), and Northern spicebush (Lindera benzoin). Dominant herbaceous species include Japanese stilt grass (*Microstegium vimineum*), crow garlic (*Allium vineale*), an unknown violet species (Viola sp.), and sweet wood-reed (*Cinna arundinacea*). Invasive species cover was moderate, with 40 percent invasive cover in the understory and 35 percent invasive ground cover. Downed woody debris is a common feature throughout this stand. Overall, Stand A is in good condition, as the stand is diverse with multiple canopy layers, and the moderate invasive cover that has not yet impacted the canopy.

Stand B is a tuliptree-American sycamore forest occurring along the hillslopes of the CA-5 study area. The canopy of this mid-successional forest is primarily in the 12-19.9" size class and is dominated by tuliptree in the 1-30+" DBH range and American sycamore in the 8-30+" DBH range. Co-dominant species include red maple, black cherry, and Virginia pine (*Pinus virginiana*). Twenty-four (24) specimen trees occur within this stand and canopy closure is approximately 75 percent. The understory contains saplings of tuliptree, red maple, and black cherry, in addition to Japanese barberry, Autumn-olive, and wine raspberry. Infill plantings, including Eastern redbud (*Cercis canadensis*) and various oak species (*Quercus sp.*), were observed but not included in the forest characterization. Dominant herbaceous species include an unknown violet species, crow garlic, garlic mustard (*Alliaria petiolata*), sweet wood-reed, Japanese stilt grass, and Christmas fern (*Polystichum acrostichoides*). Invasive species cover was moderate, with 15 percent invasive understory cover and 60 percent invasive ground cover present in the stand. Downed woody debris is a common feature throughout this stand. Overall, Stand B is in good condition, as the stand is diverse and well structured, and has moderate invasive cover that has not yet impacted the canopy.

Stand C is a red maple-ash-leaf maple forest occurring in the eastern floodplain of the CA-5 study area. The canopy of this early-successional forest is primarily in the 6-11.9" DBH size class and is dominated by red maple in the 1-16" DBH range and ash-leaf maple ranging from 1-22" DBH. Co-dominant species include black cherry, Callery pear (*Pyrus calleryana*), and river birch (*Betula nigra*). Other common species include tuliptree and American sycamore. One specimen tree occurs within this stand and canopy closure is approximately 60 percent. The understory contains saplings of the canopy species, except river birch, in addition to horsebrier (*Smilax rotundifolia*), wine raspberry, Southern arrow-wood (*Viburnum dentatum*), and European privet (*Ligustrum vulgare*). Dominant herbaceous species include an unknown speedwell species (*Veronica sp.*), an unknown violet species, an unknown bittercress species (*Cardamine sp.*), Japanese stilt grass, sweet wood-reed, garlic mustard, and crow garlic. Invasive species cover was moderate for the stand, with 3 percent invasive canopy cover, 10 percent invasive understory cover, and 75 percent invasive ground cover. Downed woody debris is an abundant feature throughout this stand. Overall, Stand C is in fair condition, as the stand is diverse with multiple canopy layers, but there is trash and evidence of disturbance from the surrounding development, as well as a high percentage of invasive species.

Stand D is a tuliptree forest occurring along the floodplain in the southwestern portion of the CA-5 study area. The canopy of this mid-successional forest is primarily in the 20-29.9" DBH size class and is dominated by tuliptree in the 8->30" DBH range. Co-dominant species include red maple. Other common



species include to black walnut (*Juglans nigra*), American elm (*Ulmus americana*), and black cherry. Eight (8) specimen trees occur within this stand and canopy closure is approximately 80 percent. The understory contains autumn olive, Japanese barberry and wine raspberry. Dominant herbaceous species include Japanese stilt grass, crow garlic, garlic mustard, deer-tongue rosette grass (*Dichanthelium clandestinum*), and Christmas fern. Invasive species cover was moderate for this stand with 35 percent invasive understory cover and 90 percent invasive ground cover. Downed woody debris is a common feature throughout this stand. Overall, Stand D is in good condition as most trees are healthy with no invasive cover in the canopy; however invasive groundcover is high, and the stand lacks a liberal shrub layer and overall species diversity.

Mass tree clearing within the LOD will not be performed on the site. All trees within the LOD not marked for removal will receive tree protection fence and tree planking". Since the project is located on parkland owned by M-NCPPC, great care was given to only removing the trees needed to accomplish the project goals. A total of 110 trees will be removed within the upland forest/wetland buffer/100 year floodplain for this project and 609 new trees will be planted within the LOD. The Forest Stand Delineation Memo is provided in Appendix II, Attachment B, Appendix C.

Existing invasive species are present throughout the site. The most prevalent invasive species was Japanese Stiltgrass (*Microstegium vimineum*), making up a large proportion of the overall herbaceous species throughout the site. Other herbaceous invasive species that were also present within the study area included; Garlic Mustard (*Alliaria petiolate*), Wild Garlic (*Allium vineale*), and Speedwell species (*Veronica sp.*). A few species of invasive vines and shrubs were also present on site such as: Japanese Barberry (*Berberis thunbergii*), Autumn Olive (*Elaeagnus umbellate*), Wineberry (*Rubus phoenicolasius*), Japanese Honeysuckle (*Lonicera japonica*), and Multiflora Rose (*Rosa multiflora*).

3.4 Determination of Credits

Mitigation credit at the CA-5 stream restoration site will be generated by providing functional uplift to approximately 3,079 LF of stream, located solely on M-NCPPC property. Stream mitigation credits at the CA-5 stream restoration site were calculated using the Maryland Stream Mitigation Framework (MSMF, USACE, 2020) which was recently provided in beta version. The Stream Mitigation Calculator spreadsheet was used to determine the mitigation potential of the CA-5 stream restoration site, measured in functional feet. A functional foot is defined as a linear foot of stream of perfect quality (100% or 1.0 score) and a drainage area of 1 square mile. A functional foot relates to streams of any flow type and quality in a stream network and these factors influence the value of a linear foot of stream as a functional foot. The CA-5 stream restoration site will provide 721 functional feet of stream mitigation calculator spreadsheet. There will be approximately 3,550 SF (0.08 AC) permanent wetland impacts due to the stream restoration construction. The proposed oxbow wetlands and the farm pond enhancement, which will provide a total of 13,312 SF (0.31 AC) of on-site wetland creation for permanent wetland impacts. In addition, the 2,343 SF (0.05 AC) of temporary will be restored in place on-site.

3.5 Mitigation Work Plan

The CA-5 stream restoration site plan set (Appendix V, Attachment A) includes plan views with proposed grading and planform alignment, typical sections and details, and landscaping plant schedules and notes.



The specific activities required to implement the restoration components of the CA-5 stream restoration site are outlined below. All activities including site access, staging, and stockpiling will occur completely within the boundaries of the subject property.

Stream Restoration

The restoration of the main channel (Mainstem 1- Geomorphic Assessment Reaches 1-4) of the CA-5 stream restoration site begins just upstream of the pedestrian bridge, at the beginning of evaluation Reach 2, and continues downstream just over 2,901 LF to the confluence at the end of the site. Mainstem 2 (Reach 5) begins just downstream of the large Storm Water Management Facility present on-site and is comprised of approximately 766 LF of existing stream, with 535 LF located on M-NCPPC property and 231 LF on PEPCO property. Restoration of Tributary 1, approximately 50 LF, at the upstream end of the site, at the beginning of confluence at evaluation reach 1/2, will be stabilized downstream of the pedestrian crossing. Restoration of Tributary 2, approximately 151 LF, extends to the M-NCPPC property line and multiple smaller headcuts along the left and right banks is also proposed. The outlet from the farm pond along the left bank near the end of the site will be lowered, dropping the surface elevation of the water in the pond, reducing the overall hazard.

Mainstem 1 is designed with stable dimension, pattern, and profile in order to tie-in to existing stable channel bed features at the upstream and downstream ends of the restoration. The proposed channel design is based on a Rosgen type B channel. The intent of the design is to reduce shear stresses within the channel and access the limited floodplain surface during high flow events to below the critical shear stress threshold of the substrate. The overall size of the floodplain will be limited to avoid major earthwork and minimize impacts to existing trees and natural resources. Proposed channel bed features such as Riffle, Run, Pool and Glide will provide stable epifaunal substrate and create diverse in-stream habitat. The riffle and run features will be stabilized using rock and log structures. Energy dissipation will be achieved mainly through drops and hardened structures within the channel due to the confined floodplain. The existing conditions in the stable reaches of the channel suggest that this channel is transporting the majority of the fine sediments to the downstream reaches. Areas of instability are occurring where sinuosity has increased, and fine sediments are being deposited within the channel. The proposed design will establish a more consistent slope throughout the channel. The riffle slopes vary from 3.8-4.5%. This will stabilize the stream unit power and provide consistent sediment transport capacity throughout the channel. The existing overall profile shows a concave slope with Reaches 2 and 3 having higher slopes and Reach 4 having a relatively flat slope. The consistent slope will also raise the channel in Reaches 2, 3, and the upstream section of reach 4. This will provide additional protection to sanitary sewer crossings and help reconnect the channel to the existing floodplain at higher flows. The existing utilities are shown with the approximate elevations. Utility test pits will be performed prior to the next design phase to verify the elevations of the sewer and water crossings. By raising the channel extensive floodplain grading will be minimized while keeping bank heights low. Appendix II, Attachment B includes a Semi-Final Design Report with documentation used to support the proposed stream designs. Proposed Riffle Grade Control structures and other log and rock in-stream structures are proposed in the transitions between meanders will provide grade control and protect the designed channel from vertical degradation.



The Mainstem 2/Reach 5 stream will be restored by raising the stream invert elevation and lowering the adjacent floodplain. Stream realignment is proposed to remove sharp bends and move the channel further away from the adjacent sewer line. The goal of the mainstem 2/reach 5 tributary restoration is to allow storm flow to get out of the channel and spread out across the graded floodplain to reduce velocity and shear stress. This will be achieved by sizing the new channel to hold approximately 55% of the bankfull discharge. The channel contains a discharge of 25 cfs before flows will spread out onto the floodplain. A 1.5-year storm event bankfull discharge for this tributary is approximately 45 cfs. The proposed dimensions of the new channel include low bank heights of 1.0' and a high width to depth ratio of 23.0 with 5:1 side slopes to reduce the bank erosion potential. A high width to depth ratio was selected for this tributary to maintain low in-channel velocities of 2.9 ft/sec. and a low shear stress of 0.37 lb./sq. ft. Sediment deposition is not a concern due to the upstream SWM facility preventing fine sediment from being carried downstream. Proposed riffle grade control structures will be utilized to provide vertical stabilization to the channel and improve the hyporheic exchange between stream flow and subsurface flow. Riffle grade controls will use a mixture of salvaged riffle material and furnished rock to ensure material will remain since there is not a stable upstream substrate supply. Log and rock j-hook structures are proposed throughout the design for grade control and to provide permanent stabilization at the top and bottom of the reach. Toewood structures are proposed along the outer meander bank of pools to reduce bank erosion and provide in-stream habitat. An imbricated rock wall is proposed at approximately station 1+00 to stabilize the right outer meander bank that is within close proximity to the existing sewer line. The graded floodplain will give the channel an approximate floodprone width of 80'. To further stabilize the floodplain, log sills will be added laterally across the floodplain to prevent any channel cutting through the floodplain. At the downstream end of the site, the outlet of the farm pond will be lowered by about 1.5' and a stable weir/step pool is proposed to stabilize the outlet. A laser level survey of the existing conditions of the pond showed that the pond depth was consistently 2.0'. Therefore, in order to reduce the hazard and create a more sustainable wetland habitat, the outlet of the pond will be lowered by 1.5' and the area will be planted with native wetland vegetation. Once the outlet is lowered, the hazard of a deep pool on park property will be minimized and the M-NCPPC's request to make the pond more of a functioning wetland/vernal pool will be achieved.

Tributary 1 at the upstream end of the site will be stabilized downstream of the pedestrian crossing, step pools are proposed to provide a stable transition to the main channel. The upstream section of the channel is lined with riprap and does not require much stabilization. A plunge pool is proposed to stabilize the pipe outfall at the top of the reach.

Tributary 2 will also be stabilized. The tributary will be realigned at the downstream end to access an abandoned channel meander, and to provide a more stable tie in angle to the mainstem. The realigned channel will cross the now exposed sewer line approximately perpendicular and will tie into the main channel within a pool feature. The channel has been raised and added rock features have been added to protect the existing sewer. Step pools are proposed in the channel downstream of the footpath crossing. Upstream of the crossing there is exposed bedrock and lower banks. Since this area is somewhat stable and unlikely to show significant uplift from any major disturbance, it will remain predominately as-is. The Tributary 2 channel is designed to convey the predicted 2-year storm from TR-55.

The channel alignments were developed by examining valley slope and width, existing land constraints, and expected flood flow pattern. A longitudinal profile was created along the proposed alignment with



riffles along straight portions of the planform and pools at the bends. The channel profile is designed to have an alternating riffle-pool sequence to create varying instream habitats. Nearly all of the water surface elevation drop in the relocated stream channels occurs in riffle reaches, rather than in pools, which were designed to be nearly flat. The proposed thalweg elevations of the longitudinal profile at the upstream and downstream tie-in locations matches the existing grades. The proposed channel cross section design is based on the existing bankfull dimensions of the representative cross section. **Table 2** provides a summary of the proposed typical riffle cross section dimensions.

CA-5 Stream Restoration Site Design Parameter	Mainstem 1 Value	Mainstem 2 Value
Drainage Area (Mi2)	0.25	0.43
Discharge (cfs)	59	45.4
Cross-Sectional Area (ft2)	12.0	14.01
Width (ft)	14.7	15.0
Mean Depth (ft)	0.82	0.94
Max. Depth (ft)	1.10	1.22
Width/Depth Ratio	18.0	16.0
Hydraulic Radius (ft)	0.78	1.03
Proposed Riffle Slopes (%)	3.8-4.5	1.2-2.75

Table 2: CA-5 Stream Restoration Mainstem 1 & Mainstem 2 Riffle Dimensions

Instream Structures

A few in-stream structures are proposed which will be used to achieve the design goals. Wherever possible, the structures will be made of, or incorporate, riprap that was previously placed within the channel, and rootwads and/or logs. There are multiple locations along the stream channel where riprap had been placed throughout the years in an attempt to stabilize the banks near sanitary sewer assets and other park assets such as bridges or walking paths. When work is being completed in areas where riprap has been placed, every effort will be taken to reuse the existing material. Along the same lines, the stream is located within a forested area, and grading outside of the existing stream channel will result in the removal of trees. Wherever possible, trees being removed on site will be used in structures.

Instream log structures such as Log Rollers, Log and Rock J-hooks, Rock Sills, Boulder Cascades will be utilized to provide grade control to prevent any potential downcutting. The wood introduces carbon to the stream for nutrient retention and processing. These will create the permanent grade controls that would withstand large storm.

Stone Toe and Toe Log structures will be added along outside meander bends to provide additional bank protection in areas of high velocity and shear stress. The stone will serve as bank protection to ensure bank stability and reduce erosion.

Riffle Grade Controls are another structure proposed to provide permanent grade control at riffle bed features, increase flow diversity and withstand large storms. The riffle material will be sized to keep a portion of the bedload mobile. Since the stream is confined with no wide floodplain to deposit excess



sediment onto, the system will be designed to continue to move some sediment through the narrow valley. In many instances, Riffle Grade Control structures will be coupled with drop structures to make up grade and provide flow diversity. A combination of log and rock drop structures such as rock sills, log j-hooks, and log sills will be installed at the downstream end of the riffle grade controls to achieve these drops.

The floodplain depressions are proposed where the existing channel is abandoned. These depressions will act as naturally occurring oxbow channels that are formed in abandoned meanders. Additional Floodplain Log sills will be added to serve as grade control points within the floodplain.

Proposed Landscaping

The stream restoration landscaping plans are included in the design plans. The proposed landscaping plans include six (6) separate landscaping zones; Riparian Planting (lowland meadow establishment), Riparian shrub planting (lowland meadow establishment), Live Stake Planting (lowland meadow establishment), Oxbow wetland (wet meadow establishment), Disturbed PFO (riparian plantings and wet meadow establishment), and Turfgrass Establishment. Live stakes will be installed on the outside meanders and adjacent to straight sections along the slope of the stream bank, from bankfull to just above normal base flow. Riparian plantings will be installed adjacent to the stream channel in areas that are void of natural vegetation or have been impacted by restoration activities. Every effort will be made to save as many large trees as possible, which should keep some of the original canopy cover. Trees to be removed are indicated with "X's" on the ESC and landscaping plans. The plant species are listed in the planting schedules and included in the design plans. Forest impacts were avoided and minimized, and the Landscape Plan proposes to plant an equivalent number of trees to the number removed by the project on-site. Lowland meadow establishment seed mix will be applied to the areas where lives stakes, or riparian reforestation have been installed. Wet meadow establishment seed mix and herbaceous wetland plantings will be applied in the proposed floodplain depression areas, as shown on the plans. Turfgrass will be established in the areas of existing grass needed for access and stockpile.

The Contractor shall provide a warranty and maintain all landscape plantings for one year after Acceptance for Maintenance of plantings and landscape work. Acceptance for Maintenance for plantings and landscape work shall be implemented after all plant materials in the project have been planted, are true to species and minimum size, and are in a healthy and thriving condition in accordance with Section 710 of the Standard Specifications and the applicable Special Provisions. During this one-year warranty period, the Contractor shall provide all required plant care and maintenance. This work shall include, but is not limited to watering, weeding, fertilizing, pest control, invasive plant control, mulching, pruning, and replacement of any plant materials that are not in a healthy and thriving condition reflective of the species and in accordance with the MDOT SHA's Standard Specifications for construction and Materials and related SP Sections.

In addition to the installation of native species, Invasive Species treatment will be performed for the entire LOD. Special Provision 20 – Non-Native Invasive (NNI) Species Control outlines the management of Japanese Stiltgrass (*Microstegium vimineum*), Garlic mustard (Alliaria petiolata), Wild Garlic (*Allium vineale*), Autumn olive (*Elaeagnus umbellata*), Multiflora rose (*Rosa multiflora*), Japanese honeysuckle



(Lonicera japonica), Wineberry (Rubus phoenicolasius), Japanese barberry (Berberis thunbergii), invasive Speedwell species (Veronica sp.) and others as specified by the Engineer during construction of the project. NNI removal will be focused heavily on the removal of Japanese Stiltgrass (Microstegium vimineum). The extents of the NNI control is to occur within the limits of disturbance (LOD), the limits of planting (LOP), and within a buffer of 50 feet outside the LOD and LOP. The methods and application rates are based on the M-NCPPC's Best Management Practices for Control of Non-native Invasives.

Construction Schedule

It is estimated that the design will be completed in 2022/2023, and the mitigation site will be constructed prior to the completion of the overall I-495/270 MLS project. The Phase I of the project will include portions of I-270 will include impacts within the Middle Potomac-Catoctin watershed therefore this site will be constructed in concurrence with Phase I. The site shall be constructed under the supervision of an approved qualified restoration specialist. It is anticipated that the overall project will take approximately seven months to construct. No instream work will be conducted between March 1 and June 15, inclusively.

3.6 Maintenance Plan

M-NCPPC and MDOT SHA have developed a long-term agreement (Appendix IV, Attachment B) that will allow MDOT SHA future access to monitor and maintain the restored stream segment. After monitoring on the site is complete M-NCPPC will provide long term maintain of the site in perpetuity to ensure protection of the conservation practices.

Following construction, the project will be placed in MDOT SHA's monitoring program and will be subject to regular inspections to determine the progress and continued viability of the project. Monitoring will be conducted by MDOT SHA for 10 years, with reporting in years 1, 3, 5, 7, and 10 following project construction. If any maintenance work is deemed necessary based upon monitoring results, MDOT SHA will coordinate with the regulatory and resource agencies to determine the appropriate course of action and obtain the appropriate approvals prior to any construction activities.

3.7 Performance Standards

The stream will be re-evaluated, using the Maryland Stream Mitigation Framework (MSMF) stream calculator during years 3, 5, 7, and 10. Notes will be made in the calculation runs for earlier years 3, 5, and 7 where further improvements are expected to occur and with any remedial actions needed to maintain the project and vegetation. Credits will then be revised accordingly. At the end of the permitted monitoring period, MDOT SHA will need to demonstrate that the project has met the goals for the stream restoration efforts at the CA-5 stream restoration site, including:

- 1. Prevent lateral and vertical migration of the stream bed and bank
- 2. Promote floodplain connectivity
- 3. Increase bedform diversity by increasing percent of stable riffles post-construction

The project's ecologically based performance standards are tied to the site's objectives functional uplift parameters. Performance standards will be measured in accordance with the approved post construction monitoring protocols developed for the project. No wetland mitigation credit is being claimed for this stream restoration project beyond the "no net loss of impacted wetlands. **Table 3** shows the specific performance standards MDOT SHA will use to demonstrate that the project has met the design goals.

Streams Functional Pyramid Category: Hydraulic							
Goal	Parameter	Performance Standard	Measurement Method				
Floodplain reconnection	Floodplain connectivity	Entrenchment Ratio, Bank Height Ratio	Cross-Section				
Streams Functional Pyramid Category: Geomorphology							
Goal	Parameter	Performance Standard	Measurement Method				
Channel stability	Vertical/Lateral migration	Stream bed/bank stability	Longitudinal Profile/BANCS				
Stabilize stream bed	Bedform Diversity	Increase in percent stable riffles from pre- to post-restoration	Quantify percent of stable riffles				

Table 3. I chommanice standards and methods for CA 5 stream nestoration doub
--

3.8 Monitoring Requirements

The CA-5 stream restoration site will be placed in MDOT SHA's Monitoring Program. Stream restoration monitoring will be required for ten years, with reports at years 1, 3, 5, 7, and 10 following project construction, with the first monitoring year beginning the first March after the completion of construction including planting. Annual monitoring reports will be submitted by MDOT SHA to both USACE and MDE no later than December 31st of each calendar year. As-built plans will be provided by MDOT SHA to MDE and USACE within 60 days of construction completion. Starting at the end of Year 5 of monitoring, if the mitigation site meets all final year performance standards for at least two consecutive monitoring years, the Permittee may request termination of the active monitoring period.

MDOT SHA will provide the monitoring team with as-built surveys in accordance with the special provisions of the project to ensure that structures and grading were built in accordance with the design plans. The as-built drawings will serve as a basis of comparison to determine overall changes to the channels and in-stream structures within the project reaches.

The proposed monitoring plan identifies two major components to ensure that the stream mitigation is providing the goals of the project, including: replacing lost functions and values to offset unavoidable impacts to aquatic resources and providing the long-term stability of the stream system. The plan will include monitoring the following indices:

- Geomorphological Monitoring; and
- Photo-Documentation.

A timeline of the various monitoring efforts is provided in Table 4.



Monitoring Task		Pre- Construction (measured by	Yr. 1	Yr. 3	Yr. 5	Yr. 7	Yr. 10
General Stream Monitoring							
Visual Inspection / Photo Documentation		х	Х	х	х	х	Х
Physical Stream Monitoring (Cross Sections and Longitudinal Profile		х	х				х
Structure Stability Assessment				х		х	
Stream Habitat Assessment		х		х		х	
Invasive Species Assessments			Х	х	х		х
Temporary Wetland Impacts				х	х		х
Wetland Creation (Oxbow)			Х	х	х		х
Functional Uplift Stream Mo	onite	oring					
Floodplain Connectivity (BHR, ER)		х		х			х
Riparian Vegetation		х		х			х
Lateral Stability		х		х			Х
Bedform Diversity		х		х			х
Annual Reporting							
Monitoring Report (Agency Submittal)			Х	х	х	х	Х
Agency Site Visit					х		TBD

Table 4: Monitoring Summary/Timeline

3.8.1 Visual Inspection/Photographic Documentation

A stream walk should be conducted in years 1, 3, 5, 7, and 10 to evaluate the condition of the restoration and make note of any potential problems. Potential problems will be documented on a clean set of post construction as-built plans. Items such as eroding banks, excessive bar formation, scour, structure failure, erosion around structures, accumulated debris, and sparsely vegetated areas will be included on the sketch. Notes should also be included describing the condition of the in-stream structures. If problems are noted, they will be discussed in the monitoring report, and adaptive management will be considered and recommended, if necessary.

Pre-construction photo documentation stations for the existing channel were established during the baseline conditions assessment. Prior to monitoring, MDOT SHA will provide the monitoring team with a shapefile of Global Positioning System (GPS)-located photo stations which will be established along the restoration reach to depict preconstruction conditions, as well as digital photograph files. Photos will be repeated at the established photo stations in years 1, 3, 5, 7, and 10 to provide a comparison of lateral



and vertical stream stability, in-stream structures, and any changes in stream and floodplain morphology. In addition to the established photo stations, photographs of any unusual or noteworthy conditions will also be taken. A log of all photographs will be included in the monitoring report to provide a side-by-side comparison of the stream from each established photo station. A map of the photo station locations and the pre-construction photos, with descriptions and general directions can be found in Appendix II, Attachment B, Appendix A.

3.8.2 Physical Stream Monitoring

A. Cross Sections and Longitudinal Profiles

A survey of the existing stream conditions within the LOD, including geomorphology and bank stability, was conducted prior to the start of construction. As part of the pre-construction geomorphic assessment, ten cross-sections within the proposed restoration reaches and one cross section upstream of the proposed work area were established, monumented, and surveyed for future comparison during Physical Stream Monitoring in years 1 and 10.

On the Mainstem, one cross-section was established in Reach 1, upstream of the limits of work, where no instream work was proposed due to site limitations. Two cross-sections were established in Reach 2, downstream of the proposed pedestrian crossing after the confluence with Tributary 1. A fourth existing cross-section is located approximately mid-way through in Reach 3. The fifth, sixth, and seventh cross sections are located in the upstream portion of Reach 4, above the pond outfall. Additional cross sections were monumented, one in Reach 5, one in Tributary 1, and one in Tributary 2. Cross-sections monumented in Tributary 1 and 2 will not be utilized during Physical Stream Monitoring. In addition to the previously established cross-sections more cross sections may be added in Year 1 monitoring and surveyed in subsequent monitoring years. Cross-section data will be overlaid and compared in order to evaluate degree of variation in channel size and shape over the monitoring period. Channel dimensions for each cross-section should be evaluated, compared, and presented in tabular form.

During pre-construction survey, a longitudinal profile was surveyed along portions of the existing thalweg. During each monitoring year, a longitudinal profile will be taken through the thalweg of the mainstem reaches, starting and ending in the same locations as the pre-construction survey. Subsequent years of longitudinal survey data should be overlaid in order to evaluate the streambed stability. Reach slope and overall channel slope should be evaluated, compared, and presented in tabular form.

B. Structure Stability Assessments

Structures constructed of rock, wood or other materials are commonly used in stream restoration projects to provide stability in high stress areas, grade control or provide energy dissipation. The use of structures entails a certain degree of risk that may potentially compromise the stability of the project. Minor performance problems associated with one structure could potentially create problems with adjacent structures or the surrounding channel and floodplain areas. A visual inspection and photo documentation of each structure is recommended to validate structure stability or identify problems over time.

An assessment of structural stability shall be completed during leaf-off at the locations of the installed structures in years 3 and 7. The evaluation consists of a visual examination of each structure to determine areas of developing weaknesses or problems with structure performance, called failure indicators. The Field Stability Assessment rating system has been modeled after the Functional Pyramid. For each of the



Failure Indicators there are four possible Adjective Ratings (Functioning, Functioning at Risk, Not Functioning, and Failure).

1-495 & 1-270 Managed Lanes Study

The overall functionality of the structure should be decided using best professional judgment and take into consideration the observations of failure indicators and any additional notes on the stability of the structure. In this context, the structure is considered to have signs of Not Functioning if it is not durable, or if it is not performing a key function related to the reason for including the structure in restoration design (i.e., grade control, pool formation, etc.). If a structure is Functioning-at-Risk, it will continue to be closely monitored. If a structure is Not Functioning in multiple categories or has one or more indicators of Failure, adaptive management will be considered. Also, if a structure is Not Functioning, Functioning at Risk, or Failing, the designer will be contacted for an assessment.

Structure Stability Assessment forms are specific to their respective structure. A Structure Stability Assessment form should be completed for each structure listed in **Table 5**. Tributary 1 and 2 structures should still be inspected for stability and have been included in **Table 5**.

Structure Type	Number
Log Roller (LR)	6
Riffle Grade Control (RGC)	57
Rock J-Hooks (RJH)	28
Riffle Grade Control (RGC) with Rock Sill (RS)	1
Boulder Cascades (BC)	14
Stone Toe (ST)	15
Toe Log (TL)	17
Rock Cross Vane/Compound Rock Cross Vane (RCV/CRCV)	2
Knickpoint Treatment	2

Table 5: Structures to be Assessed

A minimum of two photos will be recorded at each assessed structure: one photo looking upstream and one photo looking downstream of the structure. Extra photos will be taken in order to capture any of the failure indicators observed during the site visit. Photos should be taken during leaf-off in order to clearly capture the banks and structures being assessed.

3.8.3 Functional Uplift Stream Monitoring

Functional uplift opportunities have been identified and incorporated into the proposed restoration design. Functional uplift opportunities will be organized according to the Stream Functions Pyramid (USFWS, 2011). Uplift is anticipated for functional pyramid Levels 2 (Hydraulic) and 3 (Geomorphology).

No performance standards are proposed for Level 1 (Hydrology), Level 4 (Physiochemical), or Level 5 (Biological). Protocols for post-construction monitoring are described in this monitoring plan for



functional pyramid Level 2, including assessment of floodplain connectivity (bank height ratio and entrenchment ratio) which will be calculated at riffle cross section locations. Monitoring for Level 3 will include assessment of riparian vegetation, lateral channel stability, and bedform diversity. Functional scores for each measurement method are provided in the design column of the tables provided, Protocols to assess functional uplift based on the existing and proposed conditions were adapted from the USFWS's Function- Based Rapid Stream Assessment Methodology (Starr et al., 2015), currently in final draft form, which is based on A Function-Based Framework for Stream Assessment and Restoration Projects (Harman et al., 2012).

Several measurement methods are provided to measure the existing functional capacity of each element of the hierarchy. Each measurement method is rated using three (3) general categories, including (1) Functioning, (2) Functioning-at-risk and (3) Not Functioning. For some parameters, the Functioning-at-risk category is further divided into two (2) subcategories (a) trending toward Functioning and (b) trending towards Not Functioning (Starr et al., 2015). Functional ratings for the pre-construction and design conditions for each measurement method are provided in the field data sheets included in Appendix III, Attachment A and are summarized in the table below.

Reach	Hydrol	ogy	Hydrau	lics	Geomo	rphology	Physic	cochemical	Biolog	ical
	Ex	Prop	Ex	Prop	Ex	Prop	Ex	Prop	Ex	Prop
Mainstem 1	4	7	18	35	28	66	11	14	13	20
Mainstem 2	9	9	22	36	42	64	16	16	13	21

Table 6: Function Based S	Scores and Ratings
----------------------------------	--------------------

A. Level 2 Hydraulic

To monitor hydraulic function uplift, an assessment of floodplain connectivity will be completed using the Bank Height Ratio (BHR) and Entrenchment Ratio (ER). Geomorphic assessment data collected, and survey mapping analyzed during the design phase of the project was used to determine the pre-construction BHR and ER for each restoration reach. Monitoring data for the restoration reach is provided in the Semi-Final Design Report, Appendix II, Attachment B.

a. Bank Height Ratio

The pre-construction BHR of all the reaches (Mainstem 1 & Mainstem 2) is not functioning. The proposed BHR was determined based on the proposed top of bank height divided by the proposed bankfull height using the predicted bankfull discharge across the typical design cross-section for each restoration reach. Under the proposed condition, the BHR of all reaches is expected to be Functioning.

The post-construction BHR should be determined through field data collection following the guidance provided in the USFWS's Function-Based Rapid Stream Assessment Methodology (Starr et al., 2015). Post-construction BHR measurements should be performed during years 2 and 7. A qualified professional experienced in identifying bankfull must be present during field assessments. The BHR measurements should be provided in tabular form accompanied by a brief comparative analysis with preconstruction and proposed BHRs identified during development of the restoration design. It should be assumed that uplift has been achieved if the post-construction BHR is Functioning. **Table 7** shows the bank height ratio performance standards that should be used to evaluate the proposed conditions.



Table 7. Bailt Height Ratio Ferrormanee Standards				
Functioning	Functioning-At- Risk	Not Functioning		
1.0 - 1.2	1.3 - 1.5	> 1.5		

able 7. Dalik Height Natio Feriorinance Standards

Performance standards from Harman et. al (2012)

b. Entrenchment Ratio

The ER for Mainstem 1 and 2 is considered mid to low Functioning. Under the proposed condition, all the ER ratings of the CA-5 restoration reaches are expected to increase and score as Functioning.

The post-construction ER will be determined through field data collection following the guidance provided in the USFWS's Function-Based Rapid Stream Assessment Methodology (Starr et al., 2015). Postconstruction ER measurements should be performed during years 2 and 7. A qualified professional experienced in identifying bankfull must be present during field assessments. The ER measurements should be provided in tabular form accompanied by a brief comparative analysis with pre-construction and proposed ER identified during development of the restoration design. It should be assumed that uplift has been achieved if the post-construction ER for the restoration reach is functioning. **Table 8** shows the entrenchment ratio performance standards that should be used to evaluate the proposed conditions.

Reach	Functioning	Functioning-At- Risk	Not Functioning
Reach 1 - Relocation	> 2.2	2.0 - 2.2	< 2.0
Reach 2 - Restoration	> 1.4	1.2 - 1.4	< 1.2

Table 8: Entrenchment Ratio Performance Standards

Performance standards from Harman et. al (2012)

B. Level 3 Geomorphology

To monitor geomorphologic function uplift, an assessment of riparian vegetation, lateral stability, and bedform diversity will be used to determine the pre-construction conditions. Monitoring data for the restoration reach is provided in the Semi-Final Design Report, Appendix III, Attachment B.

a. Riparian Vegetation

Prior to construction, the approximate width of the riparian area generally covered by trees and / or shrubs was determined by the design team. The same estimates will be performed post-construction during the stream habitat assessment task in years 2 and 7. Additionally, a post-construction assessment of existing vegetative coverage should be conducted using a representative number of 1/10th acre plots along both streambanks of each restoration reach. Sample plots should be conducted as follows:

- One plot per 4 acres of forest stand area
- Two plots minimum per stand; and
- Three plots minimum of the total forested area of the site



Within each plot, data collection should include estimates of vegetative coverage within each stratum (i.e. trees, shrubs / saplings, herbaceous, woody vines), density of woody vegetation, dominant species within the plot, and any concerns such as invasive species coverage. A representative photograph should be taken at each plot.

Results of the plot data collection should be summarized in tabular form and should be accompanied by a brief comparative analysis with previous data collection. Guidance from the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)'s Function-Based Rapid Stream Assessment Methodology (Starr et al., 2015) should be used to assess the functional category of the post-construction monitoring results using the Riparian Vegetation Zone measurement method. It should be assumed that uplift has been achieved if riparian vegetation has increased in width and diversity from the pre-construction condition. Due to constraints the riparian vegetation in Mainstem 1 & Mainstem 2 are expected to remain as Functioning at Risk on both banks but increase to higher score within the category. **Table 9** shows the riparian vegetation performance standards that should be used to evaluate the proposed conditions.

Performance Standard	Functioning	Functioning-At-Risk	Not Functioning
Riparian Vegetation ¹	Width of riparian zone > 18 meters on each side; human activities have not impacted zone (Optimal, 9-10)	Width of riparian zone 12-18 meters on each side; human activities have impacted zone only minimally (Sub-Optimal, 6- 8); width of riparian zone 6-12 meters on each side; human activities have impacted zone a great deal (Marginal, 3-5)	Width of riparian zone <6 meters on each side; little or no riparian vegetation due to human activity (Poor, 0-2)
	Year 1: Greater than 50% native species cover	Year 1: Minimum 50% native species cover	Year 1: Less than 50% native species cover
Aerial Coverage ²	Year 2: Greater than 60% native species cover	Year 2: Minimum 60% native species cover	Year 2: Less than 60% native species cover
	Year 3: Greater than 70% native species cover	Year 3: Minimum 70% native species cover	Year 3: Less than 70% native species cover
	Year 5 & Additional monitoring years thereafter: Greater than 85% native	Year 5 & Additional monitoring years thereafter: Minimum 85% native species cover	Year 5 & Additional monitoring years thereafter: Less 85% native species cover
	species cover	Volunteer Species present	
	functions consistent with project goals		Volunteer species minimal / not present
Non-Native and Invasive Species ²	Invasive species make up less than 10% of relative plant cover over the entire site with no individual colony greater or equal to 5% of relative plant cover	Invasive species make up approximately 10% of relative plant cover over the entire site with no individual colony greater or equal to 5% of relative plant cover	Invasive species make up more than 10% of relative plant cover over the entire site. Individual colonies of invasive species are greater than 5% of relative plant cover

Table 9: Riparian Vegetation Performance Standards



Performance Standard	Functioning	Functioning-At-Risk	Not Functioning
Vegetation Density for Forested Buffers	Native plant density is greater than 435 living trees / shrubs per acre. Trees / shrubs have a minimum height of 10 inches by the end of year 1.	Native plant density is between 250 – 435 living trees / shrubs per acre. Tree / shrub heights have a minimum height of 8 inches by the end of year 1.	Native plant density is less than 250 living trees / shrubs per acre. Tree / shrub heights are less than 8 inches by the end of year 1.
Vegetation Cover for Forested Buffers 2	Average tree height of the tallest 5 native trees within each sample plot is 3 feet or taller in height at year 3 and 5 feet or higher at year 5. Canopy cover of native trees and shrubs is greater than or equal to 30% by the end of the monitoring period.	Average tree height of the 5 tallest native trees within each sample plot is 2 - 3 feet in height at year 3 and 3 - 5 feet at year 5. Canopy cover of native trees and shrubs is between $20 - 30\%$ by the end of the monitoring period.	Average tree height of the 5 tallest native trees within each sample plot is less than 2 feet in height at year 3 and less than 3 feet at year 5. Canopy cover of native trees and shrubs is less than 20% by the end of the monitoring period.
Aerial Coverage ²	Year 1: Greater than 50% native species cover Year 2: Greater than 60% native species cover Year 3: Greater than 70% native species cover Year 5 & Additional monitoring years thereafter: Greater than 85% native species cover Volunteer Species support functions consistent with project goals	Year 1: Minimum 50% native species cover Year 2: Minimum 60% native species cover Year 3: Minimum 70% native species cover Year 5 & Additional monitoring years thereafter: Minimum 85% native species cover Volunteer Species present	Year 1: Less than 50% native species cover Year 2: Less than 60% native species cover Year 3: Less than 70% native species cover Year 5 & Additional monitoring years thereafter: Less 85% native species cover Volunteer species minimal / not present

¹ Performance standards from Harman et. al (2012)

²Metrics taken from *Ecological Performance Standards and Monitoring Protocol for Permitee-Responsible Nontidal Wetland Mitigation Sites in Maryland* (2022)

b. Lateral Stability

Lateral stability was documented by the design team using the Bank Assessment for Non-point source Consequences of Sediment (BANCS) method which includes Bank Erosion Hazard Index (BEHI) and Near Bank Stress (NBS) measurements as described below. The BEHI/NBS data was used to determine the functional category of existing conditions for the left and right banks of each reach using the Dominant Bank Erosion Rate Potential measurement method in USFWS's Function-Based Rapid Stream Assessment Methodology (Starr et al., 2015). Based on BEHI and NBS data, lateral stability for Mainstem 1 was determined to be Not Functioning for the left and right banks. The lateral stability for Mainstem 2 was determined to Functioning-at-risk for the left and right banks. Under the proposed condition, lateral stability based on the BEHI for the restoration reach is expected to be functioning.

Post-construction BEHI/NBS measurements and visual observations should be performed during years 2 and 7 where erosion is present using field data collection methods outlined in Rosgen (2006). A qualified



professional experienced in identifying bankfull must be present during field assessments. The BEHI/NBS should be provided in tabular form accompanied by a brief comparative analysis with pre-construction and proposed BEHI/NBS identified during development of the restoration design. It should be assumed that uplift has been achieved if the post-construction BEHI/NBS for each restoration reach is functioning post-construction. **Table 10** shows the lateral stability performance standards that should be used to evaluate the proposed conditions.

Functioning	Functioning-At-Risk	Not Functioning
Dominant bank erosion rate potential is low or BEHI/NBS Rating: L/VL, L/L, L/M, L/H, L/VH, M/VL	Dominant bank erosion rate potential is moderate or BEHI/NBS Rating: M/L, M/M, M/H, L/Ex, H/L, M/VH, M/Ex, H/L, H/M, VH/VL, Ex/VL	Dominant bank erosion rate potential is high or BEHI/NBS Rating: H/H, H/Ex, VH/H, Ex/M, Ex/H, Ex/VH, VH/VH, Ex/Ex

Tabla	10.	Intoral	Stability	Dorformonco	Standar	4.
rable	TO:	Laterai	Stability	Performance	Standar	as

Performance standards from Starr et. al (2015)

c. Bedform Diversity

Bedform diversity in the pre-construction and design conditions were evaluated by the design team using the pool depth variability and the Shelter for Fish and Macroinvertebrates measurement methods.

Field data collected of the representative stream sections during the design phase of the project has been used to determine the pre-construction percentage of substrate favorable for epifaunal colonization: mix of snags, submerged logs, gravel, cobble, and large rocks, or other bed features that remain stable based on the Shelter for Fish and Macroinvertebrates measurement method in the USFWS's Function-Based Rapid Stream Assessment Methodology (Starr et al., 2015). Based on the pre-construction assessment bedform diversity is considered Functioning-at-Risk for Mainstem 2. Mainstem 2 is considered Not Functioning. Under the proposed conditions, bedform diversity is expected to be Functioning for Mainstem 1 and Mainstem 2 where significant portions of the stream are restored.

Post-construction bedform diversity will be evaluated during years 2 and 7. Pool depth variability will be evaluated with a longitudinal profile by measuring the bankfull pool depth at each pool within the assessment reach, and then dividing these depths by a representative mean riffle bankfull depth. The bedform diversity will also be evaluated by calculating the percentage of favorable substrate for each reach using the Shelter for Fish and Macroinvertebrates methodology. The length of favorable substrate (broken out by length of stable riffles and runs, and length of pools and glides composed of woody debris) will be measured in the field during the stream habitat assessment task of the monitoring (Section 11.4.1). The total percentage of favorable substrate will then be calculated based on the overall length of restoration within the reach. Results of the bedform diversity assessment will be provided in tabular form and will be accompanied by a brief comparative analysis with previous data collection of existing and proposed conditions. It will be assumed that uplift has been achieved if the percentage of favorable



substrate is greater than 50%. **Table 11** shows the bedform diversity performance standards that should be used to evaluate the proposed conditions.

Measurement Method	Functioning	Functioning-At-Risk	Not Functioning
Pool Max Depth Ratio/Depth Variability	> 1.5	1.2 - 1.5	< 1.2
Shelter for Fish and Macroinvertebrates (EPA 1999)	Greater than 70% of substrate favorable for epifaunal colonization and fish cover; mix of snags, submerged logs, undercut banks, rubble, gravel, cobble and large rocks, or other stable habitat and at stage to allow full colonization potential (i.e., logs/snags that are not new fall and not transient)	20-70% mix of stable habitat; suited for full colonization potential; adequate habitat for maintenance of populations; presence of additional substrate in the form of new fall, but not yet prepared for colonization (may rate at high end of scale)	Less than 20% mix of stable habitat; lack of habitat availability less than desirables obvious; substrate unstable or lacking

Table 11: Bedform Diversity Performance Standards

Performance standards from Starr et. al (2015)

3.8.4 Stream Habitat Assessment

Aquatic habitat will be assessed using the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Rapid Bioassessment Protocols for Use in Streams and Wadeable Rivers: Periphyton, Benthic Macroinvertebrates and Fish, Second Edition (Barbour et al. 1999). The RBP habitat assessment includes assessments for both high gradient and low gradient streams. The RBP high gradient habitat assessment uses a qualitative rating of 10 habitat parameters for Piedmont streams, including Epifaunal Substrate/Available Cover, Embeddedness, Velocity/Depth Diversity, Sediment Deposition, Channel Flow Status, Channel Alteration, Frequency of Riffles (or bends), Bank Stability, Vegetative Protection, and Riparian Vegetative Zone Width. Each parameter is given a score from 0-20, with the exception of Bank Stability, Vegetation Protection, and Riparian Vegetative Zone Width, which are scored from 0-10 for each bank. The scores for each parameter are then summed for a total score, which is compared to reference conditions (i.e., maximum possible score of 200) and given a narrative ranking. The RBP habitat ranking criteria are presented in **Table 12** below.



Table 12. RDF Habitat Ranking Citteria				
Score	Comparability to Reference	Narrative Ranking		
>180	>90%	Comparable to Reference		
151-179	75.1-89.9%	Supporting		
121-150	60.1-75%	Partially Supporting		
≤120	≤60%	Non-Supporting		

Table 12: RBP Habitat Ranking Criteria

Monitoring stations will be established on each of the reaches prior to construction to characterize baseline habitat conditions. The pre-construction habitat data should be used as a baseline for comparison with post-construction monitoring data taken during monitoring years 2 and 5.

3.8.5 Invasive Species Assessments

Post -construction, the monitoring team will assess invasive cover in years 1, 3, 5, 7, and 10. Invasive species will be assessed during two monitoring periods, once in the late spring and once in summer, to identify potential invasive species that could occur during different times of the growing season. The monitoring protocol will include slowly walking transects parallel to both banks of the stream to identify invasive plant species recognized in the 2010 National Park Service/U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service document entitled Plant Invaders of Mid-Atlantic Natural Areas (Swearingen et al. 2010) and within the Maryland Invasive Species Council document entitled Invasive Species of Concern in Maryland (MD Invasive Species Council 2005). These lists include both non-native invasive species and native species considered locally invasive by resource agencies. All identified invasive plants within the project area will be documented on stream restoration plans by tracing the limits of each population on field maps and through the use of a hand-held Global Positioning System (GPS) to more accurately locate either the center of smaller patches or the upstream and downstream limits of extensive patches. For each distinct invasive species population, an estimate will be made of the amount of the invasive cover relative to the total plant cover in the area. The total cover of each invasive species will then be summarized for the entire project site.

After each monitoring event, the mapped invasive cover will be reviewed to determine whether treatment is necessary based on extent and species composition. Within one week after completing each invasive species field assessment, the monitoring team will prepare and submit to the agencies a brief memo describing the vegetative conditions and recommendations for treatment or adaptive management, if necessary. Invasive species conditions described in each memo will also be summarized in each monitoring report. The monitoring team will continue to review mapped populations over time throughout the monitoring period to determine whether populations have changed and if control is warranted.

Treatment will generally be required if more than 10 percent of relative plant cover over the entire site is made up by invasive species. However, invasive species management will be confounded by its landscape setting. The stream restoration project site lies within an active riparian corridor that is susceptible to

seed inputs through animal dispersal (e.g., bird and mammals) and overbank flooding of the stream. Thus, permanent eradication of all invasive species may be extremely difficult or impossible. Also, the project site abuts similar habitat that is privately owned. The proliferation of certain invasive species on adjacent land makes the complete control of certain species difficult, especially species such as Japanese stilt-grass (*Microstegium viminium*). Therefore, any required management of invasive plants within the site will primarily focus on those species whose area-wide distribution is patchier in nature and for which treatment options have a higher likelihood of success. Also, those invasive species whose presence either precludes the establishment of native plants or results in the death of native plants, will be most aggressively treated.

3.8.6 Wetland Monitoring

The CA-5 stream restoration will include both temporary wetland impacts and wetland creation areas in the oxbow wetland. Approximately 3,550 SF (0.08 AC) permanent wetland impacts are anticipated due to the stream restoration construction. The proposed oxbow wetlands and the farm pond enhancement, which will provide a total of 12,756 square feet of on-site wetland creation. In addition, and impacts determined to be temporary will be restored in place on-site as well.

A. Temporary Wetland Impacts

Monitoring of the temporary wetland impact areas will be conducted in years 3, 5, and 10 following construction. All wetland monitoring will occur during the growing season.

Temporary wetland impact areas must meet the wetland criteria for hydrology, soils, and vegetation as described in the *Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual: Eastern Mountains and Piedmont Region, Version 2.0* (USACE, 2012). In addition, temporarily impacted wetlands areas must be dominated by native woody species (indicator status FAC or wetter) in the scrub/shrub or forested wetlands and have at least 85% native (indicator status FAC or wetter) species for vegetation establishment to be considered successful. If the MDE and the USACE determine that the project does not meet these Project Standards, MDOT SHA shall remediate the site or otherwise complete their restoration requirement to the satisfaction of the MDE and the USACE. If it is determined that remediation will not result in the site meeting the Project Standards, MDOT SHA may be required by the MDE and the USACE to mitigate for the wetland impacts resulting from the stream restoration project.

Sample Plots

Prior to construction, MDOT SHA will establish GPS-located sample plots within each temporary wetland impact area and assess them as described below. Vegetation sample plot locations will be placed randomly to provide a minimum of 1 plot per wetland impact area. Pre-construction monitoring will also include GPS-located photo points of each impact area. MDOT SHA will provide mapping (including shapefiles) of sample plots and photo points (described below) and a memo of pre-construction monitoring results to the monitoring team.

Sample plots will be re-assessed in years 3, 5, and 10 during the growing season. Routine Data Forms applicable to the *Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual: Eastern Mountains and Piedmont Region, Version 2.0* (USACE, 2012) will be used to document hydrology,



vegetation, and soils data collected at each sample plot. Plot sizes will vary depending on the size of each wetland impact area but will follow guidance in the regional supplement. For very small impact areas, plots can consist of the entire impact area.

The results will be provided in the monitoring report in designated monitoring years in tabular form and accompanied by a brief comparative analysis, conclusions, and recommendations, if any. Results will document whether wetland hydrology and vegetation requirements are being met for each plot..

Visual Assessment

In addition to data collection at the sample plots, a visual assessment of each temporary wetland impact area will also be conducted in years 3, 5 and 10. The boundaries of wetlands and cover types (i.e., forest, scrub-shrub, and emergent) will be delineated and located with a GPS unit. Areas of bare soil greater than 0.01 acres in size will be noted and boundaries located with GPS. Areas dominated by invasive species will also be located with GPS and described, noting approximate percent cover, species, and degree of dominance. Additionally, areas of open surface water or saturation will be located with GPS. All features located with GPS will be shown on as-built plans to be included with the monitoring report in years 3, 5 and 10. MDOT SHA will provide the monitoring team with digital files (.dgn) of as-builts, if available.

Photo Documentation

Photographs of temporarily impacted wetlands will be taken in years 3, 5, and 10 at designated GPSlocated photo points established pre-construction by MDOT SHA. A log of all photographs will be included in the monitoring report in designated years to provide a side-by-side comparison of each temporary wetland impact area. MDOT SHA will provide mapping of the photo point locations/directions (including shapefiles) and digital photograph files to the monitoring team.

B. Wetland Creation Monitoring (Oxbow Wetland and Farm Pond Enhancements)

The CA-5 stream restoration will result in 12,756 square feet of proposed oxbow wetlands and the farm pond enhancement. Within this area, any permanent impacts will meet wetland replacement requirements associated with the project. The location of the oxbow wetlands and the farm pond enhancement can be found on the 60% Design Plans dated March 2022.

Credit will not be sought for any wetlands created in excess of the replacement needs. Post-construction monitoring of the oxbow wetlands and the farm pond enhancement area will be conducted during the growing season in years 1, 3, 5, 7, and 10 to evaluate wetland hydrology and assess the presence and coverage of native and invasive vegetation.

Monitoring protocols for the oxbow wetlands and farm pond will follow the *Ecological Performance Standards and Monitoring Protocol for Permitee-Responsible Nontidal Wetland Mitigation Sites in Maryland.* Section I, *Performance Standards* of the referenced monitoring protocol provides final wetland performance standards for Wetland Vegetation Dominance, Aerial Cover Vegetative Standards, Non-Native and Invasive Species, Wetland Species Richness, Wetland Vegetation Density for Scrub-Shrub and Forested Wetlands, Wetland Vegetation Cover for Forested Wetlands, Wetland Hydrology, Anaerobic Soil


Conditions, Topsoil, Bulk Density, Microtopography, Woody Debris, Delineation of Aquatic Resources, and Wetland Function Assessment.

Evidence of wetland hydrology, as described in the *Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual: Eastern Mountains and Piedmont Region, Version 2.0* (USACE, 2012), will be used to determine project success. Created wetlands must also achieve a minimum of 85% native (indicator status of FAC or wetter) species to be considered successful. In addition, native woody species (FAC or wetter) must be dominant (represent more than 50% of all dominant woody plant species) in scrub-shrub or forested wetlands. If the MDE and the USACE determine that the project does not meet these Project Standards, MDOT SHA shall remediate the site or otherwise complete their restoration requirement to the satisfaction of the MDE and the USACE. If it is determined that remediation will not result in the site meeting the Project Standards, MDOT SHA may be required by the MDE and the USACE to mitigate for the wetland impacts resulting from the stream restoration project.

Reporting will follow the requirements stated in Section III of the *Ecological Performance Standards and Monitoring Protocol for Permitee-Responsible Nontidal Wetland Mitigation Sites in Maryland* titled Monitoring Reports. The report will include the required monitoring report measurements stated in Section IV.

Sample Plots

Sample plots will be established within the oxbow wetlands and the farm pond enhancement area and located with a GPS unit during year 1 of the monitoring period. Sample plots will be located on a random basis over the site in order to sample all areas of constructed wetlands. Plot sizes will vary depending on the size of each wetland but will follow guidance in the regional supplement. Each established plot will be sampled once during the growing season of year 1, 3, 5, 7, and 10. The assessment and reporting of the sample plot data for oxbow wetlands and the farm pond enhancement area areas will be the same as for temporary wetland impact areas, described above.

Visual Assessment

The visual assessment of the oxbow wetlands and the farm pond enhancement area will be the same as for temporary wetland impact areas, described above. However, the oxbow wetlands and the farm pond enhancement area will be assessed in years 1, 3, 5, 7, and 10.

Photo Documentation

The photo documentation of the oxbow wetlands and the farm pond enhancement area will be the same as for temporary wetland impact areas, described above. However, the monitoring team will establish GPS-located photo points at each sample plot during year 1 monitoring and will repeat them in years 1, 3, 5, 7, and 10.



3.8.7 Annual Report

Annual monitoring reports will be submitted by MDOT SHA to both USACE and MDE no later than December 31st of each calendar year. MDOT SHA will coordinate with the regulatory agencies concerning applicable remedial measures for any identified project failures and shall correct any project failures within one year of their identification.

3.8.8 Agency Site Visit

An Agency Site Visit consisting of MDOT SHA, MDE, and the USACE will occur in year 5 along with the Visual Inspection/Photo Documentation. A meeting minutes summary along with photos will be provided as the Final Monitoring Report in year 5. Starting at the end of Year 5 of monitoring, if the mitigation site meets all final year performance standards for at least two consecutive monitoring years, the MDOT SHA may request termination of the active monitoring period. If the site does not meet all final year performance standards, the MDOT SHA will continue to monitor the site and conduct an agency site visit at the end of year 10.

3.9 Long-term Management Plan

The purpose of the long-term management plan is to ensure that the CA-5 stream restoration site is monitored and managed after the maintenance and monitoring period is complete and it has been transferred to the Long-Term Steward (LTS). In this case, since all property rights will be held M-NCPPC, the M-NCPPC, will be the LTS. The small portion of the project located on PEPCO property will not be included in the mitigation for credit and will not require a Long-term Management Plan.

The CA-5 stream restoration site will be protected in perpetuity in accordance with M-NCPPC Montgomery County's integrated natural resource management plan, Natural Resource Management Plan for Natural Areas in M-NCPPC Parkland in Montgomery County, Maryland. The Natural Resources Management Plan for Natural Areas will be the instrument that defines the roles and maintenance responsibilities of the LTS. Following the completion of monitoring, the site will be visited to assess condition as it relates to invasive species presence, trespassing, vandalism, nuisance wildlife, erosion, and hydrology. Upon completion of the construction, MDOT SHA will coordinate with the LTS on measures that will be considered to dissuade detrimental activities from occurring onsite such as off-road vehicles, hunting, etc. A Long-Term Management plan has been included as Appendix IV, Attachment B.

3.10 Adaptive Management Plan

The CA-5 stream restoration site will be monitored for success of the project goals that were mentioned previously in the report. If deficiencies are found, remedial action will occur, and additional monitoring will take place to ensure success. If the mitigation goals of the site are not being met, an Adaptive Management Plan will be developed to assess and remediate the problem(s). Depending on the problem, the plan could include various assessments and remediation techniques.

Adaptive management strategies for streams include:

- Structure stability assessments
- Physical stream surveys including; cross sections, longitudinal profile, and pebble counts
- Habitat assessments



- Supplemental vegetative plantings and vegetation assessments
- Invasive species treatment recommendations, if appropriate
- Channel stabilization

Once a site is assessed, the monitoring team will coordinate the findings with the designers and MDOT SHA and recommendations will be developed. The agencies will be informed of the assessment findings and the recommendations. If needed, an interagency meeting will be conducted with the regulatory agencies, landowners, and MDOT SHA to determine the best course of action.

If field changes or unforeseen conditions are encountered that change the purview of the design, the Stream Restoration Specialist and contractor will work with the design team to address the concerns and make plan changes accordingly and coordinated with MDOT SHA and the regulatory agencies.

3.11 Financial Assurance

MDOT SHA is an ideal candidate for permittee-responsible mitigation. MDOT SHA frequently manages and implements roadway projects requiring compensatory mitigation, and has a funded program dedicated to the management and monitoring of its mitigation sites. MDOT SHA has committed funding for the design, construction, and monitoring of the mitigation site as part of the compensatory mitigation for the I-495/270 MLS project, and will be responsible for monitoring and maintenance, as well as any remedial actions that may be necessary. MDOT SHA establishes upfront funding for monitoring based on estimates of past monitoring on similar projects. On an annual basis, MDOT SHA reviews its need for funding and includes costs associated with monitoring, management, and remediation. The state has allocated funds to complete the aspects of this project including mitigation and maintenance and has selfinterest in completing the mitigation project, in accordance with performance standards.

3.12 Advance Mitigation

Advanced Mitigation is no longer proposed for the CA-5 stream restoration site.

4 **REFERENCES**

OP LANES

- Barbour, M. T., J. Gerritsen, B. D. Snyder, and J. B. Stribling. 1999. Rapid Bioassessment Protocols for Use in Streams and Wadeable Rivers: Periphyton, Benthic Macroinvertebrates and Fish, Second Edition. EPA 841-B-99-002. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; Office of Water; Washington, D.C. 339 pp.
- GISHydro2000, 2010. University of Maryland Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering and the Maryland State Highway Administration.
- Harman, W. R. Starr, M. Carter, K. Tweedy, M. Clemmons, K. Suggs, C. Miller. 2012, A Function-Based Framework for Stream Assessment and Restoration Projects. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Wetlands, Oceans, and Watersheds, Washington, D.C. EPA 843-K-12-006.
- MBSS. 2001a. Maryland Stream Waders Benthic Macro Invertebrate Data: Middle Patuxent River Site. Site ID: 857-5-2001. Accessed from: <u>https://geodata.md.gov/streamhealth/</u> or <u>http://eyesonthebay.dnr.maryland.gov/mbss/v_site.cfm?site=857-5-2001</u>
- Maryland Department of Environment (MDE), 2008. Code of Maryland Title 5. October 6, 2008. MD Nontidal Wetlands Protection Act, COMAR 26.23.
- MDE. 2018. Maryland's Draft 2018 Integrated Report of Surface Water Quality. MDE. Baltimore, MD. Available Online at: <u>https://mde.maryland.gov/programs/Water/TMDL/Integrated303dReports/Pages/2018IR.aspx</u>
- MDE. 2022. Ecological Performance Standards and Monitoring Protocol for Permittee-Responsible Nontidal Wetland Mitigation Sites in Maryland. February 1, 2022.
- MDE. 2021. *Phase II Wetland Mitigation Plan Required Information -* Checklist. Revised July 29, 2021.
- Maryland Department of Natural Resources (MDNR), 2015. Wildlife and Heritage Division Endangered and Nongame Species Program. Available at: <u>http://dnr2.maryland.gov/wildlife/Pages/plants_wildlife/rte/espaa.aspx</u>
- Maryland Hydrology Panel. 2016. *Application of Hydrologic Methods in Maryland: Forth Edition, July 2016.* The Maryland State Highway Administration and the Maryland Department of the Environment. Baltimore, Maryland.
- Maryland Invasive Species Council. 2005. Invasive Species of Concern in Maryland. Maryland State Highway Administration. 2003. Integrated Vegetation Management Manual for Maryland Highways.
- Montgomery County Department of Parks, The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC). 2009. Best Management Practices for Control of Non-Native Invasive. Available at: <u>nni-best_mngmnt_practices-april09.pdf</u>

- Rosgen, D. L. 2006. Watershed Assessment of River Stability and Sediment Supply (WARSSS), 1st Edition. Worksheet 5-8.
- Paul, M. J, J. B. Stribling, R. J. Klauda, P. F. Kazyak, M. T. Southerland, and N.E. Roth. 2002. A Physical Habitat Index for Freshwater Wadeable Streams in Maryland. CBWP-MANTA-EA-03-4, Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Monitoring and Non-Tidal.
- Roth, N. E., Southerland, M. T., Chaillou, J. C., Kazyak, P. F., and S. A. Stranko. 2000. *Refinement and validation of a fish Index of Biotic Integrity for Maryland streams*. Versar, Inc., Columbia, MD, with Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Monitoring and Non- Tidal Assessment Division. CBWP-MANTA-EA-00-2.
- Starr, R., W. Harman, S. Davis. 2015. Final Draft Function-Based Rapid Stream Assessment Methodology.
 US Fish and Wildlife Service. Habitat Restoration Division. Chesapeake Bay Field Office.
 Annapolis, MD. CAFE S15 06
- Stribling, J. B., B. K. Jessup, J. S. White, D. Boward, and M. Hurd. 1998. *Development of a Benthic Index of Biotic Integrity for Maryland Streams*. Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Monitoring and Non-Tidal Assessment, Annapolis, MD.
- USACE, 2020. Instructions for Maryland Stream Mitigation Framework Calculator Beta Version May 18, 2020. (Draft version).
- USACE, 2022. Ecological Performance Standards and Monitoring Protocol for Permitee-Responsible Nontidal Wetland Mitigation Sites in Maryland. Available Online at https://www.nab.usace.army.mil/Portals/63/IRT%20NT%20WetlBuffer%20Mon%20Prot%20PRM _20220201.pdf
- USDA, 2017. Soil Survey Geographic Database for Montgomery County, Maryland. Available Online at http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/
- Us. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) & Maryland U.S. Department of Transportation State Highway Administration (MDOT SHA). April 15, 2020. Draft Compensatory Mitigation Plan. Available Online at JPA Part13 Draft-Compensatory-Mitigation- Plan.pdf (495-270-p3.com)
- U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) & Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Administration (MDOT SHA). TBD. Final Compensatory Mitigation Plan.



APPENDIX I



ATTACHMENT A – RARE THREATENED AND ENDANGERED (RTE) SPECIES COORDINATION



Larry Hogan, Governor Boyd Rutherford, Lt. Governor Jeannie Haddaway-Riccio, Secretary Charles Glass, Deputy Secretary

Coordination Sheet for MD DNR Environmental Review Related to Project Locations

Date of Request: June 19, 2020 Name of Requestor: Karl Hellmann FMIS Number: TBD

Project Name and Location: Managed Lanes Study - Mitigation Site CA-5

The site is being pursued as a stream mitigation project for the I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study. The proposed design entails grading and vegetating the vertical banks to improve channel stability and installing instream-structures to provide grade-control, protect utilities and enhance habitat.

NAME OF STREAM(S) (and MDE Use Classification) WITHIN THE STUDY AREA: Unnamed Tributary to Great Seneca Creek

DNR RESPONSE:

 $\sqrt{\frac{\sqrt{100}}{1000}}$ Generally, no instream work is permitted in Use I streams during the period of March 1 through June 15, inclusive, during any year.

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES NOTES:

A nearby Maryland Biological Stream Survey (MBSS) station documents the following summary of findings for fish: American Eel, Blacknose Dace, Bluegill, Bluntnose Minnow, Brown Bullhead, Central Stoneroller, Common Shiner, Creek Chub, Creek Chubsucker, Fallfish, Fantail Darter, Golden Shiner, Green Sunfish, Greenside Darter, Largemouth Bass, Longnose Dace, Pumpkinseed, Rosyside Dace, Swallowtail Shiner, White Sucker, and Yellow Bullhead.

Important fisheries resources in this area include American Eel presence. American Eels migrate upstream through this region to smaller streams where they grow to adult stages. Some eels may reside within the project study area long term. Their spawning runs then take them back through this area as they migrate downstream as adults to a specific region of the Atlantic Ocean to spawn. Special attention has been given to American Eel management in recent years, due to their ecological and economic importance, and their declining numbers.

The Wildlife and Heritage Service has determined that there are no official State or Federal records for listed plant or animal species within the delineated area shown on the map provided. As a result, we have no specific concerns regarding potential impacts or recommendations for protection measures at this time. Please let us know however if the limits of proposed disturbance or overall site boundaries change and we will provide you with an updated evaluation. This site is located in a forested area. DNR has concerns about forest impacts from potential access and construction of this project. Please utilize design techniques that would avoid any live tree removal. Please continue coordinating closely with DNR as design progresses.

In addition, our analysis of the information provided also suggests that the forested area on or adjacent to the project site contains Forest Interior Dwelling Bird habitat. Populations of many Forest Interior Dwelling Bird Species (FIDS) are declining in Maryland and throughout the eastern United States. The conservation of FIDS habitat is strongly encouraged by the Department of Natural Resources.

During review for fisheries resources, we have noted the presence of DNR managed land within or adjacent to the project study area; please coordinate with DNR if these lands will be impacted.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS ON BMPS:

This site is located in a forested area. DNR has concerns about forest impacts from potential access and construction of this project. Please utilize design techniques that would avoid any live tree removal. Please continue coordinating closely with DNR as design progresses.

The project should be designed to maintain or enhance fish passage through the project area, particularly during low flow periods.

The project area may be within or adjacent to mapped wetland areas, impacts from the use of heavy equipment, disposal of excavated material, or other construction activities should be avoided to the extent possible. When there is no reasonable alternative to the adverse effects on wetlands or other aquatic or terrestrial habitat, the applicant shall be required to provide measures to mitigate, replace, or minimize the loss of habitat.

The fisheries resources in the above area should be adequately protected by the instream work restrictions referenced above, stringent sediment and erosion control methods, and other Best Management Practices typically used for protection of stream resources.

MD DNR, Environmental Review Program signature

Guen Giben

Gwen Gibson

DATE: September 9, 2020

IPaC resource list

This report is an automatically generated list of species and other resources such as critical habitat (collectively referred to as *trust resources*) under the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's (USFWS) jurisdiction that are known or expected to be on or near the project area referenced below. The list may also include trust resources that occur outside of the project area, but that could potentially be directly or indirectly affected by activities in the project area. However, determining the likelihood and extent of effects a project may have on trust resources typically requires gathering additional site-specific (e.g., vegetation/species surveys) and project-specific (e.g., magnitude and timing of proposed activities) information.

Below is a summary of the project information you provided and contact information for the USFWS office(s) with jurisdiction in the defined project area. Please read the introduction to each section that follows (Endangered Species, Migratory Birds, USFWS Facilities, and NWI Wetlands) for additional information applicable to the trust resources addressed in that section.

Location

Montgomery County, Maryland



Local office

Chesapeake Bay Ecological Services Field Office

└ (410) 573-4599**i** (410) 266-9127

177 Admiral Cochrane Drive Annapolis, MD 21401-7307

http://www.fws.gov/chesapeakebay/ http://www.fws.gov/chesapeakebay/endsppweb/ProjectReview/Index.html

Endangered species

This resource list is for informational purposes only and does not constitute an analysis of project level impacts.

The primary information used to generate this list is the known or expected range of each species. Additional areas of influence (AOI) for species are also considered. An AOI includes areas outside of the species range if the species could be indirectly affected by activities in that area (e.g., placing a dam upstream of a fish population even if that fish does not occur at the dam site, may indirectly impact the species by reducing or eliminating water flow downstream). Because species can move, and site conditions can change, the species on this list are not guaranteed to be found on or near the project area. To fully determine any potential effects to species, additional site-specific and project-specific information is often required.

Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act **requires** Federal agencies to "request of the Secretary information whether any species which is listed or proposed to be listed may be present in the area of such proposed action" for any project that is conducted, permitted, funded, or licensed by any Federal agency. A letter from the local office and a species list which fulfills this requirement can **only** be obtained by requesting an official species list from either the Regulatory Review section in IPaC (see directions below) or from the local field office directly.

For project evaluations that require USFWS concurrence/review, please return to the IPaC website and request an official species list by doing the following:

- 1. Draw the project location and click CONTINUE.
- 2. Click DEFINE PROJECT.
- 3. Log in (if directed to do so).
- 4. Provide a name and description for your project.
- 5. Click REQUEST SPECIES LIST.

Listed species¹ and their critical habitats are managed by the <u>Ecological Services Program</u> of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the fisheries division of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA Fisheries²).

Species and critical habitats under the sole responsibility of NOAA Fisheries are **not** shown on this list. Please contact <u>NOAA Fisheries</u> for <u>species under their jurisdiction</u>.

- Species listed under the <u>Endangered Species Act</u> are threatened or endangered; IPaC also shows species that are candidates, or proposed, for listing. See the <u>listing status page</u> for more information. IPaC only shows species that are regulated by USFWS (see FAQ).
- 2. <u>NOAA Fisheries</u>, also known as the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), is an office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration within the Department of Commerce.

The following species are potentially affected by activities in this location:

Mammals

NAME

STATUS

Northern Long-eared Bat Myotis septentrionalis Wherever found

Threatened

3017

This species only needs to be considered if the following condition applies:

 Projects with a federal nexus that have tree clearing = to or > 15 acres: 1. REQUEST A SPECIES LIST 2. NEXT STEP: EVALUATE DETERMINATION KEYS 3. SELECT EVALUATE under the Northern Long-Eared Bat (NLEB) Consultation and 4(d) Rule Consistency key

No critical habitat has been designated for this species. <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9045</u>

Critical habitats

Potential effects to critical habitat(s) in this location must be analyzed along with the endangered species themselves.

THERE ARE NO CRITICAL HABITATS AT THIS LOCATION.

Migratory birds

Certain birds are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act¹ and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act².

Any person or organization who plans or conducts activities that may result in impacts to migratory birds, eagles, and their habitats should follow appropriate regulations and consider implementing appropriate conservation measures, as described <u>below</u>.

- 1. The Migratory Birds Treaty Act of 1918.
- 2. The <u>Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act</u> of 1940.

Additional information can be found using the following links:

- Birds of Conservation Concern <u>http://www.fws.gov/birds/management/managed-species/</u> <u>birds-of-conservation-concern.php</u>
- Measures for avoiding and minimizing impacts to birds <u>http://www.fws.gov/birds/management/project-assessment-tools-and-guidance/</u> <u>conservation-measures.php</u>
- Nationwide conservation measures for birds <u>http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/pdf/management/nationwidestandardconservationmeasures.pdf</u>

The birds listed below are birds of particular concern either because they occur on the <u>USFWS Birds</u> <u>of Conservation Concern</u> (BCC) list or warrant special attention in your project location. To learn more about the levels of concern for birds on your list and how this list is generated, see the FAQ <u>below</u>. This is not a list of every bird you may find in this location, nor a guarantee that every bird on

5/13/2021

IPaC: Explore Location resources

this list will be found in your project area. To see exact locations of where birders and the general public have sighted birds in and around your project area, visit the <u>E-bird data mapping tool</u> (Tip: enter your location, desired date range and a species on your list). For projects that occur off the Atlantic Coast, additional maps and models detailing the relative occurrence and abundance of bird species on your list are available. Links to additional information about Atlantic Coast birds, and other important information about your migratory bird list, including how to properly interpret and use your migratory bird report, can be found <u>below</u>.

For guidance on when to schedule activities or implement avoidance and minimization measures to reduce impacts to migratory birds on your list, click on the PROBABILITY OF PRESENCE SUMMARY at the top of your list to see when these birds are most likely to be present and breeding in your project area.

NAME

BREEDING SEASON (IF A BREEDING SEASON IS INDICATED FOR A BIRD ON YOUR LIST, THE BIRD MAY BREED IN YOUR PROJECT AREA SOMETIME WITHIN THE TIMEFRAME SPECIFIED, WHICH IS A VERY LIBERAL ESTIMATE OF THE DATES INSIDE WHICH THE BIRD BREEDS ACROSS ITS ENTIRE RANGE. "BREEDS ELSEWHERE" INDICATES THAT THE BIRD DOES NOT LIKELY BREED IN YOUR PROJECT AREA.)

Bald Eagle Haliaeetus leucocephalus Breeds Sep 1 to Jul 31 This is not a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) in this area, but warrants attention because of the Eagle Act or for potential susceptibilities in offshore areas from certain types of development or activities. https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/1626 Kentucky Warbler Oporornis formosus Breeds Apr 20 to Aug 20 This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. Prairie Warbler Dendroica discolor Breeds May 1 to Jul 31 This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. Breeds Apr 1 to Jul 31 Prothonotary Warbler Protonotaria citrea This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. **Red-headed Woodpecker** Melanerpes erythrocephalus Breeds May 10 to Sep 10

-0N

This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.

Breeds elsewhere

Rusty Blackbird Euphagus carolinus This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.

Wood Thrush Hylocichla mustelinaBreeThis is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in

Breeds May 10 to Aug 31

Probability of Presence Summary

The graphs below provide our best understanding of when birds of concern are most likely to be present in your project area. This information can be used to tailor and schedule your project activities to avoid or minimize impacts to birds. Please make sure you read and understand the FAQ "Proper Interpretation and Use of Your Migratory Bird Report" before using or attempting to interpret this report.

Probability of Presence (

the continental USA and Alaska.

Each green bar represents the bird's relative probability of presence in the 10km grid cell(s) your project overlaps during a particular week of the year. (A year is represented as 12 4-week months.) A taller bar indicates a higher probability of species presence. The survey effort (see below) can be used to establish a level of confidence in the presence score. One can have higher confidence in the presence score if the corresponding survey effort is also high.

How is the probability of presence score calculated? The calculation is done in three steps:

- 1. The probability of presence for each week is calculated as the number of survey events in the week where the species was detected divided by the total number of survey events for that week. For example, if in week 12 there were 20 survey events and the Spotted Towhee was found in 5 of them, the probability of presence of the Spotted Towhee in week 12 is 0.25.
- 2. To properly present the pattern of presence across the year, the relative probability of presence is calculated. This is the probability of presence divided by the maximum probability of presence across all weeks. For example, imagine the probability of presence in week 20 for the Spotted
- Towhee is 0.05, and that the probability of presence at week 12 (0.25) is the maximum of any week of the year. The relative probability of presence on week 12 is 0.25/0.25 = 1; at week 20 it is 0.05/0.25 = 0.2.
- 3. The relative probability of presence calculated in the previous step undergoes a statistical conversion so that all possible values fall between 0 and 10, inclusive. This is the probability of presence score.

To see a bar's probability of presence score, simply hover your mouse cursor over the bar.

Breeding Season (=)

Yellow bars denote a very liberal estimate of the time-frame inside which the bird breeds across its entire range. If there are no yellow bars shown for a bird, it does not breed in your project area.

Survey Effort ()

Vertical black lines superimposed on probability of presence bars indicate the number of surveys performed for that species in the 10km grid cell(s) your project area overlaps. The number of surveys is expressed as a range, for example, 33 to 64 surveys.

To see a bar's survey effort range, simply hover your mouse cursor over the bar.

No Data (–)

A week is marked as having no data if there were no survey events for that week.

Survey Timeframe

Surveys from only the last 10 years are used in order to ensure delivery of currently relevant information. The exception to this is areas off the Atlantic coast, where bird returns are based on all years of available data, since data in these areas is currently much more sparse.

				probal	oility of p	presence	e b re	eding se	ason	survey e	effort –	- no data
SPECIES	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
Bald Eagle Non-BCC Vulnerable (This is not a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) in this area, but warrants attention because of the Eagle Act or for potential susceptibilities in offshore areas from certain types of development or activities.)	1++	+	+ # + #	++ •		++++	5	++++	+##+			
Kentucky Warbler BCC Rangewide (CON) (This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.)	++++	++++	++++ \$	+++	117+	++++	++++	++++	++++	++++	++++	++++
Prairie Warbler BCC Rangewide (CON) (This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.)	++++	++++	++++	+#11	₩+ ++	++++	+++	++++	++++	++++	++++	++++

Prothonotary Warbler BCC Rangewide (CON) (This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.)	++++ ++++ ++++ ++++ ++++ ++++ ++++ +++++
Red-headed Woodpecker BCC Rangewide (CON) (This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.)	
Rusty Blackbird BCC Rangewide (CON) (This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.)	++++ ++++ +#++ +#++ ++++ ++++ ++++ ++++ ++++ ++++
Wood Thrush BCC Rangewide (CON) (This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.)	++++ ++++ ++++ ++++ +++++ ++++++++++++

Tell me more about conservation measures I can implement to avoid or minimize impacts to migratory birds.

<u>Nationwide Conservation Measures</u> describes measures that can help avoid and minimize impacts to all birds at any location year round. Implementation of these measures is particularly important when birds are most likely to occur in the project area. When birds may be breeding in the area, identifying the locations of any active nests and avoiding their destruction is a very helpful impact minimization measure. To see when birds are most likely to occur and be breeding in your project area, view the Probability of Presence Summary. <u>Additional measures</u> or <u>permits</u> may be advisable depending on the type of activity you are conducting and the type of infrastructure or bird species present on your project site.

What does IPaC use to generate the migratory birds potentially occurring in my specified location?

The Migratory Bird Resource List is comprised of USFWS <u>Birds of Conservation Concern (BCC)</u> and other species that may warrant special attention in your project location.

The migratory bird list generated for your project is derived from data provided by the <u>Avian Knowledge Network</u> (<u>AKN</u>). The AKN data is based on a growing collection of <u>survey</u>, <u>banding</u>, <u>and citizen science datasets</u> and is queried and filtered to return a list of those birds reported as occurring in the 10km grid cell(s) which your project intersects, and that have been identified as warranting special attention because they are a BCC species in that area, an eagle (<u>Eagle Act</u> requirements may apply), or a species that has a particular vulnerability to offshore activities or development.

Again, the Migratory Bird Resource list includes only a subset of birds that may occur in your project area. It is not representative of all birds that may occur in your project area. To get a list of all birds potentially present in your project area, please visit the <u>AKN Phenology Tool</u>.

What does IPaC use to generate the probability of presence graphs for the migratory birds potentially occurring in my specified location?

The probability of presence graphs associated with your migratory bird list are based on data provided by the <u>Avian Knowledge Network (AKN)</u>. This data is derived from a growing collection of <u>survey</u>, <u>banding</u>, <u>and citizen</u> <u>science datasets</u>.

Probability of presence data is continuously being updated as new and better information becomes available. To learn more about how the probability of presence graphs are produced and how to interpret them, go the Probability of Presence Summary and then click on the "Tell me about these graphs" link.

How do I know if a bird is breeding, wintering, migrating or present year-round in my project area?

To see what part of a particular bird's range your project area falls within (i.e. breeding, wintering, migrating or year-round), you may refer to the following resources: <u>The Cornell Lab of Ornithology All About Birds Bird Guide</u>, or (if you are unsuccessful in locating the bird of interest there), the <u>Cornell Lab of Ornithology Neotropical Birds</u> <u>guide</u>. If a bird on your migratory bird species list has a breeding season associated with it, if that bird does occur in your project area, there may be nests present at some point within the timeframe specified. If "Breeds elsewhere" is indicated, then the bird likely does not breed in your project area.

What are the levels of concern for migratory birds?

Migratory birds delivered through IPaC fall into the following distinct categories of concern:

- 1. "BCC Rangewide" birds are <u>Birds of Conservation Concern</u> (BCC) that are of concern throughout their range anywhere within the USA (including Hawaii, the Pacific Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands);
- 2. "BCC BCR" birds are BCCs that are of concern only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA; and
- 3. "Non-BCC Vulnerable" birds are not BCC species in your project area, but appear on your list either because of the <u>Eagle Act</u> requirements (for eagles) or (for non-eagles) potential susceptibilities in offshore areas from certain types of development or activities (e.g. offshore energy development or longline fishing).

Although it is important to try to avoid and minimize impacts to all birds, efforts should be made, in particular, to avoid and minimize impacts to the birds on this list, especially eagles and BCC species of rangewide concern. For more information on conservation measures you can implement to help avoid and minimize migratory bird impacts and requirements for eagles, please see the FAQs for these topics.

Details about birds that are potentially affected by offshore projects

For additional details about the relative occurrence and abundance of both individual bird species and groups of bird species within your project area off the Atlantic Coast, please visit the <u>Northeast Ocean Data Portal</u>. The Portal also offers data and information about other taxa besides birds that may be helpful to you in your project review. Alternately, you may download the bird model results files underlying the portal maps through the <u>NOAA NCCOS</u> <u>Integrative Statistical Modeling and Predictive Mapping of Marine Bird Distributions and Abundance on the Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf</u> project webpage.

Bird tracking data can also provide additional details about occurrence and habitat use throughout the year, including migration. Models relying on survey data may not include this information. For additional information on marine bird tracking data, see the <u>Diving Bird Study</u> and the <u>nanotag studies</u> or contact <u>Caleb Spiegel</u> or <u>Pam</u> <u>Loring</u>.

What if I have eagles on my list?

If your project has the potential to disturb or kill eagles, you may need to <u>obtain a permit</u> to avoid violating the Eagle Act should such impacts occur.

Proper Interpretation and Use of Your Migratory Bird Report

The migratory bird list generated is not a list of all birds in your project area, only a subset of birds of priority concern. To learn more about how your list is generated, and see options for identifying what other birds may be in your project area, please see the FAQ "What does IPaC use to generate the migratory birds potentially occurring in my specified location". Please be aware this report provides the "probability of presence" of birds within the 10 km grid cell(s) that overlap your project; not your exact project footprint. On the graphs provided, please also look carefully at the survey effort (indicated by the black vertical bar) and for the existence of the "no data" indicator (a red horizontal bar). A high survey effort is the key component. If the survey effort bar or no data bar means a lack of data and, therefore, a lack of certainty about presence of the species. This list is not perfect; it is simply a starting point for identifying what birds of concern have the potential to be in your project area, when they might be there, and if they might be breeding (which means nests might be present). The list helps you know what to look for to confirm presence, and helps guide you in knowing when to implement conservation measures to avoid or minimize potential impacts from your project activities, should presence be confirmed. To learn more about conservation measures, visit the FAQ "Tell me about conservation measures I can implement to avoid or minimize impacts to migratory birds" at the bottom of your migratory bird trust resources page.

Facilities

National Wildlife Refuge lands

Any activity proposed on lands managed by the <u>National Wildlife Refuge</u> system must undergo a 'Compatibility Determination' conducted by the Refuge. Please contact the individual Refuges to discuss any questions or concerns.

THERE ARE NO REFUGE LANDS AT THIS LOCATION.

Fish hatcheries

THERE ARE NO FISH HATCHERIES AT THIS LOCATION.

Wetlands in the National Wetlands Inventory

Impacts to <u>NWI wetlands</u> and other aquatic habitats may be subject to regulation under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, or other State/Federal statutes.

For more information please contact the Regulatory Program of the local <u>U.S. Army Corps of</u> <u>Engineers District</u>.

Please note that the NWI data being shown may be out of date. We are currently working to update our NWI data set. We recommend you verify these results with a site visit to determine the actual extent of wetlands on site.

This location overlaps the following wetlands:

FRESHWATER POND
PUBHh

RIVERINE

<u>R5UBH</u>

A full description for each wetland code can be found at the National Wetlands Inventory website

Data limitations

The Service's objective of mapping wetlands and deepwater habitats is to produce reconnaissance level information on the location, type and size of these resources. The maps are prepared from the analysis of high altitude imagery. Wetlands are identified based on vegetation, visible hydrology and geography. A margin of error is inherent in the use of imagery; thus, detailed on-the-ground inspection of any particular site may result in revision of the wetland boundaries or classification established through image analysis.

The accuracy of image interpretation depends on the quality of the imagery, the experience of the image analysts, the amount and quality of the collateral data and the amount of ground truth verification work conducted. Metadata should be consulted to determine the date of the source imagery used and any mapping problems.

Wetlands or other mapped features may have changed since the date of the imagery or field work. There may be occasional differences in polygon boundaries or classifications between the information depicted on the map and the actual conditions on site.

Data exclusions

Certain wetland habitats are excluded from the National mapping program because of the limitations of aerial imagery as the primary data source used to detect wetlands. These habitats include seagrasses or submerged aquatic vegetation that are found in the intertidal and subtidal zones of estuaries and nearshore coastal waters. Some deepwater reef communities (coral or tuberficid worm reefs) have also been excluded from the inventory. These habitats, because of their depth, go undetected by aerial imagery.

Data precautions

Federal, state, and local regulatory agencies with jurisdiction over wetlands may define and describe wetlands in a different manner than that used in this inventory. There is no attempt, in either the design or products of this inventory, to define the limits of proprietary jurisdiction of any Federal, state, or local government or to establish the geographical scope of the regulatory programs of government agencies. Persons intending to engage in activities involving modifications within or adjacent to wetland areas should seek the advice of appropriate federal, state, or local agencies concerning specified agency regulatory programs and proprietary jurisdictions that may affect such activities.



ATTACHMENT B – MARYLAND HISTORIC TRUST (MHT) COORDINATION

ARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION Larry Hogan Governor

Boyd K. Rutherford Lt. Governor

Gregory Slater Secretary

Tim Smith, P.E. Administrator

July 23, 2020

Ms. Elizabeth Hughes State Historic Preservation Officer Maryland Historical Trust 100 Community Place Crownsville, MD 21032-2023

Ms. Julie Langan State Historic Preservation Officer Department of Historic Resources 2801 Kensington Avenue Richmond, VA 23221

Dear Ms. Hughes and Ms. Langan:

This letter serves to continue consultation under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act with the Maryland Historical Trust (MHT) and the Virginia Department of Historic Resources (DHR) for Project No. AW073A11, I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study (MLS). The MLS is the first element of a broader I-495 & I-270 Public-Private Partnership (P3) Program which considers improvements along the entire length of I-495 (Capital Beltway) in Maryland, connecting into Virginia's portion of I-495, as well as the entire length of I-270 (Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Highway) up to I-70 in Frederick County, Maryland.

MDOT SHA coordinated the project's effect on historic properties and submitted the Cultural Resources Technical Report by letter dated January 10, 2020, with responses received from MHT and DHR dated March 12, 2020, and February 14, 2020, respectively. Per that, and subsequent correspondence with DHR, we understand DHR is awaiting resolution of National Register eligibility of resources in Virginia prior to commenting on the effect determination.

This update includes:

- An expansion of the Area of Potential Effects (APE) to encompass stream and wetland mitigation sites in Maryland
- New and revised eligibility determinations for three architectural resources in Maryland;
- New and revised effect determinations for six historic properties in Maryland;

Ms. Elizabeth Hughes and Ms. Julie Langan Page Two

Revised Area of Potential Effects

The APE for this project was previously defined as a 250-foot buffer of consideration on either side of the widest proposed alternative's Limits of Disturbance (LOD) (Alt 10). The APE includes additional buffer areas at the American Legion Bridge and elsewhere to capture setting, feeling, and viewshed effects. MDOT SHA has since identified potential environmental mitigation sites where stream and wetland restoration is proposed. Due to the nature of the work at these locations (restoration of existing natural features), the APE is confined to the LOD for each mitigation site, as no substantive visual elements are proposed that would be new or inconsistent with the existing character of these locations. The current known LOD of these sites have been added to the APE (Attachment 1).

Architecture

New and Updated Eligibility Determinations

Using the APE coordinated January 10, 2020, MDOT SHA identified two additional unrecorded architectural resources in Montgomery County, as documented in the attached Determination of Eligibility (DOE) forms (**Attachment 2**). The Forest Glen Tower (M: 31-81) is a steel lattice tower at Seminary Road and Forest Glen Road (MD 192); MDOT SHA has determined that this former Cold War-era air raid siren tower lacks integrity and is not eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The Morningstar Tabernacle No. 88 Moses Hall and Cemetery (M: 35-212), at I-495 and Seven Locks Road, was the site of a late nineteenth-century African American benevolent society. MDOT SHA has determined that the property is eligible for listing in the NRHP under Criterion A for its association with the African American community in Cabin John and under Criterion C for its example of a vernacular African American American cemetery.

Additionally, MDOT SHA updated the B&O Railroad, Metropolitan Branch (M: 37-16), DOE to provide additional information that expands upon previous surveys of the line (first surveyed in 1979 and determined eligible in 2000) to clarify the period of significance, revise the boundary, and provide a list of contributing and noncontributing resources. The Metropolitan Branch remains eligible for the NRHP. It is significant under Criterion A for its association with transportation and the agricultural and residential development of Frederick and Montgomery counties and under Criterion C for its engineering, representative of nineteenth and twentieth century railroad technology.

The new and updated eligibility determinations are summarized in Table 1, Attachment 3.

Updated Effect Assessments

Both physical effects as well as potential visual, atmospheric, or audible effects were considered within the entire APE. The effect assessment coordinated in the January 10, 2020, letter and

Ms. Elizabeth Hughes and Ms. Julie Langan Page Three

described in the Cultural Resources Technical Report found no adverse effect to 34 architectural historic properties and an adverse effect on 10 architectural historic properties. MDOT SHA has identified one additional architectural historic property in the APE: the Morningstar Tabernacle No. 88 Moses Hall and Cemetery, which will experience an adverse effect. In addition, new information in the updated DOE has resulted in a revised effect assessment for the B&O Railroad, Metropolitan Branch, which was previously determined to be adverse. In the January 10, 2020, letter, MDOT SHA also identified seven architectural historic properties where effects could not be fully determined. Ongoing project development has resulted in sufficient information to determine effects for four of the seven undetermined properties. Architectural historic properties with new or updated effect determinations are described below.

- Morningstar Tabernacle No. 88 Moses Hall and Cemetery (M: 35-212): Pending MHT • concurrence that the resource is NRHP-eligible, MDOT SHA has determined that the project will adversely affect Morningstar Tabernacle No. 88 Moses Hall and Cemetery. The work proposed at this location includes widening along the outside of the I-495 inner loop to construct two new managed lanes and a new ramp to connect the managed lanes with MD 190 at the existing interchange. The width of new pavement beyond the existing edge of the outside shoulder is approximately 55 feet. A retaining wall is proposed along the edge of the proposed outside shoulder to minimize impacts to the property. The wall would retain fill for the widened roadway section. The limits of disturbance (LOD) are offset ten feet behind the proposed retaining wall to accommodate construction and maintenance of the wall, erosion and sediment control, drainage, and landscaping. A noise wall would be constructed within the LOD. As currently designed, the LOD would impact the historic property. Contributing elements within the LOD include portions of the Moses Hall foundation wall, a section of the former access road from Seven Locks Road, and at least one depression possibly marking a grave location. MDOT is continuing to examine engineering avoidance alternatives at this location, but based on current design an adverse effect is expected.
- **B&O Railroad, Metropolitan Branch (M: 37-16)**: Activities at this location are unchanged, but new information in the DOE and further analysis of the LOD have resulted in a revised finding of no adverse effect for the property, pending MHT's concurrence with the revised DOE. The updated DOE form for the Metropolitan Branch demonstrates that the segment of the railroad within the LOD was realigned to the east during the construction of I-495 between 1957 and 1964, and the railroad bridge over I-495 was also completed at this time. The Metropolitan Branch's period of significance is 1873 to 1945, and the bridge and railroad alignment within the project area do not contribute to the significance of the branch. The current LOD include one contributing element of the Metropolitan Branch: Small Structure No. 15046X0, a stone arch culvert which carries Forest Glen Creek beneath the Metropolitan Branch and the adjacent Capitol View Avenue. The structure's southern spandrel wall appears within LOD on some imagery but is excluded from the limits and will not be affected. The project will cross the underground segment of Small Structure No. 15046X0 at the Metropolitan Branch tracks. The LOD at this location represent above-grade impacts, and no physical impacts to the historic property are anticipated; the vertical aspect

Ms. Elizabeth Hughes and Ms. Julie Langan Page Four

of the LOD remains at the surface. Current project engineering is not expected to alter the character of the property, and MDOT SHA is committed to both avoiding physical impacts to the aboveground spandrel wall and limiting ground disturbance along the underground segment of the small structure. Based upon the information presented in the updated DOE and the absence of impacts to Small Structure No. 15046X0, MDOT SHA has determined the project will not adversely affect the B&O Railroad, Metropolitan Branch.

- Carsondale (PG:73-36): Carsondale, one of the earliest suburban residential developments in Maryland to offer Veterans Administration (VA) financing for African American veterans, is eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A. Updated design information has allowed MDOT SHA to make a finding of adverse effect for the property. To accommodate widening along US 50 associated with realigning the US 50/I-495 interchange and replacement of the bridge carrying Whitfield Chapel Road over US 50, the LOD in Carsondale include: a narrow linear area that extends approximately 550 feet where the northern edge of the historic district meets US 50; and a narrow strip that extends 150 along the east side of Whitfield Chapel Road. Activities within Carsondale would consist of tree removal, grading, construction of a retaining wall, and access for construction vehicles and materials. Along Whitfield Chapel Road, the roadway height would be adjusted to meet the elevation of the new bridge across US 50. There are no physical impacts to contributing dwellings, but the LOD encompass minor portions of front or rear yards, including some secondary structures, of nine dwellings that contribute to the district's significance. These include the rear yards of seven dwellings along the north side of Wallace Road (9004, 9010, 9016, 9018, 9104, 9112, 9114) and the front yards of two dwellings on Whitfield Chapel Road (4907 and 4909). These multiple minor impacts to contributing resources will result in a cumulative diminishment of the property's integrity of setting and design.
- *Capitol View Park Historic District (M: 31-7)*: Activities at this location are unchanged, but a detailed review of design needs have resulted in a revised finding of no adverse effect for the property. The LOD are in close proximity to contributing stone walls surrounding the parking lot for the Castle of Forest Glen at 10 Post Office Road. However, MDOT SHA has determined the stone walls will be avoided and no LOD impacts will occur, and the project will not adversely affect the Capitol View Park Historic District.
- *Washington Aqueduct (M: 24-49)*: Activities at this location are unchanged, but MDOT SHA's design development has resulted in a revised finding of no adverse effect for the property. The LOD at this location represent above-grade impacts, and no physical impacts to the historic property are anticipated; the vertical aspect of the APE and LOD remains at the surface at this location, and ground disturbance that would affect the Aqueduct will be prohibited. The project will cross an underground segment of the aqueduct at MacArthur Boulevard. Current project engineering is not expected to alter the character of the property. The project will not adversely affect the Washington Aqueduct.

Ms. Elizabeth Hughes and Ms. Julie Langan Page Five

Suitland Parkway (PG: 76A-22): Suitland Parkway is listed on the NRHP under Criteria A and C in the areas of transportation and landscape architecture. MDOT SHA has determined that the project will not adversely affect Suitland Parkway. In addition to the widening of the I-495 bridge over Suitland Parkway, activities at this location include grading, tree removal, landscape plantings, erosion and sediment control, construction of an auxiliary pipe to augment the existing culvert conveying Henson Creek beneath I-495, and access for construction vehicles and materials. These activities will not affect any structures that contribute to the significance of Suitland Parkway, including bridges, culverts, stone-lined ditches, stone curbing, and drop inlets. The proposed pipe extension will occur at a pipe constructed for I-495. Improvement and maintenance of the outfall will direct water away from the historic property and reduce environmental degradation along the north side of the parkway, preserving its character. In areas affected by grading and tree removal, landscape plantings consistent with the original design and character of the parkway will be used to replace vegetation and will be maintained. The existing bridges carrying I-495 over Suitland Parkway are currently being widened and replaced by MDOT SHA. The bridges, currently under construction as part of a separate project and not part of the parkway itself, will accommodate the MLS improvements by the reduction of the median on the inside of I-495. The highway over Suitland Parkway will not be additionally widened, and no diminishment of the integrity of those characteristics that qualify the 9.18-mile long parkway for inclusion in the NRHP will result.

MDOT SHA's use of the area impacted by the undertaking (I-495, bridges, relocated creek under I-495 and the proposed additional storm drain/culvert) will be authorized by a highway easement deed. NPS does not have the authority to authorize MDOT SHA use of NPS lands by way of a long-term maintenance agreement or other mechanism. NPS understands the highway easement deed will be issued by FHWA on behalf of the USA in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 107. The highway easement deed will provide MDOT SHA with an easement for their facilities, but NPS will retain the underlying ownership of the land. No character defining features of Suitland Parkway exist within the proposed area of transfer; furthermore, MDOT SHA and FHWA are subject to state (Maryland Historical Trust Act) and federal (Section 106) historic preservation requirements, which would ensure consideration of any impacts resulting from future actions related to these small MDOT SHA easement areas within Suitland Parkway.

The remaining three properties where effects cannot be fully determined will be subject to stipulations of the proposed Programmatic Agreement to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects as design advances. Updated property effect assessments are summarized in **Attachment 3**. MDOT SHA has determined the project continues to have an adverse effect on architectural historic properties.

Ms. Elizabeth Hughes and Ms. Julie Langan Page Six

Expanded APE in Maryland

MDOT SHA has conducted a preliminary review of the APE and has determined that the following mitigation sites will either not affect or will have no adverse effect on architectural historic properties.

- *AN-1 (No Architectural Properties Affected)*: This site is a natural area within Crabbs Branch Stream Valley Park and includes no architectural resources
- *AN-3 (No Architectural Properties Affected)*: This site is a natural area within Northwest Branch Stream Valley Park and includes no architectural resources.
- *CA-2 (No Architectural Properties Affected)*: This site is a natural area within Great Seneca Stream Valley Park and includes no architectural resources.
- *CA-3 (No Architectural Properties Affected)*: This site is a natural area within Magruder Branch Stream Valley Park and includes no architectural resources.
- *RFP-1 (No Architectural Properties Affected)*: Includes multiple MIHP resources, all of which have been evaluated and determined not eligible, demolished, or both. The only remaining resource, the Bond Property (PG:60-10), was determined not eligible in November 2001. The Turner/Bond Family Cemetery (PG:60-2) was relocated to Union Cemetery in the 1980s by the Donaldson Funeral Home of Laurel; the cemetery location was field checked by MDOT SHA as below and confirmed to have been completely destroyed by gravel mining.
- *RFP-4 (No Architectural Properties Affected)*: North of Greenock Road, Wilson Owens Branch passes through the golf course of the 1990 Cannon Country Club. A horse shed and fence at 5563 Greenock Road are within an area of proposed grading; however, these structures were constructed after 1981 (according to historical aerials). South of Greenock Road, the work will be confined to wooded areas along the stream bank, and the pre-1978 resources at 5461 and 5339 Greenock Road will not be affected by stream access areas.
- *AN-6 and AN-7 (No Adverse Effect to Architectural Properties)*: These sites include the Beltsville Agricultural Research Center (BARC; PG:62-14), which is listed in the NRHP under Criteria A and C. The restoration of the existing stream will occur within a small portion of the 6500-acre resource and will not introduce new visual or physical elements out of character with the surrounding agricultural landscape; furthermore, no buildings or structures associated with BARC are within the APE. MDOT SHA's proposed stream restoration activities will not alter the characteristics that qualify BARC for the NRHP and do not meet the requirements of 36 CFR §800.5(1), Criteria of Adverse Effect.

MDOT SHA will undertake additional architectural historic property identification efforts at the remaining sites within the expanded APE, and the results will be coordinated during future consultation.

Ms. Elizabeth Hughes and Ms. Julie Langan Page Seven

Archaeology

Maryland

The Study has identified proposed locations of stream restoration and mitigation, wetland creation, and fish passage improvements at eight sites on public lands and eight sites being developed on private lands by design consultants. MDOT SHA archaeologist Richard Ervin assessed the archaeological potential of the public and private mitigation sites, and additional archaeological investigations are being planned as follows. MDOT SHA will provide the results of these investigations when they are available.

MDOT SHA proposes the following archaeological evaluation approaches to the mitigation locations:

Mitigation Site	County	Proposed Work
AN-6 Paint Branch	PG	Phase I archaeology will be undertaken at this site on BARC
Fish Passage, South		property; it is considered to have high archaeological potential
Farm		based on prior sites recorded close to, but outside the LOD,
		and a favorable topographic setting.
AN-7 Paint Branch,	PG	Phase I archaeology will be undertaken at this site on BARC
South Farm		property, which is considered to have high archaeological
		potential based on prior sites recorded close to and within
		the LOD, and a favorable topographic setting. One site is
		recorded within the LOD: 18PR113 is a precontact short-term
		resource procurement site, and its status will be evaluated as
		part of the Phase I.
PA-1 Back Branch	PG	Phase I archaeological recordation will be undertaken at
		18PR605, the Chesapeake Beach Railway. Most of the
		remaining portions of the mitigation site are considered to
		have low archaeological potential based on prior disturbance
		and poorly drained soils. However, limited Phase IA
		archaeological survey will be done in undisturbed, well-
		drained, high potential portions of the LOD.
RFP-3 Tuscarora	FR	Phase I archaeology will be undertaken based on high
Creek (Hope Site)		archaeological potential. One possible archaeological site is
		within the LOD, an Archaic Period quad file site BUCKEY-
		QF02. One standing structure is recorded in the survey area,
		the Hebb-Kline Farmstead (F-1-202).
RFP-4 Cabin-	AA	Phase I archaeology will be undertaken at portions of the site
Branch (Bristol),		that are considered to have high archaeological potential based
Surplus Area,		on prior sites recorded nearby, and favorable topographic
Surplus Streams		setting.

Ms. Elizabeth Hughes and Ms. Julie Langan Page Eight

RFP-6 Mill Swamp Cr	CA	Phase I archaeology will be undertaken at portions of the site that are considered to have high archaeological potential based on favorable topographic setting. No sites are recorded in the LOD, but numerous sites have been recorded nearby, especially near the confluence of Pomonkey Creek and the Potomac River. One of these is 18CH73, a large pre-contact period site along the Potomac River 0.8 miles southwest of the LOD. Historic structures are shown in and near the project area on historic maps.
RFP-1 Indian	PG	Based on prior disturbance, no further work is warranted at
at Konterra		gravel quarrying. The Turner/Bond Family Cemetery (PG:60- 2) was within Mitigation Area 5, located adjacent to but outside the proposed design. It was situated on a bluff overlooking the stream and its floodplain, but the cemetery has been moved. Its location has been destroyed by sand and gravel quarrying, as verified by a field visit by MDOT SHA. MDOT SHA will monitor project plans as the design progresses.
RFP-2 Cabin	МО	Based on prior disturbance and low archaeological potential,
Branch Gaithersburg quad		no further work is warranted at this time. Aerial imagery shows that the site has been disturbed by construction of a golf course. Most of the LOD is on frequently flooded soils within the active stream floodplain, or slopes steeper than 15%, settings where significant archaeological resources are not expected to occur. MDOT SHA will monitor project plans as the design progresses.
RFP-5 Henson	PG	Based on prior disturbance, no further work is warranted at
Creek (Hovermale)		this time. Most of the project is within areas of Urban land where significant archaeological resources are unlikely to occur. One standing structure is recorded in the survey area: Hovermale's Tastes Best Ice Cream (PG:80-25). No structures are depicted on historic maps (PG Co 1861; USGS East Washington 1886, Washington Vicinity 1917). MDOT SHA will monitor project plans as the design progresses.
AN-1 Crabbs	MO	Based on low archaeological potential, no further work is
Branch		warranted at this time. The LOD would mostly be confined to areas immediately adjacent to the stream channel, where significant archaeological resources are unlikely to occur. MDOT SHA will monitor project plans as the design progresses. Site 18PR320 (a Late Archaic short-term site) is documented approximately 1800 feet upstream of the proposed stream site.

Ms. Elizabeth Hughes and Ms. Julie Langan Page Nine

AN-3 Northwest	MO	Based on low archaeological potential and the negative results
Branch Pebblestone		of prior survey, no further work is warranted at this time.
Dr.		Prior archaeological work indicates that the LOD is largely
		limited to terrain along Rolling Stone Creek that would have
		hear too wet and low for occupation (Wagner 2014:131: in
		Mitralitz and Dood [2014]) MDOT SUA will moniton project
		Mikolik alid Keed [2014]). MIDOT SHA will monitor project
		plans as the design progresses. The Bonifant Cemetery on
		North Sherwood Forest Lane, about 750 feet northwest of the
		stream, would not be impacted by the current design. Site
		18MO596 (Late Archaic) is recorded approximately 2000 feet
		to the west of the study area.
CA-2 Lower	MO	Based on low archaeological potential, no further work is
Magruder Branch		warranted at this time. The results of prior archaeological
		survey at the adjacent SC-19 mitigation site (Emory 2011)
		suggest that the APE of CA-2, Lower Magruder Branch, is too
		wet for habitation, and is unlikely to contain significant
		archaeological resources MDOT SHA will monitor project
		plans as the design progresses
CA-3 Unner	MO	Based on low archaeological potential no further work is
Magruder Branch	1010	warranted at this time. The results of prior archaeological
Magrader Drahen		survey at the nearby SC-10 mitigation site (Emory 2011)
		suggest that the ADE of CA 3 Lower Magrider Branch is too
		suggest that the AFE of CA-5, Lower Magruder Dianen, is too
		wet for haditation, and is unlikely to contain significant
		archaeological resources. MDO1 SHA will monitor project
		plans as the design progresses.
CA-5 Seneca Creek	MO	Based on low archaeological potential, no further work is
Tributary		warranted at this time. The LOD is mostly confined to areas
		of occasionally flooded soils on the active floodplain, or
		slopes greater than 15%. MDOT SHA will monitor project
		plans as the design progresses.

MDOT SHA noted several locations requiring additional archaeological study in our January 10, 2020 letter, and those will continue to be proposed as actions to be completed under the proposed Programmatic Agreement. To the extent feasible, limited additional investigations are being conducted at two cemetery locations, the Montgomery County Poor Farm and the Morningstar Tabernacle No. 88 Moses Hall and Cemetery. Preliminary mapping and recordation is underway at the Morningstar Tabernacle No. 88 Moses Hall and Cemetery to identify and record known interments, possible grave sites and depressions, and formal and informal grave markers. The foundation of the lodge building was also partially mapped. Completion of this initial work is pending required legal access to clear bamboo that obscures portions of the cemetery property. The technical report of the results of this work will be provided when it is available; MDOT

Ms. Elizabeth Hughes and Ms. Julie Langan Page Ten

SHA will continue consultation including appropriate consulting parties on additional work expected beyond this surface mapping.

Virginia

No changes to the project, including the APE or effects assessments within Virginia are included in this letter, and it is informational for DHR, although any comments are welcome. MDOT SHA, National Park Service, and DHR will continue to coordinate on the outstanding eligibility and effects issues related to the George Washington Memorial Parkway (GWMP) and archaeological sites within the GWMP park boundaries under separate cover. MDOT SHA has requested an eligibility determination from the Keeper of the National Register regarding the proposed Dead Run Ridges Archaeological District in Fairfax County.

Ongoing Preliminary Engineering

For the overall project, MDOT SHA may require geotechnical borings or other minimally invasive preliminary engineering studies as part of project development prior to completion of Section 106 review. Consistent with MDOT SHA's statewide programmatic agreement, MDOT SHA will ensure cultural resources staff review proposed boring locations to avoid impacts to known archaeological sites. Geotechnical borings are assumed to have minimal potential to affect historic properties, and may inform on the potential for deeply buried surfaces within the LOD. For borings occurring outside MDOT SHA right-of-way, MDOT SHA will coordinate as appropriate with land-managing agencies on such borings.

MDOT SHA respectfully requests any comments on the revised APE, review by MHT of the enclosed information supporting the analysis, and concurrence on the following determinations:

- The Morningstar Tabernacle No. 88 Moses Hall and Cemetery is eligible for the NRHP and will be adversely affected
- The B&O Railroad, Metropolitan Branch, as revised, continues to be eligible for the NRHP but will not experience an adverse effect
- The Forest Glen Tower is **not** eligible for the NRHP
- There will be no adverse effect to the NRHP-eligible properties in Attachment 3, Table 4
- Properties in Attachment 3, Table 2 will experience an adverse effect
- Properties in Attachment 3, Table 3 should be subject to provisions of the proposed Programmatic Agreement to avoid, minimize or mitigate potential adverse effects
- No historic properties will be affected within the expanded APE at the following proposed mitigation sites: AN-1, AN-3, CA-2, CA-3, and RFP-1 (Table 5, Attachment 3).

We request the above responses from MHT by **August 24, 2020**. We look forward to working with the respective State Historic Preservation Offices and additional consulting parties on continued development of the proposed Programmatic Agreement for the MLS undertaking.

Ms. Elizabeth Hughes and Ms. Julie Langan Page Eleven

Please feel free to contact Steve Archer, MDOT SHA Cultural Resources Team Leader at 410-545-8508 or <u>sarcher@mdot.maryland.gov</u> with any questions or information needs on this project.

Sincerely,

Digitally signed by Steve Archer Adobe Acrobat version: 2017.011.30171

Julie M. Schablitsky for Chief Archaeologist/Assistant Division Chief Environmental Planning Division

Attachments

cc:

Mr. Marc Holma, Virginia DHR
Ms. Jeanette Mar, Environmental Manager, FHWA Maryland Division
Mr. Tony Opperman, VDOT
Ms. Mandy Ranslow, ACHP
Mr. John Simkins, FHWA Virginia Division
Mr. Steve Archer, MDOT SHA-EPLD
Ms. Lisa B. Choplin, DBIA, Director, I-495 & I-270 P3 Office, MDOT SHA
Mr. Richard Ervin, MDOT SHA-EPLD
Mr. Jeffrey Folden, P.E., DBIA, Deputy Director, I-495 & I-270 P3 Office, MDOT SHA
Mr. Matt Manning, MDOT SHA-EPLD
Dr. Julie Schablitsky, MDOT SHA-EPLD
I-495 & I-270 MLS Section 106 Consulting Parties

-For Maryland Historical Trust Use Only-Concurrence with the MDOT State Highway Administration's Determination(s) of Eligibility and/or Effects

 Project Number: AW073A11
 MHT Log No.

 Project Name: I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study (MLS)
 County: Montgomery and Prince George's

 Letter Date: July 23, 2020
 Letter Date: July 23, 2020

The Maryland Historical Trust has reviewed the documentation attached to the referenced letter and concurs with the MDOT State Highway Administration's determinations as follows:

Appropriate Area of Potential Effects (Attachment 1)

- [] Concur
- [] Do Not Concur

Eligibility (as noted in the Eligibility Table [Attachment 3]):

- [] Concur
- [] Do Not Concur

Effect (as noted in the Effects Table [Attachment 3]):

-] No Properties Affected
- [] No Adverse Effect
- [] Conditioned upon the following action(s) (see comments below)
 -] Adverse Effect

Comments:

By:

MD State Historic Preservation Office/ Maryland Historical Trust

Date

Return by U.S. Mail or Facsimile to: Dr. Julie M. Schablitsky, Assistant Division Chief, Environmental Planning Division, MDOT State Highway Administration, P.O. Box 717, Baltimore, MD 21203-0717 Telephone: 410-545-8870 and Facsimile: 410-209-5046 A_Proj Number: 11729

Attachment 3

Table 1: New and Updated Eligibility Determinations

MIHP#	Name	Туре	SHA NR Det.	SHPO Concurrence	Remarks
M: 37-16	B&O Railroad, Metropolitan Branch	Structure	Remains Eligible	Requested 7/2020	Updated DOE provides additional information that expands upon previous surveys (first surveyed in 1979 and determined eligible in October 2000) to clarify the period of significance, revise the boundary, and provide a list of contributing and noncontributing resources.
M: 31-81	Forest Glen Tower	Structure	Not Eligible	Requested 7/2020	Cold War-era air raid siren tower lacks integrity
M: 35-212	Morningstar Tabernacle No. 88 Moses Hall and Cemetery	District	Eligible	Requested 7/2020	Significant under Criteria A for its association with the African American community in Cabin John and under Criterion C for its example of a vernacular African American cemetery. Meets Criteria Consideration D.

Table 2: Properties Experiencing an Adverse Effect

MIHP#/DHR#	Name	Туре	Impact	SHPO Concurrence	Period of Significance	NRHP Criteria	Remarks
PG:73-36	Carsondale	District	Adverse	Requested 7/2020	1955-1962	A	Eligible
M: 35-212	Morningstar Tabernacle No. 88 Moses Hall and Cemetery	Landscape	Adverse	Requested 7/2020	1887-1973	A, C, Criteria Consideration D	Eligible

Table 3: Properties Where Effects Cannot Be Fully Determined

MIHP#/DHR#	Name	Туре	Impact	SHPO Concurrence	Period of Significance	NRHP Criteria	Remarks
M: 29-59	Carderock Springs Historic District	District	Effects Cannot Be Fully Determined	Concurred 3/2020	1962-1967	A, C	Listed
M: 29-39	Gibson Grove A.M.E. Zion Church	Building	Effects Cannot Be Fully Determined	Concurred 3/2020	1923	A, Criteria Consideration A	Eligible
M: 32-5	Polychrome Historic District	District	Effects Cannot Be Fully Determined	Concurred 3/2020	1934-1935	A, C	Listed

Table 4: Properties Experiencing No Adverse Effect

MIHP#/DHR#	Name	Туре	Impact	SHPO Concurrence	Period of Significance	NRHP Criteria	Remarks
M: 37-16	B&O Railroad, Metropolitan Branch	Structure	No Adverse	Requested 7/2020	1873-1945	A, C	Eligible; project will avoid contributing resources
PG:62-14	Beltsville Agricultural Research Center (BARC)	District	No Adverse	Requested 7/2020	Not established		Listed; stream restoration
M: 31-7	Capitol View Park Historic District	District	No Adverse	Requested 7/2020	1887-1941	A, C	Eligible; project will avoid contributing resources
PG:76A-22	Suitland Parkway	District	No Adverse	Requested 7/2020	1942-1944	A, C	Listed
M: 29-49	Washington Aqueduct	Structure	No Adverse	Requested 7/2020	1853-1939	A, C	Listed (NHL); project will avoid below-ground impacts

Attachment 3

Table 5: Stream and	Wetland Mitigation	Site Summary

Site Number	County	Architecture	Archaeology	Effect	Remarks
AN-1	Montgomery	No architectural resources present	Low potential; no further work is warranted	NPA	
AN-3	Montgomery	No architectural resources present	Low potential, negative results of prior survey; no further work is warranted	NPA	
AN-6	Prince George's	No adverse effect	Phase I archaeology will be undertaken	TBD	Within Beltsville Agricultural Research Center (PG:62-14)
AN-7	Prince George's	No adverse effect	Phase I archaeology will be undertaken	TBD	Within Beltsville Agricultural Research Center (PG:62-14)
CA-2	Montgomery	No architectural resources present	Low potential, negative results of prior survey; no further work is warranted	NPA	
CA-3	Montgomery	No architectural resources present	Low potential, negative results of prior survey; no further work is warranted	NPA	
CA-5	Montgomery	Additional evaluation to be completed	Low potential; no further work is warranted	TBD	
PA-1	Prince George's	Additional evaluation to be completed	Phase I archaeology will be undertaken	TBD	
RFP-1	Prince George's	No architectural resources present	Prior disturbance; no further work is warranted	NPA	
RFP-2	Montgomery	Additional evaluation to be completed	Prior disturbance and low potential; no further work is warranted	TBD	
RFP-3	Frederick	Additional evaluation to be completed	Phase I archaeology will be undertaken	TBD	
RFP-4	Anne Arundel	No architectural resources present	Phase I archaeology will be undertaken	TBD	
RFP-5	Prince George's	Additional evaluation to be completed	Prior disturbance; no further work is warranted	TBD	
RFP-6	Calvert	Additional evaluation to be completed	Phase I archaeology will be undertaken	TBD	

Larry Hogan, Governor Boyd Rutherford, Lt. Governor



Maryland DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING MARYLAND HISTORICAL TRUST

September 4, 2020

Dr. Julie M. Schablitsky MDOT State Highway Administration 707 North Calvert Street Baltimore, MD 21202

Re: I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study (MLS) Montgomery and Prince George's Counties, Maryland MDOT SHA Project No. AW073A11

Dear Dr. Schablitsky:

Thank you for providing the Maryland Historical Trust (Trust), the Maryland State Historic Preservation Office, with additional information regarding the above-referenced undertaking. The Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Administration's (MDOT SHA) submittal represents ongoing consultation to assess the project's effects on historic properties, pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, and the Maryland Historical Trust Act of 1985, as amended, State Finance and Procurement Article §§ 5A-325 and 5A-326 of the Annotated Code of Maryland. Trust staff have conducted a thorough review of the materials and we are writing to provide our comments and concurrence.

Revised Area of Potential Effects (APE): Based on ongoing design development, MDOT SHA has expanded the undertaking's APE to include potential environmental mitigation sites and additional buffer areas in the vicinity of the American Legion Bridge. The Trust agrees that the MDOT SHA's redefined APE encompasses the geographic area within which an undertaking may directly or indirectly cause alterations in the character or use of historic properties.

Additional Identification and Evaluation of Historic Properties within the APE: MDOT SHA conducted additional assessments of the APE to identify historic properties. Determination of Eligibility (DOE) Forms were prepared for two newly identified architectural resources and an existing DOE was updated to identify the property's areas of significance.

The Trust concurs with MDOT SHA that the following properties are <u>eligible</u> for listing in the National Register:

MIHP No. M: 35-212	Morningstar Tabernacle No. 88 Moses Hall and Cemetery This property is eligible for the National Register under Criteria A and C as the site of a 19 th century African American benevolent society and cemetery.
MIHP No. M: 37-16	B&O Railroad, Metropolitan Branch The Metropolitan Branch of the B&O Railroad was determined eligible in 2000. The Trust concurs with the MDOT SHA's updated documentation to identify a period of significance, National Register boundary, and contributing/non-contributing features.

Dr. Julie M. Schablitsky I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study (MLS) Page 2

The Trust concurs with MDOT SHA that the following property is not eligible for listing in the National Register:

MIHP No. M: 31-81 Forest Glen Tower The Trust agrees that the steel lattice tower lacks integrity and is not eligible for National Register-listing.

The potential for significant archeological resources was assessed by MDOT SHA within the expanded APE, including the environmental mitigations sites. We agree with MDOT SHA's recommendations on Pages 7-9 of your letter that additional Phase I investigations are warranted for several environmental mitigation areas. We look forward to receiving the results of this work, along with the analysis of several other locations requiring archeological study as noted in MDOT SHA's 10 January 2020 letter, as project planning continues.

Revised Assessment of Effects: The Trust concurs with MDOT SHA's determination that the overall proposed undertaking will have an <u>adverse effect</u> on historic properties, including archeological properties, in Maryland. Furthermore, the Trust agrees with the following specific findings stated in MDOT SHA's submittal letter dated 23 July 2020 and accompanying attachments:

- In addition to the properties noted as adversely affected in our previous correspondence, we agree that the undertaking will also adversely affect the Carsondale Historic District (MIHP No. PG:73-36) and the Morningstar Tabernacle No. 88 Moses Hall and Cemetery (MIHP No. M: 35-212).
- We agree that the undertaking may affect the historic properties listed in Table 3 (Attachment #3) and further consultation will be needed during design development to consider and address effects.
- We concur that the undertaking will have no adverse effect on the historic properties listed in Table 4 (Attachment #3).

The Trust appreciates MDOT SHA's robust and continuous coordination with our office and other consulting parties in accordance with Section 106. We look forward to working with your office as the project advances to develop and refine avoidance and minimization efforts.

If you have questions or need further assistance, please contact Tim Tamburrino (for historic structures) at <u>tim.tamburrino@maryland.gov</u> or Beth Cole (for archeology) at <u>beth.cole@maryland.gov</u>. Thank you for providing us this opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth Hughes Director/State Historic Preservation Officer EH/BC/TJT/202003475

cc: Caryn Brookman (SHA) Jeanette Masr (FHWA) Rebeccah Ballo (Montgomery County Planning) Joey Lampl (Montgomery County Parks) Sarah Rogers (Heritage Tourism Alliance of Montgomery County, Inc.) Howard Berger (Prince George's County Planning Department) Aaron Marcavitch (Anacostia Trails Heritage Area, Inc.) Friends of Moses Hall


APPENDIX II



ATTACHMENT A - VICINITY MAP







ATTACHMENT B - STREAM DESIGN REPORT (UNDER SEPARATE COVER)



ATTACHMENT C – GEOPROBE MAP AND LOGS

					RK&K			
				SOIL	PROBE LOG			
DATE:		4/28/20)20		SOIL PROBE ID:	CA-5 SN-1		
INSPECTOR:		Ted Chade	eayne		DRILLING CONTRACTOR:	Tidewater, Inc.		
PROJECT NA	ME:	495/270 M	litigation		SAMPLING METHOD:	Geoprobe 7822DT		
COMMISSION	\ # :	14136-30			SAMPLE INTERVAL:	Continuous		
WEATHER:		Overcast, 51 °F	light rain		GROUNDWATER DEPTH:	Free groundwater not encountered.		
TIME	PLASTI	C TUBE	CORE	CORE		SOIL DESCRIPTION		
	SAMPLE	E DEPTH	RECOVERY	RECOVERY				
	FROM	то	(FEET)	(%)				
1110	0.0	4.0	3.2	80%	0 to 0.5 - dark brown claye roots. 0.5 to 2.3 - brown clayey S 2.3 to 4.0 - as above, with	ey SILT, very soft, slightly moist, some thin SILT, soft, slightly moist, trace thin roots. faint mottling.		
1115	4.0	8.0	3.3	83%	 4.0 to 4.5 - brown clayey SILT, soft, slightly moist, trace thin roots, fair mottling. 4.5 to 6.4 - mottled orange-brown and gray silty CLAY, soft, slightly moist, slightly micaceous. 6.4 to 8.0 - dark brown SILT, soft, slightly moist, slight mottling, micaceous, faint degraded rock structure. 			
					END CORING AT 8.0 FEE BACKFILLED	ΞT		
LOG PREPAR	RED BY:	Ted Chade	eayne					

					RK&K			
				SOIL	PROBE LOG			
DATE:		4/28/20	020		SOIL PROBE ID:	CA-5 SN-2		
INSPECTOR:		Ted Chade	eayne		DRILLING CONTRACTOR:	Tidewater, Inc.		
PROJECT NA	ME:	495/270 M	litigation		SAMPLING METHOD:	Geoprobe 7822DT		
COMMISSION	l #:	14136-30			SAMPLE INTERVAL:	Continuous		
WEATHER:		Overcast, 51 °F	light rain		GROUNDWATER DEPTH:	Free groundwater not encountered.		
TIME	PLASTI	C TUBE	CORE	CORE		SOIL DESCRIPTION		
	SAMPLE	E DEPTH	RECOVERY	RECOVERY				
	FROM	ТО	(FEET)	(%)				
1020	0.0	4.0	1.9	48%	0 to 1.0 - very dark brown moist, some thin roots. 1.0 to 4.0 - brown silty CL/ cobble, very soft, moist.	silty CLAY, trace sand, very soft, slightly AY, little fine to course sand, trace gravel and		
1025	4.0	8.0	3.5	88%	 4.0 to 4.5 - brown clayey SILT, little fine to course sand, little gray gravel, soft, moist, slightly micaceous. 4.5 to 8.0 - brown and dark gray clayey SILT and fine to course angul gravel, medium stiff, slightly moist, micaceous, faint degraded rock structure. 			
					END CORING AT 8.0 FEE BACKFILLED	ΞT		
LOG PREPAR	RED BY:	Ted Chade	eayne					

					RK&K			
				SOIL	PROBE LOG			
DATE:		4/28/20	020		SOIL PROBE ID:	CA-5 SS-1		
INSPECTOR:		Ted Chade	eayne		DRILLING CONTRACTOR:	Tidewater, Inc.		
PROJECT NA	ME:	495/270 N	litigation		SAMPLING METHOD:	Geoprobe 7822DT		
COMMISSION	l #:	14136-30			SAMPLE INTERVAL:	Continuous		
WEATHER:		Overcast, 51 °F	light rain		GROUNDWATER DEPTH:	Free groundwater not encountered.		
TIME	PLASTI	C TUBE	CORE	CORE		SOIL DESCRIPTION		
	SAMPLE	E DEPTH	RECOVERY	RECOVERY				
	FROM	то	(FEET)	(%)				
1230	0.0	4.0	3.2	80%	0 to 0.3 - very dark brown moist, thin roots. 0.3 to 2.1 - brown SILT, lit moist, trace thin roots. 2.1 to 4.0 - brown clayey S small mottling.	clayey SILT, little sand, very soft, slightly tle sand and angular gravel, soft, slightly SILT, soft, slightly moist, slightly micaceous,		
1235	4.0	8.0	3.9	98%	 4.0 to 4.5 - very dark grayish brown CLAY, very soft, wet. 4.5 to 4.7 - gray silty CLAY, soft, moist. 4.7 to 7.3 - brown clayey SILT, soft, slightly moist, slightly micaceous small mottling. 7.3 to 8.0 - gray medium to coarse SAND, some angular gravel, loos slightly moist, faint degraded rock structure. 			
					END CORING AT 8.0 FEE BACKFILLED	ΞT		
LOG PREPAR	RED BY:	Ted Chade	eayne					

				RK&K			
			SOIL	PROBE LOG			
	4/28/20)20		SOIL PROBE ID:	CA-5 SS-2		
	Ted Chade	eayne		DRILLING CONTRACTOR:	Tidewater, Inc.		
ME:	495/270 M	litigation		SAMPLING METHOD:	Geoprobe 7822DT		
l #:	14136-30			SAMPLE INTERVAL:	Continuous		
	Overcast, 51 °F	light rain		GROUNDWATER DEPTH:	Free groundwater not encountered.		
PLASTI	C TUBE	CORE	CORE		SOIL DESCRIPTION		
SAMPLE	DEPTH	RECOVERY	RECOVERY				
FROM	ТО	(FEET)	(%)				
0.0	4.0	2.6	65%	0 to 0.5 - very dark brown roots. 0.5 to 3.5 - brown SILT, so coarse sand, soft, slightly 3.5 to 4.0 - brown clayey S slightly micaceous.	silty CLAY, very soft, slightly moist, thin ome fine sand, little angular gravel and moist, little thin roots. SILT, trace fine sand, soft, slightly moist,		
4.0	8.0	2.8	70%	 4.0 to 4.7 - dark brown clayey SILT, trace fine sand, soft, slightly mois slightly micaceous. 4.7 to 6.7 - brown SILT, some fine to medium sand, little angular gravel, medium stiff, slightly moist, slightly micaceous (gravel inclusions at 5.0 to 5.1 feet and 5.6 to 5.7 feet). 6.7 to 8.0 - brown to tan and gray SILT, some fine to medium sand ar angular gravel, medium stiff, slightly moist, heavily micaceous, degraded rock structure. 			
				END CORING AT 8.0 FEE BACKFILLED	ΞT		
RED BY:	Ted Chade	eavne					
	ME: I #: PLASTIN SAMPLE FROM 0.0 4.0 4.0	4/28/20 Ted Chada ME: 495/270 M 1#: 14136-30 Overcast, 51°F PLASTIC TUBE SAMPLE DEPTH FROM TO 0.0 4.0 4.0 8.0 4.0 8.0 10 10 4.0 10	H/28/2020 Ted Chadeayne ME: 495/270 Mitigation I#: 14136-30 Overcast, light rain 51°F CORE PLASTIC TUBE CORE SAMPLE DEPTH FROM TO 0.0 4.0 4.0 8.0 2.8 4.0 8.0 2.8 Image: Same Same Same Same Same Same Same Same	SOIL 4/28/2020 Ted Chadeayne ME: 495/270 Mitigation I#: 14136-30 Overcast, light rain S1"F CORE CORE PLASTIC TUBE CORE RECOVERY FROM TO (FEET) (%) 0.0 4.0 2.6 65% 4.0 8.0 2.8 70% 4.0 8.0 2.8 1 Image: Colspan="2">Image: Colspan="2" 4.0 8.0 2.8 70% Image: Colspan="2" Image: Cols	SOIL PROBE LOG 4/28/2020 SOIL PROBE ID: Ted Chadeayne DRILLING CONTRACTOR: ME: 495/270 Mitigation SAMPLING METHOD: ME: 14138-30 SAMPLE INTERVAL: Overcast, light rain S1*F CORE CORE PLASTIC TUBE CORE CORE SAMPLE DEPTH RECOVERY RECOVERY FROM TO (FEET) 0 to 0.5 - very dark brown roots. 0.0 4.0 2.6 65% 0 to 0.5 - very dark brown roots. 0.0 4.0 2.6 65% 0 to 0.5 - very dark brown roots. 0.0 4.0 2.6 65% 0 to 0.5 - very dark brown roots. 0.0 4.0 2.6 65% 70 * or 0.5 - vory of ark brown roots. 0.0 4.0 2.8 70% 10 to 4.7 - dark brown rola slightly micaceous. 4.0 8.0 2.8 70% 4.0 to 4.7 - dark brown rola slightly micaceous. 4.0 8.0 2.8 70% FID corning AT 8.0 FEE 6.7 to 8.0 - brown to tan a angular gravel, medium stiff, slightly inclusions at 5.0 to 5.1 fee 6.7 to 8.0 - brown to tan a angular gravel, me		





ATTACHMENT D - RIGHT OF ENTRY PERMITS



MONTGOMERY COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PARKS THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

Maryland State Highway Administration I-495 and I-270 MLS

RIGHT OF ENTRY AGREEMENT

This Right of Entry Agreement ("Agreement") is made this day of <u>429</u> 2018, by and between **THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION (M-NCPPC)** a public body corporate and agency of the State of Maryland, whose address is 8787 Georgia Avenue, Silver Spring, Maryland 20901, its successors and assigns, (the "Permittor") and the Maryland State Highway Administration, a public body corporate and agency of the State of Maryland, whose address is 707 North Calvert Street; P-601 Baltimore, MD, 21202 its successors and assigns (the "Permittee"), (Permittor and Permittee, collectively, the "Parties").

WHEREAS, Permittor is the owner of certain lands known as Rock Creek Regional Park, Cabin John SVU #2, Little Seneca SVU #1, Great Seneca SVU #4; Magruder Branch SVU #1, Cashell Local Park, Northwest Branch SVU #5, Wheaton Regional Park, Rock Creek SVU #2;Rock Creek SVU #16, Upper Rock Creek Local Park, North Branch SVU #4, Heritage Farm Neighborhood Park, Kensington Parkway SVP, Norwood Village NCA, Gunners Branch Local Park, Watts Branch SVU #1, Little Falls SVU #2, Capital Crescent Trail Special Park, Quince Orchard Valley Neighborhood Park and Booze Creek SVP and

WHEREAS, a portion of the Properties known as Rock Creek Regional Park, Cabin John SVU #2, Little Seneca SVU #1, Great Seneca SVU #4, Magruder Branch SVU #1, Cashell Local Park, Northwest Branch SVU #5, Wheaton Regional Park, Rock Creek SVU #2, Rock Creek SVU #16, Upper Rock Creek Local Park, North Branch SVU #4, Heritage Farm Neighborhood Park, Kensington Parkway SVP, Norwood Village NCA, Gunners Branch Local Park, Watts Branch SVU #1, Little Falls SVU #2, Capital Crescent Trail Special Park, Quince Orchard Valley Neighborhood Park and Booze Creek SVP as shown on the attached plans, known hereto as <u>Exhibit A</u> (the "MNCPPC Land") is necessary to be entered onto to facilitate an Investigative Environmental Assessment Survey and Soil Sampling.

WITNESSETH:

The Maryland State Highway Administration., its contractors, assigns and business are hereby permitted to enter upon the MNCPPC property referenced above to conduct the Investigative Environmental Assessment and Monitoring Survey, subject to the terms and conditions set forth as follows:

- 1. Permittor warrants that the person signing this Agreement is authorized to execute this Agreement.
- 2. All employees, contractors and agents of the Maryland State Highway Administration will exercise all normal and reasonable safety precautions in the performance of the work hereunder

- 3. All Activities associated with this Right-of-Entry Agreement shall be conducted in accordance with the Scope of Work description provided by MD SHA and at the locations indicated on the accompanying maps; (See attached copies).
- 4. Appropriate barricades, fences, signs or other suitable devices necessary for employee or public safety shall be provided and adequately maintained.
- 5. No trash, debris or litter will be left on the Permittor's property and no vehicles, equipment or materials of any kind will be stored on Permittor's property.
- 6. Upon completion of the work, all areas disturbed by the work will be restored to a condition at least equivalent to their state just prior to the commencement of the work to the extent practicable.
- 7. The Maryland State Highway Administration shall require all contractors, assigns and business invitees who perform work on the Permittor's property to carry insurance in the usual and customary amounts for the type of work being done.
- 8. This Right of Entry shall commence upon execution by both the Permittor and Permittee and shall remain in effect until January 1, 2019.
- 9. All equipment required to perform the aforementioned surveys and soil sampling shall be handcarried into park property. No motorized equipment shall be permitted on MNCPPC property other than in designated parking areas.
- 10. The Permittee shall notify the Permittor a minimum of 48 hours prior to entering onto MNCPPC property. Please notify Jay Childs at 301-370-3416 or at jay.childs@montgomeryparks.org prior to commencing any work covered under this agreement.

ACCORDINGLY, the parties hereto have caused this Right of Entry to be executed as of the day and year above first written.

PERMITTOR

THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION, MONTGOMERY COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PARKS

MARYLAND STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

Kurt Wiebusch Construction Section Manager

Date

Title:

An Exelon Company

pepco.com

Pepco 701 Ninth Street NW Washington, DC 20068-0001 202.833.7500

September 25, 2020

Mr. Jeffrey T. Folden Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Administration 707 North Calvert Street, P-601 Baltimore, MD 21202

Re: Request for Permission to Ingress and Egress Potomac Electric Power Company's ("PEPCO") Quince Orchard to Bureau of Standards 69 kV RW T/L Property No. M-703 and M-704 to Conduct Wetlands and Waters delineations and Topographic Survey in Connection with Traffic Relief Plan (TRP) to Reduce Congestion on Maryland Roads

Dear Mr. Folden:

We have reviewed your application dated May 15, 2020 requesting access to a portion of Potomac Electric Power Company's ("PEPCO") Quince Orchard to Bureau of Standards 69 kV RW T/L Property No. M-703 and M-704 in order to conduct Phase 1 mitigation sites for I-495 and I-270 Managed Lanes Study.

We are pleased to grant the permission requested provided Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Administration (SHA), hereinafter referred to as the "Licensee," agrees to the following conditions:

YOUR RECEIPT OF THIS LETTER DOES NOT CONSTITUTE APPROVAL OF YOUR REQUEST. PEPCO'S APPROVAL SHALL NOT BECOME EFFECTIVE UNTIL THIS OFFICE RECEIVES THIS PERMISSION LETTER SIGNED BY SHA.

- 1. Licensee's use of the Property shall be limited to obtaining information in connection with the following field studies:
 - Wetland and Water Delineation
 - Phase 1 Topographic Surveys
- 2. Licensee shall conduct the surveys as described in the scope of work submitted by Licensee on May 15, 2020 and approved by PEPCO, said scope of work attached hereto as Exhibit "A" and made part hereof.

Re: Request for Permission to Ingress and Egress Potomac Electric Power Company's ("Pepco") Quince Orchard to Bureau of Standards 69 kV RW T/L Property No. M-703 and M-704 to Conduct Wetlands and Waters delineations and Topographic Survey in Connection with Traffic Relief Plan (TRP) to Reduce Congestion on Maryland Roads

- 3. Licensee shall access the Property from public roads, and any vehicular traffic within the Property shall be limited to the use of PEPCO's existing roads.
- 4. The Licensee shall ensure that unauthorized persons do not enter PEPCO's property while their representatives are on the property.
- 5. Licensee shall minimize the impact to PEPCO's property and shall restore any damage to the Property caused by the field studies and other related activities.
- 6. Licensee shall provide PEPCO with a minimum of three (3) business days advance notice prior to scheduling the commencement of activities described herein by notifying Mr. Marcus L. Smith, Manager, Real Estate and Third-Party Attachments, at (202) 872-3453 or (443) 518-0328.
- 7. Licensee shall complete all field studies within one (1) year from the date of this permission letter. Upon completion of the onsite activities, Licensee shall provide written notice of completion to PEPCO within five (5) business days. All notices shall be provided to:

Mr. Marcus L. Smith, Manager, Real Estate & Third-Party Attachments, PHI Service Company, 701 Ninth Street, N.W., Room 4223, Mailstop EP4223 Washington, D. C. 20068 Email: <u>Marcus.Smith3@exeloncorp.com</u> Phone: (202) 872-3453- Mobile- (443) 518-0328

- 8. Licensee shall provide PEPCO with copies of all data and reports generated in connection with these field studies within thirty (30) days of completion of the onsite activities. One (1) hardcopy and one (1) electronic copy shall be sent to Mr. Marcus L. Smith, at the above postal and email addresses.
- 9. No other uses of the Property will be permitted unless prior written permission is obtained from PEPCO.

Mr. Folden Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Adminsitration September 25, 2020 P a g e | **3 of 7**

Re: Request for Permission to Ingress and Egress Potomac Electric Power Company's ("Pepco") Quince Orchard to Bureau of Standards 69 kV RW T/L Property No. M-703 and M-704 to Conduct Wetlands and Waters delineations and Topographic Survey in Connection with Traffic Relief Plan (TRP) to Reduce Congestion on Maryland Roads

- 10. Extreme care shall be used in the location and operation of all persons and equipment to ensure that such persons and equipment will at no time come within 20 feet of any electric circuits attached to steel structures or within 10 feet of any other electric circuits. Also, all activities must be performed in strict compliance with the National Electric Safety Code (NESC) and all other applicable codes, laws and regulations, including but not limited to the Maryland High Voltage Line Act, Md. Code Ann., Lab. & Empl. §§ 6-101 et Seq. (1999).
- 11. Extreme care shall be used to avoid damaging any utilities which are located underground within the Property. At least 48 hours in advance of commencing work on PEPCO's property, the Licensee shall notify the national "One Call Notification System" by telephone (call 811).
- 12. Licensee shall be responsible for any damages to the Property or facilities arising directly or indirectly from this work, and shall promptly reimburse PEPCO for the cost of repairing any such damages.
- 13. Any debris left on the Property as a result of this use shall be promptly removed by Licensee.
- 14. Should this use of the Property create any erosion or drainage problems, Licensee shall promptly take necessary corrective action to remedy the problem.
- 15. Licensee's use of the Property shall not create or enlarge a non-tidal wetland. If the use of PEPCO's property impacts a wetland such that mitigation is necessary, the mitigation shall not be located on PEPCO's property.
- 16. Upon completion of the work, any disturbed areas within the Property shall be properly graded and sodded or fertilized and seeded in accordance with accepted practices.
- 17. If Licensee's use of the Property necessitates the relocation and/or adjustment of any of PEPCO's facilities or equipment, the Licensee shall promptly reimburse PEPCO for the cost of such relocation and/or other adjustment.

Mr. Folden Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Adminsitration September 25, 2020 P a g e | **4 of 7**

Re: Request for Permission to Ingress and Egress Potomac Electric Power Company's ("Pepco") Quince Orchard to Bureau of Standards 69 kV RW T/L Property No. M-703 and M-704 to Conduct Wetlands and Waters delineations and Topographic Survey in Connection with Traffic Relief Plan (TRP) to Reduce Congestion on Maryland Roads

- 18. PEPCO reserves the right to construct, reconstruct, maintain and add to, in, over, under, along, through and across said Property such overhead and/or underground electric transmission and/or distribution cables, pipes, conduits and/or wire and appurtenant facilities (including ground, neutral, or static wires and/or cables) as PEPCO may from time to time deem necessary or advisable.
- 19. The permission granted herein shall be non-exclusive and may be revoked at any time upon written notice to Licensee. PEPCO may grant to third parties easement rights in, or permission to use the Property.
- 20. If Licensee fails to perform any of the work or to comply with any of the stipulations set forth herein, PEPCO may upon the expiration of fifteen (15) calendar days written notice to Licensee, perform such work as is necessary to bring Licensee's use of property into compliance with the stipulations, and the costs of such work shall be paid by Licensee. Licensee agrees to pay, upon demand from PEPCO, the costs of any such work performed by PEPCO.
- The Licensee and/ or its contractors shall indemnify and hold harmless PEPCO 21. Holdings LLC its parents and their subsidiaries and affiliates ("Indemnified Persons") (which shall be deemed to include their shareholders, directors, officers, employees, agents, and servants) against any and all losses, expenses, demands, claims and liability in connection with property damage and injuries to persons, firms or corporations (including the parties hereto and their respective employees, licensees and invitees, trespassers and/or the general public's use of the Property) (collectively, "Claims") caused by or growing out of Licensee's presence on, or use of, the Property, except, however, with respect to any Claims arising from the gross negligence or intentional misconduct of any of the Indemnified Persons. The Licensee agrees to defend at its expense, including attorney's fees, any suit or action brought against the Indemnified Persons, based on any alleged injuries or damages, losses and expenses caused by or growing out of the Licensee's presence on or use of the Property, except, however, with respect to any Claims arising from the gross negligence or intentional misconduct of any of the Indemnified Persons.
- 22. No explosives shall be used on the Property unless prior written permission is obtained from PEPCO.

Re: Request for Permission to Ingress and Egress Potomac Electric Power Company's ("Pepco") Quince Orchard to Bureau of Standards 69 kV RW T/L Property No. M-703 and M-704 to Conduct Wetlands and Waters delineations and Topographic Survey in Connection with Traffic Relief Plan (TRP) to Reduce Congestion on Maryland Roads

- 23. At no time shall Licensee store vehicles, equipment, material, fuel or explosives on the Property.
- 24. Licensee shall comply with all applicable federal, state and local laws, codes and regulations pertaining to this use, and must obtain all necessary permits.
- 25. Licensee shall conduct all activities on the Property in compliance with all applicable environmental laws.
- 26. Prior to beginning work, Licensee and its contractors shall meet with a PEPCO safety inspector who will explain the PEPCO safety procedures that must be followed while working under PEPCO transmission lines.
- 27. PEPCO reserves the right but not the obligation to have one (1) safety inspector on site during any time work is performed on the Property. The Licensee shall reimburse PEPCO for the expenses incurred by the safety inspector associated with such project. The reimbursement rate shall be calculated at a minimum of four plus (4+) hours per day. The safety inspector will work no more than 40 hours per week, at PEPCO's then prevailing rate during any period of construction. All invoices for the safety inspector will be forwarded to Mr. Jeffrey T. Folden, SHA, 707 North Calvert Street, P-601, Baltimore, MD 21202. The Licensee agrees to pay all such invoices upon receipt without delay to PEPCO.
- 28. The Licensee and its contractors shall procure and maintain at its own expense the following minimum insurance in forms and with insurance companies rated at least A-VII by AM Best:
 - (a) Commercial General Liability and/or Umbrella/Excess Liability (including contractual liability coverage equivalent to what is insured by ISO CGL form 00 01): \$2,000,000 per occurrence and in the aggregate;
 - (b) Workers Compensation insurance for statutory obligations imposed by Workers Compensation, Occupational Disease, or other similar laws;

Mr. Folden Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Adminsitration September 25, 2020 P a g e | **6 of 7**

Re: Request for Permission to Ingress and Egress Potomac Electric Power Company's ("Pepco") Quince Orchard to Bureau of Standards 69 kV RW T/L Property No. M-703 and M-704 to Conduct Wetlands and Waters delineations and Topographic Survey in Connection with Traffic Relief Plan (TRP) to Reduce Congestion on Maryland Roads

- (c) Employer's Liability: \$1,000,000 per accident/ per disease, per employee/ per disease, policy limits
- (d) Business Automobile Liability (for all owned, non-owned, hired, and leased vehicles): \$2,000,000 per accident.
- (e) Licensee shall provide certificates of insurance and applicable policy wording and/or endorsements to PEPCO Holdings LLC to Potomac Electric Power Company, Attention: Marcus L. Smith, Manager, Real, 701 9th Street NW suite 4214, Mailstop EP4223, Washington, D.C. 20068.
- (f) With respect to subsections (a) and (d) above, such insurance shall include PEPCO Holdings LLC, its officers, directors, employees and agents as additional insured. All insurance required hereunder shall provide a waiver of subrogation in favor of PEPCO Holdings LLC, state that required coverage is primary to any other valid insurance available to PEPCO Holdings LLC (to the extent permitted by applicable insurance law), and allow cross-liabilities and coverage regardless of fault. Developer shall provide at least thirty (30) days prior written notice to PEPCO Holdings LLC of cancellation of any required coverage if not replaced.
- (g) Notwithstanding the forgoing, Licensee may self-insure any of the required insurance under the same terms as required by this letter. In the event Licensee elects to self-insure its obligation under this letter, the following conditions apply: (i) Licensee shall promptly provide PEPCO with written notice of any claim, demand, lawsuit, or the like for which it seeks coverage pursuant to this Section and provide PEPCO with copies of any demands, notices, summonses, or legal papers received in connection with such claim, demand, lawsuit, or the like; (ii) Licensee shall not settle any such claim, demand, lawsuit, or the like without the prior written consent of PEPCO; and (iii) PEPCO shall fully cooperate with Licensee in the defense of the claim, demand, lawsuit, or the like.
- (h) Licensee shall maintain adequate insurance coverage for subcontractors, and in the event any subcontractor(s) provide any services hereunder, Licensee shall require such subcontractor(s) to maintain insurance in

Mr. Folden Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Adminsitration September 25, 2020 P a g e | **7 of 7**

Re: Request for Permission to Ingress and Egress Potomac Electric Power Company's ("Pepco") Quince Orchard to Bureau of Standards 69 kV RW T/L Property No. M-703 and M-704 to Conduct Wetlands and Waters delineations and Topographic Survey in Connection with Traffic Relief Plan (TRP) to Reduce Congestion on Maryland Roads

accordance with this Section.

30. Licensee shall guarantee that its contractors shall agree to and abide by the terms and conditions set forth in this permission letter.

If the foregoing is acceptable to SHA, please so indicate by having this letter executed by an authorized officer of SHA and returned to Mr. Marcus Smith, Manager of Real Estate & Third-Party Attachments.

The grant of permission herein shall not become effective until PEPCO has received this letter, fully executed, which receipt must occur within thirty (30) calendars days from the date of this letter.

Sincerely,

Marcus L. Smith

Marcus Smith, Manager, Real Estate & Third Party Attachments

MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

Accepted and Agreed to: Li	sa B. Choplin
	rinted Name
Signature: 100B	CL
Title: Director	
Date: 9/30/20	



I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study

CA-5 Phase II Mitigation Plan

APPENDIX III



ATTACHMENT A – FUNCTIONAL ASSESSMENT

		RAF	PID AS	SESSI	MENT FIE	EL STREA	SHEET	CTION-BAS	ED		
/atershed: tream: each Length:	Seneca Creets 40. Trib to 6 2901	reat	Seneci	aGreek	Rater(s): Date: Latitude:	JS, SM, S 12/07/20 39.13073	5N 020 6				
hoto(s):	See attached photo	docum	nent		Longitude:	-77.2539	39				
each ID:	Mainstem 1	-			Reach Score	Reach Total	Ex. 100/170	Prop.: 145/170	Qualit	y: Ex: 0.58 P	prop:0.85
		Func	tion-base	ed Rapid	d Reach Le	vel Stream As	ssessmen	t			
Assessment						Cat	egory	and the second se			
Parameter	Measurement Method	F	unctioni	ng		Functioni	ng-at-Risk	(N	lot Functi	oning
			St	ream Fu	Inction Pyra	mid Level 1	Hydrology				
	1. Concentrated Flow	No poten flow/ir adja	tial for con mpairment: acent land	centrated s from use	Some potent restoration si	ial for concentra ite, however, me reso	ted flow/imp asures are i urces	airments to reach n place to protect	Potent flow/in resto	tial for conce npairments to pration site a	entrated to reach and no
	Existing Condition	10	9	8	7	6	6 5 4		3	12 nents are in	1 place
ŧ	Proposed Condition	10	9	8	7	6	(5)	4	3	Q	1
Runo	2. Flashiness	Non-flashy flow regime as a result of rainfall patterns, geology, and soils, impervious cover less than 6%			Semi-flash geolog	y flow regime as yy, and soils, imp	a result of n pervious cov	ainfall patterns, er 7 - 15%	Flashy flow regime as a result of rainfall patterns, geology, and soils, impervious cover greater than 15%		
	Existing Condition	10	9	8	7	- 6	5	4	3	(2)	1
	Proposed Condition	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	(2)	1
	Stream Function Pyran	nid Leve	I 1 Hydro	ology Ov	verall EXIST	ING Conditio	n F	FAR	S	core: 4	
	Stream Function Pyran	nid Leve	1 1 Hydro	ology Ov	Inrall DPOD	OSED Condit	tion E		0		
			and the second of the second se		relati FROF	OBED COllul			0	Lore.	
			St	ream Fu	nction Pyra	mid Level 2 H	lydraulics		5		
	3. Bank Height Ratio (BHR)		Str <1.20	ream Fu	nction Pyra	mid Level 2 H	lon r (1 lydraulics - 1.50		5	>1.50	
	3. Bank Height Ratio (BHR) Existing Condition	10	<1.20	ream Fu	nction Pyra	mid Level 2 F	lion P (1 lydraulics - 1.50 5	4	3	>1.50 2	1
Stability)	3. Bank Height Ratio (BHR) Existing Condition 1 O Proposed Condition 4a. Entrenchment (Meandering streams in alluvial valleys or Rosgen C, E, DA Streams)	10 10	Str <1.20 9 >2.2	ream Fu 8 8	nction Pyra 7 7	mid Level 2 F	- 1.50 5 - 1.4	4 4	3	>1.50 2 2 <1.4	1
cal Stability)	3. Bank Height Ratio (BHR) Existing Condition Proposed Condition 4. Entrenchment (Meandering streams in alluvial valleys or Rosgen C, E, DA Streams) Existing Condition	10 10 10	Str <1.20 9 9 9 >2.2 9	ream Fu	nction Pyra	mid Level 2 H 1.21 6 6 2.1	- 1.50 - 1.50 - 1.4 5	4 4 4	3 3 3	>1.50 2 2 <1.4 2	
ertical Stability)	3. Bank Height Ratio (BHR) Existing Condition OProposed Condition 4a. Entrenchment (Meandering streams in alluvial valleys or Rosgen C, E, DA Streams) Existing Condition Proposed Condition	10 10 10 10 10	Str <1.20 9 9 9 >2.2 9 9	8 8 8 8 8 8	nction Pyra	mid Level 2 H 1.21 6 6 2.1 6 6	- 1.50 - 1.50 - 1.4 - 5 5	4 4 4 4 4	3 3 3 3 3 3	>1.50 2 2 <1.4 2 2	1 1 1 1
rity (Vertical Stability)	3. Bank Height Ratio (BHR) Existing Condition OProposed Condition 4a. Entrenchment (Mandering streams in alluvial valleys or Rosgen C, E, DA Streams) Existing Condition Proposed Condition 4b. Entrenchment (Non meandering streams in colluvial valleys or Rosgen B Streams)	10 10 10 10 10	Str <1.20 9 9 >2.2 9 9 9 >1.4	8 8 8 8 8	7 7 7 7 7	mid Level 2 F 1.21 6 6 2.1 6 6 1.3	- 1.50 - 1.50 - 1.4 - 1.4 - 1.1	4 4 4 4	3 3 3 3 3	>1.50 2 2 <1.4 2 <1.1	1 1 1
ctivity (Vertical Stability)	3. Bank Height Ratio (BHR) Existing Condition OProposed Condition 4a. Entrenchment (Meandering streams in alluvial valleys or Rosgen C, E, DA Streams) Existing Condition Proposed Condition Proposed Condition 4b. Entrenchment (Non meandering streams in colluvial valleys or Rosgen B Streams)	10 10 10 10 10	Str <1.20 9 9 >2.2 9 9 9 >1.4 9	8 8 8 8 8 8 8	nction Pyra	mid Level 2 H 1.21 6 6 2.1 6 6 1.3	- 1.50 - 1.50 - 1.4 - 1.4 - 1.1 5 - 1.1 5	4 4 4 4 4	3 3 3 3 3	>1.50 2 2 <1.4 2 <1.1 2 <1.1	
mectivity (Vertical Stability)	3. Bank Height Ratio (BHR) Existing Condition OProposed Condition 4a. Entrenchment (Meandering streams in alluvial valleys or Rosgen C, E, DA Streams) Existing Condition Proposed Condition Proposed Condition 4b. Entrenchment (Non meandering streams in colluvial valleys or Rosgen B Streams) Streams in Colluvial valleys or Rosgen B Streams) Streams Condition 21.9 Proposed Condition	10 10 10 10 10 10	Str <1.20 9 9 >2.2 9 9 9 >1.4 9 9	8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	nction Pyra	mid Level 2 H 1.21 6 6 2.1 6 6 1.3 6 6 6 6	- 1.50 - 1.50 - 1.4 - 1.4 - 1.1 - 1.1 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5	4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	3 3 3 3 3 3	>1.50 2 2 <1.4 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1	1 1 1 1 1 1
Floodplain Connectivity (Vertical Stability)	3. Bank Height Ratio (BHR) Existing Condition 1 Proposed Condition 4a. Entrenchment (Meandering streams in alluvial valleys or Rosgen C, E, DA Streams) Existing Condition Proposed Condition 4b. Entrenchment (Non meandering streams in colluvial valleys or Rosgen B Streams) ~1.4 Existing Condition >1.5 Froposed Condition 5. Floodplain Drainage	10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1	Str <1.20 9 9 >2.2 9 9 >1.4 9 9 >1.4 9 9 s<1.4 9 s<1.0%; h for stream, d areas an s jams are epresented	8 8 8 8 8 8 8 1 flow; heet flow; illslopes ; ponding d litter or well	runoff is equ and rill erosi 50 - 200 ft fro or de	mid Level 2 H	- 1.50 5 5 - 1.4 5 - 1.4 5 - 1.1 5 - 1.1 5 - 1.1 5 - 1.1 5 - 1.1 5 - 1.9 - 1.9 - 1.50 - 1.4 - 1.10 -	4 4 4 4 flow (minor gully 40%; hillslopes d areas and litter resented	3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	>1.50 2 2 <1.4 2 <1.4 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 otherwise accentrated flint (extensive erosion); hi fa; hillslopes stream; ponced areas and dareas a	1 1 1 1 1 1 0 ws e gully Ilslopes <50 ft ding or litter or ot well bsent
Floodplain Connectivity (Vertical Stability)	3. Bank Height Ratio (BHR) Existing Condition 1 Proposed Condition 4a. Entrenchment (Meandering streams in alluvial valleys or Rosgen C, E, DA Streams) Existing Condition Proposed Condition 4b. Entrenchment (Non meandering streams in colluvial valleys or Rosgen B Streams) 1.4 Existing Condition 71.4 Existing Condition 5. Floodplain Drainage Existing Condition	10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 runoff is p hillsloper >200 ft fro or wetland debri ra 10	Str <1.20 9 9 >2.2 9 9 >1.4 9 9 9 >1.4 9 9 9 x < 10%; h om stream d areas an s jams are epresented 9	8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	runoff is equ and rill erosi 50 - 200 ft fro or de	mid Level 2 H	Item Item 4ydraulics 5 - 1.50 5 - 1.4 5 - 1.4 5 - 1.1 5 - 1.1 5 - 1.1 5 - 1.1 5 - 1.1 5 - 1.1 5 - 1.1 5 - 1.1 5 - 1.1 5 - 1.1 5 - 1.1 5 - 1.1 5 - 1.1 5 - 1.2 5	4 4 4 4 4 flow (minor gully 40%; hillstopes d areas and litter esented	3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 cor prese and rill >40% from s wetlan debris repres 3	>1.50 2 2 <1.4 2 <1.4 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 stream; pond d areas and s are n esented or a 2	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 0 ws e gully Ilslopes <50 ft ding or litter or ot well bsent
Floodplain Connectivity (Vertical Stability)	3. Bank Height Ratio (BHR) Existing Condition O Proposed Condition 4. Entrenchment (Meandering streams in alluvial valleys or Rosgen C, E, DA Streams) Existing Condition Proposed Condition 4b. Entrenchment (Non meandering streams in colluvial valleys or Rosgen B Streams) Streams) Existing Condition 71.5 Proposed Condition 5. Floodplain Drainage Existing Condition Proposed Condition Proposed Condition	10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	Str <1.20 9 9 >2.2 9 9 >1.4 9 9 >1.4 9 9 >1.4 9 9 s<1.4 9 9 s<1.4 9 9 9 9 2 2.2 9 9 9 9 2 1.4	sy ream Fu 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	runoff is equ and rill erosi 50 - 200 ft fro or de	mid Level 2 H 1.21 6 6 7 1.3 6 6 6 1.3 6 6 6 ally sheet and cr on occurring); h m stream; pond ebris jams are m 6 6 6	- 1.50 5 5 - 1.4 5 - 1.4 5 - 1.1 5 - 1.1 5 5 - 1.1 5 5 - 1.1 5 5 - 1.50 5 - 1.4 5 5 - 1.50 5 - 5 - 1.4 5 5 - 1.50 5 - 1.50 5 - 1.4 5 - 1.50 5 - 1.4 5 - 1.50 5 - 1.4 5 - 1.50 5 - 1.4 5 - 1.50 5 - 1.4 5 - 1.50 5 - 1.4 5 - 1.4 5 - 1.50 5 - 1.4 5 - 1.1 5 - 1.50 5 - 1.50 5 - 1.4 5 - 1.4 5 - 1.4 5 - 5 - 1.1 5 - 5 - 1.50 5 - 1.50 5 - 1.50 5 - 1.50 5 - 1.50 5 - 1.50 5 - 1.50 5 - 1.50 5 - 1.50 5 - 1.5 5 - 1.5 5 - 1.5 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5 - 5	4 4 4 4 flow (minor gully 40%; hillslopes id areas and litter esented 4 4 4	3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 cor prese and rill >40% from s wetlan debris repre 3 3	<pre>>1.50 2 2 2 </pre> <pre><1.4 2 2 </pre> <pre><1.4 2 2 </pre> <pre><1.1 2 2 </pre> <pre><1.1 2 2 </pre> <pre></pre> <pre><</pre>	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 0 ws e gully Ilslopes <50 ft ding or litter or ot well bsent 1 1
Floodplain Connectivity (Vertical Stability)	3. Bank Height Ratio (BHR) Existing Condition 1 O Proposed Condition 4a Entrenchment (Meadering streams in alluvial valleys or Rosgen C, E, DA Streams) Existing Condition Proposed Condition 4b. Entrenchment (Non meandering streams in colluvial valleys or Rosgen B Streams) 1.4 Existing Condition 71.5 Proposed Condition 5. Floodplain Drainage Existing Condition Proposed Condition 5. Floodplain Drainage Existing Condition Proposed Condition Existing Condition	10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	Stable Stable Stable Stable Stable Stable Stable Stable	ream Fu	runoff is equ and rill erosis 50 - 200 ft fro or de	mid Level 2 F 1.21 6 6 7 2.1 6 6 6 1.3 6 6 6 1.3 6 6 6 1.3 6 6 6 1.3 6 6 6 6 1.3 7 6 6 6 6 1.3 7 7 8 8 9 1.21 1	$\frac{1}{1}$	4 4 4 4 4 4 flow (minor gully 40%; hillslopes to areas and litter resented 4 4 4	3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 cor prese and rill >40% from s wetlan- debris repre 3 3 Wide	>1.50 2 2 <1.4 2 <1.4 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 centrated fl nt (extensive erosion); hi	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 0 ws e gully llslopes <50 ft ding or litter or ot well bsent 1 1 1 ability
Floodplain Connectivity (Vertical Stability)	 3. Bank Height Ratio (BHR) Existing Condition Proposed Condition 4a. Entrenchment (Meandering streams in alluvial valleys or Rosgen C, E, DA Streams) Existing Condition Proposed Condition 4b. Entrenchment (Non meandering streams in colluvial valleys or Rosgen B Streams) 1.4 Existing Condition 71.5 Proposed Condition 5. Floodplain Drainage Existing Condition Proposed Condition 6. Vertical Stability Extent Existing Condition 	10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	Stable 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	ream Fu	runoff is equi and rill erosi 50 - 200 ft fro or de	mid Level 2 H 1.21 6 6 2.1 6 6 1.3 6 6 1.3 6 6 1.3 6 6 1.3 6 6 6 1.3 6 6 6 1.3 6 6 6 1.3 6 6 6 1.3 6 6 6 6 6 1.3 7 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6	$\frac{1000}{1} \frac{1}{1} \frac{1}{1} \frac{1}{1} \frac{1}{1} \frac{1}{1} \frac{5}{5} \frac{5}{5} \frac{1}{1} \frac{1}{1} \frac{1}{1} \frac{5}{5} \frac{5}{5} \frac{1}{1} \frac{1}{1} \frac{5}{5} \frac{5}{5} \frac{5}{5} \frac{1}{1} \frac{5}{5} \frac{5}{5} \frac{5}{5} \frac{1}{5} \frac$	4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 40% from s wetland debris represent 3 3 3 Wide 3 2	>1.50 2 2 <1.4 2 <1.4 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 active in the image of the	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

	Sti	ream Fur	iction P	yrannu Leve	a s Geomorpi	lology					
⁷ . Riparian Vegetation Zone (EPA, 1999, nodified)	Riparian width c veget diversity activities invasive	n zone extent of >100 fee ation comm and densit do not imp species not or sparse	ends to a t; good nunity y; human vact zone; of present	Riparian zone extends to a width of 25-100 feet; species composition is dominated by 2 or 3 species; human activities greatly impact zone; invasive species well represented and alter the community				Riparian zone extends to a width of <25 feet; little or no riparian vegetation due to human activities; majority of vegetation is invasive			
	10			-	0	-					
Left Bank Existing	10	9	8	A	6	5	4	3	2	1	
Right Bank Existing	10	9	0	T	6	5	4	3	2	1	
Right Bank Proposed	10	9	8	(7)	6	5	4	3	2	1	
3. Dominant Bank Erosion Rate Potential	Dominate pc BEHI/NB L/M, I	Dominate bank erosion rate potential is low or BEHI/NBS Rating: L/VL, L/L, L/M, L/H, L/VH, M/VL			Dominate bank erosion rate potential is moderate or BEHI/NBS Rating: M/L, M/M, M/H, L/Ex, H/L, M/VH, M/Ex, H/L, H/M, VH/VL, Ex/VL				3 2 1 Dominate bank erosion rate potential is high or BEHI/NBS Rating: H/H, H/Ex, VH/H, Ex/M, Ex/H,		
Existing Condition (Right bank)	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
Proposed Condition (Right Bank)	10	9	(8)	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
Existing Condition (Left bank)	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
Proposed Condition (Left Bank 9. Lateral Stability Extent	10	9	(8)	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
		Stable			Localized I	nstability		Wide	spread Insta	ability	
Existing Condition	10	9	8	7	6	5	1	2	2	4	
Proposed Condition 10. Shelter for Fish and	10 Greater th	9 nan 70% of	8 f	7 20-70% mix	6 of stable habitat	5 ; suited for full	4 4 colonization	3 Less tha	an 20% mix	1 1	
Proposed Condition 10. Shelter for Fish and Macroinvertebrates (EPA 1999)	10 Greater th substrate epifaunal fish cover submerge banks, rul and large stable hat allow full potential (are not ne transient)	9 han 70% of favorable colonizatio ; mix of sr ed logs, un bble, grave rocks, or o bitat and at colonizatio (i.e., logs/s ew fall and	8 f for ags, dercut al, cobble other t stage to n mags that not	7 20-70% mix potentia populations; p new fall, but r	6 of stable habitat al; adequate habi resence of addit not yet prepared high end o	5 ; suited for full tat for mainten; ional substrate for colonizatior of scale)	4 colonization ance of in the form of n (may rate at	3 Less tha stable h habitat than de substrai lacking	an 20% mix abitat; lack availability I sirables obv te unstable	1 of ess vious; or	
Proposed Condition 10. Shelter for Fish and Macroinvertebrates (EPA 1999) Existing Condition	10 Greater th substrate epifaunal fish cover submerge banks, rul and large stable hat allow full of potential (are not ne transient) 10	9 nan 70% of favorable colonizatio ;; mix of sr ed logs, un bble, grave rocks, or o bitat and at colonizatio (i.e., logs/s ew fall and	8 for and ags, dercut el, cobble other t stage to n inags that not 8	7 20-70% mix potentia populations; p new fall, but r	6 of stable habitat al; adequate habi resence of addit not yet prepared high end o	5 ; suited for full i itat for mainten; ional substrate for colonizatior of scale)	4 4 colonization ance of in the form of n (may rate at	3 Less tha stable h habitat than de substrai lacking	an 20% mix abitat; lack availability I sirables obv te unstable	1 of of ess vious; or	
Proposed Condition 10. Shelter for Fish and Macroinvertebrates (EPA 1999) Existing Condition Proposed Condition	10 Greater th substrate epifaunal fish cover banks, rul and large stable hat allow full d potential (are not ne transient) 10 10	9 han 70% of favorable colonizatio ; mix of sr ed logs, un bble, grave rocks, or co bitat and at colonizatio (i.e., logs/s ew fall and	8 f for ags, dercut el, cobble other t stage to n mags that not 8 8	7 20-70% mix potentia populations; p new fall, but r 7 7	6 of stable habitat al; adequate habi resence of addit not yet prepared high end o 6 6	5 ; suited for full i itat for mainten: ional substrate for colonization of scale)	4 4 colonization ance of in the form of n (may rate at 4 4	3 Less tha stable h habitat i than de substrai lacking 3 3	an 20% mix abitat, lack availability I sirables obv te unstable	1 of of ess vious; or 1	
Proposed Condition 10. Shelter for Fish and Macroinvertebrates (EPA 1999) Existing Condition Proposed Condition 1a. Pool-to-Pool Spacing Ratio (Watersheds < 10 mi ²)	10 Greater th substrate epifaunal fish cover submerge banks, rul and large stable hat allow full of potential (are not ne transient) 10 10	9 han 70% of favorable colonizatic colonizatic bble, grave rocks, or c bitat and at colonizatio (i.e., logs/s ew fall and 9 9 4.0 - 5.0	8 for on and hags, dercut el, cobble other t stage to n mags that not 8 8	7 20-70% mix potentia populations; p new fall, but r new fall, but r	6 of stable habitat al; adequate habitat resence of addit not yet prepared high end of 6 6 3.0 - 4.0 or	5 ; suited for full itat for maintenational substrate for colonization of scale)	4 4 colonization ance of in the form of n (may rate at 4 4	3 Less tha stable h habitat : than de substrai lacking 3 3	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 3.0 or >7.1	1 1 of ess vious; or 1 1 0	
Proposed Condition 10. Shelter for Fish and Macroinvertebrates (EPA 1999) Existing Condition Proposed Condition (1a. Pool-to-Pool Spacing Ratio (Watersheds < 10 mi ²) Existing Condition	10 Greater th substrate epifaunal fish cover submerge banks, rul and large stable hat allow full potential (are not ne transient) 10 10	9 han 70% of favorable colonizatic colonizatic bble, grave rocks, or c bitat and al colonizatio (i.e., logs/s aw fall and 9 4.0 - 5.0	8 f for ags, dercut el, cobble other t stage to n nags that not 8 8 8	7 20-70% mix potentia populations; p new fall, but r 7 7 7	6 of stable habitat al; adequate habitat resence of addit not yet prepared high end of 6 3.0 - 4.0 or 6	5 ; suited for full - tat for mainten; ional substrate for colonization of scale)	4 4 colonization ance of in the form of n (may rate at 4 4 4	3 Less tha stable h habitat i than de substrai lacking 3 3 3	2 an 20% mix labitat; lack availability I sirables obv te unstable 2 2 3.0 or >7.1 2	1 of ess vious; or 1 1 1 1 1	
Proposed Condition 10. Shelter for Fish and Macroinvertebrates (EPA 1999) Existing Condition Proposed Condition 11a. Pool-to-Pool Spacing Ratio (Watersheds < 10 mi ²) Existing Condition 4.9 Proposed Condition	10 Greater th substrate epifaunal fish cover submerge banks, rul and large stable hat allow full of potential (are not ne transient) 10 10 10 10 10 10	9 han 70% of favorable colonizatio ; mix of sr ed logs, un- bble, grave rocks, or co bitat and at colonizatio (i.e., logs/s ew fall and 9 9 4.0 - 5.0 9 9	8 f for for ags, dercut al, cobble other t stage to n mags that not 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	7 20-70% mix potentia populations; p new fall, but r 7 7 7 7 7	6 of stable habitat al; adequate habi resence of addit not yet prepared high end of 6 6 3.0 - 4.0 or 6 6	5 ; suited for full - tat for mainten; ional substrate for colonization of scale)	4 4 colonization ance of in the form of n (may rate at 4 4 4 4	3 Less tha stable h habitat i than de substrai lacking 3 3 3 3	2 an 20% mix labitat; lack availability I sirables obv te unstable 2 2 3.0 or >7.1 2 2 2	$\frac{1}{1}$ of ess vious; or $\frac{1}{1}$ 0 $\frac{1}{1}$	
Proposed Condition 10. Shelter for Fish and Macroinvertebrates (EPA 1999) Existing Condition Proposed Condition 11a. Pool-to-Pool Spacing Ratio (Watersheds < 10 mi ²) Existing Condition 10. Pool-to-Pool Spacing Ratio (Watersheds > 10 mi ²)	10 Greater th substrate epifaunal fish cover submerge banks, rul and large stable hat allow full o potential (are not ne transient) 10 10	9 han 70% of favorable colonizatic colonizatic colonizatio bble, grave rocks, or colonizatio (i.e., logs/s aw fall and 9 4.0 - 5.0 9 5.0 - 7.0	8 f for for and hags, dercut al, cobble other t stage to n mags that not 8 8 8 8 8 8	7 20-70% mix potentia populations; p new fall, but r 7 7 7 7	6 of stable habitat al; adequate habitat resence of addit not yet prepared high end of 3.0 - 4.0 or 6 6 6 3.5 - 5.0 or	5 ; suited for full - tat for mainten; ional substrate for colonization of scale) 5 5.0 - 7.0 5 5 7.0 - 8.0	4 4 colonization ance of in the form of n (may rate at 4 4 4 4	3 Less tha stable h habitat i than de substrai lacking 3 3 3 3 3	$\frac{2}{2}$ an 20% mix abitat; lack availability I sirables obv te unstable $\frac{2}{2}$ 3.0 or >7.0 (2) 2 (3.5 or >8.0	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
Proposed Condition 10. Shelter for Fish and Macroinvertebrates (EPA 1999) Existing Condition Proposed Condition 11a. Pool-to-Pool Spacing Ratio (Watersheds < 10 mi ²) Existing Condition 10. Pool-to-Pool Spacing Ratio (Watersheds > 10 mi ²) Existing Condition 10. Pool-to-Pool Spacing Ratio (Watersheds > 10 mi ²) Existing Condition	10 Greater th substrate epifaunal fish cover submerge banks, rul and large stable hat allow full potential (are not ne transient) 10 10 10	9 han 70% of favorable colonizatio colonizatio bble, grave rocks, or co bitat and al colonizatio (i.e., logs/s aw fall and 9 4.0 - 5.0 9 5.0 - 7.0 9	8 f for for and hags, dercut sl, cobble other t stage to n nags that not 8 <tr< td=""><td>7 20-70% mix potentia populations; p new fall, but r 7 7 7 7 7</td><td>6 of stable habitat al; adequate habi resence of addit not yet prepared high end of 3.0 - 4.0 or 6 6 3.5 - 5.0 or 6</td><td>5 ; suited for full - tat for mainten; ional substrate for colonization of scale) 5 5.0 - 7.0 5 5 7.0 - 8.0 5</td><td>4 4 colonization ance of in the form of n (may rate at 4 4 4 4 4</td><td>3 Less tha stable h habitat i than de substrai lacking 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3</td><td>2 2 2 2 $3.0 or >7.0$ 2 $3.5 or >8.0$ 2</td><td>1 3 of of ess vious; or 1 1 0 1 1 0 1 1 1</td></tr<>	7 20-70% mix potentia populations; p new fall, but r 7 7 7 7 7	6 of stable habitat al; adequate habi resence of addit not yet prepared high end of 3.0 - 4.0 or 6 6 3.5 - 5.0 or 6	5 ; suited for full - tat for mainten; ional substrate for colonization of scale) 5 5.0 - 7.0 5 5 7.0 - 8.0 5	4 4 colonization ance of in the form of n (may rate at 4 4 4 4 4	3 Less tha stable h habitat i than de substrai lacking 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	2 2 2 2 $3.0 or >7.0$ 2 $3.5 or >8.0$ 2	1 3 of of ess vious; or 1 1 0 1 1 0 1 1 1	
Proposed Condition 10. Shelter for Fish and Macroinvertebrates (EPA 1999) Existing Condition Proposed Condition 11a. Pool-to-Pool Spacing Ratio (Watersheds < 10 mi ²) Existing Condition 11b. Pool-to-Pool Spacing Ratio (Watersheds > 10 mi ²) Existing Condition 11b. Pool-to-Pool Spacing Ratio (Watersheds > 10 mi ²) Existing Condition Proposed Condi	10 Greater th substrate epifaunal fish cover submerge banks, rul and large stable hal allow full of potential (are not ne transient) 10 10 10	9 han 70% of favorable colonizatio ; mix of sr ed logs, un bble, grave rocks, or c colonizatio (i.e., logs/s ew fall and 9 9 4.0 - 5.0 9 5.0 - 7.0 9 9 >1.5	8 f for for and hags, dercut el, cobble other t stage to n nags that not 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	7 20-70% mix potentia populations; p new fall, but r 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	6 of stable habitat al; adequate habitat not yet prepared high end of 6 6 3.0 - 4.0 or 6 6 3.5 - 5.0 or 6 6 1.2 -	5 ; suited for full - tat for mainten; ional substrate for colonization of scale) 5 5.0 - 7.0 5 5.0 - 7.0 5 7.0 - 8.0 5 5 1.5	4 4 colonization ance of in the form of n (may rate at 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	3 Less tha stable h habitat i than de substrai lacking 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	$\frac{2}{2}$ an 20% mix abitat; lack availability I sirables obv te unstable $\frac{2}{2}$ $\frac{2}{3.0 \text{ or } >7.1}$ (2) $\frac{2}{2}$ $(3.5 \text{ or } >8.0)$ $\frac{2}{2}$ (1.2)	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
Proposed Condition 10. Shelter for Fish and Macroinvertebrates (EPA 1999) Existing Condition Proposed Condition 1a. Pool-to-Pool Spacing Ratio (Watersheds < 10 mi ²) Existing Condition 1b. Pool-to-Pool Spacing Ratio (Watersheds > 10 mi ²) Existing Condition 1b. Pool-to-Pool Spacing Ratio (Watersheds > 10 mi ²) Existing Condition 2a. Pool Max Depth Ratio/Depth Variability Gravel Bed Streams) Existing Condition	10 Greater th substrate epifaunal fish cover submerge banks, rul and large stable hat allow full o potential (are not ne transient) 10 10 10 10	9 nan 70% of favorable colonizatio ; mix of sr ed logs, un- bble, grave rocks, or co- bitat and ar- colonizatio (i.e., logs/s ew fall and 9 9 4.0 - 5.0 9 9 5.0 - 7.0 9 9 >1.5 9	8 for for for and hags, dercut el, cobble other t stage to n mags that not 8	7 20-70% mix potentia populations; p new fall, but r 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	6 of stable habitat al; adequate habitat not yet prepared high end of 3.0 - 4.0 or 6 6 3.5 - 5.0 or 6 6 1.2 - 6	5 ; suited for full - tat for mainten- tional substrate for colonization of scale) 5 5.0 - 7.0 5 5.0 - 7.0 5 5 7.0 - 8.0 5 5 1.5	4 4 colonization ance of in the form of n (may rate at 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	3 Less tha stable h habitat i than de substrai lacking 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	$\frac{2}{2}$ an 20% mix abitat; lack availability I sirables obv te unstable $\frac{2}{2}$ $\frac{2}{3.0 \text{ or } >7.1}$ $\frac{2}{2}$ $\frac{2}{3.5 \text{ or } >8.0}$ $\frac{2}{2}$ <1.2 (2)	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
Proposed Condition 10. Shelter for Fish and Macroinvertebrates (EPA 1999) Existing Condition Proposed Condition 11a. Pool-to-Pool Spacing Ratio (Watersheds < 10 mi ²) Existing Condition 11b. Pool-to-Pool Spacing Ratio (Watersheds > 10 mi ²) Existing Condition Proposed Condition Depth Variability Sravel Bed Streams) Existing Condition 2b. Pool Max Depth Ratio/Depth Variability	10 Greater tr substrate epifaunal fish cover submerge banks, rui and large stable hat allow full o potential (are not ne transient) 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	9 nan 70% of favorable colonizatio ; mix of sr ed logs, un bble, grave rocks, or co bitat and at colonizatio (i.e., logs/s ew fall and 9 9 4.0 - 5.0 9 9 5.0 - 7.0 9 9 >1.5 9 9 >1.2	8 for for on and hags, dercut el, cobble other t stage to n nags that not 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	7 20-70% mix potentia populations; p new fall, but r 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	6 of stable habitat al; adequate habi resence of addit not yet prepared high end of 3.0 - 4.0 or 6 6 6 3.5 - 5.0 or 6 6 6 1.2 - 6 6 1.2 -	5 ; suited for full itat for mainten- ional substrate for colonization of scale) 5 5.0 - 7.0 5 5.0 - 7.0 5 5.0 7.0 - 8.0 5 5 1.5 5 5 1.2	4 4 colonization ance of in the form of n (may rate at 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	3 Less tha stable h habitat i than de substrai lacking 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	an 20% mix abitat, lack availability I sirables obv te unstable 2 2 3.0 or >7.1 2 3.5 or >8.0 2 <1.2 <1.2 <1.1	1 c of of ess vious; or 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	
Proposed Condition 10. Shelter for Fish and Macroinvertebrates (EPA 1999) Existing Condition Proposed Condition 11a. Pool-to-Pool Spacing Ratio (Watersheds < 10 mi ²) Existing Condition 10. Pool-to-Pool Spacing Ratio (Watersheds > 10 mi ²) Existing Condition Proposed Condition Proposed Condition Proposed Condition 2a. Pool Max Depth Ratio/Depth Variability Gravel Bed Streams) Existing Condition 2b. Pool Max Depth Ratio/Depth Variability Sand Bed Streams) Existing Condition	10 Greater tr substrate epifaunal fish cover submerge banks, rul and large stable hal allow full optential (are not ne transient) 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	9 han 70% of favorable colonizatic colonizatic is mix of sr ed logs, un bble, grave rocks, or c bitat and al colonizatio (i.e., logs/s ew fall and 9 4.0 - 5.0 9 9 5.0 - 7.0 9 9 >1.5 9 9 >1.2 9	8 f for for and hags, dercut el, cobble other t stage to n nags that not 8 <tr< td=""><td>7 20-70% mix potentia populations; p new fall, but r 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7</td><td>6 of stable habitat al; adequate habitat not yet prepared high end of 3.0 - 4.0 or 6 6 6 3.5 - 5.0 or 6 6 6 1.2 - 6 6 6 1.1 -</td><td>5 ; suited for full - tat for mainten; ional substrate for colonization of scale) 5 5.0 - 7.0 5 5.0 - 7.0 5 7.0 - 8.0 5 5 1.5 5 1.2</td><td>4 4 colonization ance of in the form of n (may rate at 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4</td><td>3 Less tha stable h habitat i than de substrai lacking 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3</td><td>2 2 an 20% mix abitat; lack availability I sirables obv te unstable 2 2 3.0 or >7.1 2 2 3.5 or >8.0 2 4.1.2 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 <1</td><td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td></tr<>	7 20-70% mix potentia populations; p new fall, but r 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	6 of stable habitat al; adequate habitat not yet prepared high end of 3.0 - 4.0 or 6 6 6 3.5 - 5.0 or 6 6 6 1.2 - 6 6 6 1.1 -	5 ; suited for full - tat for mainten; ional substrate for colonization of scale) 5 5.0 - 7.0 5 5.0 - 7.0 5 7.0 - 8.0 5 5 1.5 5 1.2	4 4 colonization ance of in the form of n (may rate at 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	3 Less tha stable h habitat i than de substrai lacking 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	2 2 an 20% mix abitat; lack availability I sirables obv te unstable 2 2 3.0 or >7.1 2 2 3.5 or >8.0 2 4.1.2 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	

e ity	11 Pool to Pool Spanie	-	Moo	derate Grad	lient Perenni	al Streams in	Colluvial Valle	VS	-		
ers s al)	Ratio (3-5% Slope)		2.0 - 4.	0		1		10			
m i m	Existing Conditio	n 10	q	0	7	4.	0-0.0			>6.0	
co co eai	Proposed Conditio	n 10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	-
or ot str	12 Pool Max Depth				1	b	5	4	3	2	_
edi e	Ratio/Depth Variability	1	>1.5			1.1	2 - 1.5			c1.2	
ăğ	Existing Condition	1 10	9	8	7	6	5		-	\$1.2	
	Proposed Condition	1 10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	
								4	3	2	
51	ream Function Pyramic	Level	3 Geomo	rphology	Overall EX	ISTING Con	lition F	FAD (X		-
St	ream Function Pyramic	level	3 Goomo	mholes	0			FAR	F)	Score:	79
			o deomo	phology	Overall PF	ROPOSED Co	ndition(F)	FAR NI	F	Score:	11
~	12 10/04-0	S	tream Fu	inction Py	ramid Lev	el 4 Physicoc	hemical				OC
a	Nutrient Englisher	Very cle	ear, or clear	but tea-	Frequent clo	udiness especia	ally offer storm		-		
Nutrients (Do not complete if stream is ept	Existing Condition	colored) surface; submerg Clear wa reach; di commun quantitie macroph growth p	(; no oil she no noticea ged objects ater along e iverse aqua ity includes s of many s nytes; little a resent	een on bble film on or rocks. entire atic plant s low species of algal	no oli she greenish wa	en on water sur iter along entire on strean	face. Fairly cle reach; modera n substrate	ar or slightly te algal grow	time; c depth- water other c polluta mats, s sheen foam c odor of sewag polluta Pea-gr water a dense s macrop stream;	bipects visibil < 0.5 ft; slow maybe brigh bivious wate ints; floating surface scun or heavy co: or heavy co: or heavy co: or surface; o f chemicals, e, or other hs. een, gray, or long entire r stands of whytes cloggi severe alge	algal r movi t gree algal n, at of r stro oil, r brow reach
pu	Proposed Condition	10	9	8	7	6	(5)	4	BIOOMS	creating this	ck
a	14. Detritus (Petersen, 1992)	10	9	8	(7)	6	5	4	3	2	1
ter Qualit		Mainly c and woo	consisting o d without s covering it	of leaves ediment	Leaves and	d wood scarce; f sedin	ine organic det nent	pris without	Fine o black odo	rganic sedin in color and r (anaerobic)	nent - I foul) or
Na	Existing Condition	10	9	8	7	(6)	5		uc	suntus absen	it
- L	Proposed Condition	10	9	8	$\overline{(7)}$	6	5	4	3	2	1
Stre	am Function Pyramid L	evel 4	Physicoc	hemical (Overall EVI	STINC	5	4	3	2	1
Strea	am Function Pyramid I	evel 4	Dhuninge			STING Condi	tion F (F	AR) NF		Score: 1	1
			nysicuc	nemical	Jverall PR	OPOSED Con	dition F	FAR NF		Score: 1	1
- 11	5 Macroinvertobrate		Stream	Function	Pyramid L	evel 5 Biolog	y	-			4
ear	Existing Condition	10	Abundant	-		Ran	Э		T N	lot prosent	1
(str)	Proposed Condition	10	9	8	A	6	(5)	4	3	2	4
16 era	6. Macroinvertebrate		3	đ	0	6	5	4	3	2	1
	olerance	Abundant	intolerant :	species		Limited intoler:	ant species		0	- C	1
hq	Existing Condition	10	9	85	7	e			Only t	olerant spec	ies
is e is e	Proposed Condition	10	9	(8)	7	6	(5)	4	3	2	1
2 17	7. Fish Presence	F	Abundant	G	1	6	5	4	3	2	1
-	Existing Condition	10	9	8	7	Rare)		N	ot present	1.
100	Proposed Condition	10	9	8	7	0	5	4	(3)	2	1
(Do r	roposed condition			0	1	(6)	5	4	3	2	1
(Dor	evisting hist	TOT			ph and an	-				1	1
lf e NF cal	existing biology is FAR or B , provide description of use(s)	IBI = L tax	1.57 a fan Taxa	nd	FIBI	= 1.3 P	oor or	nly Ear	stun	Blackn BIBI-2	2.6
b b b b b b b b b b b b b b b b b b b	existing biology is FAR or B F, provide description of use(s)	181 = 1 + GX EPT .evel 5	1.57 a fau Taxa Biology (Dverall E)	KISTING CO	= 1.3 P	FAR ME	oly ta	stun ice = 1	Blackin BFBJ-2 Ro	or or

Ex = 74/170 (Not functioning) = 0.41 Prop = 143.170 (functioning) = 0.84

Droft Final David E

	Bankfull Determinatio	n and Rosgen Stream C	Classification	
Rosgen Stream Type (Observation)	B4-B4c, F4b			
Regional Curve (circle one): Piedmont	Coastal Plain	Allegheny Plateau/Ridge a	nd Valley Urban	Karst
DA (sqmi) 0.25				
BF Width (ft) 21.5			BF Area (sqft)	17.8
BF Depth (ft) 0.8			Percent Impervious (%)	35.0%
	Fie	Id Measurements		
Parameter		Measurem	ents and Ratios	
	Reach 1	Reach 2	Reach 3	Reach 4
Water surface to geomorphic feature elevation difference	0.22	0.18	0.25	0.25
Riffle Mean Depth at Bankfull Stage (dbkf)	0.80	0.80	1.00	0.80
Riffle Width at Bankfull Stage (Wbkf)	13.70	14.60	16.30	21.50
Riffle XS Area at Bankfull Stage (Abkf = dbkf*Wbkf)	11.40	11.70	16.30	17.20
Floodprone Area Width (Wfpa) (Wfpa=Width at elevation determined by 2xDmax)	18.10	220	16.90	43.60
Entrenchment Ratio (ER) (ER=Wfpa/Wbkf)	1.30	1.50	1.00	2.00
Low Bank Height (LBH)	2.40	3.30	3.30	3.80
Riffle Maximum Depth at Bankfull Stage (Dmax)	1.20	1.30	1.40	1.30
Bank Height Ratio (BHR) (BHR=LBH/Dmax)	2.00	2.50	2.40	2.90
BEHI/NBS Ratings and Lengths	Refer to CA5_Semi-Final Desi	ign Report, Table 15: BEHI Su	mmary Table and Appendix B f	or ratings and lengths
Pool to Pool Spacing (P-P)	20.40	29.20	26.70	41.40
Pool to Pool Spacing Ratio (P-P Ratio) (P- P Ratio=P-P/Wbkf)	1.49	2.00	1.64	1.93
Pool Maximum Depth at Bankfull Stage (Dmbkfp)	1.27	1.33	1.39	1.59
Pool Depth Ratio (Dmbkfp Ratio) (Dmbkfp Ratio=Dmbkfp/dbkf)	1.59	1.66	1.39	1.99
Macroinvertebrate Taxa Observed	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A



CA-5 Photo Point 1 Upstream; Long Pro Start



CA-5 Photo Point 2 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 1 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 2 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 3 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 3 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 4 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 4 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 5 Upstream at Confluence



CA-5 Photo Point 5 Downstream at Confluence



CA-5 Photo Point 6 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 6 Downstream





CA-5 Photo Point 7 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 7 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 8 Upstream at Floodplain



CA-5 Photo Point 8 Downstream at Floodplain



CA-5 Photo Point 9 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 9 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 9 Upstream at Floodplain Seep



CA-5 Photo Point 10 Upstream at Confluence with Headcut Trib



CA-5 Photo Point 11 Upstream at Valley



CA-5 Photo Point 10 Downstream at Confluence with Headcut Trib



CA-5 Photo Point 11 Downstream at Valley



CA-5 Photo Point 12 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 12 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 13 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 13 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 14 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 14 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 15 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 15 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 16 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 16 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 17 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 17 Downstream


CA-5 Photo Point 18 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 18 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 19 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 19 Downstream





CA-5 Photo Point 20 Downstream

<image>

CA-5 Photo Point 20 Upstream

CA-5 Photo Point 21 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 21 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 22 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 22 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 23 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 23 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 24 Down Valley at Farm Pond



CA-5 Photo Point 25 Upstream Pond Outfall



CA-5 Photo Point 25 Downstream Pond Outfall



CA-5 Photo Point 26 Up Valley at Farm Pond



CA-5 Photo Point 27 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 27 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 28 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 28 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 29 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 29 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 30 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 30 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 31 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 31 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 32 Upstream at Confluence with Mainstem 2



CA-5 Photo Point 32 Downstream Mainstem 2



CA-5 Photo Point 32 Upstream Mainstem 2

Team Line Title b Collect Send Leader 12/07/2020 Set attached photo document Listics: 39.129621 Listics: 39.129621 seth long: Transformed to the construction of	/atershed:	Senera Cierth				Rater(s):	JS, SM, SN	I				
Operation See attached photo document Latitude: Operating in the service of the se	tream:	Un. Trib to Gre	at Sent	ica Ci	eek	Date:	12/07/202	0				
Beach ScontReach Total Ex. 190172 Prop: 140170 Quality: Ex: 6.89 Prop.845 Function-based Rapid Reach Level Stream Assessment Assessment Stream Function Pyramid Level 1 Hydrology Proceed Condition 10 Proceed Condition Pramid Level 1 Hydrology Overall PROPOSED Condition Proceed Condition 10 Proceed Condition Pramid Level 1 Hydrology Overall PROPOSED Condition Proceed Condition 10 Proceed Condition Pramid Level 1 Hydrology Overall PROPOSED Condition Proceed Condition 10 Proceed Condition Pramid Level 1 Hydrology Overall PROPOSED Condition Proceed Condition 10 Proceed Condition Pramid Level 1 Hydrology Overall PROPOSED Condition Proceed Condition 10 <t< td=""><td>noto(s):</td><td>See attached photo</td><td>docum</td><td>nent</td><td>-</td><td>Latitude: Longitude:</td><td>-77.25733</td><td>9</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	noto(s):	See attached photo	docum	nent	-	Latitude: Longitude:	-77.25733	9				
Function-based Rapid Reach Level Stream Assessment Assessment Parameter Category Assessment Parameter Measurement Method Functioning Functioning Functioning-at-Risk Not Functioning Stream Function Pyramid Level 1 Hydrology Some potential for concentrated flow/mpairments for adjustment and the restration site. however, measures are in place the propert condition Optential for concentrate flow/mpairments to reach result of rainfal patterns, geology, and sols, impervious cover 7 - 15% Potential for concentrate flow/mpairments are and no treatments are and po- treatments are and po- treatments are and po- treatments are an place than 100 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Stream Function Pyramid Level 1 Hydrology Overall EXISTING Condition Proposed Condition 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 9 2 7 1 Stream Function Pyramid Level 1 Hydrology Overall EXISTING Condition (10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1) 9 2 7 1 9 5 4 3 2 1 Stream Function Pyramid Level 1 Hydrology Overall EXISTING Condition (10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1) 9 2 1 Stream Function Pyramid Level 1 Hydrology Overall EXISTING Condition (10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1) 9 2 1 Stream Function Pyramid Level 1 Hydrology Overall EXISTING Condition (10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1) 9 2 1 Stream Function Pyramid Level 2 Hydraulics 9 2 1 9 2 1 Stream Function Pyramid Level 1 Hydrology Overall EXISTING Condition (10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1) 9 2 1<	each ID:	Mainsten 2				Reach Score	e/Reach Total E	x. 100/170 Pro	p.: 145/170	Quality:	Ex: 0.58 F	Prop:0.85
Spessment Parameter Measurement Method Functioning Functioning Functioning Not Functioning Stream Function Pyramid Level 1 Hydrology I. Concentrated Flow Not parameter Some potential for concentrated flowingairments to reach restration site. Not Functioning 1. Concentrated Flow No potential for concentrated flowingairments are in place pactors. Not Functioning Priorial for concentrated flowingairments are in place pactors. 2. Flashiness Non-flashy flow regime as a result of rainfal patterns, impervious cover releast m flowing consider releast m package and asis, impervious cover releast m flowing consider r			Funct	tion-base	d Rapio	Reach Le	vel Stream Ass	sessment				
Parameter Measurement Method Functioning Functioning Functioning Not Functioning Stream Function Pyramid Level 1 Hydrology Parameter 1. Concentrated Flow No potential for concentrated for magnetists to reach and agaant and use no potential for concentrated for magnetists to reach and the storation site, however, measures are in place to provide the storation site, however, measures are in place to provide the storation site, however, measures are in place to provide the storation site and no treatments are in place to provide the storation site, however, measures are inplaced to provide site in place to provide site in the provide site in place to provide site in place to provide site in place toperation. The provide s	ssessment					***	Cate	gory		-	-	
Stream Function Pyramid Level 1 Hydrology Plantial for concentrated flow/impairments to reach flow/impairments from restoration site, howver, measures are in place to protect restoration site and no restoration site, howver, measures are in place to protect restoration site and no restoration site, howver, measures are in place to protect restoration site and no restoration site, howver, measures are in place to protect restoration site and no res	Parameter	Measurement Method	Fu	unctionin	g		Functionin	g-at-Risk		No	ot Functi	oning
Image: constrained provide proveprovide proveprovide provide provide provide provide provide pr				Str	eam Fu	nction Pyra	amid Level 1 H	ydrology				
Upport Existing Condition 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Proposed Condition 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Proposed Condition 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Proposed Condition 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Proposed Condition 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 (3) 2 1 Proposed Condition 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 (3) 2 1 Stream Function Pyramid Level 1 Hydrology Overall PKOPOSED Condition F FAR NF Score: O Score: O Stream Function Pyramid Level 1 Hydrology Overall PKOPOSED Condition 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 1		1. Concentrated Flow	No potent flow/in adja	tial for conc npairments acent land u	centrated from use	Some potent restoration s	tial for concentrate ite, however, mea resour	ed flow/impairn sures are in pl rces Large 5	nents to reach ace to protect	Potentia flow/imp restora treatm	al for conce pairments ation site a ents are ir	entrated to reach and no n place
Non-flash flow regime as a result of rainfall patterns, geology, and soils, impervious cover 7.4 15% Tesh flow regime as a result of rainfall patterns, geology, and soils, impervious cover 7.4 15% Flash flow regime as a result of rainfall patterns, geology, and soils, impervious cover 7.4 15% Flash flow regime as a result of rainfall patterns, geology, and soils, impervious cover 7.4 15% Flash flow regime as a result of rainfall patterns, geology, and soils, impervious cover 7.4 15% Flash flow regime as a result of rainfall patterns, geology, and soils, impervious cover 7.4 15% Flash flow regime as a result of rainfall patterns, geology, and soils, impervious cover 7.4 15% Flash flow regime as a result of rainfall patterns, geology, and soils, impervious cover 7.4 15% Flash flow regime as a result of rainfall patterns, geology, and soils, impervious cover 7.4 15% Flash flow regime as a result of rainfall patterns, geology, and soils, impervious cover 7.4 15% Flash flow regime as a result of rainfall patterns, geology, and soils, impervious cover 7.4 15% Flash flow regime as a result of rainfall patterns, geology, and soils, impervious cover 7.4 15% Flash flow regime as a result of rainfall patterns, geology, and soils, impervious cover 7.4 15% Flash flow regime as a result of rainfall patterns, geology, and soils, impervious cover 7.4 15% Flash flow regime as a result of rainfall patterns, geology, and soils, impervious cover 7.4 15% Flash flow regime as a result of rainfall patterns, flow regime as a result of rainfall patterns, flow regime as a result of rainfall patterns, geology, and soils, interviewer and rainfall patterns, flow regime as a result of rainfall patterns, flow regime as a result of rainfall patterns, flow regime as a re		Existing Condition	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Existing Condition 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Stream Function Pyramid Level 1 Hydrology Overall EXISTING Condition F FAR NF Score: • Stream Function Pyramid Level 1 Hydrology Overall PROPOSED Condition F FAR NF Score: • Stream Function Pyramid Level 1 Hydrology Overall PROPOSED Condition F FAR NF Score: • Stream Function Pyramid Level 2 Hydraulics Stream Function Pyramid Level 2 Hydraulics 0 (BHR) *1.20 1.21-1.50 >1.50 0 0 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 0 0 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Weight Ratio (10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Proposed Condition 10 9 8 7 6 5 4	Runofi	2. Flashiness	Non-flash result o geol impervior	ny flow regi f rainfall pa ogy, and so us cover le 6%	me as a atterns, pils, ess than	Semi-flash geolog	y flow regime as a gy, and soils, impe	a result of rainf rvious cover	all patterns, 7 - 15%	Flashy result o geol impervi	flow regin f rainfall p ogy, and s ous cover than 15%	ne as a atterns, soils, greater
Proposed Condition 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Stream Function Pyramid Level 1 Hydrology Overall EXISTING Condition F FAR NF Score:		Existing Condition	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Stream Function Pyramid Level 1 Hydrology Overall EXISTING Condition F FAR NF Score: Stream Function Pyramid Level 1 Hydrology Overall PROPOSED Condition F FAR NF Score: Stream Function Pyramid Level 2 Hydraulics Stream Function Pyramid Level 2 Hydraulics 3: Bank Height Ratio <		Proposed Condition	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	(3)	2	1
Oppose Existing Condition 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 4.1.0 Proposed Condition 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 4.1.0 Proposed Condition 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Weadering streams in alluvial valeys on Rosgen C. E. DA >2.2 2.1-1.4		Stream Function Pyran	nid Leve	I 1 Hydro I 1 Hydro	logy Ov	verall EXIST	OSED Condition	on F FA	R NF R NF	Sc Sc	ore: 9 ore: 9	-
Vitiges Proposed Condition (10) 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 4a Entrenchment Magdening streams in alluvial valleys by Rosgen C, E, DA Streams) >2.2 2.1-1.4 <1.4		Stream Function Pyran Stream Function Pyran 3. Bank Height Ratio	nid Leve	I 1 Hydro I 1 Hydro Str <1.20	logy Ov logy Ov ream Fu	verall EXIST verall PROP nction Pyra	ING Condition POSED Conditi amid Level 2 Hy 1.21 -	F FA	R NF	Sc Sc	ore: 9 ore: 9 >1.50	
Age. Entrenchment (Meadeding streams in alluvial valeys bx.Rosgen C, E, DA Streams) >2.2 2.1-1.4 <1.4 Streams) Existing Condition 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Proposed Condition 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 4b. Entrenchment (Non meandering streams in colluvial valeys or Rosgen B Streams) >1.4 1.3-1.1 <1.1		3. Bank Height Ratio (BHR)	nid Leve	I 1 Hydro I 1 Hydro Str <1.20 9	logy Ov logy Ov eam Fu 8	verall EXIST verall PROP nction Pyra	ING Condition POSED Conditi amid Level 2 Hy 1.21 - 6	F FA on F FA ydraulics 1.50 5	R NF NF	Sc Sco 3	>1.50 2	(1)
Existing Condition 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Proposed Condition 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 4b. Entrenchment (Non meandering streams in colluvial valleys or Rosgen B Streams) >1.4 1.3 - 1.1 <1.1 <1.1 20 Existing Condition 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 20 Existing Condition 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 30 0 0 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 10 9 8 7 6 5 4	~	3. Bank Height Ratio (BHR) 2. Existing Condition	nid Leve nid Leve	I 1 Hydro I 1 Hydro Str <1.20 9 9	logy Ov logy Ov ream Fu 8 8	verall EXIST verall PROP nction Pyra 7 7	TING Condition POSED Condition amid Level 2 Hy 1.21 - 6 6	F FA on F FA ydraulics 1.50 5 5	A NF	Sc Sco 3 3	>1.50 2 2	
Proposed Condition 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 4b. Entrenchment (Non meandering streams) >1.4 1.3-1.1 <1.1 <1.1 <1.1 20 Existing Condition >1.4 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 20 Existing Condition >1.4 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 20 Existing Condition >1.4 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 1.4 1.3-1	Stability)	Stream Function Pyran Stream Function Pyran 3. Bank Height Ratio (BHR) 2.6 Existing Condition 4.0 Proposed Condition 4.a. Entrenchment (Meandering streams in alluvial valleys or Rosgen C, E, DA Streams)	10 10	I 1 Hydro I 1 Hydro Str <1.20 9 9 >2.2	logy Ov logy Ov eam Fu 8 8	verall EXIST verall PROP nction Pyra 7 7	ING Condition POSED Condition amid Level 2 Hy 1.21 - 6 6 2.1 -	F FA on F FA ydraulics 1.50 5 5 1.4	A NF	Sc Sco 3 3	>1.50 2 <1.4	
Valleys or Rosgen B Streams) 20 Existing Condition 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 10 0 0 0 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1	ical Stability)	Stream Function Pyran Stream Function Pyran 3. Bank Height Ratio (BHR) 2.6 Existing Condition 4.1.0 Proposed Condition 4.a. Entrenchment (Meandering streams in alluvial valleys or Rosgen C, E, DA Streams) Existing Condition Reased Condition	10 10 10 10	I 1 Hydro I 1 Hydro Str <1.20 9 9 >2.2 9	logy Ov logy Ov eam Fu 8 8 8	verall EXIST verall PROP nction Pyra 7 7 7	ING Condition POSED Conditi amid Level 2 Hy 1.21 - 6 6 2.1 - 6	F FA on F FA ydraulics 1.50 5 5 1.4	R NF NF 4 4	Sc Sc 3 3	>1.50 2 <1.4 2	(1) 1 1
Sector	ty (Vertical Stability)	Stream Function Pyran Stream Function Pyran 3. Bank Height Ratio (BHR) 2.6 Existing Condition 6.1.0 Proposed Condition 4a. Entrenchment (Meandering streams in alluvial valleys or Rosgen C, E, DA Streams) Existing Condition Proposed Condition Proposed Condition 4b. Entrenchment (Non meandering streams in colluvial related by the streams in colluvial	10 10 10 10 10 10	I 1 Hydro I 1 Hydro Str <1.20 9 9 >2.2 9 9 9 9 >1.4	logy Ov logy Ov eam Fu 8 8 8 8 8 8	verall EXIST verall PROP nction Pyra 7 7 7 7	ING Condition POSED Condition Post of the second secon	F FA on F FA ydraulics 1.50 5 1.50 5 5 1.4 5 5 1.1 5 5	R NF 4 4 4 4 4 4	Sc Sc 3 3 3 3	>1.50 2 <1.4 2 <1.1	(1) 1 1 1 1
Solution No concentrated flow; runoff is primarily sheet flow; hillslopes < 10%; hillslopes >200 ft from stream; ponding or wetland areas and litter or debris jams are well represented runoff is equally sheet and concentrated flow (minor gully and rill erosion occurring); hillslopes 10 - 40%; hillslopes >200 ft from stream; ponding or wetland areas and litter or debris jams are well represented concentrated flows present (extensive gully and rill erosion); hillslopes >200 ft from stream; ponding or wetland areas and litter or debris jams are well represented concentrated flows present (extensive gully and rill erosion); hillslopes >200 ft from stream; ponding or wetland areas and litter or debris jams are not well represented or absent Existing Condition 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 6. Vertical Stability Extent Stable Localized Instability Widespread Instability Widespread Instability Existing Condition 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1	tivity (Vertical Stability)	Stream Function Pyran Stream Function Pyran 3. Bank Height Ratio (BHR) 2.6 Existing Condition 4.0 Proposed Condition 4a. Entrenchment (Meandering streams in alluvial valleys or Rosgen C, E, DA Streams) Existing Condition Proposed Condition 4b. Entrenchment (Non meandering streams in colluvial valleys or Rosgen B Streams) Condition	10 10 10 10 10	1 1 Hydro 1 1 Hydro Str <1.20 9 9 >2.2 9 9 >1.4 (9)	logy Ov logy Ov eam Fu 8 8 8 8 8 8	verall EXIST verall PROP nction Pyra 7 7 7 7 7	ING Condition POSED Condition amid Level 2 Hy 1.21 - 6 6 6 1.3 -	F FA on F FA ydraulics 1.50 5 5 1.4 5 5 1.1	A A 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	Sc Scr 3 3 3	>1.50 2 2 <1.4 2 <1.1	
Existing Condition 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 Proposed Condition 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 6. Vertical Stability Extent Stable Localized Instability Widespread Instability Existing Condition 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1	nectivity (Vertical Stability)	Stream Function Pyran Stream Function Pyran 3. Bank Height Ratio (BHR) 2.6 Existing Condition <u>61.0</u> Proposed Condition 4a. Entrenchment (Meandering streams in alluvial valleys or Rosgen C, E, DA Streams) Existing Condition Proposed Condition Proposed Condition 4b. Entrenchment (Non meandering streams in colluvial valleys or Rosgen B Streams) 2.0 Existing Condition 5.1.4 Proposed Condition	10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	I 1 Hydro I 1 Hydro Str <1.20 9 9 >2.2 9 9 9 >1.4 9 9	logy Ov logy Ov eam Fu 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	verall EXIST verall PROP nction Pyra 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	ING Condition POSED Condition POSED Condition amid Level 2 Hy 1.21 - 6	F FA on F FA ydraulics 1.50 5 1.50 5 5 1.4 5 5 1.1 5 5 5 5 5	R NF NF 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	Sc Sc 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	>1.50 2 2 <1.4 2 <1.1 2 2 <1.1 2 2	1 1 1 1 1 1
Proposed Condition1098(7)6543216. Vertical Stability ExtentStableLocalized InstabilityWidespread InstabilityExisting Condition10987654321	Floodplain Connectivity (Vertical Stability)	Stream Function Pyran Stream Function Pyran 3. Bank Height Ratio (BHR) 2.6 Existing Condition 4.0 Proposed Condition 4a. Entrenchment (Meandering streams in alluvial valleys or Rosgen C, E, DA Streams) Existing Condition Proposed Condition 4b. Entrenchment (Non meandering streams in colluvial valleys or Rosgen B Streams) 2.0 Existing Condition >1.4 Proposed Condition 5. Floodplain Drainage	10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	I 1 Hydro I 1 Hydro Str <1.20 9 9 >2.2 9 9 >1.4 9 9 >1.4 9 9 >1.4 9 9 s	logy Ox logy Ox eam Fu 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 9 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	verall EXIST verall PROP nction Pyra 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	ING Condition POSED Condition amid Level 2 Hy 1.21 - 6 6 6 1.3 - 6 6 4 1.3 - 6 6 5 4 4 4 4 5 5 4 4 5 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	F FA on F FA ydraulics 1.50 5 5 1.4 5 1.1 5 5 1.1 5 5 1.1 5 5 1.1 5 5 1.1 5 5 5 1.1 5 5 1.1 5 5 5 1.1 5 5 5 1.1 5 5 5 1.5 1.	A NF A NF A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A	Sc Sc 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 conc presen and rill e >40%; from st wetland debris represe	<pre>>1.50 2 2 2 <1.4 2 contrated f t (extensive rossion); h hillslopess ream; pon areas anc jams are r sented or a sented or a </pre>	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
b. vertical Stability Extent Stable Localized Instability Widespread Instability Existing Condition 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Floodplain Connectivity (Vertical Stability)	Stream Function Pyran Stream Function Pyran 3. Bank Height Ratio (BHR) 2. Existing Condition 4. Entrenchment (Meandering streams in alluvial valleys or Rosgen C, E, DA Streams) Existing Condition Proposed Condition 4b. Entrenchment (Non meandering streams in colluvial valleys or Rosgen B Streams) 2. Existing Condition 5. Floodplain Drainage Existing Condition	10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	I 1 Hydro I 1 Hydro Str <1.20 9 9 >2.2 9 9 >1.4 9 9 >1.4 9 9 >1.4 9 9 >1.4 9 9 >1.4 9 9 > 2.2 9 9 9 >1.4	logy Ox logy Ox eam Fu 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	verall EXIST verall PROP nction Pyra 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	ING Condition POSED Condition 1.21 - 6 6 6 6 1.3 - 6 6 6 4 1.3 - 6 6 6 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	F FA on F FA ydraulics 1.50 5 5 1.4 5 5 1.1 5 5 1.1 5 5 1.1 5 5 5 1.1 5 5 5 1.1 5 5 5 1.1 5 5 5 5	A NF A NF A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A	Sc Sca 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	<pre>>1.50 2 2 2 <1.4 2 contrasted f t (extensiv rearsion); h hillslopes rears and jams are r isented or a 2</pre>	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
Existing Condition 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Floodplain Connectivity (Vertical Stability)	Stream Function Pyran Stream Function Pyran Stream Function Pyran Stream Function Pyran 3. Bank Height Ratio (BHR) 2. Existing Condition 4. Entrenchment (Meandering streams in alluvial valleys or Rosgen C, E, DA Streams) Existing Condition Proposed Condition 4b. Entrenchment (Non meandering streams in colluvial valleys or Rosgen B Streams) 2. Existing Condition 5. Floodplain Drainage Existing Condition Proposed Condition 5. Floodplain Drainage	10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	I 1 Hydro I 1 Hydro Str <1.20 9 9 >2.2 9 9 >1.4 9 9 >1.4 9 9 >1.4 9 9 >1.4 9 9 >1.4 9 9 >1.4 9 9 >2.2 9 9 9 >1.4 9 9 >1.4 9 9 9 >1.4 9 9 9 >1.4 9 9 9 >1.4 9 9 9 >1.4 9 9 9 >1.4 9 9 9 >1.4 9 9 9 >1.4 9 9 9 >1.4 9 9 9 >1.4 9 9 9 >1.4 9 9 9 >1.4 9 9 9 >1.4 9 9 9 >1.4 9 9 9 9 >1.4 9 9 9 9 >1.4 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	logy Ov logy Ov eam Fu 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	verall EXIST verall PROP nction Pyra 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	ING Condition POSED Condition 1.21 - 6 6 6 6 1.3 - 6 6 6 4 1.3 - 6 6 6 6 4 1.3 - 6 6 6 6 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	F FA on F FA ydraulics 1.50 5 5 1.4 5 5 1.1 5 5 1.1 5 5 1.1 5 5 5 1.1 5 5 5 1.1 5 5 5 5	A NF A NF A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A	Sc Sca 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	<pre>>1.50 2 2 2 <1.4 2 contrasted f t (extensive rears; point areas and jams are r sented or a 2 2 2 </pre>	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
	Floodplain Connectivity (Vertical Stability)	Stream Function Pyran Stream Function Pyran Stream Function Pyran Stream Function Pyran 3. Bank Height Ratio (BHR) 2.6 Existing Condition 4.1.0 Proposed Condition 4.1.0 Proposed Condition 4.1.0 Proposed Condition 5. Existing Condition 5. Floodplain Drainage Existing Condition Froposed Condition Condition Froposed Condition 5. Floodplain Drainage Existing Condition Froposed Condition Condition Froposed Condition Condition Streams Stre	10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	I 1 Hydro I 1 Hydro Str <1.20 9 9 >2.2 9 9 >1.4 9 9 >1.4 9 9 >1.4 9 9 9 >1.4 9 9 9 >1.4 9 9 9 >1.4 9 9 9 >1.4	logy Ox logy Ox eam Fu 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	verall EXIST verall PROP nction Pyra 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	ING Condition POSED Condition amid Level 2 Hy 1.21 - 6 6 6 6 1.3 - 6 6 6 4 4 4 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	F FA on F FA ydraulics 1.50 5 5 1.4 5 5 1.4 5 5 1.1 5 5 1.1 5 5 1.1 5 5 1.1 5 5 5 1.1 5 5 5 1.1 5 5 5 1.2 5 5 5 1.2 5 5 5 1.2 5 5 5 5 1.2 5 5 5 1.2 5 5 5 5 1.2 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	A NF A NF A A A A A A A A A A A A V (minor gully %; hillslopes reas and litter ented A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A	Sc Sc Sc 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	ore: Q >1.50 2 2 <1.4 2 <1.4 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 <1.1 2 called a state of the stat	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

/ Piparian Vocotation				1	Charles Contraction of Contraction			-		2
Zone (EPA, 1999, modified)	Ripariar width o veget diversity activities invasive	1 zone exte of >100 fee ation comr and densit do not imp species no or sparse	ends to a nunity y; human pact zone; ot present	Riparian zor compositi activities re	ne extends to a w on is dominated l greatly impact zo presented and alt	idth of 25-100 f by 2 or 3 specie ne; invasive sp er the commur	eet; species as; human ecies well ity	Riparia a width no ripar to hu majorit	n zone ext of <25 feet ian vegetai uman activi ty of vegeta invasive	ends to ; little c tion du ties; ation is
Left Bank Existing	10	9	8	7	6	(5)	4	3	2	1
Left Bank Proposed	10	9	8	G	6	5	4	3	2	1
Right Bank Existing	10	9	8	7	6	(5)	4	3	2	1
Right Bank Proposed	10	9	8	(7)	6	5	4	3	2	1
8. Dominant Bank Erosion Rate Potential	Dominat po BEHI/NE L/M,	e bank ero otential is lo or IS Rating: I L/H, L/VH,	sion rate ow L/VL, L/L, M/VL	Dominat BEHI/NBS R	e bank erosion ra or ating: M/L, M/M, I H/L, H/M, VH	te potential is r M/H, L/Ex, H/L, I/VL, Ex/VL	noderate M/VH, M/Ex,	BEHI/I H/Ex, \	nate bank e potential is or NBS Rating /H/H, Ex/M	rosion high g: H/H, , Ex/H,
Existing Condition (Right bank)	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Proposed Condition (Right Bank)	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Existing Condition (Left bank)	10	9	8	7	6	. 5	4	3	2	1
Proposed Condition (Left Bank)	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
9. Lateral Stability Extent		Stable			Localized I	nstability	0	Wides	spread Inst	ability
Existing Condition	10	9	A	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
IVIAUTOINVERTEDRATES (EPA 1999)	substrate epifaunal fish cover submerge	colonization colonization r; mix of sr ed logs, un	tor on and nags, dercut	potenti populations; p new fall, but i	al; adequate habi resence of addit not yet prepared	tat for maintena ional substrate for colonizatior	ance of in the form of (may rate at	stable h habitat a than des	abitat; lack availability l sirables ob	of ess vious;
	and large stable ha allow full potential are not ne transient)	orocks, or o bitat and al colonizatio (i.e., logs/s ow fall and	n t stage to n nags that not		nign end c	of scale)		lacking	e unstable	or
Existing Condition	and large stable ha allow full potential are not ne transient) 10	e rocks, or o bitat and a colonizatio (i.e., logs/s ew fall and	t stage to n nags that not	7	6	of scale)	4	substrat lacking 3	e unstable	or 1
Existing Condition Proposed Condition	and large stable ha allow full potential are not ne transient) 10	e rocks, or o bitat and a colonizatio (i.e., logs/s ew fall and	t stage to n nags that not <u>8</u>	7	6 6	of scale)	4 4	substrat lacking 3 3	e unstable	or 1 1
Existing Condition Proposed Condition 11a. Pool-to-Pool Spacing Ratio (Watersheds < 10 mi ²)	and large stable ha allow full potential are not ne transient) 10	e rocks, or c bitat and a colonizatio (i.e., logs/s aw fall and 9 4.0 - 5.0	t stage to n nags that not <u>8</u> 8	777	6 6 3.0 - 4.0 or	5.0 - 7.0	4 4	substrat lacking 3 3	2 2 3.0 or >7.	or 1 1 0
Existing Condition Proposed Condition 11a. Pool-to-Pool Spacing Ratio (Watersheds < 10 mi ²) 3.5 Existing Condition	and large stable ha allow full potential are not ne transient) 10 10	e rocks, or c bitat and a colonizatio (i.e., logs/s aw fall and 9 9 9 4.0 - 5.0 9	other t stage to n nags that not 8 8 8	7 7	6 6 3.0 - 4.0 or	5 5 5.0 - 7.0 5	4 4 4	substrat lacking 3 3 	2 2 3.0 or >7. 2	or 1 1 0
Existing Condition Proposed Condition 11a. Pool-to-Pool Spacing Ratio (Watersheds < 10 mi ²) 3.5 Existing Condition ~5.5 Proposed Condition	and large stable ha allow full potential are not no transient) 10 10 10	e rocks, or c bitat and a colonizatio (i.e., logs/s ew fall and 9 9 4.0 - 5.0 9 9	ther t stage to n nags that not 8 8 8 8 8 8	7	6 6 3.0 - 4.0 or 6	5 5 5.0 - 7.0 5 5	4 4 4 4 4	substrat lacking 3 3 3 3 3 3	2 2 3.0 or >7. 2 2	0r 1 1 0 1 1
Existing Condition Proposed Condition 11a. Pool-to-Pool Spacing Ratio (Watersheds < 10 mi ²) 3.5 Existing Condition ~5.5 Proposed Condition 11b. Pool-to-Pool Spacing Ratio-Watersheds > 10 mi ²)	and large stable ha allow full potential are not ne transient) 10 10 10	bile, grave e rocks, or c bitat and a colonizatio (i.e., logs/s ew fall and 9 9 4.0 - 5.0 9 9 5.0 - 7.0	other t stage to n nags that not. 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	77	6 6 3.0 - 4.0 or 6 3.5 - 5.0 or	5 5 5.0 - 7.0 5 5 7.0 - 8.0	4 4 4 4	substrat lacking 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	2 2 3.0 or >7. 2 2 3.5 or >8.0	or 1 1 0 1 1 0
Existing Condition Proposed Condition 11a. Pool-to-Pool Spacing Ratio (Watersheds < 10 mi ²) 3.5 Existing Condition ~5.5 Proposed Condition 11b. Pool-to-Pool Spacing Ratio-(Watersheds > 10 mi ²) Existing Condition	and large stable ha allow full potential are not ne transient) 10 10 10 10	bite, grave e rocks, or c bitat and a colonizatio (i.e., logs/s ew fall and 9 9 4.0 - 5.0 9 9 5.0 - 7.0 9	ther t stage to n nags that not. 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	6 6 3.0 - 4.0 or 6 3.5 - 5.0 or 6	5 5.0 - 7.0 5 7.0 - 8.0 5	4 4 4 4 4	substrat lacking 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	2 2 3.0 or >7. 2 2 3.5 or >8.0 2	1 1 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
Existing Condition Proposed Condition 11a. Pool-to-Pool Spacing Ratio (Watersheds < 10 mi ²) 5 Existing Condition -5 S Proposed Condition 11b. Pool-to-Pool Spacing Ratio (Watersheds > 10 mi ²) Existing Condition Proposed Condition 12a. Pool Max Depth Ratio/Depth Variability (Gravel Bed Streams)	and large stable ha allow full potential are not no transient) 10 10 10 10 10	bite; grave rocks, or c bitat and a colonizatio (i.e., logs/s ew fall and 9 9 4.0 - 5.0 9 9 5.0 - 7.0 9 9 5.1.5	ther t stage to n nags that not. 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	7 7 7 7 7 7	6 6 3.0 - 4.0 or 6 3.5 - 5.0 or 6 6 6 1.2 -	5 5.0 - 7.0 5 7.0 - 8.0 5 5 1.5	4 4 4 4 4 4 4	substrat lacking 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	2 2 3.0 or >7. 2 2 3.5 or >8.0 2 2 3.5 or >8.1	0 or
Existing Condition Proposed Condition 11a. Pool-to-Pool Spacing Ratio (Watersheds < 10 mi ²) 5 Existing Condition 5 Proposed Condition 11b. Pool-to-Pool Spacing Ratio (Watersheds > 10 mi ²) Existing Condition Proposed Condition 12a. Pool Max Depth Ratio/Depth Variability (Gravel Bed Streams) 1.2 Existing Condition	and large stable ha allow full potential are not no transient) 10 10 10 10 10 10	bite, grave rocks, or c bitat and a colonizatio (i.e., logs/s ew fall and 9 9 4,0 - 5.0 9 9 5.0 - 7.0 9 9 >1.5 9	other t stage to n nags that not 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	7 7 7 7 7 7 7	6 6 3.0 - 4.0 or 6 3.5 - 5.0 or 6 6 1.2 - 6	5 5.0 - 7.0 5 7.0 - 8.0 5 5 1.5 5	4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	substrat lacking 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	2 2 3.0 or >7. 2 3.5 or >8.0 2 2 <1.2 2	or 1 1 1 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
Existing Condition Proposed Condition 11a. Pool-to-Pool Spacing Ratio (Watersheds < 10 mi ²) 5.5 Existing Condition ~5.5 Proposed Condition 11b. Pool-to-Pool Spacing Ratio (Watersheds > 10 mi ²) Existing Condition Proposed Condition 12a. Pool Max Depth Ratio/Depth Variability (Gravel Bed Streams) 1.2 Existing Condition ~12b. Peol Max Depth	and large stable ha allow full potential are not ne transient) 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	bite, grave rocks, or c bitat and a colonizatio (i.e., logs/s ew fall and 9 9 4.0 - 5.0 9 9 5.0 - 7.0 9 9 >1.5 9 9 9	ther t stage to n nags that not 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	7 7 7 7 7 7 7	6 6 3.0 - 4.0 or 6 3.5 - 5.0 or 6 6 1.2 - 6 6 6	5.0 - 7.0 5 7.0 - 8.0 5 1.5 5	4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	substrat lacking 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	2 2 3.0 or >7. 2 3.5 or >8.0 2 <1.2 2 <1.2 2	or 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
Existing Condition Proposed Condition 11a. Pool-to-Pool Spacing Ratio (Watersheds < 10 mi ²) 5.5 Existing Condition ~5.5 Proposed Condition 1b. Pool-to-Pool Spacing Ratio (Watersheds > 10 mi ²) Existing Condition Proposed Condition 12a. Pool Max Depth Ratio/Depth Variability (Gravel Bed Streams) .2 Existing Condition ~12b. Pool Max Depth Ratio/Depth Variability (Sand Bed Streams)	and large stable ha allow full potential are not ne transient) 10 10 10 10 10 10	bite, grave rocks, or c bitat and a colonizatio (i.e., logs/s ew fall and 9 9 4.0 - 5.0 9 9 5.0 - 7.0 9 9 >1.5 9 9 >1.2	ther t stage to n nags that not 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	6 6 3.0 - 4.0 or 6 6 6 1.2 - 6 6 6 1.1 -	5 5.0 - 7.0 5 5 7.0 - 8.0 5 5 1.5 5 1.2	4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	substrat lacking 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	e unstable 2 2 3.0 or >7. 2 3.5 or >8.0 2 <1.2 2 <1.2 2 <1.1	or 1 1 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
Existing Condition Proposed Condition 11a. Pool-to-Pool Spacing Ratio (Watersheds < 10 mi ²) 5 Existing Condition 5 Proposed Condition 11b. Pool-to-Pool Spacing Ratio (Watersheds > 10 mi ²) Existing Condition Proposed Condition Proposed Condition 12a. Pool Max Depth Ratio/Depth Variability (Gravel Bed Streams) 1.2 Existing Condition 22b. Pool Max Depth Ratio/Depth Variability (Sand Bed Streams) Existing Condition	and large stable ha allow full potential are not ne transient) 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	bite, grave procks, or c bitat and a colonizatio (i.e., logs/s ew fall and 9 9 4.0 - 5.0 9 9 5.0 - 7.0 9 9 >1.5 9 9 >1.2 9	bither t stage to n nags that not 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	6 6 3.0 - 4.0 or 6 6 3.5 - 5.0 or 6 6 6 1.2 - 6 6 6 1.1 -	5 5.0 - 7.0 5 5 7.0 - 8.0 5 1.5 5 1.2 5	4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	substrat lacking 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	e unstable 2 2 3.0 or >7. 2 2 3.5 or >8.0 2 2 <1.2 2 <1.1 2	or 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

> #			Mode	rate Gradi	ent Perennial	Streams in Co	Iluvial Valleys				(1997) (1997)
ete (I)	11. Pool-to-Pool Spacing Battis (3-5% Slope)		2.0 - 4.0			4.0 -	6.0			>6.0	
n is n is	Existing Condition	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	
con	Proposed Condition	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	
stre ephe	12. Pool Max Depth Ratio/Depth Variability	-	>1.5			1.2 -	1.5			<1.2	
ÅÅ	Existing Condition	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
	Proposed Condition	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
St	tream Function Pyramid	Level 3 (Geomor	phology	Overall EXI	STING Condi	tion F F	AR		Score:	42
St	tream Function Pyramid	Level 3	Geomor	phology	Overall PR	OPOSED Con	dition (F) F	AR NF		Score:	61
		Stre	eam Fui	nction Py	ramid Leve	I 4 Physicoch	emical				
utrients (Do not complete if stream is ephemers	Nutrient Enrichment (USDA 1999)	colored; ol depth 3 to colored); r surface; n submerge Clear wate reach; dive community guantities macrophyl growth pre	bjects visi 6 ft (less no oil shero o noticeal d objects er along e erse aqua y includes of many s tes; little a esent	ible at if slightly en on ble film on or rocks. intire attic plant s low species of algal	visible to de no oil she greenish wat	oth 0.5 to 3.0 ft; en on water surfa er along entire ro on stream	may have slight g ace. Fairly clear each; moderate a substrate	green color; or slightly algal growth	appeara time; ob depth< (water m other ob pollutan mats, st sheen o foam on odor of sewage pollutan Pea-gre water al dense s macropi stream; blooms	nce most jects visibl 0.5 ft; slow aybe brigh vious wate ts; floating urface scui r heavy co surface; c chemicals, or other ts. en, gray, c ong entire tands of mytes clogg severe alg creating th	of the le at movin at greener algal m, bat of pr stror or stror or brow reach gal bick
Z	Existing Condition	10	9	(8)	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
and	Proposed Condition	10	9	18	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
r Quality a	14. Detritus (Petersen, 1992)	Mainly co and wood	onsisting d without covering i	of leaves sediment t	Leaves an	d wood scarce; sedir	fine organic debr nent	is without	Fine of black odor de	rganic sed in color ar (anaerobi stritus abse	iment nd foul ic) or ent
ate	Existing Condition	10	9	(8)	7	6	5	4	3	2	4
3	Proposed Condition	10	9	(8)	7	6	5	4	3	2	,
S	tream Function Pyramid	level 4	Physico	chemica	Overall EX	ISTING Cond	lition E E		1	Scoro:	8 P
0	troom Evention Dumonid	Level A	Dhuste							00010.	10
3	tream Function Pyramia	Level 4 I	Physico	cnemica	Overall PR	OPOSED Col	naition F I	FAR NF		Score:	16
	The second secon		Stream	n Functio	on Pyramid	Level 5 Biolo	gy			112-11	1.1
E	15. Macroinvertebrate	10	Abundant		7	Ra	re			Not preser	nt
tre	Proposed Condition	10	9	8	(7)	6	5	4	3	2	
Jy e if : eral)	16. Macroinvertebrate	Abundan	t intoleran	t snecies	0	Limited intole	ant species	4	Only	2	
plet	Tolerance		, moreral						Only	tolerant sp	ecies
omomo	Existing Condition	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	
l ot c	17 Fish Presence	10	Abundant	8	1	6	5	4	3	2	
Ĕ	Existing Condition	10	Abundani	8	7	6	s s	1	60	Not presen	nt
0	Drange of Condition	10	9	8	7	(6)	5	4	3	2	
Do Do	Floposed Condition			9	1	0	3	4		2	
(Do	If existing biology is FAR or NF, provide description of cause(s)	BIBJ -	= 1.57 xa.f	poor	FIBI= 3EPT	1.3 poor Fand		1 38.	BIB	7=2.	0

Ex= 102/170=0.60 (Functioning-at-Risk) Prop= 146/ 170=0.86 (Functioning)

Bankfull Determination and Rosgen Stream Classification										
Rosgen Stream Type (Observation) B4c	Rosgen Stream Type (Observation) B4c									
Regional Curve (circle one): Piedmont	Coastal Plain	Allegheny Plateau/Ridge	and Valley Urban	Karst						
DA (sqmi) 0.41										
BF Width (ft) 11.3			BF Area (sqft)	12.3						
BF Depth (ft) 1.1			Percent Impervious (%)	33.8%						
Field Measurements										
Parameter		Measureme	nts and Ratios							
Water surface to geomorphic feature elevation difference	0.33									
Riffle Mean Depth at Bankfull Stage (dbkf)	1.10									
Riffle Width at Bankfull Stage (Wbkf)	11.30									
Riffle XS Area at Bankfull Stage (Abkf = dbkf*Wbkf)	12.30									
Floodprone Area Width (Wfpa) (Wfpa=Width at elevation determined by 2xDmax)	22.30									
Entrenchment Ratio (ER) (ER=Wfpa/Wbkf)	2.00									
Low Bank Height (LBH)	5.65									
Riffle Maximum Depth at Bankfull Stage (Dmax)	1.60									
Bank Height Ratio (BHR) (BHR=LBH/Dmax)	3.53									
BEHI/NBS Ratings and Lengths	Refer to CA5_Semi-Final Des	ign Report, Table 15: BEHI Su	ummary Table and Appendix B	for ratings and lengths						
Pool to Pool Spacing (P-P)	52.20									
Pool to Pool Spacing Ratio (P-P Ratio) (P- P Ratio=P-P/Wbkf)	4.60									
Pool Maximum Depth at Bankfull Stage (Dmbkfp)	1.89									
Pool Depth Ratio (Dmbkfp Ratio) (Dmbkfp Ratio=Dmbkfp/dbkf)	1.72									
Macroinvertebrate Taxa Observed	N/A									



• CA-5 Photo Point 33 Upstream Main Channel



CA-5 Photo Point 33 Downstream Main Channel



CA-5 Photo Point 34 Upstream Main Channel



CA-5 Photo Point 34 Downstream Main Channel



CA-5 Photo Point 35 Upstream Main Channel ٠



CA-5 Photo Point 36 Upstream Main Channel ٠



CA-5 Photo Point 35 Downstream Main Channel •



CA-5 Photo Point 36 Downstream Main Channel



CA-5 Photo Point 37 Upstream Main Channel ٠



CA-5 Photo Point 38 Upstream Main Channel ٠



CA-5 Photo Point 37 Downstream Main Channel ٠



CA-5 Photo Point 38 Downstream Main Channel



CA-5 Photo Point 39 Upstream Main Channel ٠



CA-5 Photo Point 40 Upstream Main Channel ٠



CA-5 Photo Point 39 Downstream Main Channel



CA-5 Photo Point 40 Downstream Main Channel



ATTACHMENT B – MITIGATION CREDIT REPORT

							ST	REAM M	ITIGAT	ION CA	ALCULA	TOR						
BACKGR		IFORMA	TION															
Corps Proje	ect ID #:	TBD			Corps PM:							T		· / E			701	
Project Nan	ne:	CA-5 Se	neca Creek 0063 _77 25646132		Date:			\		3/4/2022		lotal 3	stream Ga	ins (Funct	ional ree	er)		
County:		Montgom	ery		Collaborators		Coastal Re	sources, Inc.										
			Raw Ch	ange in Re	ach Value (Fu	nctional F	eet)					Stream M	itigation Adju	stments				
Reach Name	Physiographic Region	Evaluation	Activity	Resource Type	Length (Feet)	<u>Stream</u> Quality	<u>Channel</u> <u>Thread</u>	<u>Drainage Area</u> (sqmi)	<u>Raw Reach</u> <u>Value</u> (Functional	Raw Change in Value (Functional	<u>Site Sensitivity</u>	Site Protection	Ē	uffer Adjustment	<u>t</u>	Stream Gains (Functional Feet)	REMARKS	
	Piedmont	Existing	Preliminary Resource	Perennial	2901		Primary	0.25	693	1001	1	Deed Restriction	Evaluation	Buffer Area (Acres)	Buffer Quality		REPORTED A	
Mainstem 1			Evaluation	Headwater		41%	1	0.58		<u>596</u>	0.1	0	Existing Buffer	250.23	58%	655		
	Piedmont	Proposed	Restoration/Enhancement	Perennial Headwater	2634	84%	Primary 1	0.25	1289		<u>60</u>	Q	Proposed Buffer Function	250.23 al Feet	<u>58%</u>	5		
	Piedment	Eviation	Preliminary Resource	Perennial	511		Primary	0.42	221		2	Deed Restriction	Evaluation	Buffer Area	Buffer Quality		Part of buffer area from Mainstem 1	
Mainstem 2	Fiedmoni	Existing	Evaluation	Headwater	511	60%	1	0.43	221	55	0.2	0	Existing Buffer	64.07	42%	66	overlapped with Mainstem 2. Only accounted	
	Piedmont	Proposed	Restoration/Enhancement	Perennial Headwater	445	0.00	Primary	0.43	275		<u>11</u>	<u>o</u>	Proposed Buffer	64.07	42%	2	adjustments.	
			Preliminary Resource			80%		0.72			0	Select From List	Evaluation	Buffer Area	⊆ Buffer Quality			
	Not Selected	Existing	Evaluation	NA	0	0%	0	FALSE	0		0	0	Existing Buffer	(Acres)				
	Not Selected	Proposed	NA	NA	0		NA	0	0	<u>v</u>	0	NA	Proposed Buffer			NA		
						0%	0	FALSE			_		Function	al Feet	<u>0</u>			
	Not Selected	Existing	Preliminary Resource	NA	0		NA	0	0		0	Select From List	Evaluation	Buffer Area (Acres)	Buffer Quality	_		
						0%	0 NA	FALSE		<u>o</u>	0	0	Existing Buffer Proposed Buffer			NA	NA	
	Not Selected	Proposed	NA	NA	0	0%	0	FALSE	0		<u>0</u>	NA	Function	al Feet	٥			
	Not Selected	Existing	Preliminary Resource	NA	0		NA	0	0		0	Select From List	Evaluation	Buffer Area	Buffer Quality	NA		
		Existing	Evaluation			0%	0	FALSE		<u>o</u>	0	0	Existing Buffer				NA	NA
	Not Selected	Proposed	NA	NA	0	0%	NA 0	0 FALSE	0		<u>0</u>	NA	Proposed Buffer Function	al Feet	0			
	Not Selected	Existing	Preliminary Resource	NA	0		NA	0	0		0	Select From List	Evaluation	Buffer Area (Acres)	Buffer Quality			
			Evaluation			0%	0	FALSE		<u>o</u>	0	0	Existing Buffer			NA		
	Not Selected	Proposed	NA	NA	0		NA	0	0		<u>0</u>	NA	Eunction	al Feet	0	1		
						0%	0	FALSE						Buffer Area	<u>×</u>			
	Not Selected	Existing	Evaluation	NA	0	0%	NA	0 EALSE	0		0	Select From List	Evaluation Existing Buffer	(Acres)	Butter Quality			
						070	NA	0		<u>0</u>	-		Proposed Buffer			NA		
	Not Selected	Proposed	NA	NA	0	0%	0	FALSE	0		<u>v</u>	NA	Function	al Feet	<u>0</u>			
	Not Selected	Existing	Preliminary Resource	NA	0		NA	0	0		0	Select From List	Evaluation	Buffer Area (Acres)	Buffer Quality			
			Evaluation			0%	0 NA	FALSE		<u>o</u>	0	0	Existing Buffer			NA		
	Not Selected	Proposed	NA	NA	0				0		<u>o</u>	NA	Function	al Feet	0	1		
						0%	0	FALSE						Puffer Area	-			
	Not Selected	Existing	Preliminary Resource	NA	0		NA	0	0		0	Select From List	Evaluation	(Acres)	Buffer Quality	_		
						0%	0	FALSE		0	0	0	Existing Buffer			NA		
	Not Selected	Proposed	NA	NA	0		NA	0	0		0	NA	Proposed Buffer					
		posed				0%	0	FALSE			-		Function	al Feet	<u>0</u>			
			Preliminary Resource						_		0	Select From List	Evaluation	Buffer Area	Buffer Quality			
	Not Selected	Existing	Evaluation	NA	0	0%	NA	0 FALSE	0	٥	0	0	Existing Buffer	(Acres)		NA		
	Not Selected	Proposed	NA	NA	0		NA	0	0		0	NA	Proposed Buffer					
						0%	0	FALSE			_		Function	al Feet	<u>0</u>			



ATTACHMENT C – MITIGATION MAP



39.1301°, -77.2541°

SISCO ALBERT FAVLOV ANDREIR &NADEJDAV MADEJDAV B B B B B B B B B B B B C M B B B B C M C S COLLEENM C S COLLEENM C S COLLEENM C S COLLEENM C S COLLEENM C S COLLEENM C S COLLEENM C S COLLEEN C ALBOY C S C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C	VERBEY BENJAMIN F&SL ESAIHONC ETIAL WG2 WG2	IDAVID JR EAVERS TOMAS RALE MILLER RIANS WIL1 MARYLAND NATIONAL CAPITOL 1	MAY LANCE H.B.LH HO WILLIAM KIUN
WL2	WL6		VOODFORK MCHELUEIK ALBERTI LEWISB JOEHL XID & RJ KURITD
ALLO NSPEL DETRUER DETRUER DETRUER DETRUER	SILBERMANN JOSHUAM PEREIRA JOAQUIN 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 20	ZIMERMA STUART SHOOK E &RC BARBARAA	A CAN
Wetland ID	Cowardin Class	Impact (SF)	Impact (AC)
WL4	PFO	177	< 0.01

WL4	PFO	177	< 0.01
WL6	PFO	995	0.02
WL7	PEM	349	0.01
WL8	PEM	2,029	0.05
	Total:	3,550	0.08

Permanent Wetland impacts will be replaced onsite via oxbow wetland creation.

J///		2 5	المركب	1 Billin								
2111		Proposed Planting Areas										
	(Туре	Area (SF)	Area (AC)								
E)	Floodplain De	epression Planting	13,312	0.31								
)	Riparian Plan	ting/Reforestation	144,850	3.33								
	Proposed Tree Removal and Plantings											
	Total Trees To Be Removed Total Trees To Be Planted											
-		09										
20		Temporary we	liand impacts									
1	Wetland ID	Cowardin Class	Impact (SF)	Impact (AC)								
1	WL2	PFO	618	0.01								
	WL3	PFO	1,042	0.02								
1	WL6	PFO	683	0.02								
ì		Total	: 2,343	0.05								





APPENDIX IV



ATTACHMENT A – PHOTO STATION LOCATIONS















Study











I-495 & I-270 Managed Lanes Study
Phase II Mitigation Design Plan
Stream Site CA-5: Great Seneca Creek
Bradbury Dr. Tributary
Appendix A: CA-5 Site Sketch Map
Sheet 12 of 12

כ	Study	



CA-5 Photo Point 1 Upstream; Long Pro Start



CA-5 Photo Point 2 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 1 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 2 Downstream

Appendix A



CA-5 Photo Point 3 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 3 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 4 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 4 Downstream


CA-5 Photo Point 5 Upstream at Confluence



CA-5 Photo Point 6 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 5 Downstream at Confluence



CA-5 Photo Point 6 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 7 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 8 Upstream at Floodplain



CA-5 Photo Point 7 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 8 Downstream at Floodplain

April 2020



CA-5 Photo Point 9 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 9 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 9 Upstream at Floodplain Seep



CA-5 Photo Point 10 Upstream at Confluence with Headcut Trib



CA-5 Photo Point 11 Upstream at Valley



CA-5 Photo Point 10 Downstream at Confluence with Headcut Trib



CA-5 Photo Point 11 Downstream at Valley



CA-5 Photo Point 12 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 12 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 13 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 13 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 14 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 14 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 15 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 15 Downstream

April 2020



CA-5 Photo Point 16 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 16 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 17 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 17 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 18 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 18 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 19 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 19 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 20 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 20 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 21 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 21 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 22 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 22 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 23 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 23 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 24 Down Valley at Farm Pond



CA-5 Photo Point 25 Downstream Pond Outfall



CA-5 Photo Point 25 Upstream Pond Outfall



CA-5 Photo Point 26 Up Valley at Farm Pond

April 2020



CA-5 Photo Point 27 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 27 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 28 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 28 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 29 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 29 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 30 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 30 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 31 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 31 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 32 Upstream at Confluence with Mainstem 2



CA-5 Photo Point 32 Downstream Mainstem 2



CA-5 Photo Point 32 Upstream Mainstem 2



CA-5 Photo Point 33 Upstream Main Channel



CA-5 Photo Point 34 Upstream Main Channel



CA-5 Photo Point 33 Downstream Main Channel



CA-5 Photo Point 34 Downstream Main Channel



CA-5 Photo Point 35 Upstream Main Channel



CA-5 Photo Point 36 Upstream Main Channel



CA-5 Photo Point 35 Downstream Main Channel



CA-5 Photo Point 36 Downstream Main Channel



CA-5 Photo Point 37 Upstream Main Channel



CA-5 Photo Point 38 Upstream Main Channel



CA-5 Photo Point 37 Downstream Main Channel



CA-5 Photo Point 38 Downstream Main Channel



• CA-5 Photo Point 39 Upstream Main Channel



• CA-5 Photo Point 40 Upstream Main Channel



CA-5 Photo Point 39 Downstream Main Channel



CA-5 Photo Point 40 Downstream Main Channel



CA-5 Photo Point 101 Upstream in Tributary 1



CA-5 Photo Point 101 Downstream in Tributary 1



CA-5 Photo Point 101 36" Reinforced Concrete Pipe with Energy Dissipation into Tributary 1



CA-5 Photo Point 102 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 103 Upstream at Groundwater Seep



CA-5 Photo Point 102 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 103 Downstream at Groundwater Seep



CA-5 Photo Point 104 Upstream at Groundwater Seep from Confluence



CA-5 Photo Point 105 at Groundwater seep adjacent to Trail



CA-5 Photo Point 104 Downstream from Confluence



CA-5 Photo Point 105 at Groundwater seep adjacent to Trail



CA-5 Photo Point 106 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 201 Upstream at Groundwater Seep Headcut



CA-5 Photo Point 106 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 201 Downstream at Groundwater Seep Headcut



CA-5 Photo Point 202 Upstream Start of Headcut



CA-5 Photo Point 203 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 202 Downstream Start of Headcut



CA-5 Photo Point 203 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 204 Upstream



CA-5 Photo Point 204 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 205 Upstream at Confluence



CA-5 Photo Point 301 Upstream at Top of Tributary 2



CA-5 Photo Point 302 Upstream Near Trail



CA-5 Photo Point 301 Downstream at Top of Tributary 2



CA-5 Photo Point 302 Downstream Near Trail



CA-5 Photo Point 303 Upstream at Headcut



CA-5 Photo Point 303 at Abandoned Tributary



CA-5 Photo Point 303 Downstream



CA-5 Photo Point 304 Upstream at Confluence



ATTACHMENT B – LONG TERM MANAGEMENT PLAN

MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION LONG-TERM MANAGEMENT PLAN CA-5 MITIGATION SITE

Contents				
۱ ۸	Burpasa of	Etablishmont	Z	
	Purpose of Establishment Purpose of this Long-Term Management Plan		ב ר	
	C Long Term Steward and Responsibilities		ב כ	
Г	D Eminent Domain		Z	
ц П		anagement Penorte	Z	
	Setting and		Z	
B History and Land Lise			Z	
C		calu Ose	J J	
Г		v and Hydrology	2 3 y	
		and lises	ט ג	
F	Results of A	Annual Management and Monitoring	उ २	
	Management and Monitoring Biological Resources		उ २	
Δ	Biological F	Resources	3	
	Flement A1	Waters of the U.S. including wetlands	0	
	Element A2	Threatened/Endangered Plant Species Monitoring (<i>if applicable</i>)		
	Element A3	Threatened/Endangered Animal Species Monitoring (<i>if applicable</i>)		
	Element A4	Invasive Species	5	
	Element A5.	Vegetation Management	5	
в	Security Safely and Public Access		6	
_	Element B1.	Trash and trespass.	6	
	Element B2.	Fire Hazard Reduction	6	
С	Infrastructu	Infrastructure and Facilities		
0	Element C1.	Fences, Gates, Signage, Crossings, and Property Boundaries	7	
	Element C2.	Berms, Structures, and Roads	7	
С	Reporting a	Reporting and Administration		
	Element D1.	Annual Report	7	
IV	Transfer, R	eplacement, Amendments, and Notices	8	
А	Transfer		8	
В	Replaceme	nt	8	
С	Amendmen	ranster eplacement mendments		
С	Notices	Notices		
V	Funding and Task Prioritization		9	
А	A Funding		9	
В	Task Prioritization		9	
C Enforcement		nt	9	

LONG-TERM MANAGEMENT PLAN

I Introduction

A Purpose of Establishment

Compensatory mitigation is required when unavoidable impacts to, and to conserve and protect waters of the U.S. This Long-Term Management Plan (LTMP) was developed to protect and ensure the integrity of the mitigation as required by the 2008 Federal Mitigation Rule (33 CRF 332).

B Purpose of this Long-Term Management Plan

The purpose of this LTMP is to ensure the CA-5 Mitigation Site is managed, monitored, and maintained in perpetuity. This management plan establishes objectives, priorities and tasks to monitor, manage, maintain and report on the waters of the U.S., covered species and covered habitat on the site after Performance Standards established for the site have been achieved

C Long Term Steward and Responsibilities

The Long-Term Steward for the CA-5 Mitigation Site is the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC). The small portion of the project located on Potomac Electric Power Company (PEPCO) property, Long-Term Steward is being discussed with Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Administration (MDOT SHA). The Long-Term Steward, and subsequent Long-Term Stewards upon transfer, shall implement this long-term management plan, managing and monitoring the mitigation property in perpetuity to preserve its habitat and conservation values. Long-Term Steward will maintain a copy of the Long-term Management Plan and all addendums associated with the CA-5 Site including all deed restrictions and/or easements. Any subsequent grading, or alteration of the site's hydrology and/or topography by the Long-Term Steward or its representatives must be approved by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) and the Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE), i.e., "regulatory agencies" and the necessary permits, such as a Section 404 permit and/or Maryland Nontidal Wetlands Permit, must be obtained if required.

D Eminent Domain

If the site is taken in whole or in part through eminent domain, the Long-Term Steward shall use all monies received as compensation for lands and all associated services and values taken to provide replacement compensation within the same service area subject to COE and MDE approval. The COE and MDE shall have the right to participate in any proceeding associated with the determination of the amount of such compensation. Replacement compensation may be determined in consultation with the COE and MDE.

II Long-Term Management Reports

Long-Term Management reports will be produced for the CA-5 mitigation site. Reports will provide information obtained from inspections and observations made during the annual walk through. Reports will follow the following format.

Property Description

A Setting and Location

The Report will provide the address and a location map depicting the sites location in relation to cities, towns, or major roads, and other distinguishable landmarks. The CA-5 property map will show site and property boundaries on a topographic map.

B History and Land Use

A brief description of the site's history and land use will be provided.

C Cultural Resources

A brief discussion on any cultural resources identified during mitigation work plan development and approval will be provided.

D Topography and Hydrology

A description of site topography and hydrology will be provided. Hydrologic conditions observed during the annual walk-through will be noted and monthly rainfall amounts for the year prior to the site walk through will be provided and compared to seasonal averages to supply some perspective on the observed condition. Any significant precipitation events (storms or flooding) will be noted. Any discernible change in hydrologic inputs such as precipitation, surface run-off and/or out of bank flooding will be noted. Likewise, should contributing drainage areas undergo significant land use change; a description of such change will be provided.

However, unless deemed necessary, no borings will be conducted nor monitoring wells be installed.

E Adjacent Land Uses

A description of land use adjacent to the mitigation site will be provided. Any significant change in adjacent land use will be described in order to provide some perspective, if any, on its influence of the mitigation site.

F Results of Annual Management and Monitoring

A summary of any site management will be provided describing any action(s) taken to ensure long-term sustainability of the mitigation site as further described in **Section III** below.

III Management and Monitoring

The overall goal of long-term management is to foster the long-term viability of the mitigation site's waters of the U.S., and any listed species/habitat. Routine monitoring and minor maintenance tasks are intended to assure the viability of the mitigation site in perpetuity.

A Biological Resources

The approach to the long-term management of the mitigation site's biological resources is to conduct annual site examinations and monitoring of selected characteristics to determine stability and ongoing trends of the preserved, restored, enhancement, and created waters of the U.S., including wetlands and streams. Annual monitoring will assess the site's condition, degree of erosion, establishment of invasive or non-native species, water quality, fire hazard, and/or other aspects that may warrant management actions. While it is not anticipated that major management actions will be needed, an objective of this long-term management plan is to conduct monitoring to identify any issues that arise and using adaptive management

to determine what actions might be appropriate. Those chosen to accomplish monitoring responsibilities will have the knowledge, training, and experience to accomplish monitoring responsibilities.

Adaptive management means an approach to natural resource management which incorporates changes to management practices, including corrective actions as determined to be appropriate by the regulatory agencies in discussion with the Long-Term Steward. Adaptive management includes those activities necessary to address the effects of climate change, fire, flood, or other natural events. Before considering any adaptive management changes to the long-term management plan, the regulatory agencies will consider whether such actions will help ensure the continued viability of a site's biological resources.

The Long-Term Steward for the site shall implement the following:

Element A1. Waters of the U.S., including wetlands

Objective: Monitor, conserve, and maintain the mitigation site's waters of the U.S., including wetlands and/or streams. Limit any impacts to waters of the U.S. from vehicular travel or other adverse impacts.

Task: At least one annual walk-through survey will be conducted to qualitatively monitor the general condition of these habitats. General topographic conditions, hydrology, general vegetation cover and composition, invasive species, erosion, will be noted, evaluated and mapped during a site examination. Notes to be made will include observations of species encountered, water quality, general extent of wetlands and streams, and any occurrences of erosion, structure failure, or invasive or non-native species establishment

Task: Establish reference sites for photographs and prepare a site map showing the reference sites for the mitigation site's file. Reference photographs will be taken of the overall site at least every five years from the beginning of the long-term management.

Special attention should be paid to any area adjacent to or draining from the site. Streams and wetlands should be observed near site boundaries to observe if increased sediment deposition has occurred. The report should provide a discussion of any recent changes in the watershed (i.e., subdivision being developed upstream of stream bank).

Element A2. Threatened/Endangered Plant Species Monitoring (*if applicable*)

The CA-5 mitigation site has no known Rare, Threatened or Endangered plant species, thus this segment of the LTM plan is not applicable.

Objective: Monitor population status and trends.

Objective: Manage to maintain habitat for species(s) identified in the Mitigation Work Plan.

Task: Monitor status every year by conducting population assessment surveys. The annual survey dates will be selected during the appropriate period as identified by the Maryland department of Natural resources (MD DNR) and/or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife

Service (USFWS). Occupied habitat will be mapped and numbered to allow repeatable data collection over subsequent survey years. Abundance will be assessed semiquantitatively using broad abundance categories, i.e., 0, 1 - 100, 101 - 500, 501 - 1,000, and >1,000 plants. Task: Visually observe for changes to occupied habitat, such as changed hydrology or vegetation composition. Record any observed changes. Size of population (1 acre, etc).

Task: Implement other tasks that enhance or monitor habitat characteristics for the specie(s) identified in the Mitigation Work Plan.

Element A3. Threatened/Endangered Animal Species Monitoring (*if applicable*)

The CA-5 mitigation site has no known Threatened or Endangered animal species, thus this segment of the LTM plan is not applicable.

Objective: Manage to maintain habitat for specie(s) identified in the Mitigation Work Plan.

Task: Monitor status every year by conducting population assessment surveys. [The annual survey dates will be selected during the appropriate period each year as identified by MD DNR and/or USFWS.]

Task: Implement other tasks that enhance or monitor habitat characteristics for specie(s) identified in the Mitigation Work Plan.

Element A4. Invasive Species

Invasive species threaten the diversity or abundance of native species through competition for resources, predation, parasitism, interbreeding with native populations, transmitting diseases, or causing physical or chemical changes to the invaded habitat.

Objective: Monitor and maintain control over invasive species that diminish site quality for which the site was established. The Long-Term Steward shall consult the MD DNR at <u>http://www.dnr.state.md.us</u> for guidance on what species may threaten the site and on management of those species.

Task: Mapping of invasive species cover or presence shall occur each year. Mapping shall be accomplished through use of available technologies, such as GIS and aerial photography.

Task: Each year's annual walk-through survey (or a supplemental survey) will include a qualitative assessment (e.g. visual estimate of cover) of invasive species. Additional actions to control invasive species will be evaluated and prioritized in coordination with the regulatory agencies.

Element A5. Vegetation Management

Objective: Analyze effects of any authorized silvicultural manipulations on the wetland, streams, and buffers on the site. If determined appropriate, develop and implement specific silvicultural manipulations (e.g. selective thinning) in coordination with the regulatory agencies.

Objective: Adaptively manage vegetation based on site conditions and data acquired through monitoring to maintain biological values.

Task: Review and explore potential vegetation management regimes as proposals and/or opportunities and funding arise. If determined to potentially maintain site quality, develop specific silvicultural practices, amend this long-term management plan with the regulatory agencies approval to reflect those practices, and implement silvicultural actions as funding allows.

Task: Implement vegetation management techniques, if determined beneficial and as funding allows, to allow development of vegetation as identified in the Mitigation Work Plan. Implementation of vegetation management techniques must be approved by the regulatory agencies.

B Security, Safely, and Public Access

The CA-5 mitigation site will be fenced or appropriately marked and shall have no general public access, nor any regular public use. Research and/or other educational programs or efforts, hunting, and passive recreational activities may be allowed on the site as deemed appropriate by the regulatory agencies but are not specifically funded or a part of this long-term management plan.

Potential mosquito abatement issues will be addressed through the development of a plan by the Long-Term Steward and any local mosquito control district or local health department in coordination with and approved by the regulatory agencies.

Potential wildfire fuels will be reduced as needed where approved by the regulatory agencies.

Element B1. Trash and trespass

Objective: Monitor sources of trash and trespass.

Objective: Collect and remove trash, repair vandalized structures, and rectify trespass impacts.

Task: During each site visit, record occurrences of trash and/or trespass. Record type, location, and management mitigation recommendations to avoid, minimize, or rectify a trash and/or trespass impact.

Task: At least once yearly collect and remove as much trash as possible and repair and rectify vandalism and trespass impacts.

Element B2. Fire Hazard Reduction

Objective: Maintain the site as required for fire control while limiting impacts to biological values.

Task: Reduce vegetation in any areas recommended by authorities, and was approved by the regulatory agencies, for fire control.

C Infrastructure and Facilities

Element C1. Fences, Gates, Signage, Crossings, and Property Boundaries

Objective: Monitor condition of fences, gates, signage, crossings, and property boundaries.

Objective: Maintain fences, gates, signage, crossings and property boundaries to prevent casual trespass, allow necessary access, and facilitate management.

Task: During each site visit, record condition of fences, gates, signs, crossings, and property boundaries. Record location, type, and recommendations to implement repair or replacement to fence, gate, signage, crossings or property boundary markers, if applicable.

Task: Maintain fences, gates, signs, crossings and property boundary markers as necessary by replacing posts, wire, gates, and signs. Replace fences and/or gates, as necessary, and as funding allows. Note any trespass by livestock.

Element C2. Berms, Structures, and Roads

Objective: Monitor condition of berms, structures, and roads.

Objective: Maintain berms, structures, and roads to facilitate management and maintain conditions of wetlands and streams.

Task: During each site visit, record condition of berms, structures, and roads. Record location, type, and recommendations to implement repair or replacement to berms, structures, and roads, if applicable.

Task: Maintain berms, structures, and roads as necessary. Replace berms, structures, and roads as necessary, and as funding allows.

D Reporting and Administration

Element D1. Annual Report

Objective: Provide annual report on all management tasks conducted and general site conditions to COE and MDE and any other appropriate parties. Each report shall include a cover page with the following information: the site name (if applicable), Long-Term Steward (name, address, phone number, and email address), monitoring year, and any requested action (e.g. maintenance recommendations requiring regulatory approval).

Task: Prepare annual report and any other additional documentation. Include a summary. Complete and circulate to the COE and MDE and other parties by December 31 of each year. Reports should be distributed electronically.

Task: Make recommendations with regard to (1) any enhancement measures deemed to be warranted, (2) any problems that need near-,short-, and long-term attention (e.g., weed removal, fence repair, erosion control), and (3) any changes in the monitoring or management program that appear to be warranted based on monitoring results to date. Provide documentation of the cost of any recommended maintenance and repairs.

IV Transfer, Replacement, Amendments, and Notices

A Transfer

Any subsequent transfer of responsibilities under this long-term management plan to a different Long- Term Steward shall be requested by the Long-Term Steward in writing to the COE and MDE, shall require written approval by the COE and MDE, and shall be incorporated into this long-term management plan by amendment.

The long-term steward shall be required to ensure that any subsequent property owners (if not identified as the long-term steward) are notified of the deed restriction, conservation easement, purpose and location of the mitigation site lands, and requirement for long-term stewardship.

B Replacement

Any subsequent transfer of responsibilities under this long-term management plan to a different Long-Term Steward shall be requested by the Long-Term Steward in writing to the COE and MDE, shall require written approval by the COE and MDE, and shall be incorporated into this long-term management plan by amendment.

The long-term steward shall be required to ensure that any subsequent property owners (if not identified as the long-term steward) are notified of the deed restriction, conservation easement, purpose and location of the mitigation site lands, and requirement for long-term stewardship.

C Amendments

The Long-Term Steward, property owner, and the regulatory agencies may meet and confer from time to time, upon the request of any one of them, to revise the long-term management plan to better meet management objectives and preserve the conservation values of the mitigation site. Any proposed changes to the long-term management plan shall be discussed with the COE and MDE and the Long-Term Steward. Any proposed changes will be designed with input from all parties.

Amendments to the long-term management plan shall be approved by the COE and MDE in writing shall be required management components and shall be implemented by the Long-Term Steward.

If the Maryland Department of Natural Resources (MD DNR) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) determine, in writing, that continued implementation of the long- term management plan would jeopardize the continued existence of a state or federally listed species, any written amendment to this long-term management plan, determined by either the MD DNR or USFWS as necessary, shall be a required management component and shall be implemented by the Long-Term Steward.

D Notices

Any notices regarding this long term management plan shall be directed as follows:

Long-Term Steward:

Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission 6611 Kenilworth Avenue, Riverdale, Maryland 20737 PH – 301-699-2255 Email: <u>matthew.harper@montgomeryparks.org</u>
MDOT SHA Contact:

Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Administration Office of Environmental Design 707 N. Calvert Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21202 PH -410-545-8628 Email: <u>WBuettner@mdot.maryland.gov</u>

Regulatory Agencies:

U.S Army Corps of Engineers P.O. Box 1715 Baltimore, Maryland 21203 PH – 410-962-7608

Maryland Department of the Environment Baltimore District 1800 Washington Boulevard Baltimore, Maryland 21230 PH – 410-537-3000

V Funding and Task Prioritization

A Funding

The funding of costs for the long term management of any mitigation site shall be provided by the Maryland State Highway Administration through the Environmental Preservation Fund.

B Task Prioritization

Due to unforeseen circumstances, prioritization of tasks, including tasks resulting from new requirements, may be necessary if insufficient funding is available to accomplish all tasks. The Long-Term Steward and the regulatory agencies shall discuss task priorities and funding availability to determine which tasks will be implemented. In general, tasks are prioritized in this order: 1) required by a local, state, or federal agency; 2) tasks necessary to maintain or remediate a mitigation site (including unauthorized impacts); and 3) tasks that monitor resources, particularly if past monitoring has not shown downward trends.

Equipment and materials necessary to implement priority tasks will also be considered priorities. Final determination of task priorities in any given year of insufficient funding will be determined in consultation with the COE and MDE and as authorized by the COE and MDE in writing.

C Enforcement

The regulatory agencies and its authorized agents shall have the right to inspect the Bank sites and take actions necessary to verify compliance with this Long-Term Management Plan. The Long-Term Management Plan herein shall be enforceable by any proceeding at law or in equity or administrative proceeding by the Corps or MDE. Failure by any agency (or owner) to enforce the Long-Term Management Plan contained herein shall in no event be deemed a waiver of the right to do so thereafter.



APPENDIX V



ATTACHMENT A – DESIGN PLANS (UNDER SEPARATE COVER)



(UNNAMED TRIBUTARY TO GREAT SENECA CREEK)



MONTGOMERY COUNTY

HORIZONTAL DATUM	NAD	83 (200
VERTICAL DATUM	NAD	88

COASTAL	RESOURCES	INC.	
			ĺ

SHEET NOS. AND OTHER CLARIFICATIONS

()

ЧЦ

 \bigcirc

HOL

DRIL

 \bigcirc

HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THESE DOCUMENTS WERE PREPARED OR APPROVED BY ME, AND THAT I AM A DULY LICENSED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER UNDER THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF MARYLAND. MD LICENSE NO._ EXPIRATION DATE:



MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

S.H.A. CONTRACT NO. – AW073B12

- FEDERAL AID PROJECT NO. XX
- I-495 & I-270 MANAGED LANES STUDY P3 PROGRAM STREAM RESTORATION OF CA-5

LIMIT OF WORK INFORMATION LIMIT OF WORK A - CA-5 RIVER STA.0+00 LIMIT OF WORK B - CA-5 RIVER STA. 26+33





SURVEY BOOK	K RIGHT OF WAY PLAT NUMBERS	REVISIONS NOTE: SEE SHEET NO. 2 FOR LIST OF REVISED SHEET NUMBERS	PLAN ACCEPTED	
- -		SEMI-FINAL REVIEW NOVEMBER 1, 2021	"THESE PLANS" REFER TO: STREAM RESTORATION OF CA–5 (UNNAMED TF	RIBUTARY TO GREAT SENECA CREEK)
		THIS DOCUMENT/PLAN IS DRAFT AND SUBJECT TO CHANGE. IT IS AN INTERAGENCY/INTRA-AGENCY DELIBERATIVE COMMUNICATION THAT IS NOT FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE UNDER MD. GENERAL PROVISIONS CODE ANN. § 4-344 (MARYLAND PUBLIC INFORMATION ACT).	*NOTE ACCEPTANCE OF THESE PLANS BY THE ADMINISTRATION SHALL NOT RELIEVE THE DESIGN-BUILDER OF THEIR RESPONSIBILITY TO COORDINATE ALL DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH THE CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS. IN SIGNING, SEALING AND SUBMITTING ANY SEGMENT OF THE COMPLETE PROJECT PLANS FOR DESIGN, THE DESIGN-BUILD TEAM SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY CHANGES NECESSARY TO ADDRESS COMMENTS ON FUTURE PLAN SUBMITTALS.	PLAN ACCEPTED FOR CONSTRUCTION
STR	UCTURE INVENTORY NO.:		G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-C Tuesday, March 08, 2022 AT 11:00 AM	onstruction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\C CONTRACT NO.: AX073A11

GEOMETRIC DESIGN CRITERIA

THIS PROJECT WAS DESIGNED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE 2011 PUBLICATION OF AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION OFFICIALS (AASHTO) "A POLICY ON GEOMETRIC DESIGN OF HIGHWAYS AND STREETS."

STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS BOOK, BOOK OF STANDARDS AND MANUAL ON UNIFORM TRAFFIC CONTROL DEVICES (MUTCD) ALL WORK ON THIS PROJECT SHALL CONFORM TO: THE MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION (MDOT SHA) SPECIFICATIONS ENTITLED "STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION AND MATERIALS" DATED MAY 2017 REVISIONS THEREOF OR ADDITIONS THERETO; THE SPECIAL PROVISIONS INCLUDED IN THE INVITATION FOR BIDS BOOK; THE ADMINISTRATION'S "BOOK OF STANDARDS FOR HIGHWAYS AND INCIDENTAL STRUCTURES" AND THE LATEST ADOPTED MUTCD.

RIGHT OF WAY

RIGHT OF WAY AND EASEMENT LINES SHOWN ON THESE PLANS ARE FOR ASSISTANCE IN INTERPRETING THE PLANS. THEY ARE NOT OFFICIAL. FOR OFFICIAL FEE RIGHT OF WAY AND EASEMENT INFORMATION, SEE APPROPRIATE RIGHT OF WAY PLATS.

UTILITIES

THE LOCATION OF UTILITIES SHOWN ON THE PLANS ARE FOR INFORMATION AND GUIDANCE ONLY. NO GUARANTEE IS MADE OF THE ACCURACY OF SAID LOCATIONS.

ADA COMPLIANCE

THE DESIGN OF THIS PROJECT HAS INCORPORATED FACILITIES TO ACCOMODATE PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES IN COMPLIANCE WITH STATE AND FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS.

ENVIRONMENTAL INFORMATION

ALL STORMWATER MANAGEMENT FACILITIES CONSTRUCTED FOR THIS CONTRACT SHALL BE INSPECTED AND MAINTAINED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE MDOT SHA BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES (BMP) INSPECTION AND REMEDIATION PROGRAM.

STANDARD STABILIZATION NOTE:

FOLLOWING INITIAL SOIL DISTURBANCE OR REDISTURBANCE, PERMANENT OR TEMPORARY STABILIZATION SHALL BE COMPLETED WITHIN THREE (3) CALENDAR DAYS AS TO THE SURFACE OF ALL PERIMETER CONTROLS, DIKES, SWALES, DITCHES, PERIMETER SLOPES, AND ALL SLOPES GREATER THAN 3 HORIZONTAL TO 1 VERTICAL (3:1), AND SEVEN DAYS (7) AS TO ALL OTHER DISTURBED OR GRADED AREAS ON THE PROJECT SITE.

OWNERS / DEVELOPERS CERTIFICATION:

I / WE HEREBY CERTIFY THAT ANY CLEARING, GRADING, CONSTRUCTION AND/OR DEVELOPMENT WILL BE DONE PURSUANT TO THIS PLAN, AND THAT ANY RESPONSIBLE PERSONNEL INVOLVED IN THE CONSTRUCTION PROJECT WILL HAVE A CERTIFICATE OF ATTENDANCE AT A MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT (MDE) APPROVED TRAINING PROGRAM FOR THE CONTROL OF SEDIMENT AND EROSION BEFORE BEGINNING THE PROJECT. I HEREBY AUTHORIZE THE RIGHT OF ENTRY FOR PERIODIC ON-SITE EVALUATION BY MDE COMPLIANCE INSPECTORS.

EXISTING STRUCTURES PLANS

FOR THE CONVENIENCE AND INFORMATION OF BIDDERS, PRINTS OF PLANS OF EXISTING PERTINENT STRUCTURE(S) ARE INCLUDED WITH THIS CONTRACT. NO RESPONSIBILITY FOR THEIR ACCURACY OR COMPLETENESS IS ASSUMED BY THE MDOT SHA. DIMENSIONS, DETAILS, ETC., AS SHOWN THEREON MAY NOT BE AS BUILT.

SEMI-FINAL PLANS: NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION



B

INDEX OF SHEETS

SHEET_	DRAWING	SHEET_
NUMBER	NUMBER	TITLE
01	TI-01	TITLE SHEET
02	IN-01	INDEX OF SHEETS
03	GN01	GENERAL NOTES
04	KE-01	CA-5 STREAM RESTORATION KEY MAP
05–08	GS-01-04	CA-5 STREAM RESTORATION GEOMETRY SHEETS
09–12	EN-01-04	CA-5 EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL NOTES AND DETAILS
13–21	ES-01-09	CA-5 EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL PLANS
22–30	SD-01-09	CA-5 STREAM RESTORATION DETAILS
31–39	SR-01-09	CA-5 STREAM RESTORATION PLANS
40	LD-01	CA-5 STREAM RESTORATION LANDSCAPE DETAILS
41–49	LS-01-09	CA-5 STREAM RESTORATION LANDSCAPE PLANS
50–61	DP-01-12	CA-5 STREAM RESTORATION PROFILE
62-76	XS-01-15	CA-5 STREAM RESTORATION CROSS SECTION



I–495 & I–270 MANAGED LANES STUDY P3 PROGRAM CA-5 STREAM RESTORATION

SEMI-FINAL (65%) DESIGN-NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

INDEX OF SHEETS REVISIONS SCALE NA DATE DECEMBER 2021 CONTRACT NO. AW073B12 MONTGOMERY SĆN COUNTY _____ DESIGNED BY ____ CĴN LOGMILE _ DRAWN BY THIS DOCUMENT/PLAN IS DRAFT AND SUBJECT TO CHANGE. IT IS AN INTERAGENCY/INTRA-AGENCY DELIBERATIVE COMMUNICATION THAT IS NOT FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE UNDER MD. GENERAL PROVISIONS CODE ANN. § 4-344 (MARYLAND PUBLIC INFORMATION ACT). CHECKED BY _____ KŜK HORIZONTAL SCALE _____ MDE/PRD <u>168251/20-PR-0040-01</u> VERTICAL SCALE _____ IN-01 OF 01 SHEET NO. 02 OF 76 DRAWING NO.

CONVENTIONAL SIGNS (SAMPLES)

PROPOSED MEDIAN BARRIER ELECTRICAL HAND BOX – SIGNALS	E
FLOW LINE	
STATE, COUNTY OR CITY LINES PROPOSED TRAFFIC BARRIER	 Ţ
EXISTING TRAFFIC BARRIER PROPOSED FENCE LINE EXISTING FENCE LINE	
RIGHT OF WAY LINE EXISTING ROADWAY RAILROAD	
BASE LINE OR SURVEY LINE	-+
HISTORIC BOUNDARY	
WATERS OF THE U.S	_
WETLAND BOUNDARY	
EXISTING MAJOR CONTOUR (SURVEY	_
EXISTING MINOR CONTOUR (SURVEY)	-
EXISTING CONTOUR (LIDAR)	_

-

 H.B. 	•
F.H. F.H. H	

PROPOSED PIPE / CULVERT
EXISTING PIPE / CULVERT
EXISTING DROP INLET
UTILITY POLE
WETLAND
WETLAND BUFFER
WATERS OF THE U.S
HEDGE /TREE LINE BUSH /TREE
CONIFEROUS TREE
GROUND ELEVATION
GRADE ELEVATION
SANITARY SEWER LINE
WATER LINE

GENERAL NOTES

- 1. THE LOCATION OF THE UNDERGROUND AND SURFACE UTILITIES SHOWN ON THE PLANS ARE FOR INFORMATION AND GUIDANCE ONLY. NO GUARANTEE IS MADE AS TO THE ACCURACY OF SAID LOCATIONS. CONTRACTOR SHALL CONTACT "MISS UTILITY" AT 1-800-257-7777, 48 HOURS PRIOR TO EXCAVATION FOR MARKING AND LOCATION OF UTILITIES.
- 2. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL CHECK ALL DIMENSIONS AND ELEVATIONS PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION. ANY CONFLICTS CONCERNING THE CONSTRUCTION AROUND EXISTING OBSTRUCTIONS PER THESE PLANS SHALL BE RESOLVED BETWEEN THE CONTRACTOR AND THE QAD INSPECTOR.
- 3. THE CONTRACTOR AND OTHERS SHALL PERFORM ALL WORK IN A MANNER THAT WILL ENSURE THE LEAST PRACTICAL OBSTRUCTION TO TRAFFIC, PEDESTRIANS, BUSINESSES, RESIDENTS, AND BE CONSISTENT WITH SAFETY.
- ALL INVERT ELEVATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE AND MAY BE MODIFIED TO MEET CONDITIONS 4 ENCOUNTERED DURING INSTALLATION OF DRAINAGE STRUCTURES, EXCEPT STORMWATER MANAGEMENT FACILITIES.
- 5. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY ALL PIPE LENGTHS AND SIZES IN THE FIELD BEFORE ORDERING ANY DRAINAGE STRUCTURES
- 6. ALL BENCHMARKS AND COORDINATES SHOWN ON THE CONTRACT PLANS ARE "NAD83(2001) AND "NAVD 88"
- 7. ALL EXISTING UTILITY FRAMES AND GRATES WITHIN THE LIMITS OF CONSTRUCTION SHALL BE ADJUSTED TO FINISHED GRADE.
- 8. THE CONTRACTOR WILL NOTIFY PROPERTY OWNERS 72 HOURS PRIOR TO IMPACTS OR OBSTRUCTIONS OF DRIVEWAY ENTRANCES.
- 9. THE TIME OF YEAR RESTRICTION FOR IN-STREAM WORK IS MARCH 1 THROUGH JUNE 15, INCLUSIVE, OF ANY YEAR.



-

HDWL...



STREAM LEGEND



PROPOSED BASELINE PROPOSED MAJOR CONTOUR PROPOSED MINOR CONTOUR

OXBOW WETLAND TOE LOG

RIFFLE GRADE CONTROL MIX

CLAY CHANNEL BLOCK

 ∞ Ż bo

 ∞

ROCK SILL

STONE TOE

ROCK J-HOOK



BOULDER CASCADE



LOG ROLLER

VEGETATED ROCK PACK

EXISTING 100 YEAR FLOODPLAIN

PROPOSED 100 YEAR FLOODPLAIN

____ SURVEY BOUNDARY NOTE: CONTOURS OUTSIDE SURVEY BOUNDARY FROM MONTGOMERY COUNTY LIDAR

KNICKPOINT TREATMENT

AASHTO	American Association of State Highway	
AUT	Average Dally Tranic	
AHD	Anead	HP
	Approximate	IN
₿ or B/L	Baseline	I.S.I
BK	Back /Book	INV
BIT	Bituminous	J.B
B.C	Bituminous Concrete	Κ
B.M	Bench Mark	L
ВОТ	Bottom	LF
C.C.	Center of Curve	L.L
CAP	Corrugated Aluminum Pipe	LP
САРА	Corrugated Aluminum Pipe Arch	L.P
CATV	Cable Television	LT
C.B.R	California Bearing Ratio	MAC
€ or C/L	Centerline	M.C
CL	Class	MAX
CLF	Chainlink Fence	M.D.D
CMP	Corrugated Metal Pipe	MOD.
C.O.	Cleanout	MIN.
COMB	Combination	N
CONC	Concrete	NB
CONSTR	Construction	NE
COR.	Corner	N.P.
CORR	Correction	0.C.
CPP_S	Corrugated Polyethylene Pipe – Type 'S'	OHE
CSP	Corrugated Steel Pipe – Aluminized Type 2	0 M
CSPA	Corrugated Steel Pipe Arch -	PAV'T
	Aluminized Type 2	PC
DC	Degree of Curve	PCC
DHV	Design Hourly Volume	P/C
	Drop Inlet	P/GE
	Diameter	PGE
	Double Opening	PGI
E.	Fast	P/GI
F	Electric	P/B
F	External Distance	PI
Ε ΕΔ	Each	PI
	Easthound	POC
	Elevation	POT
	End Soction	
	LIIU Section	
	Existing	
	Flat Bollom Ditch	
		PVC
G		
G.V	Gas Valve	
H.B.		PVI
HUPE	HIGN Density Polyetheylene	К



ABBREVIATIONS

.. Headwall HERCP..... -- Horizontal Ellipitical Reinforced Concrete Pipe HP..... ...High Point ._ Inch ... Inlet Sediment Trap ...Invert _Junction Box _K Inlet _ Length ... Linear Feet ...Liquid Limit ...Low Point Light Pole ._ Left __Macadam ... Moisture Content ._ Maximum __Maximum Dry Content ... Modified _ Minimum _ North __ Northbound ... Northeast N.P. Non-PlasticOn Center OHE Overhead Electric O.M. Optimum Moisture PAV' T..... Pavement PC _____Point of Curvature PCC _____Point of Compound Curvature P/C _____ Point of Crown P/GEProfile Grade Elevation P.G.E. Profile Ground Elevation P.G.L. Profile Grade Line P/GL Profile Ground Line P/R _____ Point of Rotation P.I. _____Plasticity Index PI _____ Point of Intersection POC Point On Curve POT _____ Point On Tangent PPWP Polyvinyl Chloride Profile Wall Pipe PROP _____ Proposed PRC _____ Point of Reverse Curve PT _____Point PT _____Point of Tangency PVC _____ Point of Vertical Curve PVCPolyvinyl Chloride ... Point of Vertical Intersection Point of Vertical Reverse Curve PVT _____ ... Point of Vertical Tangency __Radius R.F. _____Rock Fragments RTRight

RW or R/W	Right of Way
RCP	Reinforced Concrete Pipe
RCPP	Reinforced Concrete Pressure Pipe
R.Q.D.	Rock Quality Designation
R.M	Rootmat
S	South
SAN	Sanitary Sewer
SB or S/B	Southbound
S.D	Storm Drain
S.D.D.	Surface Drain Ditch
S⁄E	Super Elevation
SF	Silt Fence
SF	Square Feet
SHT	Sheet
SPP	Structural Steel Plate Pipe
SPPA	Structural Steel Plate Pipe Arch
S.P.T	Standard Penetration Testing
SRP	Steel Spiral Rib Pipe –
	Aluminized Type 2
SRPA	Steel Spiral Rib Pipe Arch –
	Aluminized Type 2
SSD	Stopping Sight Distance
SSF	Super Silt Fence
SSM	Soil Stabilization Matting
STD.	Standard
STA	Station
SO	Single Opening
SY	Square Yards
S/W/M	Stormwater Management
Т	Tangont
' Т	Talaphana
т <u>с</u>	
Т.С	Top of Croto
T.G	
TRA <u>y</u>	
15 <u></u>	Temporary Swale
то.	
1.3 TVD	Tursiand
ТҮР	Typical
U.D.	
U.G	
U.P	
USDA	United States Department
	of Agriculture
VCL	Vertical Clearance
V.C. <u>L</u>	Vertical Curve Length
VV	vvater
VV	VVest
WB	Westbound
VVB	Wetland Butter
VV.M.	Water Meter
W.S	Wrapped Steel
WUS	Waters of the United States
W.V	Water Valve





		DA
LEGEND		
LOD	PROPOSED BASELINE PROPERTY LINE LIMIT OF DISTURBANCE	



PLOTTED: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 AT 11:00 AM FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pGS-P001_CA5.dgn

C	A-5 TRAVERSE	DATA	
TRAVERSE POINT NO.	NORTHING	EASTING	ELEVATION
CEM1	533633.9357	1241309.7423	391.7832
CEM2	533551.6221	1241070.0751	391.4471
CEM3	533355.6335	1241061.0744	375.1505
CEM4	533338.3008	1241442.1427	365.8423
CEM4B	533472.6240	1241416.2494	368.8816
CEM5	533265.7102	1241244.8547	353.9733
CEM6	533203.0244	1241034.6170	349.5832
CEM7	533268.2191	1240842.5756	343.6390
CEM7A	533341.1103	1240747.2458	347.4910
CEM8	533277.5611	1240510.2063	335.5591
CEM8A	533088.8805	1240521.5718	349.5015
CEM9	533318.9800	1240312.9542	329.1078
CEM100	532963.4315	1240702.4856	369.9270
CEM101	532968.9264	1240789.3847	381.0300



		HIGHWAY HYDRAULICS DIVISION	
0 50' 100' SCALE: 1" = 50'	MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION	I-495 & I-270 MANAGED LANES STUDY P3 PROGRAM CA-5 STREAM RESTORATION	
1: NAD 83(2001) Horizontal NAVD 88 Vertical	STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION	SEMI-FINAL (65%) DESIGN- NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION	
REVISIONS	CA–5 STREAM REST	ORATION GEOMETRY DATA	
	SCALE <u>1" = 50</u> DATE <u>D</u>	ECEMBÉR 2021 CONTRACT NO. <u>AW073B12</u>	
SEMI-FINAL REVIEW DECEMBER 2021 IS DOCUMENT/PLAN IS DRAFT AND BJECT TO CHANGE. IT IS AN 'ERAGENCY/INTRA-AGENCY DELIBERATIVE MMUNICATION THAT IS NOT FOR BLIC DISCLOSURE UNDER MD. GENERAL	SCALE 1" = 50' DATE D DESIGNED BY SCN DRAWN BY CJN CHECKED BY KSK MDE/PRD 168251/20-PR-0040-01	ECEMBER 2021 CONTRACT NO. AW073B12 COUNTY MONTGOMERY LOGMILE HORIZONTAL SCALE VERTICAL SCALE	

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	BASELINE F	OR CONSTR	UCTION (CA-5 MAINSTEM 1)		BASELINE FOR CONSTRUCTION (CA-5 MAI	STEM 1)		BASELINE FOR CONST	TRUCTION (CA-5 MAINSTEM 1)		BASELINE FO	OR CONSTRUCTION (CA	-5 MAINSTEM 1)			CURVE DATA	(CA-5 MAINSTEM 1)	
	CURVE	POINT NO	STATION	NORTHING EASTING BEARING	CURVE	POINT NO. STATION NORTHING EAST	NG BEARING	CURVE	POINT NO. STATIO	N NORTHING EASTING BEARING	CURVE	POINT NO.	STATION NORTHING	EASTING BEARING	CURVE	DELTA	Dc R	ADIUS TANGENT LENGTH	EXTERNAL
		РОВ	0	533,278.43 1,241,440.10		PC 7+15.24 533,260.34 1,240,	87.46		PC 15+21.70	533,363.48 1,240,070.18		PC	22+81.83 533,142.93	1,239,415.48	MS1-1 14	4° 43' 51.3" 1'	13° 19' 23.0" 50	0.55968 6.535558261 12.99903503	1 0.420656987
		PC	0+20.52	533,281.73 1,241,419.85	MS1-17	PI 533,264.57 1,240,	79.70	M\$1_35	PI	533,361.25 1,240,063.23	MS1-53	PI	533,141.52	1,239,406.32	MS1-2 41	L° 43' 47.9" 24	47° 53' 53.2" 23	8.11263 8.809679063 16.83352298	8 1.622044062
	MS1-1	PI		533,282.78 1,241,413.40	10131-17	CC 533,239.27 1,240,	75.99	IVI3T-33	CC	533,393.95 1,240,060.38	10131-33	CC	533,123.16	1,239,418.51	MS1-3 15	5° 30' 18.2" 4(5° 44' 56.9" 12	2.5601 16.68521249 33.1665269	7 1.13054007
	111511	CC		533,331.64 1,241,427.98		PT 7+32.17 533,262.75 1,240,	71.05 S78.130253V	V	PT 15+36.05	15+36.05 533,362.25 1,240,056.00 N82.137942W		PT	22+99.18 533,133.64	1,239,401.47 S31.596939W	MS1-4 28	3° 27' 7.6" 14	43° 14' 22.0"	40 10.14091612 19.8633262	7 1.265459888
		PT	0+33.52	533,285.44 1,241,407.43 N66.019286W	<u>'</u>	PC 7+52.99 533,258.47 1,240,	50.68		PC 15+62.23	62.23 533,365.83 1,240,030.07	12-24	PC	23+18.30 533,117.35	1,239,391.45	MS1-5 25'	<u>)° 53' 21.4"</u> 14	43° 14' 22.0"	40 9.194031805 18.07413399	9 1.043028895
		PC	0+53.17	533,293.43 1,241,389.47	MS1-18	PI 533,256.75 1,240,	42.51	51 MS1-36	PI	533,366.87 1,240,022.54	MS1-54	PI	533,108.08	1,239,385.75	MS1-6 24	° 12' 3.8" 1/	43° 14' 22.0"	40 8.575639055 16.89551775	5 0.908942607
	MS1-2	PI		533,297.01 1,241,381.42		CC 533,292.72 1,240,	43.48			533,348.00 1,240,027.60	-	CC	533,123.64	1,239,381.23	MS1-7 28°	<u>° 47' 49.6" 15</u>	59° 9' 17.8"	36 9.242263574 18.09376229	9 1.167451298
			0.70.00	533,272.31 1,241,380.08		PT 7+69.38 533,258.91 1,240,	34.44 N /5.02889/	4 N /5.02889/W	PT 15+76.62	2 533,362.20 1,240,016.54 552.081931W			23+35.98 533,112.85	1,239,375.97 N63.998989W	MS1-8 57	° 7' 56.2" 28	36° 28' 44.0"	20 10.88902443 19.9429253	3 2.772150822
	-		0+72.04	533,294.32 1,241,373.03 572.250728W	1.5.5.3	PC 7+92.84 533,264.97 1,240,	02.40	MS1-37 MS1-37 CC 3 S66.693211W	PC 16+01.66	533,346.81 1,239,996.79	1.4.4.4	PC DI	23+64.28 533,125.26	1,239,350.53	MS1 10 E4	· 58 30.5 28	36° 28' 44.0"		5 2.249684002
\rightarrow	1.000	PL DI	0+73.94	533 288 04 1 241 353 39	MS1-19	CC 533 240 82 1 240	05.40		FI	533 366 53 1 239 981 /3	MS1-55		533 089 31	1 239 333 00	MS1-11 47	2° 5' 21 6" 2	26° 28' 44 0"	20 7 695176125 14 6919506	0 1 /20310532
	MS1-3	cc		533,176,40, 1,241,406,64		PT 8+09.54 533.263.78 1.240.	95.43 S66.693211V		PT 16+15.72	2 533.341.66 1.239.983.90 \$84.309567W		PT	23+81.68 533.129.30	1,239,333,75 N88,918500W	/ MS1-12 35	5° 13' 44.5" 2	29° 10' 59.2"	25 7.937438186 15.371563	8 1.229809854
		PT	1+07.11	533,278.89 1,241,339.44 S56.745664W		PC 8+41.45 533,251.15 1,240,	66.13	0	PC 16+40.72	2 533,339.18 1,239,959.03		PC	24+09.50 533,129.82	1,239,305.93	MS1-13 28	3° 32' 52.0" 1	79° 2' 57.5"	32 8.141172914 15.9440946	1 1.019368504
	-	PC	1+44.14	533,258.58 1,241,308.47	1 100	PI 533,246.94 1,240,	56.35		PI	533,338.47 1,239,951.97		PI	533,129.98	1,239,297.45	MS1-14 35	5° 49' 30.0" 1'	90° 59' 9.4"	30 9.696964631 18.75792679	9 1.528259119
	NAC1 A	PI		533,253.02 1,241,299.99	IVIS1-20	CC 533,272.28 1,240,	57.03	IVIS1-38	CC	533,319.28 1,239,961.01	IVIS1-56	CC	533,102.83	1,239,305.42	MS1-15 71	L° 10' 57.3" 4'	9° 15' 20.0"	14 10.01979762 17.39318655	5 3.216165206
	10131-4	СС		533,292.03 1,241,286.54		PT 8+61.39 533,251.67 1,240,	46.81 N63.643772\	N	PT 16+54.35	5 533,333.48 1,239,946.93 S45.255489W		PT	24+25.94 533,125.27	1,239,290.40 S56.197275W	MS1-16 52	2° 1' 38.6" 21	36° 28' 44.0"	20 9.760567214 18.16098046	6 2.254632604
		PT	1+64.00	533,252.17 1,241,289.89 S85.197783W		PC 8+89.52 533,264.16 1,240,	21.61		PC 16+79.59	9 533,315.71 1,239,929.00	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	PC	24+54.32 533,109.48	1,239,266.82	MS1-17 40'	J° 26' 19.2" 25	38° 43' 56.7"	24 8.839477068 16.93891020	6 1.576089514
	The second second	PC	2+01.28	533,249.05 1,241,252.74	MS1-21	PI 533,268.11 1,240,	13.63	MS1-39	PI	533,309.09 1,239,922.32	MS1-57	PI	533,104.63	1,239,259.58	MS1-18 26	50' 27.1" 11	53° 42' 8.0"	35 8.351361918 16.3961414	7 0.982568639
	MS1-5	PI		533,248.28 1,241,243.58		CC 533,228.31 1,240,	03.85	_	СС	533,325.65 1,239,919.15		СС	533,121.11	1,239,259.04	MS1-19 38'	<u>s° 16' 40.4" 2</u> 7	29° 10' 59.2"	25 8.676061504 16.7018807	1 1.462691534
		CC		533,209.19 1,241,256.09		PT 9+07.04 533,268.30 1,240,	04.73 N88.745219	N	PT 16+96.16	5 533,312.77 1,239,913.66 N66.938247W	-	PT	24+69.90 533,108.99	1,239,252.04 N60.012036W	MS1-20 49	1° 39' 46.9" 24	49° 6' 43.5"	23 10.64284464 19.9360126	5 2.343049184
	6	PT	2+19.36	533,243.59 1,241,235.67 \$59.308494W		PC 9+35.68 533,268.93 1,240,	76.10		PC 17+24.58	3 533,323.91 1,239,887.51		PC	24+91.24 533,119.65	1,239,233.56	MS1-21 25°	<u>6'5.2"</u> 12	43° 14' 22.0"	40 8.904945802 17.5241156	5 0.979239375
		PC	2+48.25	533,228.84 1,241,210.82	MS1-22	PI 533,269.13 1,240,		— MS1-40		533,326.88 1,239,880.52	MS1-58		533,124.02	1,239,225.98	MS1-22 28	* 43' 34.6" 15	59° 9' 17.8"	36 9.218546088 18.0492533	8 1.161560677
	MS1-6		-	533 263 24 1 241 190 40	6	PT 9+53 73 533 273 74 1 240	70.00 58 90 NGO 0189391	N	PT 17+38.65	5 533 323 01 1 239 873 99 559 346236		PT	25+07 25 533 120 01	1,239,223.30	MS1-24 47	7° 35' 17 5" 2	29 10 59.2 86° 28' 44 0''	20 8 818588576 16 611/1130	1 857893413
		PT	2+65.15	533,223,49,1,241,194,93,583,509542W		PC 9+77 49 533,285 61 1 240	38 31		PC 17+70.18	3 533 306 93 1 239 846 86		PC	25+30.24 533.109.45	1,239,197,78	MS1-25 57	7° 5' 39 0" 3	18° 18' 35 6"	18 9 792362467 17 9366	6 2 491226481
	MS1-7	PC	2+97.88	533,219,79 1,241,162,40		PI 533,289,26 1,240,	32.00		PI	533,302,49 1,239,839,37	1.000	PI	533.105.15	1.239.189.46	MS1-26 64	4° 40' 57.9" 2	1° 58' 18.7"	15 9.497775809 16.933906	7 2.754090946
		PI		533,218.75 1,241,153.22	MS1-23	CC 533,307.27 1,240,	50.81	— MS1-41	CC	533,341.34 1,239,826.47	- MS1-59	СС	533,125.45	1,239,189.52	MS1-27 70	J° 1' 36.6" 2	1° 58' 18.7"	15 10.508351 18.33298539	9 3.314623683
		СС		533,255.56 1,241,158.33		PT 9+91.67 533,295.72 1,240,	28.63 N27.509956	N	PT 17+87.34	4 533,301.57 1,239,830.71 S83.920681W		PT	25+47.52 533,109.51	1,239,181.16 N62.323264W	/ MS1-28 49	€ 39' 56.3" 21	36° 28' 44.0"	20 9.255200438 17.33657399	9 2.037666282
		PT	3+15.98	533,222.26 1,241,144.67 N67.693342W	1	PC 10+21.49 533,322.17 1,240,	14.86		PC 18+16.63	3 533,298.47 1,239,801.57		РС	25+73.81 533,121.72	1,239,157.88	MS1-29 40	J° 30' 32.3" 24	49° 6' 43.5"	23 8.487192068 16.26134032	2 1.515962743
		PC	3+49.08	533,234.82 1,241,114.04	MS1-24	PI 533,329.99 1,240,	10.79	MS1-42	PI	533,297.65 1,239,793.92	MS1-60	PI	533,127.28	1,239,147.27	MS1-30 24	↓° 17' 25.2" 1/	43° 14' 22.0"	40 8.608246988 16.95785730	6 0.915790548
	MS1-8	PI		533,238.96 1,241,103.96	10151-24	CC 533,312.93 1,240,	97.12	10151-42	СС	533,258.69 1,239,805.81		CC	532,988.88	1,239,088.20	MS1-31 30'	J° 36' 41.5" 19	90° 59' 9.4"	30 8.210314056 16.02815633	1 1.103203322
		СС		533,216.32 1,241,106.45		PT 10+38.11 533,332.26 1,240,	02.26 N75.098144\	N	PT 18+31.84	4 533,294.05 1,239,787.11 S62.136161W		PT	25+97.72 533,131.09	1,239,135.91 N71.455231W	/ MS1-32 28'	<u>5° 58' 4.7"</u> 1/	43° 14' 22.0"	40 10.33277487 20.2234563	3 1.313027443
		PT	3+69.03	533,232.74 1,241,095.02 S55.174386W		PC 10+69.72 533,340.39 1,240,	71.71	1	PC 18+59.88	3 533,280.95 1,239,762.32		POE	26+34.18 533,142.69	1,239,101.35	MS1-33 22°	<u>° 3' 2.2"</u> 12	43° 14' 22.0"	40 7.793548085 15.39423068	8 0.752170393
		PC	3+99.89	533,215.11 1,241,069.69	MS1-25	PI 533,342.91 1,240,	62.25	MS1-43	PI	533,277.02 1,239,754.89	_				MS1-34 56°	<u>° 35' 2.8" 34</u>	47° 14' 49.7"	16.5 8.881385558 16.2950570	5 2.238436686
	MS1-9			533,209.55 1,241,061.69		CC 533,322.99 1,240,3	67.08	1	CC 19,76.65	533,196.96 1,239,806.72	-				MS1-35 25	<u>° 41' 28.6" 1</u>	/9° 2' 57.5"		2 0.82143564
		PT	4+18.03	533,251.55 1,241,058.27 533,212,42 1,241,052,37 N72,850486W/	,	PC 11+16 96 533 316 65 1 240	33 28	V	PC 19+03 12	2 533,271.85 1,239,748.27 552.025101W	-				MS1-37 37	40 48.5 51 2° 13' 30 5" 2	18 18 35.0		1 1 022360124
\rightarrow $-$		PC	4+43.08	533,219,81,1,241,032,37,1472,83048000	diseas.	PI 533,310,27 1,240,	26.25	and the second	PI	533,250,19 1,239,720,52	-				MS1-38 39	+° 3' 14 7" 2	36° 28' 44 0"	20 7 092995216 13 63244499	9 1 22052264
		PI		533,222.51 1,241,019.67	MS1-26	CC 533,327.76 1,240,4	23.21	- MS1-44	СС	533,279.21 1,239,708.94					MS1-39 67	/° 48' 22.6" 4'	9° 15' 20.0"	14 9.40872078 16.56819620	6 2.867840013
1	MS1-10	сс		533,202.61 1,241,023.13		PT 11+33.90 533,313.90 1,240,	17.47 N67.509547\	N	PT 19+20.11	1 533,249.35 1,239,711.84 S84.463531W					MS1-40 53	3° 42' 55.9" 2	1° 58' 18.7"	15 7.596034435 14.06268954	4 1.813677145
		PT	4+60.05	533,217.01 1,241,012.33 S53.128553W		PC 11+63.50 533,325.23 1,240,	90.12		PC 19+43.88	3 533,247.05 1,239,688.17					MS1-41 24	4° 34' 28.0" 14	43° 14' 22.0"	40 8.712066425 17.15619909	9 0.937758871
		PC	4+81.73	533,203.99 1,240,994.98	MS1-27	PI 533,329.25 1,240,	80.41	MS1-45	PI	533,246.16 1,239,678.98					MS1-42 21	L° 47' 4.3" 14	43° 14' 22.0"	40 7.697182226 15.2084642	2 0.733850962
	MS1-11	PI		533,199.38 1,240,988.83		CC 533,311.37 1,240,	84.38	IVIS1-45	CC	533,219.18 1,239,690.87					MS1-43 10'	J° 6' 46.8" 6(0° 18' 40.8"	95 8.405829483 16.76799032	2 0.371159002
		CC		533,219.99 1,240,982.98		PT 11+81.84 533,321.50 1,240,	73.31 S42.463608V	V	PT 19+61.73	3 533,239.97 1,239,672.12 S47.945772W					MS1-44 32°	<u>° 26' 25.3"</u> 19	90° 59' 9.4"	30 8.72726748 16.98573744	4 1.243642516
		PT	4+96.42	533,200.08 1,240,981.16 N84.782108W	-	PC 12+09.57 533,301.04 1,240,	54.59	-	PC 19+87.24	4 533,222.88 1,239,653.17					MS1-45 36°	<u>)° 31' 3.9"</u> 20	04° 37' 40.0"	28 9.237826289 17.84594283	1 1.484528732
	1.0.1	PC	5+16.54	533,201.91 1,240,961.14	MS1-28	PI 533,294.21 1,240,	48.34	MS1-46		533,216.45 1,239,646.04	-				MS1-46 3°	39' 56.0" 19	9° 5' 54.9"	300 9.599662085 19.1927752	9 0.153549891
	MS1-12			533,202.05 1,240,955.25	Her to sta	PT 12+26 91 533 294 55 1 240	39.03	N/	PT 20+06 //	1 533 210 /9 1 239 638 52 551 611322W					MS1-47 21	<u>4/ 12.1 14</u> /*/8'23.2" 2	+3 14 22.0 1° 58' 18 7"		3 0.733999601
		PT	5+31.91	533,207,78 1,240,947,19 N49,553078W	r	PC 12+54.84 533,295.59 1,240,	11.17		PC 20+31.23	3 533,195.09 1,239,619.08	-				MS1-49 64	40 23.2 23 4° 30' 9.4" 3	58° 5' 55.0"	16 10.0957557 18.0125238	8 2.918886945
		PC	5+50.74	533,220.00 1,240,932.86		PI 533,295.91 1,240,	02.69		PI	533,190.31 1,239,613.05					MS1-50 22	2° 46' 39.7" 1	43° 14' 22.0"	40 8.057308404 15.90182283	3 0.803433908
	MC1 12	PI		533,225.28 1,240,926.66	- MIS1-29	CC 533,318.58 1,240,	12.03	IVIS1-47	СС	533,163.74 1,239,643.92					MS1-51 76	5° 19' 0.2" 81	0° 44' 12.4"	13 10.21470327 17.31571653	1 3.533002236
	10121-12	СС		533,195.64 1,240,912.10		PT 12+71.10 533,301.66 1,240,	96.45 N47.361803	N	PT 20+46.44	4 533,183.63 1,239,609.22 S29.824631W					MS1-52 57	/° 55' 51.5" 3!	58° 5' 55.0"	16 8.856350131 16.1773801	7 2.287562376
		PT	5+66.69	533,226.96 1,240,918.69 N78.100869W	1	PC 13+03.77 533,323.78 1,240,	72.42		PC 20+66.77	7 533,166.00 1,239,599.11					MS1-53 49')° 41' 41.9" 21	36° 28' 44.0"	20 9.261421591 17.34682050	6 2.040279715
		PC	5+84.02	533,230.53 1,240,901.73	MS1-30	PI 533,329.61 1,240,	66.09	MS1-48	PI	533,156.05 1,239,593.41					MS1-54 84'	+° 24' 14.7" 11	17° 27' 53.4"	12 10.88171261 17.67754752	2 4.199125572
	MS1-14	PI		533,232.53 1,240,892.24		CC 533,294.36 1,240,	45.33		СС	533,173.46 1,239,586.10					MS1-55 24'	<u>° 55' 10.2"</u> 1/	43° 14' 22.0"	40 8.838314562 17.39710118	8 0.964811782
		CC		533,259.89 1,240,907.92		PT 13+20.72 533,332.32 1,240,	57.92 N71.652144	N	PT 20+86.35	5 533,158.95 1,239,582.31 N75.368919W					MS1-56 34°	<u>-° 53' 3.2" 2</u> !	12° 12' 23.7"	27 8.483085836 16.43880324	4 1.301285224
			6+02.78	533,239.71 1,240,885.72 N42.275869W		PC 13+50.38 533,341.66 1,240,	29.77	1.000	PC 21+21.89	9 533,167.93 1,239,547.92					MS1-57 63°	* 47' 26.5" 49	9° 15' 20.0"		7 2.489704141
	1.11		6+21.59	533,253.63 1,240,873.06	MS1-31	PI 533,344.24 1,240,	21.98	MS1-49		533,170.48 1,239,538.15	-				MS1-58 5/	18' 29.3" 35	58° 5' 55.0"		3 2.232977122
	MS1-15			533,201.04 1,240,800.32	10100	PT 13+66 40 533 342 50 1 240	20.33		DT 21+20 00	533,152.44 1,239,543.88					NS1 60 0°	- 59 48.9 31 7'55 1" 2	18 18 35.6		5 2.292590145
		PT	6+38.99	533,257,05,1,240,857,13,566,541547W		PC 13+94 41 533 336 55 1 240	86 59	V	PC 21+55.50	5 533,102.70 1,239,531.05 540.128485W 6 533,142,27 1,239,514,38 38	-				10131-00 3	7 33.1 30	5 11 49.9	130 11.97908299 23.90742720	5 0.477507801
		PC	6+67.82	533,245,57 1,240,830,68	Sistan	PI 533,334,35 1,240,	76.50	. Sector	PI	533,136,11 1,239,509,19	-							HIGHWAY HYDBAL	JUCS DIVISION
		PI		533,241.69 1,240,821.73	MS1-32	CC 533,375.64 1,240,	78.10	- MS1-50	CC	533,168.05 1,239,483.80								I-495 & I-270) MANAGED
	MS1-16	сс		533,263.92 1,240,822.72	1	PT 14+14.63 533,337.32 1,240,	66.60 N73.295700	N	PT 21+82.59	9 533,132.44 1,239,502.02 S62.906167W	1								STUDY
		PT	6+85.98	533,246.35 1,240,813.15 N61.431078W	'	PC 14+40.53 533,344.77 1,240,	41.79		PC 22+03.17	7 533,123.07 1,239,483.70]					M ₁	ARYLAND DEPART OF TRANSPORTAT	MENT P3 PRO ION CA-	GKAM -5
\downarrow					MC1_22	PI 533,347.01 1,240,	34.33	MS1 51	PI	533,118.42 1,239,474.60							STATE HIGHWA	Y STREAM RES	STORATION
					1012-22	CC 533,383.08 1,240,	53.29	10131-31	СС	533,134.64 1,239,477.77				DATUM: NAD 83	2001) Horiz	zontal	ADMINISTRATIC	SEMI-FINAL (6	,5%) DESIGN-
L					_	PT 14+55.93 533,351.89 1,240,	28.25 N51.245089\	N	PT 22+20.49	9 533,126.15 1,239,467.93 N40.777106W	-			NAVI	Joo vertical			NOT FOR CO	NSTRUCTION
					66.	PC 14+81.57 533,367.94 1,240,	08.25		PC 22+40.57	7 533,141.36 1,239,454.82	-			F	(EVISIONS	CA	–5 STREAN	RESTORATION GEO	METRY DAT
					MS1-34	PI 533,373.50 1,240, CC 522.255 CO 1.240,	01.32	MS1-52		533,148.07 1,239,449.03	-					SCAL'	E NTS	DATE <u>DECE</u> MBÉR 2021 CONTRACT	NO AW073B12
						DT 1/1±07 97 522 270 79 1 240	97.92 97 87 572 1707000	V	PT 22156 75	5 533 1/6 72 1 220 //0 20 C01 201010//	-			SEMI-FI		N			
						ו 1,240, אין 1,240, אי	32.01372.170/890	•	22+30./5	J JJJ,140.72 1,233,440.20 301.231313W	J			DECE	.IMBER 2021	DESIG	NED BY	S <u>ĆN</u> COUNTY	MONTGOMERY

COASTAL RESOURCES INC. m

PLOTTED: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 AT 11:00 AM FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pGS-P003_CA5.dgn



CUDVE	DOINT NO	STATION	NORTHING	EASTING	DEADING
CURVE	POINT NO.	STATION	NORTHING	EASTING	BEARING
	POB	0	532,657.99	1,239,501.98	
	PC	0+27.47	532,681.87	1,239,488.39	-
MS2-1	PI		532,689.24	1,239,484.19	
	CC	0.000	532,694.73	1,239,510.99	
	PT	0+43.88	532,697.68	1,239,485.15	N6.514586E
	PC	0+64.18	532,717.84	1,239,487.46	
MS2-2	PI		532,727.01	1,239,488.50	• no
	CC		532,721.02	1,239,459.64	
1.2	PT	0+82.01	532,735.00	1,239,483.89	N29.971494V
	PC	1+06.12	532,755.90	1,239,471.85	
M\$2-3	PI		532,763.34	1,239,467.55	
11152 5	CC		532,743.41	1,239,450.19	
1	PT	1+22.68	532,766.57	1,239,459.58	N67.923286V
	PC	1+49.08	532,776.49	1,239,435.13	
NACO 4	PI		532,779.78	1,239,427.02	
IVIS2-4	СС		532,739.41	1,239,420.08	
	РТ	1+66.30	532,779.39	1,239,418.29	S87.428925W
1	PC	1+90.70	532,778,29	1.239.393.91	
	PI		532,777,64	1,239,379,26	
MS2-5	CC	10	532,812,64	1,239,392,37	
	PT	2+18.42	532,787,75	1,239,368,65	N46 380011V
	PC	2+18 91	532,788,09	1 239 368 29	1110.0000111
	DI	2110.51	532,700.05	1,239,300.23	
MS2-6	CC	1	532,004.72	1,239,330.84	
	DT	2.62.24	552,621.49	1,239,400.13	
_		2+03.34	532,828.54	1,239,354.52	N8.786475E
	PC	2+78.77	532,843.80	1,239,356.88	-
MS2-7	PI		532,851.45	1,239,358.07	
MS2-7	CC	Constraint and	532,846.72	1,239,337.98	
	PT	2+93.49	532,857.78	1,239,353.59	N35.297081V
	PC	3+15.24	532,875.53	1,239,341.02	
MS2-8	PI		532,883.31	1,239,335.51	
11152 0	CC		532,892.96	1,239,365.64	
	PT	3+33.71	532,892.84	1,239,335.48	N0.228136W
	PC	3+51.94	532,911.07	1,239,335.40	
N/52 0	PI		532,920.23	1,239,335.37	
10132-3	СС		532,910.95	1,239,305.38	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	PT	3+69.73	532,927.81	1,239,330.22	N34.170575V
	PC	3+86.97	532,942.08	1,239,320.54	
1462 10	PI		532949.45	1239315.53	
MS2-10	СС		532926.4	1239297.44	
	РТ	4+04.22	532952.56	1239307.18	N69.575825
	PC	4+16.13	532956.72	1239296.02	
	PI		532961 73	1239282 55	
MS2-11	cc		532986 /19	1739307 11	
	PT	1+12 12	52200.40	1720777 /2	N20 875000
CURVE MS2-1 MS2-2 MS2-3 MS2-4 MS2-4 MS2-5 MS2-6 MS2-7 MS2-7 MS2-7 MS2-10 MS2-10 MS2-11 MS2-12 MS2-13 MS2-14 MS2-15 MS2-16	PC	4143.13	522006.00	1220272.00	1120.0/30091
	DI	4733.08	532300.89	1220270.07	
MS2-9 MS2-10 MS2-11 MS2-12			532992.11	1220200 57	
		1.00 70	552997.04	1239299.5/	NI1 20701 15
		4+66.70	532997.69	12392/1.09	N1.297014E
	PC	4+85.55	533016.53	1239271.52	
MS2-13	PI		533024.8	1239271.71	
	CC		533017.07	1239247.48	
	PT	5+01.49	533031.44	1239266.76	N36.692972V
	PC	5+21.87	533047.78	1239254.58	
MS2-14	PI		533055.8	1239248.61	
	CC		533005.6	1239197.98	
1.22.7	PT	5+41.73	533061.84	1239240.65	N52.811908
	PC	5+54.43	533069.52	1239230.53	
MCD 15	PI	1 1	533076.51	1239221.32	
10152-15	СС		533262.69	1239377.09	
	PT	5+77.54	533084.34	1239212.81	N47.351994
	PC	5+95.46	533096.48	1239199.63	
1.1.1.1	PI		533104 2	1239191 25	
MS2-16	CC		533032 50	1239140 70	
	DT	6+18 12	522100 F	1720101 16	N62 202207
				17.17101.10	11 VUZ DUZZ 7/V



	BASELINE F	OR CONST	RUCTION (C/	A-5 TRIBUTAR	Y 1)
CURVE	POINT NO.	STATION	NORTHING	EASTING	BEARING
2017	POB	0	533,338.69	1,241,420.60	S38.791030W
	PC	0+00.49	533,338.20	1,241,420.56	
T1 1	PI		533,330.33	1,241,419.93	<u> </u>
11-1	CC		533,341.38	1,241,380.69	
	PT	0+16.08	533,323.29	1,241,416.36	S26.886036W
	PC	0+26.90	533,313.64	1,241,411.47	
T1 2	PI		533,312.38	1,241,410.83	
11-2	CC		533,316.94	1,241,404.97	
	PT	0+29.69	533,311.45	1,241,409.77	S48.830067W
	PC	0+39.33	533,305.10	1,241,402.51	
T1 2	PI		533,304.07	1,241,401.33	
11-3	CC		533,314.27	1,241,394.49	
	PT	0+42.46	533,303.37	1,241,399.92	S63.519375W
	PC	0+52.36	533,298.95	1,241,391.05	
T1 4	PI		533,298.23	1,241,389.61	n
11-4	СС	[533,312.39	1,241,384.36	
	PT	0+55.57	533,297.83	1,241,388.05	S75.762072W
	POE	0+66.21	533,295.22	1,241,377.74	\$75.762072W

CURVE DATA (CA-5 TRIBUTARY 1)										
CURVE	DELTA	Dc	RADIUS	TANGENT	LENGTH	EXTERNAL				
T1-1	22° 20' 5.5"	143° 14' 22.0"	40	7.89658521	15.59267167	0.772001				
T1-2	21° 56' 38.5"	425° 50' 3.6"	7.291076191	1.413546374	2.792450142	0.135761				
T1-3	14° 41' 21.5"	110° 11' 28.3"	12.18563433	1.570669449	3.124113584	0.100809				
T1-4	12° 14' 33.7"	21° 26' 50.4"	15.02062689	1.610903021	3.209538489	0.086135				

1		CURVE	DATA (CA-5 M	AINSTEM 2)					
CURVE	DELTA	Dc	RADIUS	TANGENT	LENGTH	EXTERNAL			
MS2-1	36° 9' 19.9"	220° 22' 6.2"	26.0000001	8.486945964	16.40686353	1.350105151			
MS2-2	36° 29' 9.9"	204° 37' 40.0"	28	9.229244664	17.83046296	1.481841141			
MS2-3	37° 57' 6.4"	229° 10' 59.2"	25	8.596427289	16.5595924	1.436689697			
MS2-4	24° 38' 52.0"	143° 9' 24.6"	40.02308379	8.743929931	17.21733358	0.944019436			
MS2-5	46° 11' 27.8"	166° 38' 15.5"	34.3834588	14.66261941	27.71946897	2.99587569			
MS2-6	55° 9' 59.3"	124° 9' 52.4"	46.1450407	24.10686261	44.4301441	5.917475626			
MS2-7	44° 5' 0.8"	299° 29' 42.1"	19.13079512	7.745574214	14.71929482	1.508517897			
MS2-8	35° 4' 8.2"	189° 57' 28.9"	30.16233674	9.530103124	18.46141709	1.469758088			
MS2-9	33° 56' 32.8"	190° 49' 22.0"	30.02565059	9.163272897	17.78741479	1.367107548			
MS2-10	35° 24' 18.9"	205° 12' 51.8"	27.91996347	8.911806257	17.25281129	1.387794051			
MS2-11	48° 41' 59.8"	180° 23' 2.9"	31.76320051	14.37499568	26.99790082	3.101414895			
MS2-12	22° 10' 22.5"	201° 8' 30.5"	28.48526826	5.581593013	11.02351918	0.54169659			
MS2-13	37° 59' 24.0"	238° 18' 37.1"	24.04251056	8.276150521	15.94139533	1.384580927			
MS2-14	16° 7' 8.2"	81° 10' 3.0"	70.58954998	9.995437101	19.85885062	0.704161729			
MS2-15	5° 27' 35.7"	23° 37' 43.8"	242.4823418	11.56224391	23.10698601	0.275503735			
MS2-16	14° 57' 1.1"	65° 57' 53.3"	86.85810373	11.39676667	22.66406055	0.744501677			

PLOTTED: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 AT 11:00 AM FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pGS-P004_CA5.dgn

BASELINE FOR CONSTRUCTION (CA-5 TRIBUTARY 2)									
CURVE	POINT NO.	STATION	NORTHING	EASTING	BEARING				
	POB	0	533,076.15	1,240,540.68	N13.389292W				
	PC	0+26.30	533,200.83	1,240,524.85					
T2 1	PI		533,211.05	1,240,522.42					
12-1	CC	1	533,195.27	1,240,501.52					
	РТ	0+46.11	533,216.19	1,240,513.25	N60.709550W				
	PC	0+57.01	533,221.53	1,240,503.75					
T2 2	PI		533,223.92	1,240,499.49					
12-2	CC		533,260.69	1,240,525.72					
	PT	0+66.74	533,227.16	1,240,495.84	N48.294614W				
	PC	0+81.99	533,237.31	1,240,484.45					
T2 2	PI		533,241.02	1,240,480.29	-				
12-3	CC		533,265.39	1,240,509.48					
	РТ	0+93.06	533,245.78	1,240,477.38	N31.425925W				
6.21	PC	1+09.39	533,259.48	1,240,468.51					
T2 4	PI		533,261.98	1,240,466.85					
12-4	CC		533,252.87	1,240,458.54					
	РТ	1+15.26	533,263.40	1,240,464.21	N61.687656W				
	PC	1+72.88	533,290.84	1,240,413.56					
TO F	PI		533,295.50	1,240,405.12					
12-5	CC		533,259.07	1,240,396.00	207.10				
	PT	1+91.72	533,295.36	1,240,395.48	S89.177536W				
	POE	2+48.12	533,294.55	1,240,339.09	S89.177536W				

BASELINE FOR CONSTRUCTION (CA-5 POND OUTLET)									
CURVE	POINT NO.	POINT NO. STATION		EASTING	BEARING				
	РОВ	0	533,183.02	1,239,677.12	N41.718275W				
	PC	0+11.03	533, 1 91.25	1,239,669.78					
DO 1	PI		533,194.99	1,239,666.44					
PO-1	CC		533,218.14	1,239,699.94					
	PT	0+20.99	533,199.43	1,239,664.13	N27.591186W				
	PC	0+23.03	533,201.23	1,239,663.18					
DO 3	PI		533,207.40	1,239,659.96					
PU-2	СС		533,186.12	1,239,634.26					
	PT	0+36.74	533,211.72	1,239,654.50	N51.659208W				
	POE	0+46.17	533,217.56	1,239,647.11	N51.659208W				

CURVE DATA (CA-5 POND OUTLET)										
CURVE	DELTA	Dc	RADIUS	TANGENT	LENGTH	EXTERNAL				
PO-1	14° 7' 37.5"	141° 47' 45.1"	40.4072276	5.006879739	9.962976696	0.30902084				
PO-2	24° 4' 4.9"	175° 34' 7.6"	32.63437639	6.956901145	13.70860061	0.733287536				

CURVE DATA (CA-5 TRIBUTARY 2)											
CURVE	DELTA	Dc	RADIUS	TANGENT	LENGTH	EXTERNAL					
T2-1	47° 19' 12.9"	238° 53' 6.4"	23.98465817	10.50862864	19.80879313	2.201122389					
T2-2	12° 24' 53.8"	127° 34' 35.6"	44.91090452	4.884808262	9.731362244	0.26487103					
T2-3	16° 52' 7.3"	152° 20' 47.1"	37.60887648	5.576632873	11.07258564	0.411202745					
T2-4	28° 8' 21.0"	119° 12' 32.1"	11.95632614	2.996474002	5.872002794	0.369767775					
T2-5	29° 44' 42.6"	157° 51' 39.4"	36.29509352	9.6387824	18.84263672	1.258067995					

DATUM: NA

		HIGHWAY HYDRAULICS DIVISION		
	MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION	I-495 & I-270 MANAGED LANES STUDY P3 PROGRAM CA-5		
M: NAD 83(2001) Horizontal NAVD 88 Vertical	STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION	STREAM RESTORATION SEMI-FINAL (65%) DESIGN- NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION		
REVISIONS	CA-5 STREAM RES	TORATION GEOMETRY DATA		
	SCALE <u>NTS</u> DATE <u>I</u>	DECEMBER 2021 CONTRACT NO. <u>AW073B12</u>		
SEIVII-FINAL REVIEVV DECEMBER 2021	DESIGNED BY <u>SCN</u> DRAWN BY <u>CJN</u>	COUNTY MONTGOMERY		
SUBJECT TO CHANGE. IT IS AN NTERAGENCY/INTRA-AGENCY DELIBERATIVE COMMUNICATION THAT IS NOT FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE UNDER MD. GENERAL	CHECKED BY <u>KSK</u> MDE/PRD <u>168251/20-PR-0040-01</u>	HORIZONTAL SCALE VERTICAL SCALE		
PROVISIONS CODE ANN. § 4-344 (MARYLAND PUBLIC INFORMATION ACT)	DRAWING NO. GS-C)4 OF 04 SHEET NO. 08 OF 76		

1. NOTIFICATION

NOTIFY THE REGIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR (REC) IN WRITING AND/OR BY TELEPHONE AT (410) 365-0164 PRIOR TO THE FOLLOWING POINTS:

- PRE-CONSTRUCTION MEETING.

 $-\bigcirc$

-

- EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL (ESC) MEETING (MINIMUM 7 WORKING DAYS PRIOR TO COMMENCING EARTH DISTURBING
- ACTIVITIES). - UPON INSTALLATION OF INITIAL ESC MEASURES.
- INSTALLATION OF MAJOR ESC BASINS/TRAPS.
- REMOVAL OR MODIFICATION OF ANY ESC MEASURES.
- REMOVAL OF ALL ESC DEVICES. - FINAL ACCEPTANCE BY THE ADMINISTRATION.

2. STANDARDS AND SPECIFICATIONS

CONSTRUCT THIS PLAN ACCORDING TO THE MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT (MDE) "2011 MARYLAND STANDARDS AND SPECIFICATIONS FOR SOIL EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL", THE MDE "2000 MARYLAND STORMWATER DESIGN MANUAL, VOLUMES I & II", THE MDOT SHA "FIELD GUIDE FOR EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL", THE ANNOTATED CODE OF MARYLAND, THE CODE OF MARYLAND (COMAR) 26.17.01 AND 26.17.02, ALL REVISIONS THERE OF, AND AS SPECIFIED. KEEP A COPY OF THE 2011 "MARYLAND STANDARDS AND SPECIFICATIONS FOR SOIL EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL" ON THE SITE AT ALL TIMES. PERFORM VEGETATIVE STABILIZATION ACCORDING TO THOSE STANDARDS AND AS SPECIFIED.

3. INSPECTION

DAILY INSPECT ALL ESC MEASURES AND MAINTAIN THEM IN A CONTINUOUSLY-EFFECTIVE OPERATING CONDITION UNTIL REMOVED AS APPROVED BY THE REC AND THE ENGINEER.

4. SHUTDOWNS / LIQUIDATED DAMAGES

COMPLETE COMPLIANCE WITH THE APPROVED ESC PLAN IS EXPECTED AT ALL TIMES. IN CASES WHERE THE CONTRACTOR IS FOUND TO BE IN NON-COMPLIANCE, THE ADMINISTRATION WILL TAKE STEPS TO IMPOSE SELECTED OR TOTAL SHUTDOWNS AND MAY IMPOSE LIQUIDATED DAMAGES FOR NON-COMPLIANCE.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S DISTRICT ENGINEER MAY IMPOSE A TOTAL OR PARTIAL SHUTDOWN IF THE PROJECT MAY ADVERSELY IMPACT THE WATERS OF THE STATE.

5. RECORD KEEPING

ENSURE THE STORMWATER MANAGEMENT (SWM)/ESC APPROVAL LETTER, APPROVED EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL PLANS, APPROVED MODIFICATIONS, MODIFICATION APPROVAL LETTER(S), DAILY LOG BOOKS, TEST REPORTS, AND NATIONAL POLLUTANT DISCHARGE **ELIMINATION SYSTEM (NPDES) NOTICE OF INTENT (NOI) PERMIT** ARE AVAILABLE ON-SITE FOR REVIEW AND INSPECTION BY THE ADMINISTRATION.

6. CLEARING AND GRUBBING

UNLESS OTHERWISE SPECIFIED OR APPROVED. LIMIT THE CLEARING AND GRUBBING AREA TO A SINGLE 20-ACRE **GRADING UNIT PER GRADING OPERATION. ONCE THIS FIRST** UNIT IS HALF GRADED. STABILIZATION MEASURES ARE IN PLACE, AND APPROVED, WORK MAY PROCEED TO A SECOND 20-ACRE GRADING UNIT. UNLESS SPECIFICALLY APPROVED, NO MORE THAN 30 ACRES MAY BE DISTURBED AT ANY TIME.

7. SENSITIVE AREAS

WITH THE APPROVAL AND ASSISTANCE OF THE ENGINEER, COORDINATE WITH THE APPROPRIATE ADMINISTRATION **REPRESENTATIVES TO COORDINATE WITH THE APPROPRIATE REGULATORY AGENCIES TO ENSURE THAT ALL PERMIT CONDITIONS** ARE MET PRIOR TO COMMENCING CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES WITHIN SPECIFIED SENSITIVE AREAS. SENSITIVE AREAS INCLUDE BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO FLOODPLAINS, WETLANDS, WETLAND BUFFERS, CHESAPEAKE BAY CRITICAL AREA, FORESTS, ARCHEOLOGICAL SITES, HISTORIC SITES, PARKLAND, AND OPEN WATERS. DESIGNATE A RESPONSIBLE PARTY TO MONITOR ALL WORK IN THESE AREAS AND ENSURE THAT REASONABLE CARE IS TAKEN DURING WORK IN AND ADJACENT TO THESE AREAS.

EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL – GENERAL NOTES 8. INGRESS / EGRESS CONTROLS

PROTECT ALL POINTS OF CONSTRUCTION INGRESS AND EGRESS AND PREVENT THE DEPOSITION OF MATERIALS ON PUBLIC ROADS. IF DEPOSITION OCCURS, MECHANICALLY REMOVE ALL MATERIALS DEPOSITED ON PUBLIC ROADS IMMEDIATELY. FLUSHING OF ROAD SURFACES IS PROHIBITED.

9. EROSION AND SEDIMENT **CONTROL EXCAVATION**

DISPOSE OF MATERIAL REMOVED FROM ESC DEVICES IN AN APPROVED WASTE SITE AS SPECIFIED IN SECTION 201. MATERIALS MAY BE STORED FOR RE-USE. MATERIALS STORED ON-SITE MAY BE REUSED ONCE IT IS DRIED AND IF IT MEETS THE REQUIREMENTS FOR EMBANKMENTS OR OTHER UNSPECIFIED NEEDS.

10. DEWATERING PRACTICES

OPERATE DEWATERING PRACTICES IN A MANNER THAT DOES NOT DISCHARGE SEDIMENT INTO WATERWAYS. NO VISIBLE CHANGES TO STREAM CLARITY ARE ACCEPTABLE.

11. STANDARD STABILIZATION NOTE

FOLLOWING INITIAL SOIL DISTURBANCE OR REDISTURBANCE, COMPLETE PERMANENT OR TEMPORARY STABILIZATION WITHIN THREE (3) CALENDAR DAYS FOR SURFACES OF ALL PERIMETER CONTROLS, DIKES, SWALES, DITCHES, PERIMETER SLOPES, AND ALL SLOPES GREATER THAN 3 HORIZONTAL TO 1 VERTICAL (3:1); AND SEVEN (7) DAYS AS TO ALL OTHER DISTURBED OR GRADED AREAS ON THE SITE. ENSURE CONTINUED STABILIZATION.

12. INCREMENTAL STABILIZATION

REFER TO THE MDE "2011 MARYLAND STANDARDS AND SPECIFICATIONS FOR SOIL EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL" FOR THE INCREMENTAL STABILIZATION OF CUT AND FILLS.

13. SEDIMENT TRAPS AND BASINS

PLAN DIMENSIONS ARE RELATIVE TO THE OUTLET ELEVATION. MAINTAIN INFLOW AND OUTFLOW LOCATIONS FOR TRAPS AND BASINS IN STABLE CONDITION.

14. OFF-SITE UTILITY WORK

FOLLOW ADDITIONAL BEST MANAGEMENT ESC PRACTICES FOR UTILITY CONSTRUCTION IN AREAS OUTSIDE OF DESIGNED CONTROLS:

- (a) CALL "MISS UTILITY" AT 1-800-257-7777 AT LEAST 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE START OF WORK.
- (b) PLACE EXCAVATED MATERIAL ON THE HIGH SIDE OF TRENCHES. (c) BACKFILL, COMPACT, AND STABILIZE AT THE END OF EACH WORKING DAY ALL TRENCHES FOR UTILITY
- INSTALLATIONS. WHEN THIS IS NOT POSSIBLE, CONFORM TO (d). (d) PLACE TEMPORARY SILT FENCES IMMEDIATELY DOWNSTREAM OF ANY DISTURBED AREA THAT IS INTENDED TO REMAIN DISTURBED FOR MORE THAN ONE (1) DAY.

15. SITE INFORMATION*

TOTAL AREA DISTURBED	
TOTAL CUT	1
TOTAL FILL	4
OFFSITE WASTE/BORROW AREA	
LOCATION (IF KNOWN)	Т

* (NOT FOR BIDDING PURPOSES)

16. MODIFICATIONS

SUBMIT MODIFICATIONS OF THE ESC MEASURES OR PLAN TO THE ADMINISTRATION FOR APPROVAL. OBTAIN ALL APPROVALS PRIOR TO IMPLEMENTING ANY MODIFICATION.



(|)

STANDARD SYMBOLS										
AT-GRADE INLET PROTECTION		PERMANENT SOIL STABILIZATION MATTING-TYPE B	B B B B B	TEMPORARY ACCESS BRIDGE	ТВ					
BAFFLE BOARDS	BB	PERMANENT SOIL STABILIZATION MATTING-TYPE C		TEMPORARY ACCESS CULVERT						
BENCHING	BENCHING	PIPE OUTLET SEDIMENT TRAP ST I	ST-I	TEMPORARY ASPHALT BERM	T <u>AB</u>					
CATCH BASIN INSERT	СПСВІ	PIPE SLOPE DRAIN NOTE: DESIGNATION PSD-12 REFERS TO PIPE SLOPE DRAIN WITH 12 IN PIPE	PSD - 12	TEMPORARY BARRIER DIVERSION	TBD					
CLEAR WATER DIVERSION PIPE NOTE: DESIGNATION CWD-12 REFERS TO CLEAR WATER DIVERSION WITH 12 INCH PIPE.	CWD - 12	PLUNGE POOL	PP	TEMPORARY GABION OUTLET STRUCTURE	TGOS					
CLEAR WATER PIPE	⊢-∏I C₩P	PORTABLE SEDIMENT TANK	⊠PST	TEMPORARY SOIL STABILIZATION MATTING-TYPE A						
COMBINATION INLET PROTECTION		REMOVABLE PUMPING STATION	⊠RPS	TEMPORARY SOIL STABILIZATION MATTING-TYPE E						
CONCRETE WASHOUT STRUCTURE	CWS	RIPRAP INFLOW PROTECTION	୍ପେ RRP 🔀	TEMPORARY SOIL STABILIZATION MATTING-TYPE D						
CURB INLET PROTECTION		RIPRAP OUTLET SEDIMENT TRAP ST III	ST-III	TEMPORARY STONE OUTLET STRUCTURE	KARE TSOS					
DIVERSION FENCE	⊢ DFI	ROCK OUTLET PROTECTION I	ROPI	TEMPORARY SWALENOTE: PLACE DESIGNATION (A-1, B-2, ETC.) ON FLOW CHANNEL SIDE OF SWALE.						
EARTH DIKE NOTE: PLACE DESIGNATION (A-1, B-2, ETC.) ON FLOW CHANNEL SIDE OF DIKE.	A-I	ROCK OUTLET PROTECTION II	ROPII	VERTICAL DRAW-DOWN DEVICE						
EMERGENCY SPILLWAY	ES	ROCK OUTLET PROTECTION III	ROPIII	WASH RACK OPTION	WR					
FILTER BAG	Øfв	SILT FENCE	۱−−−− SF−−−−−۱	CHESAPEAKE BAY CRITICAL AREA	—— СВСА ——					
FILTER BERM	FB-A FB-B	SILT FENCE ON PAVEMENT	⊢—_SF0P——I	DRAINAGE BOUNDARY	DA					
FILTER LOG NOTE: DESIGNATION FL-18 REFERS TO FILTER LOG WITH 18 INCH DIAMETER.	FL-18	SOD	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	EXISTING CONTOURS	<u> </u>					
GABION INFLOW PROTECTION	GP GP	STABILIZED CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCE (SCE)	SCE	LIMIT OF DISTURBANCE (LOD)	LOD					
GABION INLET PROTECTION		STANDARD INLET PROTECTION		PROPOSED CONTOURS	<u> </u>					
HORIZONTAL DRAW-DOWN DEVICE	HDDD	STOCKPILE AREA		TEMPORARY ORANGE CONSTRUCTION FENCE (TOCF)						
	LOD	STONE CHECK DAM	CD	TREE PROTECTION FENCE	TPF					
MEDIAN INLET PROTECTION		STONE/RIPRAP OUTLET SEDIMENT TRAP ST II	ST-II	WETLAND	• • • • • •					
MEDIAN SUMP INLET PROTECTION		SUBSURFACE DRAINS	┝── SSD ── ┥	WETLAND BUFFER	— в —					
MOUNTABLE BERM	MB	SUMP PIT	⊠sp	100-YEAR FLOODPLAIN						
PERIMETER DIKE/SWALE		SUPER SILT FENCE	⊢−−−−SSF−−−−I	SANITARY SEWER	— — SAN — — — — —					
OVERHEAD UTILITY LINE	Е	PROPERTY LINE		MANHOLE	Ś					

ACRES CU. YDS. ,498 _CU.YDS. TRD

PEDESTRIAN TRAIL BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES FOR WORKING IN NONTIDAL WETLANDS, WETLAND BUFFERS, WATERWAYS, AND 100-YEAR FLOODPLAINS 1) NO EXCESS FILL, CONSTRUCTION MATERIAL, OR DEBRIS SHALL BE STOCKPILED OR STORED IN NONTIDAL WETLANDS, NONTIDAL WETLAND BUFFERS, WATERWAYS, OR THE 100-YEAR FLOODPLAIN. 2) PLACE MATERIALS IN A LOCATION AND MANNER WHICH DOES NOT ADVERSELY IMPACT SUBSURFACE WATER FLOW INTO OR OUT OF NONTIDAL WETLANDS, NONTIDAL WETLAND BUFFERS, WATERWAYS, OR THE 100-YEAR FLOODPLAIN.

3) DO NOT USE THE EXCAVATED MATERIAL AS BACKFILL IF IT CONTAINS WASTE METAL PRODUCTS, UNSIGHTLY DEBRIS, TOXIC MATERIAL, OR ANY OTHER DELETERIOUS SUBSTANCE. IF ADDITIONAL BACKFILL IS REQUIRED, USE CLEAN

MATERIAL FREE OF WASTE METAL PRODUCTS, UNSIGHTLY DEBRIS, TOXIC MATERIAL, OR ANY OTHER DELETERIOUS SUBSTANCE. 4) PLACE HEAVY EQUIPMENT ON MATS OR SUITABLY OPERATE THE EQUIPMENT TO PREVENT DAMAGE TO NONTIDAL WETLANDS, NONTIDAL WETLAND BUFFERS, WATERWAYS, OR THE 100-YEAR FLOODPLAIN. 5) REPAIR AND MAINTAIN ANY SERVICEABLE STRUCTURE OR FILL SO THERE IS NO PERMANENT LOSS OF NONTIDAL WETLANDS, NONTIDAL WETLAND BUFFERS, OR WATERWAYS, OR PERMANENT MODIFICATION OF THE 100-YEAR FLOODPLAIN IN EXCESS OF THAT LOST UNDER THE ORIGINALLY AUTHORIZED STRUCTURE OR FILL.

6) RECTIFY ANY NONTIDAL WETLANDS, WETLAND BUFFERS, WATERWAYS, OR 100-YEAR FLOODPLAIN TEMPORARILY IMPACTED BY ANY CONSTRUCTION. 7) ALL STABILIZATION IN THE NONTIDAL WETLAND AND NONTIDAL WETLAND BUFFER SHALL CONSIST OF THE FOLLOWING SPECIES: ANNUAL RYEGRASS (LOLIUM MULTIFLORUM), MILLET (SETARIA ITALICA), BARLEY (HORDEUM SP.), OATS (UNIOLA SP.), AND/OR RYE (SECALE CEREALE). THESE SPECIES WILL ALLOW FOR THE STABILIZATION OF THE SITE WHILE ALSO ALLOWING FOR THE VOLUNTARY REVEGETATION OF NATURAL WETLAND SPECIES. OTHER NON- PERSISTENT VEGETATION MAY BE ACCEPTABLE, BUT MUST BE APPROVED BY THE NONTIDAL WETLANDS AND WATERWAYS DIVISION. KENTUCKY 31 FESCUE SHALL NOT BE UTILIZED IN WETLAND OR BUFFER AREAS. THE AREA SHOULD BE SEEDED AND MULCHED TO REDUCE EROSION AFTER CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES HAVE BEEN COMPLETED. 8) AFTER INSTALLATION HAS BEEN COMPLETED, MAKE POST-CONSTRUCTION GRADES AND

ELEVATIONS THE SAME AS THE ORIGINAL GRADES AND ELEVATIONS IN TEMPORARILY IMPACTED AREAS.

9) TO PROTECT AQUATIC SPECIES, IN-STREAM WORK IS PROHIBITED AS DETERMINED BY THE CLASSIFICATION OF THE STREAM:

USE I WATERS: IN-STREAM WORK SHALL NOT BE CONDUCTED DURING THE PERIOD MARCH 1 THROUGH JUNE 15, INCLUSIVE, DUR USE III WATERS: IN-STREAM WORK SHALL NOT BE CONDUCTED DURING THE PERIOD OCTOBER 1 THROUGH APRIL 30, INCLUSIVE, USE IV WATERS: IN-STREAM WORK SHALL NOT BE CONDUCTED DURING THE PERIOD MARCH 1 THROUGH MAY 31, INCLUSIVE, DUP 10) STORMWATER RUNOFF FROM IMPERVIOUS SURFACES SHALL BE CONTROLLED TO PREVENT THE WASHING OF DEBRIS INTO THE 11) CULVERTS SHALL BE CONSTRUCTED AND ANY RIPRAP PLACED SO AS NOT TO OBSTRUCT THE MOVEMENT OF AQUATIC SPECIES, OF THE ACTIVITY IS TO IMPOUND WATER.

P.E. CERTIFICATION	DESIGN CERTIFICATION	
I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THESE DOCUMENTS WERE PREPARED OR APPROVED BY ME, AND THAT I AM A DULY LICENSED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER UNDER THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF MARYLAND	I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS PLAN HAS BEEN DESIGNED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE MARYLAND STANDARDS AND SPECIFICATIONS FOR SOIL EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL, THE 2000 MARYLAND STORMWATER DESIGN MANUAL, VOLUMES 1 & II INCLUDING SUPPLEMENTS, THE ENVIRONMENT ARTICLE SECTIONS 4101 THROUGH 116 AND SECTIONS 4201 AND 215, AND THE CODE OF MARYLAND REGULATIONS (COMAR) 26.17.01 AND COMAR 26.17.02 FOR EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL AND STORMWATER MANAGEMENT, RESPECTIVELY.	
LICENSE NO	DATE DESIGNER'S_SIGNATURE	THIS SUB INTE COM
EXPIRATION DATE:	MD REGISTRATION NO PRINTED NAME P.E., R.L.S., R.L.A., OR R.A. (CIRCLE ONE)	PRC (M

		HIGHWAY HYDRAULICS DIVISION		
RING ANY YEAR. DURING ANY YEAR. RING ANY YEAR	MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION	I-495 & I-270 MANAGED LANES STUDY P3 PROGRAM CA-5		
WATERWAY. UNLESS THE PURPOSE	STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION	STREAM RESTORATION SEMI-FINAL (65%) DESIGN- NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION		
REVISIONS	CA–5 STREAM RESTOR	ATION ESC NOTES AND DETAILS		
	SCALE <u>NTS</u> DATE	DECEMBÉR 2021 CONTRACT NO. AW073B12		
DECEMBER 2021	DESIGNED BY <u>SĈN</u>	COUNTYMONTGOMERY		
DOCUMENT/PLAN IS DRAFT AND	DRAWN BY <u>Cjn</u>			
ECT TO CHANGE. IT IS AN RAGENCY/INTRA-AGENCY DELIBERATIVE /IUNICATION THAT IS NOT FOR IC DISCLOSURE UNDER MD. GENERAL	MDE/PRD <u>168251/20-PR-0040-01</u>	VERTICAL SCALE		
ISIONS CODE ANN. § 4-344 RYLAND PUBLIC INFORMATION ACT).	DRAWING NO. EN-	01 OF 04 SHEET NO. 09 OF 76		

PARK PERMIT GENERAL NOTES

 $-\bigcirc$

-

(+)

1. THE CONTRACTOR MUST NOTIFY M-NCPPC OF THEIR INTENTION TO START PERMIT WORK AS STATED IN THE PARK PERMIT. A PRE-CONSTRUCTION MEETING SHALL BE SCHEDULED AND CONDUCTED BY M-NCPPC CONSTRUCTION STAFF. PRIOR TO THIS MEETING THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOT PERFORM ANY CONSTRUCTION RELATED ACTIVITY AT THE PROJECT SITE, EXCEPT LIMITED CLEARANCE FOR STAKEOUT AND FLAGGING OF LOD. ALL STAKEOUT AND FLAGGING WORK MUST BE DONE BY HAND AND ANY SMALL VEGETATION CLEARED FOR INSTALLATION OF THE LOD SHALL BE CUT TO THE GROUND. THE LOD SHALL BE APPROVED BY M-NCPPC CONSTRUCTION STAFF AND PERMITTING AGENCIES HAVING JURISDICTION. M-NCPPC CONSTRUCTION STAFF MAY REQUIRE MINOR ADJUSTMENTS TO THE LOD TO REDUCE IMPACTS ON EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES THAT ARE TO REMAIN WITH THE APPROVAL OF PERMITTING AUTHORITIES. THIS ADJUSTMENT SHALL BE PERFORMED AT NO ADDITIONAL COST TO M-NCPPC.

2. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL FOLLOW ALL THE REQUIREMENTS AND INSTRUCTIONS FOUND IN THE PARK PERMIT INCLUDING WHO TO NOTIFY BEFORE WORK BEGINS.

3. UNLESS NOTED OTHERWISE, ALL WORK SHALL BE NEW AND M-NCPPC WILL NOT PROVIDE ANY EQUIPMENT, MATERIALS, OR LABOR FOR THE WORK. 4. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY AND ALL ITEMS REQUIRED TO PROVIDE A SITE CLEAR OF OBSTRUCTIONS (ABOVE AND BELOW GRADE) AND ROUGH GRADE TO SPECIFIED ELEVATIONS AT THE BEGINNING OF CONSTRUCTION.

5. ALL WORK SHALL BE PERFORMED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LATEST APPLICABLE CODES, STANDARDS AND SPECIFICATIONS OF M-NCPPC, MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND STATE AND FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS. 6. THE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR ENSURING THAT ALL ELEMENTS ARE CONSTRUCTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE DESIGN DOCUMENTS AND CONTRACT CONDITIONS INCLUDING THE 2010 ADA STANDARDS FOR ACCESSIBLE DESIGN (ADA), THE MARYLAND ACCESSIBILITY CODE,

MONTGOMERY PARKS ADA COMPLIANCE MANUAL, AND UPDATES. IF THE CONTRACTOR OBSERVES THAT PORTIONS OF THE PROJECT ARE NON-COMPLIANT WITH THE ADA, HE SHALL NOTIFY THE M-NCPPC

CONSTRUCTION STAFF SO THAT A FIELD ADJUSTMENT CAN BE MADE TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE. GRADE TOLERANCES SHALL BE MEASURED WITH A TWO (2) FOOT DIGITAL LEVEL.

7. PRIOR TO THE START OF CONSTRUCTION, TREE PROTECTION MEASURES SHALL BE INSTALLED, INSPECTED AND SHALL BE MAINTAINED DURING CONSTRUCTION.

8. ALL EXISTING CONDITIONS TO REMAIN SHALL BE VERIFIED, PHOTOGRAPHED AND DOCUMENTED PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION. IF THEY ARE DIFFERENT FROM THE CONDITIONS SHOWN ON THE CONTRACT DRAWINGS, THE M-NCPPC CONSTRUCTION STAFF SHALL BE NOTIFIED BEFORE PROCEEDING WITH THE WORK. ALL OTHER DAMAGES SHALL BE CORRECTED, AND RESTORATION WORK SHALL BE PERFORMED IN ACCORDANCE WITH

M-NCPPC REQUIREMENTS AND TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE M-NCPPC CONSTRUCTION STAFF AT NO COST TO M-NCPPC. 9. ALL EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL DEVICES SHALL MEET CURRENT

MONTGOMERY COUNTY DPS STANDARDS AND INSPECTOR DIRECTIVES. THESE SHALL BE APPROVED BY THE PERMITTING AUTHORITIES PRIOR TO THE START OF CONSTRUCTION. THE CONTRACTOR IS REQUIRED TO MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE MDE NOI. BEFORE THE START OF CONSTRUCTION, A SITE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE CONTRACTOR SHALL HAVE PROOF OF COMPLETION OF THE MDE RESPONSIBLE PERSONNEL CERTIFICATION. 10. ANY WORK WITHIN THE MONTGOMERY COUNTY RIGHT-OF-WAY SHALL BE PERFORMED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LATEST MCDOT STANDARDS AND SPECIFICATIONS. ANY WORK WITHIN THE MARYLAND STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION RIGHT-OF-WAY SHALL BE PERFORMED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LATEST MDSHA STANDARDS AND SPECIFICATIONS. THIS WORK INCLUDES, BUT IS NOT LIMITED TO, REPAIRING, RESTORING, AND OBTAINING FINAL INSPECTION APPROVAL

11. IF IT IS DETERMINED THAT TREES ARE DAMAGED DURING CONSTRUCTION, A CERTIFIED ARBORIST SHALL INSPECT THEM AND SUBMIT A REPORT RECOMMENDING APPROPRIATE ACTION EITHER TO REPAIR OR REPLACE. IF APPROVED BY M-NCPPC CONSTRUCTION STAFF, CORRECTIVE WORK AND/OR REPLACEMENT SHALL BE PERFORMED AT NO COST TO M-NCPPC.

PARK PERMIT GENERAL NOTES CONTINUED

1. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE REGIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR AT LEAST SEVEN (7) 12. LOCATION FOR STABILIZED CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCE, STAGING DAYS BEFORE ANY LAND DISTURBING ACTIVITY AND HOLD A PRE-CONSTRUCTION MEETING BETWEEN PROJECT REPRESENTATIVES AND LANDOWNERS. 2. LOD, ACCESS ROUTES, AND STAGING AREAS SHALL BE STAKED AND REVIEWED IN THE FIELD WITH THE QAD INSPECTOR PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION TO ALLOW FOR ADJUSTMENTS. ANY ADJUSTMENT MUST BE APPROVED BY THE QAD INSPECTOR AND PRD PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION. ALL PROTECTED RESOURCES WITHIN THE PROPOSED LOD ARE CONSIDERED TO BE IMPACTED DURING CONSTRUCTION. PROTECTED RESOURCES OUTSIDE OF THE LOD SHOULD BE FLAGGED TO 25 FEET BEYOND THE LOD AND REVIEWED BY THE QAD INSPECTOR BEFORE CONSTRUCTION. 3. TREE PROTECTION FENCING (TPF) SHALL BE INSTALLED ALONG THE ENTIRE LIMITS OF DISTURBANCE PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION. ALL TREES WITHIN THE LOD NOT MARKED FOR REMOVAL WILL RECEIVE TREE PLANKING (TP) AND TPF. TPF MAY BE INSTALLED AROUND CLUMPS OF TREES AS SHOWN ON PLANS. TREES JUST OUTSIDE OF THE LOD SHALL ALSO RECEIVE TP AND TPF AS SHOWN ON THE PLANS. INSTALL ALL TP OUTSIDE THE LOD BY HAND. INSTALL TPF AND TREE PLANKING IMMEDIATELY AFTER CONSTRUCTION LOD STAKEOUT AND PRIOR TO THE INSTALLATION OF SEDIMENT AND EROSION CONTROLS. LOCATION AND INSTALLATION OF THE TPF AND TREE PLANKING MUST BE APPROVED BY THE INSPECTOR. 4. CLEAR AND GRUB FOR THE MINIMUM AREA REQUIRED FOR INSTALLATION OF THE STABILIZED CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCE (SCE), DIVERSION FENCE (DF), OUTLET PROTECTION (OP), AND SUPER SILT FENCE (SSF). INSTALL SCE, SSF, DF, ACCESS ROADS, AND STAGING/STOCKPILE AREAS. 5. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL STABILIZE ALL DISTURBED AREAS BY THE END OF EACH WORKDAY. 6. WHERE PUMP AROUND PRACTICES ARE UTILIZED, THE EXACT LOCATION OF THE HOSES AND FILTER BAG MAY BE MODIFIED IN THE FIELD BASED ON EXISTING CONDITIONS ANY ADJUSTMENTS MUST BE APPROVED BY THE QAD INSPECTOR. 7. UNLESS OTHERWISE STATED, THE WORK AREAS OF THE SOC ARE ASSUMED TO INCLUDE ALL WORK WITHIN THE LOD IN THE STATION RANGE OF THE WORK AREA, INCLUDING FLOODPLAIN GRADING AND STRUCTURE INSTALLATION. WORK WITHIN THE FLOODPLAIN SHALL BE CONDUCTED IN AN ORDER WHICH DOES NOT REQUIRE THE CONTRACTOR TO TRACK OVER FINISHED GRADING OR CROSS OVER THE STREAM IN ANY AREAS OTHER THAN THOSE SHOWN ON THE PLANS. 8. WORK IN THE STREAM AREAS MUST OCCUR FROM UPSTREAM TO DOWNSTREAM UNLESS OTHERWISE SPECIFIED. 9. UPON FINAL APPROVAL OF THE INSPECTOR, PERMANENTLY STABILIZE AND VEGETATE ALL REMAINING DISTURBED AREAS. COMPLETE FINAL FLOODPLAIN GRADING AS ACCESS ROAD IS REMOVED. REMOVE AND DISPOSE OF MULCH ACCESS ROAD MATERIALS PRIOR TO VEGETATING. ONCE DISTURBED AREAS ARE FULLY COMPLETED AND STABILIZED WITH VEGETATION, REMOVE ANY REMAINING EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL MEASURES AND STABILIZE ANY AREAS DISTURBED BY THEIR REMOVAL. 10. ALL EXISTING HARD SURFACE TRAILS USED FOR ACCESS SHALL BE REHABILITATED UPON DEMOBILIZATION FROM THE SITE PER PARKS DETAIL #538-ASPHALT TRAIL REHAB -MILL AND OVERLAY. MAINSTEM 1 WORK AREA 1 (MAINSTEM 1 STA. 0+00-2+21, TRIBUTARY 1 STA. 0+00-0+66) 11. INSTALL PUMP AROUND 1 (PA-1) INCLUDING SD-1 US, SD-1 DS, SD-1 TRIB, CLEAN WATER PUMP (CWP), DIRTY WATER PUMP (DWP), FILTER BAG (FB), AND OUTLET PROTECTION (OP). 12. INSTALL PROPOSED STRUCTURES WITHIN THE WORK AREA, AS SHOWN ON THE PLANS, INSTALLATION OF STRUCTURES SHOULD BE DIRECTED BY THE DESIGNATED SPECIALIST AND APPROVED BY THE QAD INSPECTOR. 13. ONCE STRUCTURES HAVE BEEN APPROVED BY THE QAD INSPECTOR AND THE WORK AREA HAS BEEN PERMANENTLY STABILIZED, REMOVE ESC PRACTICES INCLUDING PA-1, TB-1, AND THE MULCH ACCESS ROAD ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF THE STREAM. WORK AREA 2 (MAINSTEM 1 STA. 1+64-3+36) 14. INSTALL PA-2 INCLUDING SD-2 US, SD-2/3 DS, CLEAN WATER PUMP (CWP), DIRTY WATER PUMP (DWP), FILTER BAG (FB), AND OUTLET PROTECTION (OP). 15. INSTALL PROPOSED STRUCTURES WITHIN THE WORK AREA, AS SHOWN ON THE PLANS. INSTALLATION OF STRUCTURES SHOULD BE DIRECTED BY THE DESIGNATED SPECIALIST AND APPROVED BY THE QAD INSPECTOR. 16. ONCE STRUCTURES HAVE BEEN APPROVED BY THE QAD INSPECTOR AND THE WORK AREA HAS

SEQUENCE OF CONSTRUCTION

AND STORAGE AREAS AND ACCESS ROUTES SHALL BE IDENTIFIED AND ADJUSTED IN THE FIELD WITH APPROVAL FROM THE M-NCPPC CONSTRUCTION STAFF. 13. THE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR CLEARING ALL UTILITIES, INCLUDING CALLING *MISS UTILITY*AND ALL OTHER PRIVATE UTILITY LOCATING SERVICES FOR UTILITY LOCATION AT LEAST 48 HOURS PRIOR TO THE START OF ANY WORK, ALL THE EXISTING UTILITIES MAY NOT BE SHOWN ON THE DRAWINGS. PRIOR TO THE START OF CONSTRUCTION RELATED ACTIVITY, ALL UTILITIES WITHIN THE LOD OR TREE PLANTING AREAS SHALL BE LOCATED AND IDENTIFIED UTILIZING APPROPRIATED INSTRUMENTS. THE LOCATIONS SHALL BE STAKED AND FLAGGED. 14. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE M-NCPPC CONSTRUCTION STAFF IMMEDIATELY IF EXISTING UTILITIES ARE FOUND WITHIN THE WORK AREA THAT ARE NOT SHOWN ON THE DRAWINGS AND IMPACT THE CONTRACT WORK. 15. EXISTING SIGNS, FENCES, AND OTHER MINOR SITE FEATURES IN THE WAY OF PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION, WHETHER SHOWN OR NOT SHOWN ON THESE PLANS. SHALL BE REMOVED AND REPLACED AT NO COST TO M-NCPPC. 16. DAMAGES TO EXISTING UTILITIES SHALL BE CORRECTED IMMEDIATELY IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE AFFECTED UTILITY. UPON COMPLETION OF THE CORRECTIVE ACTION A COPY OF THE APPROVAL DOCUMENTATION FROM THE UTILITY SHALL BE SUBMITTED TO THE M-NCPPC CONSTRUCTION STAFF REPAIR WORK WILL BE AT NO COST TO M-NCPPC. NO WORK SHALL BE PERFORMED OUTSIDE OF THE LOD WITHOUT PRIOR APPROVAL OF THE M-NCPPC CONSTRUCTION STAFF. AREAS DISTURBED OUTSIDE APPROVED LOD SHALL BE RESTORED IMMEDIATELY TO THE SATISFACTION OF M-NCPPC CONSTRUCTION STAFF AT NO COST TO M-NCPPC. 17. UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED, THE PARK FACILITIES SHALL REMAIN OPEN THROUGHOUT CONSTRUCTION FOR USE BY PARKS STAFF AND THE PUBLIC. SAFE ACCESS FOR ALL USERS SHALL BE PROVIDED WITH APPROPRIATE DETOURS, FENCING, TEMPORARY FACILITIES, SIGNAGE, ETC. AND SHALL BE APPROVED BY M-NCPPC CONSTRUCTION STAFF. 18. IF THE CONTRACTOR FINDS THAT CONFLICTS EXIST AMONG VARIOUS CONTRACT/PERMIT REQUIREMENTS, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL COMPLY WITH THE MOST STRINGENT REQUIREMENT. 19. ONLY APPROVED PLANS THAT HAVE BEEN SIGNED BY THE APPROPRIATE AUTHORITIES SHALL BE USED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE IMPROVEMENTS. 20. PRIOR TO VEGETATIVE STABILIZATION, ALL DISTURBED AREAS MUST BE TOPSOILED PER THE MONTGOMERY COUNTY "STANDARDS AND SPECIFICATIONS FOR TOPSOIL". IF ON-SITE MATERIALS DO NOT MEET REQUIREMENTS OF TOPSOIL, COORDINATE WITH M-NCPPC REGARDING TILLING-IN OF CERTIFIED COMPOST TO ON-SITE SOILS TO MEET SPECIFICATIONS. IF THERE IS A CONFLICT BETWEEN MONTGOMERY COUNTY AND M-NCPPC SPECIFICATIONS, THE STRICTER SPECIFICATION WILL BE USED. 21. METAL LANDSCAPE STAPLES ARE NOT ALLOWED TO BE USED FOR ANCHORING ANYTHING ON PARK PROPERTY. ALSO, EROSION CONTROL MATTING WITH PLASTIC NON-BIODEGRADABLE FIBERS OR FILAMENTS IN THEM WILL NOT BE ALLOWED ON PARK PROPERTY. 22. PAVEMENT REMOVAL SHALL INCLUDE REMOVAL OF GRAVEL SUBBASE AND SCARIFICATION OF SUBGRADE, UNLESS OTHERWISE

DIRECTED BY M-NCPPC CONSTRUCTION STAFF. BEEN PERMANENTLY STABILIZED, REMOVE ESC PRACTICES INCLUDING PA-2 AND THE MULCH ACCESS

23. TOPOGRAPHIC SURVEY COMPLETED BY CHESAPEAKE ROAD WITHIN THE WORK AREA. LEAVE SD-2/3 DS IN PLACE. RESTORE THE WETLAND ON THE RIGHT BANK TO EXISTING CONDITIONS AFTER REMOVING CONTROLS. ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT (CEM), 4/14/2020-10/27/2020, USING NAD 83(2001) HORIZONTAL AND NAVD 88 VERTICAL DATUM. 24. THIS SITE IS LOCATED WITHIN THE SENECA CREEK WATERSHED WORK AREA 3 (MAINSTEM 1 STA. 2+85 - 4+50) OF MONTGOMERY COUNTY, RUNOFF FROM THIS SITE DRAINS INTO 17. INSTALL PA-3 INCLUDING SD-3 US. CLEAN WATER PUMP (CWP), DIRTY WATER PUMP (DWP), FILTER BAG GREAT SENECA CREEK. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL TAKE PRECAUTIONS (FB), AND OUTLET PROTECTION (OP). SD-2/3 DS SHOULD ALREADY BE IN PLACE FROM WORK AREA 2. NOT TO CONTAMINATE THE RECEIVING WATERS. 18. INSTALL FABRIC BASED STREAM DIVERSION 1 (FBSD-1), AS SHOWN IN THE PLANSET. ONCE FBSD-1 IS INSTALLED AND APPROVED BY THE QAD INSPECTOR, REMOVE PA-3, BUT LEAVE SD-2/3 DS IN PLACE TO FORCE FLOWS INTO FBSD-1. 19. INSTALL PROPOSED STRUCTURES FROM STATION 3+50 UP TO APPROXIMATELY STATION 4+50, AS SHOWN ON THE PLANS. INSTALLATION OF STRUCTURES SHOULD BE DIRECTED BY THE DESIGNATED SPECIALIST AND APPROVED BY THE QAD INSPECTOR. 20. ONCE STRUCTURES HAVE BEEN APPROVED BY THE QAD INSPECTOR AND THE WORK AREA HAS BEEN PERMANENTLY STABILIZED, RE-INSTALL SD-3 US AND THE CWP TO DIVERT FLOWS AROUND FBSD-1. REMOVE THE FBSD-1, GRADE THE PROPOSED CHANNEL, AND INSTALL THE STRUCTURE BETWEEN STATION 3+00 AND STATION 3+50. 21. ONCE THE REMAINING STRUCTURE AND CHANNEL GRADING HAS BEEN APPROVED BY THE QAD INSPECTOR AND THE ENTIRE WORK AREA HAS BEEN PERMANENTLY STABILIZED, REMOVE ESC PRACTICES INCLUDING SD-3 US. SD-2/3 DS, AND THE MULCH ACCESS ROAD WITHIN THE WORK AREA. WORK AREA 4 (MAINSTEM 1 STA. 4 + 22 - 5 + 29) 22. INSTALL PA-4 INCLUDING SD-4 US, SD-4 DS, CLEAN WATER PUMP (CWP), DIRTY WATER PUMP (DWP), FILTER BAG (FB), AND OUTLET PROTECTION (OP).



EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL – GENERAL NOTES AND SEQUENCE OF CONSTRUCTION

23. INSTALL PROPOSED STRUCTURES AND FILL EXISTING CHANNEL WITHIN THE WORK AREA, AS SHOWN ON THE PLANS. GRADING AND INSTALLATION OF STRUCTURES SHOULD BE DIRECTED BY THE DESIGNATED SPECIALIST AND APPROVED BY THE QAD INSPECTOR.

24. ONCE STRUCTURES HAVE BEEN APPROVED BY THE QAD INSPECTOR AND THE WORK AREA HAS BEEN PERMANENTLY STABILIZED, REMOVE ESC PRACTICES INCLUDING SD-4 US, SD-4 DS, AND THE MULCH ACCESS ROAD WITHIN THE WORK AREA.

WORK AREA 5 (MAINSTEM 1 STA. 5+00-8+17) 25. INSTALL PA-5 INCLUDING SD-5 US, SD-5 DS, CLEAN WATER PUMP (CWP), DIRTY WATER PUMP (DWP), FILTER BAG (FB), AND OUTLET PROTECTION (OP). 26. INSTALL PROPOSED STRUCTURES WITHIN THE WORK AREA, AS SHOWN ON THE PLANS. GRADING AND INSTALLATION OF STRUCTURES SHOULD BE DIRECTED BY THE DESIGNATED SPECIALIST AND APPROVED BY THE QAD INSPECTOR. 27. ONCE STRUCTURES HAVE BEEN APPROVED BY THE QAD INSPECTOR AND THE WORK AREA HAS BEEN PERMANENTLY STABILIZED, REMOVE ESC PRACTICES INCLUDING SD-5 US, SD-5 DS, AND THE MULCH ACCESS ROAD WITHIN THE WORK AREA.

WORK AREA 6 (MAINSTEM 1 STA. 7 + 80-10 + 30) 28. INSTALL PA-6 INCLUDING SD-6 US, SD-6 DS, CLEAN WATER PUMP (CWP), DIRTY WATER PUMP (DWP), FILTER BAG (FB), AND OUTLET PROTECTION (OP). 29. INSTALL PROPOSED STRUCTURES WITHIN THE WORK AREA, AS SHOWN ON THE PLANS. GRADING AND INSTALLATION OF STRUCTURES SHOULD BE DIRECTED BY THE DESIGNATED SPECIALIST AND APPROVED BY THE QAD INSPECTOR. 30. ONCE STRUCTURES HAVE BEEN APPROVED BY THE QAD INSPECTOR AND THE WORK AREA HAS BEEN PERMANENTLY STABILIZED, REMOVE PA-7.

PRESENT DURING WORK. INSPECTOR.

33. ONCE STRUCTURES HAVE BEEN APPROVED BY THE QAD INSPECTOR AND THE WORK AREA HAS BEEN PERMANENTLY STABILIZED, REMOVE PA-7.

WORK AREA 8 (MAINSTEM 1 STA. 12 + 27 - 14 + 46) 34. INSTALL PA-8 INCLUDING SD-8 US, SD-8 DS, CLEAN WATER PUMP (CWP), DIRTY WATER PUMP (DWP), FILTER BAG (FB), AND OUTLET PROTECTION (OP). 35. INSTALL PROPOSED STRUCTURES WITHIN THE WORK AREA, AS SHOWN ON THE PLANS. GRADING AND INSTALLATION OF STRUCTURES SHOULD BE DIRECTED BY THE DESIGNATED SPECIALIST AND APPROVED BY THE QAD INSPECTOR. 36. ONCE STRUCTURES HAVE BEEN APPROVED BY THE QAD INSPECTOR AND THE WORK AREA HAS BEEN PERMANENTLY STABILIZED, REMOVE PA-8.

WORK AREA 9 (MAINSTEM 1 STA. 15 + 00 - 18 + 34) 37. INSTALL PA-9 INCLUDING SD-9 US, SD-9 DS, CLEAN WATER PUMP (CWP), DIRTY WATER PUMP (DWP), FILTER BAG (FB), AND OUTLET PROTECTION (OP). 38. INSTALL PROPOSED STRUCTURES WITHIN THE WORK AREA, AS SHOWN ON THE PLANS. GRADING AND INSTALLATION OF STRUCTURES SHOULD BE DIRECTED BY THE DESIGNATED SPECIALIST AND APPROVED BY THE QAD INSPECTOR. 39. ONCE STRUCTURES HAVE BEEN APPROVED BY THE QAD INSPECTOR AND THE WORK AREA HAS BEEN PERMANENTLY STABILIZED, REMOVE PA-9.

FLOWS FROM EXITING THE POND. STABILIZED, REMOVE PA-10.

WORK AREA 11 (MAINSTEM 1 STA. 20 + 46 - 23 + 95) 43. INSTALL PA-11 INCLUDING SD-11 US, SD-11 DS, CLEAN WATER PUMP (CWP), DIRTY WATER PUMP (DWP), FILTER BAG (FB), AND OUTLET PROTECTION (OP). 44. INSTALL PROPOSED STRUCTURES WITHIN THE WORK AREA, AS SHOWN ON THE PLANS, GRADING AND INSTALLATION OF STRUCTURES SHOULD BE DIRECTED BY THE DESIGNATED SPECIALIST AND APPROVED BY THE QAD INSPECTOR. 45. ONCE STRUCTURES HAVE BEEN APPROVED BY THE QAD INSPECTOR AND THE WORK AREA HAS BEEN PERMANENTLY STABILIZED, REMOVE PA-11.

WORK AREA 12 (MAINSTEM 1 STA. 23 + 77 - 26 + 17) 46. INSTALL PA-12 INCLUDING SD-12 US, SD-12 DS, CLEAN WATER PUMP (CWP), DIRTY WATER PUMP (DWP), FILTER BAG (FB), AND OUTLET PROTECTION (OP). 47. INSTALL PROPOSED STRUCTURES WITHIN THE WORK AREA, AS SHOWN ON THE PLANS. GRADING AND INSTALLATION OF STRUCTURES SHOULD BE DIRECTED BY THE DESIGNATED SPECIALIST AND APPROVED BY THE QAD INSPECTOR. 48. ONCE STRUCTURES HAVE BEEN APPROVED BY THE QAD INSPECTOR AND THE WORK AREA HAS BEEN PERMANENTLY STABILIZED, REMOVE PA-12.

MAINSTEM 2

WORK AREA 13 (MAINSTEM 2 STA 0+00-6+20) 49. CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES IN WORK AREA 12 AND WORK AREA 13 CAN BE CONDUCTED CONCURRENTLY. 50. INSTALL PA-13 INCLUDING SD-13 US, SD-13 DS, CLEAN WATER PUMP (CWP), DIRTY WATER PUMP (DWP), FILTER BAG (FB), AND OUTLET PROTECTION (OP). 51. INSTALL PROPOSED STRUCTURES WITHIN THE WORK AREA, AS SHOWN ON THE PLANS. GRADING AND INSTALLATION OF STRUCTURES SHOULD BE DIRECTED BY THE DESIGNATED SPECIALIST AND APPROVED BY THE QAD INSPECTOR. 52. ONCE STRUCTURES HAVE BEEN APPROVED BY THE QAD INSPECTOR AND THE WORK AREA HAS BEEN PERMANENTLY STABILIZED, REMOVE PA-13.



WORK AREA 7 (MAINSTEM 1 STA. 9+93-12+87, TRIBUTARY 2 STA. 0+82-3+48) 31. INSTALL PA-7 INCLUDING SD-7 US, SD-7 DS, SD-7 TRIB, CLEAN WATER PUMP (CWP), DIRTY WATER PUMP (DWP), FILTER BAG (FB), AND OUTLET PROTECTION (OP). TRIB 2 IS EPHEMERAL AND DOES NOT NEED TO BE ACTIVELY PUMPED UNLESS FLOW IS

32. INSTALL PROPOSED STRUCTURES AND FILL EXISTING CHANNEL WITHIN THE WORK AREA, AS SHOWN ON THE PLANS. GRADING AND INSTALLATION OF STRUCTURES SHOULD BE DIRECTED BY THE DESIGNATED SPECIALIST AND APPROVED BY THE QAD

WORK AREA 10 (MAINSTEM 1 STA. 17+80 - 20+92, POND OUTLET STA. 0+00-0+46)

40. INSTALL PA-10 INCLUDING SD-10 US, SD-10 DS, SD-10 POND, CLEAN WATER PUMP (CWP), DIRTY WATER PUMP (DWP), FILTER BAG (FB), AND OUTLET PROTECTION (OP). SD-10 POND SHOULD BE PLACED UPSTREAM OF THE EXISTING POND OUTLET TO BLOCK

41. INSTALL PROPOSED STRUCTURES WITHIN THE WORK AREA, AS SHOWN ON THE PLANS. GRADING AND INSTALLATION OF STRUCTURES SHOULD BE DIRECTED BY THE DESIGNATED SPECIALIST AND APPROVED BY THE QAD INSPECTOR. 42. ONCE STRUCTURES HAVE BEEN APPROVED BY THE QAD INSPECTOR AND THE WORK AREA HAS BEEN PERMANENTLY



HIGHWAY HYDRAULICS DIVISION I-495 & I-270 MANAGED LANES STUDY P3 PROGRAM CA–5 STREAM RESTORATION

SEMI-FINAL (65%) DESIGN-NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

REVISIONS	CA–5 STREAM	RESTORATION	ESC NOTES AND DETAILS
	SCALE <u>NTS</u>	DATEDECEMBÈR	2021 CONTRACT NO. <u>AW073B12</u>
DECEMBER 2021	DESIGNED BY	SCN	COUNTY MONTGOMERY
	DRAWN BY	CĴN	LOGMILE
IS DOCUMENT/PLAN IS DRAFT AND BJECT TO CHANGE. IT IS AN	CHECKED BY	KŜK	HORIZONTAL SCALE
ERAGENCY/INTRA-AGENCY DELIBERATIVE MMUNICATION THAT IS NOT FOR BLIC DISCLOSURE UNDER MD. GENERAL	MDE/PRD <u>168251/20</u>)PR004001	VERTICAL SCALE
OVISIONS CODE ANN. § 4-344 //ARYLAND PUBLIC INFORMATION ACT) .	DRAWING NO.	EN-02 OF	04 SHEET NO. 10 OF 76

FABRIC- BASED STREAM DIVERSION

CHANNEL EXCAVATION

-

-

1. ALL DISTURBANCES RESULTING FROM CONSTRUCTION OF THE CHANNEL SHOULD BE CONTAINED BY APPROPRIATE SEDIMENT CONTROL MEASURES.

2. EXCAVATION OF THE CHANNEL SHOULD BEGIN AT THE DOWNSTREAM END AND PROCEED UPSTREAM. THE CHANNEL SHOULD HAVE A MINIMUM CAPACITY SUFFICIENT TO CONVEY THE STREAM'S BASE FLOW FOR PROJECTS WITH DURATION OF 2 WEEKS OR LESS. FOR PROJECTS OF LONGER DURATION, CHANNELS SHOULD HAVE A CAPACITY SUFFICIENT TO CONVEY BANKFULL FLOW. ALL EXCAVATED MATERIALS SHOULD BE STOCKPILED OUTSIDE OF THE 100 YEAR FLOOD PLAIN AND TEMPORARILY STABILIZED TO PREVENT RE-ENTRY INTO THE STREAM CHANNEL

3. THE PROCESS OF EXCAVATION AND STABILIZATION WITH FABRIC SHOULD BE A CONTINUOUS AND UNINTERRUPTED OPERATION. ALL MATERIALS SHOULD BE ON-SITE PRIOR TO CHANNEL CONSTRUCTION.

4. THE DOWNSTREAM AND UPSTREAM CONNECTION TO THE NATURAL CHANNEL SHOULD BE CONSTRUCTED UNDER DRY CONDITIONS. THE STREAM SHOULD BE CONTAINED BY SANDBAGS ALONG THE OPPOSING BANK DURING THE PROCESS OF CUTTING THE DIVERSION CHANNEL INTO THE NATURAL STREAM CHANNEL. EXCAVATION AND STABILIZATION SHOULD BE A CONTINUOUS AND UNINTERRUPTED OPERATION.

5. ALL DEBRIS SUCH AS ROCKS, STICKS, ETC. SHOULD BE REMOVED AND THE CHANNEL SURFACES MADE SMOOTH SO THAT THE FABRIC WILL REST FLUSH WITH THE CHANNEL AT ALL SIDES AND BOTTOM.

STABILIZATION WITH GEOTEXTILE FABRIC

1. THE FABRIC SHOULD HAVE A MINIMUM WIDTH SUCH THAT IT IS KEYED IN AND ANCHORED AT THE TOP OF STREAM BANK. 2. FABRIC SHOULD BE PLACED SO THAT IT RESTS FLUSH WITH

THE CHANNEL AT ALL POINTS OF CONTACT. 3. FABRIC SHOULD BE PLACED SUCH THAT ONE PIECE WILL LINE THE ENTIRE CHANNEL. IF THIS IS NOT POSSIBLE, FABRIC SHOULD BE PLACED SO THAT TRANSVERSE OVERLAPPING OCCURS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE DETAIL. LONGITUDINAL OVERLAPS SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED. UPSTREAM SECTIONS SHOULD OVERLAP DOWNSTREAM SECTIONS. OVERLAP WIDTH SHOULD EQUAL 2 FEET (0.6 METERS) MINIMUM.

4. THE FABRIC SHOULD BE KEYED INTO 2 BY 2-FOOT (0.6 BY 0.6-METER) TRENCHES LOCATED AT THE UPSTREAM EDGE AND AT 50-FOOT (15.25-METER) INTERVALS WITH THE OVERLAP PLACED NEAREST TO EACH 50 FEET INCREMENT. THE KEY-IN SHOULD BE FROM TOP OF CHANNEL TO TOP OF CHANNEL. CLASS I RIPRAP SHOULD BE CAREFULLY PLACED INTO THE TRENCH WITH ZERO DROP HEIGHT.

5. THE FABRIC SECTIONS SHOULD BE SECURED WITH HOLD DOWN PINS AND WASHERS. OVERLAPS SHOULD BE PINNED ALONG TRANSVERSE AND LONGITUDINAL AXES WITH SPACING EQUAL TO 3 FEET (0.9 METERS) MAXIMUM. 6. SEDIMENT FROM SURROUNDING AREAS OF DISTURBANCE

SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED TO ENTER THE DIVERSION CHANNEL

ALTERNATE METHODS OF PLACING THE FABRIC 1. THE ABOVE DESIGN MAY BE MODIFIED TO ALLOW SEWING OF THE GEOTEXTILE FABRIC. SEWING OF THE GEOTEXTILE FABRIC, RATHER THAN OVERLAPPING, SHOULD ELIMINATE THE REQUIREMENT FOR TRANSVERSE PLACEMENT OF THE FABRIC. EITHER TRANSVERSE OR LONGITUDINAL PLACEMENT SHOULD WORK EQUALLY WELL

2. THE SPACING OF THE PINS COULD BE EITHER LARGER OR SMALLER DEPENDING ON THE ANTICIPATED VELOCITIES AND THICKNESS AND TYPE OF GEOTEXTILE FABRIC 3. THE ENTIRE BOTTOM OF THE CHANNEL COULD BE RIPRAPPED

IF HIGH VELOCITIES ARE ANTICIPATED. WHEN THE AREA IS RIPRAPPED, IT IS NOT REQUIRED THAT THE GEOTEXTILE FABRIC UNDERNEATH THE RIPRAP BE PINNED

REMOVAL OF DIVERSION

1. WATER SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED THROUGH THE NATURAL STREAM UNTIL ALL CONSTRUCTION IS COMPLETED. 2. AFTER REDIRECTING THE FLOW THROUGH THE NATURAL CHANNEL, ALL FABRIC SHOULD BE REMOVED FROM THE TEMPORARY DIVERSION. THE DIVERSION SHOULD THEN BE BACKFILLED AND STABILIZED. POINTS OF TIE-IN TO THE NATURAL CHANNEL SHOULD BE PROTECTED WITH RIPRAP ACCORDING TO THE RIPRAP GUIDELINES.













2. USE 2" x10" x12', OR APPROPRIATE SIZE, BOARDS AROUND TRUNK OF TREE TO PROTECT ALL AREAS EXPOSED TO CONSTRUCTION

OUTSIDE OF BOARDS TO SECURE IT TO THE TREE.

4. NOTHING SHALL BE DIRECTLY ATTACHED OR SCREWED INTO THE TREE TRUNK TO SECURE THE BOARDS.





COASTA

RESOURCES

INC.

(+)



PUMP-AROUND PRACTICE

-

-

-(+)

DESCRIPTION THE WORK SHALL CONSIST OF INSTALLING A TEMPORARY PUMP AROUND AND SUPPORTING MEASURES TO DIVERT FLOW AROUND INSTREAM CONSTRUCTION SITES.

IMPLEMENTATION SEQUENCE SEDIMENT CONTROL MEASURES, PUMP-AROUND PRACTICES, AND ASSOCIATED CHANNEL AND BANK CONSTRUCTION SHALL BE COMPLETED IN THE FOLLOWING SEQUENCE (REFER TO DETAIL)

1. CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES INCLUDING THE INSTALLATION OF EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL MEASURES SHALL NOT BEGIN UNTIL ALL NECESSARY EASEMENTS AND/OR RIGHT-OF-WAYS HAVE BEEN ACQUIRED. ALL EXISTING UTILITIES SHALL BE MARKED IN THE FIELD PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION. THE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY DAMAGE TO EXISTING UTILITIES THAT MAY RESULT FROM CONSTRUCTION AND SHALL REPAIR THE DAMAGE AT HIS/HER OWN EXPENSE TO THE COUNTY'S OR UTILITY COMPANY'S SATISFACTION

2. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOTIFY THE REGIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR AT (410) 365-0164 AT LEAST SEVEN (7) DAYS BEFORE COMMENCING ANY LAND DISTURBING ACTIVITY

3. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL CONDUCT A PRE-CONSTRUCTION MEETING ON SITE WITH THE SEDIMENT CONTROL INSPECTOR AND THE QAD INSPECTOR TO REVIEW LIMITS OF DISTURBANCE, EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL REQUIREMENTS, AND THE SEQUENCE OF CONSTRUCTION. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL STAKE OUT ALL LIMITS OF DISTURBANCE PRIOR TO THE PRE-CONSTRUCTION MEETING SO THEY MAY BE REVIEWED. THE PARTICIPANTS WILL ALSO DESIGNATE THE CONTRACTOR'S STAGING AREAS AND FLAG ALL TREES WITHIN THE LIMIT OF DISTURBANCE WHICH WILL BE REMOVED FOR CONSTRUCTION ACCESS. TREES SHALL NOT BE REMOVED WITHIN THE LIMIT OF DISTURBANCE WITHOUT APPROVAL FROM THE INSPECTOR. 4. CONSTRUCTION SHALL NOT BEGIN UNTIL ALL SEDIMENT AND EROSION CONTROL MEASURES HAVE BEEN INSTALLED AND APPROVED BY THE QAD INSPECTOR AND THE SEDIMENT CONTROL INSPECTOR. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL STAY WITHIN THE LIMITS OF THE DISTURBANCE AS SHOWN ON THE PLANS AND MINIMIZE DISTURBANCE WITHIN THE WORK AREA WHENEVER POSSIBLE 5. UPON INSTALLATION OF ALL SEDIMENT CONTROL MEASURES AND APPROVAL BY THE SEDIMENT CONTROL INSPECTOR AND THE LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT INSPECTION AND ENFORCEMENT DIVISION, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BEGIN WORK AT THE UPSTREAM SECTION AND PROCEED DOWNSTREAM BEGINNING WITH THE ESTABLISHMENT OF STABILIZED CONSTRUCTION ENTRANCES, IN SOME CASES, WORK MAY BEGIN DOWNSTREAM IF APPROPRIATE, THE SEQUENCE OF CONSTRUCTION MUST BE FOLLOWED UNLESS THE CONTRACTOR GETS WRITTEN APPROVAL FOR DEVIATIONS FROM THE WMA. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL ONLY BEGIN WORK IN AN AREA WHICH CAN BE COMPLETED BY THE END OF THE DAY INCLUDING GRADING ADJACENT TO THE CHANNEL. AT THE END OF EACH WORK DAY, THE WORK AREA MUST BE STABILIZED AND THE PUMP AROUND REMOVED FROM THE CHANNEL WORK SHALL NOT BE CONDUCTED IN THE CHANNEL DURING RAIN EVENTS 6. SANDBAG DIKES SHALL BE SITUATED AT THE UPSTREAM AND DOWNSTREAM ENDS OF THE WORK AREA AS SHOWN ON THE PLANS, AND STREAM FLOW SHALL BE PUMPED AROUND THE WORK AREA. THE PUMP SHALL DISCHARGE ONTO A STABLE VELOCITY DISSIPATER MADE OF RIPRAP OR SANDBAGS AS A TEMPORARY MEASURE FOR DEWATERING IN CHANNEL CONSTRUCTION SITES. 7. WATER FROM THE WORK AREA SHALL BE PUMPED TO A SEDIMENT FILTERING MEASURE SUCH AS A DEWATERING BASIN,

SEDIMENT BAG, OR OTHER APPROVED SOURCE. THE MEASURE SHALL BE LOCATED SUCH THAT THE WATER DRAINS BACK INTO THE CHANNEL BELOW THE DOWNSTREAM SANDBAG DIKE 8. TRAVERSING A CHANNEL REACH WITH EQUIPMENT WITHIN THE WORK AREA WHERE NO WORK IS PROPOSED SHALL BE AVOIDED.

IF EQUIPMENT HAS TO TRAVERSE SUCH A REACH FOR ACCESS TO ANOTHER AREA, THEN TIMBER MATS OR SIMILAR MEASURES SHALL BE USED TO MINIMIZE DISTURBANCE TO THE CHANNEL. TEMPORARY STREAM CROSSINGS SHALL BE USED ONLY WHEN NECESSARY AND SHALL BE USED ONLY WHERE NOTED ON THE PLANS OR SPECIFIED.

9. ALL STREAM RESTORATION MEASURES SHALL BE INSTALLED AS INDICATED BY THE PLANS AND ALL BANKS GRADED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE GRADING PLANS AND TYPICAL CROSS-SECTIONS. ALL GRADING MUST BE STABILIZED AT THE END OF EACH DAY WITH SEED AND MULCH OR SEED AND MATTING AS SPECIFIED ON THE PLANS. 10. AFTER AN AREA IS COMPLETED AND STABILIZED, THE CLEAN WATER DIKE SHALL BE REMOVED. AFTER THE FIRST

SEDIMENT FLUSH, A NEW CLEAN WATER DIKE SHALL BE ESTABLISHED UPSTREAM FROM THE OLD SEDIMENT DIKE. FINALLY, UPON ESTABLISHMENT OF A NEW SEDIMENT DIKE BELOW THE OLD ONE, THE OLD SEDIMENT DIKE SHALL BE REMOVED. 11. A PUMP AROUND MUST BE INSTALLED ON ANY TRIBUTARY OR STORM DRAIN OUTFALL WHICH CONTRIBUTES BASEFLOW TO THE WORK AREA. THIS SHALL BE ACCOMPLISHED BY LOCATING A SANDBAG DIKE AT THE DOWNSTREAM END OF THE TRIBUTARY OR STORM DRAIN OUTFALL AND PUMPING THE STREAM FLOW AROUND THE WORK AREA. THIS WATER SHALL DISCHARGE ONTO THE SAME VELOCITY DISSIPATER USED FOR THE MAIN STEM PUMP AROUND.

12. IF A TRIBUTARY IS TO BE RESTORED, CONSTRUCTION SHALL TAKE PLACE ON THE TRIBUTARY BEFORE WORK ON THE MAIN STEM REACHES THE TRIBUTARY CONFLUENCE. CONSTRUCTION IN THE TRIBUTARY, INCLUDING PUMP AROUND PRACTICES, SHALL FOLLOW THE SAME SEQUENCE AS FOR THE MAIN STEM OF THE RIVER OR STREAM. WHEN CONSTRUCTION ON THE TRIBUTARY IS COMPLETED, WORK ON THE MAIN STEM SHALL RESUME. WATER FROM THE TRIBUTARY SHALL CONTINUE TO BE PUMPED AROUND THE WORK AREA IN THE MAIN STEM.

13. THE CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR PROVIDING ACCESS TO AND MAINTAINING ALL EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL DEVICES UNTIL THE SEDIMENT CONTROL INSPECTOR APPROVES THEIR REMOVAL

14. AFTER CONSTRUCTION, ALL DISTURBED AREAS SHALL BE REGRADED AND REVEGETATED AS PER THE PLANTING PLAN. 15. IF, IN THE JUDGMENT OF THE QAD INSPECTOR, INADEQUATE ENERGY DISSIPATION OR CHANNEL BED EROSION IS OCCURRING, THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE REQUIRED TO INCREASE THE MATERIAL OR PLACEMENT SIZE OF THE OUTFALL PROTECTION AT THE DIRECTION OF THE QAD INSPECTOR.

16. THE CONDITION OF THE OUTLET PROTECTION SANDBAGS IS TO BE CHECKED TWICE PER DAY (START OF WORK DAY AND MID-DAY) TO ENSURE THAT SAND IS NOT ESCAPING BAGS. DAMAGED OR LEAKING BAGS ARE TO BE REMOVED AND REPLACED. 17. OUTFALL PROTECTION MATERIALS AND GEOTEXTILE SHALL BE REMOVED FROM THE CHANNEL AT THE COMPLETION OF EACH CONSTRUCTION STAGE







FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pES-P001_CA5.dgn

DIVERSION FENCE (DF)							
.)	OFFSET (LF)	FROM (STA.)	OFFSET (LF)	QTY (LF)	STREAM		
)	27.89 RT.	1+14.42	81.31 RT.	62	MAINSTEM 1		



FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pES-P002_CA5.dgn

3+63 RT. 7+3 5+58 RT. 6+0 6+06 RT. 7+7 HB	36 RT. 06 RT. 79 RT.	572.11 87.67 440.33	MAINSTEM 1 MAINSTEM 1 MAINSTEM 1
5+58 RT. 6+0 6+06 RT. 7+7 HE	06 RT. 79 RT.	87.67 440.33	MAINSTEM 1 MAINSTEM 1
6+06 RT. 7+7 HE	79 RT.	440.33	MAINSTEM 1
HE			
	EAVY DUTY I	MULCH MATTING	j
TO (STA.) FROM	/I (STA.)	QTY (SY)	STREAM
1+92 RT. 3+6	53 RT.	218.89	MAINSTEM 1



FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pES-P003_CA5.dgn

		SUPER SILT FENCE	(SSF)		
TO (STA.)	OFFSET (LF)	FROM (STA.)	OFFSET (LF)	QTY (LF)	STREAM
11+21.05	60.12 LT.	12+19.72	44.63 LT.	60	MAINSTEM 1
12+23.41	55.04 LT.	12+24.88	38.92 LT.	18	MAINSTEM 1

		DIVERSION FENCE	E(DF)		
TO (STA.)	OFFSET (LF)	FROM (STA.)	OFFSET (LF)	QTY (LF)	STREAM
11.20.07	04 70 1 7	12.22.41	FF OALT	62	NAAINICTENA 1

		TEMPORARY	BRIDGE (TB)		
TO (STA.)	OFFSET (LF)	FROM (STA.)	OFFSET (LF)	QTY	STREAM
1+49.11	7.73 LT./ 7.47 RT.	1+63.16	8.41 LT./ 6.79 RT.	1	TRIB 2

	MULCH MATTING				
TO (STA.)	FROM (STA.)	QTY (SY)			
7+36 RT.	12+03 RT.	872.22			
8+91 LT.	9+75 LT.	206.22			
9+74 LT.	12+98 LT.	385.00			



PLOTTED: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 AT 11:00 AM FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pES-P004_CA5.dgn

	/ /							
IDGE (TB)			1		SUPER SILT FE	NCE (SSF)		
OFFSET (LF)	QTY	STREAM	TO (STA.)	OFFSET (LF)	FROM (STA.)	OFFSET (LF)	QTY (LF)	STREAM
.3.24 LT./ 9.46 RT.	1	MAINSTEM 1	13+29.62	31.77 LT.	13+50.42	30.63 LT.	25	MAINSTEM 1
.63 LT./ 13.07 RT.	1	MAINSTEM 1	13+49.20	39.36 LT.	13+61.05	58.23 LT.	42	MAINSTEM 1
		15+25.78	53.65 LT.	16+09.68	40.54 LT.	54	MAINSTEM 1	
NDBAG DIVERSION	SANDBA	G TOP FLEV. (FT)	16+04.41	25.84 LT.	16+76.57	31.21 LT.	67	MAINSTEM 1
SD-9 US	SATUDDA	322.0	16+88.60	61.94 LT.	17+71.76	39.68 LT.	93	MAINSTEM 1
SD-8 DS	322.0		17+78.51	64.69 LT.	17+78.77	37.56 LT.	28	MAINSTEM 1
SD-9 DS	DS 318.0				DIVERSION FE	ENCE (DF)		
			TO (STA.)	OFFSET (LF)	FROM (STA.)	OFFSET (LF)	QTY (LF)	STREAM
			15,25.27	CC CALT	16:57.01	F1 70 IT	02	NAAINICTENA 1

E BED MARK		
RÉ RÉ		
LE BED MAPLEED		
ELIZ CIBLE MAPLE		
7.6 RED MARQED MAPLE FINE		
Ф МАРИ		
RED MEPLÉ		
OPLAR		
+0/7/0		
, 19 Ctc		
/		
C+		
1 E ,		
312.85'		
Fair En		
G ATT ATT AND A AN		
RED MAPLE		
IRAV PT CEMIL		
XFB		
		NOTES:
31 AM TO BU	35	1. EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL
18 1		WILL BE STRICTLY ENFORCED.
OOP THERE		2. REFER TO KEY MAP (SHEET KM-01) FOR PARCEL INFORMATION
	E	3. ENTIRE LOD SHOULD BE
DWP COMPLE	ί	DEMARCATED USING TREE
	뿌	PROTECTION FENCE, OTHER THAN
007	S	LOCATIONS WHERE THERE IS SUPER
		ALONG THE LOD
	Z	4. SPECIAL CONDITIONS REGARDING
Real NAR	-	FLOOD ACTION PLAN REQUIREMENTS
~	Ċ.	MAY BE INCLUDED IN THE PERMIT.
	ATG	5. ALL TREES WITHIN THE LOD NOT MARKED FOR REMOVAL WILL
	7M	RECEIVE TREE PROTECTION FENCE
	_	(TPF) AND TREE PLANKING (TP).
		CLUSTERS OF TREES MAY RECEIVE
AR		IPF AND IP AROUND THE CLUSTER Instead of fach individual tref
		6. INSTALL TPF AND TP BY HAND ON
		ALL TREES MARKED ON PLAN.
		7. WHERE POSSIBLE, FLUSH CUT
		TREES DESIGNATED FOR REMOVAL
		M-NCPPC MAY PROVIDE FFFDRACK
		ON WHERE FLUSH CUTTING OR
		REMOVAL IS APPROPRIATE PRIOR TO
		REQUIRED FOR DIVERSION FENCE
		20' 0 20' 40'
		SUALE: I = ZU
		DATUM: NAD 83(2001) Horizontal
		DATUM: NAD 83(2001) Horizontal NAVD 88 Vertical
		DATUM: NAD 83(2001) Horizontal NAVD 88 Vertical
		DATUM: NAD 83(2001) Horizontal NAVD 88 Vertical HIGHWAY HYDRAULICS DIVISION
		DATUM: NAD 83(2001) Horizontal NAVD 88 Vertical HIGHWAY HYDRAULICS DIVISION
		DATUM: NAD 83(2001) Horizontal NAVD 88 Vertical HIGHWAY HYDRAULICS DIVISION I-495 & I-270 MANAGED LANES STUDY P3 PROGRAM
	MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION	DATUM: NAD 83(2001) Horizontal NAVD 88 Vertical HIGHWAY HYDRAULICS DIVISION I-495 & I-270 MANAGED LANES STUDY P3 PROGRAM CA-5
	MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION STATE HIGHWAY	DATUM: NAD 83(2001) Horizontal NAVD 88 Vertical HIGHWAY HYDRAULICS DIVISION I-495 & I-270 MANAGED LANES STUDY P3 PROGRAM CA-5 STREAM RESTORATION
	MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION	DATUM: NAD 83(2001) Horizontal NAVD 88 Vertical HIGHWAY HYDRAULICS DIVISION I-495 & I-270 MANAGED LANES STUDY P3 PROGRAM CA-5 STREAM RESTORATION SEMI-FINAL (65%) DESIGN-
	MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION	DATUM: NAD 83(2001) Horizontal NAVD 88 Vertical HIGHWAY HYDRAULICS DIVISION I-495 & I-270 MANAGED LANES STUDY P3 PROGRAM CA-5 STREAM RESTORATION SEMI-FINAL (65%) DESIGN- NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION
REVISIONS	MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION	DATUM: NAD 83(2001) Horizontal NAVD 88 Vertical HIGHWAY HYDRAULICS DIVISION I-495 & I-270 MANAGED LANES STUDY P3 PROGRAM CA-5 STREAM RESTORATION SEMI-FINAL (65%) DESIGN- NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION RESTORATION ESC PLAN
REVISIONS	MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION CA-5 STREAM	DATUM: NAD 83(2001) Horizontal NAVD 88 Vertical HIGHWAY HYDRAULICS DIVISION I-495 & I-270 MANAGED LANES STUDY P3 PROGRAM CA-5 STREAM RESTORATION SEMI-FINAL (65%) DESIGN- NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION RESTORATION ESC PLAN
REVISIONS SEMI-FINAL REVIEW	MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION CCA-5 STREAM SCALE 1" = 20' DATE	DATUM: NAD 83(2001) Horizontal NAVD 88 Vertical HIGHWAY HYDRAULICS DIVISION I-495 & I-270 MANAGED LANES STUDY P3 PROGRAM CA-5 STREAM RESTORATION SEMI-FINAL (65%) DESIGN- NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION RESTORATION ESC PLAN
REVISIONS SEMI-FINAL REVIEW DECEMBER 2021	MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION CCA-5 STREAM SCALE 1"' = 20' DESIGNED BY SCN	DATUM: NAD 83(2001) Horizontal NAVD 88 Vertical HIGHWAY HYDRAULICS DIVISION I-495 & I-270 MANAGED LANES STUDY P3 PROGRAM CA-5 STREAM RESTORATION SEMI-FINAL (65%) DESIGN- NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION RESTORATION ESC PLAN DECEMBER 2021 CONTRACT NO. AW073B12
REVISIONS SEMI-FINAL REVIEW DECEMBER 2021	Image: constraint of transportation STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION CA-5 STREAM SCALE _ 1" = _20' DATE DESIGNED BY SCN DRAWN BY C.IN	DATUM: NAD 83(2001) Horizontal NAVD 88 Vertical HIGHWAY HYDRAULICS DIVISION I-495 & I-270 MANAGED LANES STUDY P3 PROGRAM CA-5 STREAM RESTORATION SEMI-FINAL (65%) DESIGN- NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION RESTORATION ESC PLAN DECEMBER 2021 CONTRACT NO. AW073B12
REVISIONS SEMI-FINAL REVIEW DECEMBER 2021 HIS DOCUMENT/PLAN IS DRAFT AND JBJECT TO CHANGE IT IS AN	Image: constraint of transportation Image: constraint of transport of	DATUM: NAD 83(2001) Horizontal NAVD 88 Vertical HIGHWAY HYDRAULICS DIVISION I-495 & I-270 MANAGED LANES STUDY P3 PROGRAM CA-5 STREAM RESTORATION SEMI-FINAL (65%) DESIGN- NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION RESTORATION ESC PLAN DECEMBER 2021 CONTRACT NO. AW073B12
REVISIONS SEMI-FINAL REVIEW DECEMBER 2021 HIS DOCUMENT/PLAN IS DRAFT AND UBJECT TO CHANGE. IT IS AN ITERAGENCY/INTRA-AGENCY DELIBERATIVE OMMI INICATION THAT IS NOT FOD	Image: constraint of transportation State Highway Administration Scale _ 1" = 20' Designed by date Designed by date Designed by constraint Checked by ksk MDE/PRD _ 168251/20-PR-0040-4	DATUM: NAD 83(2001) Horizontal NAVD 88 Vertical
REVISIONS SEMI-FINAL REVIEW DECEMBER 2021 HIS DOCUMENT/PLAN IS DRAFT AND JBJECT TO CHANGE. IT IS AN ITERAGENCY/INTRA-AGENCY DELIBERATIVE OMMUNICATION THAT IS NOT FOR JBLIC DISCLOSURE UNDER MO. GENERAL DOWISIONS CODE ANIAL S 4 244	MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION CA-5 STREAM SCALE 1" = 20' DESIGNED BY SCN DRAWN BY CJN CHECKED BY KSK MDE/PRD 168251/20-PR-0040-4	DATUM: NAD 83(2001) Horizontal NAVD 88 Vertical HIGHWAY HYDRAULICS DIVISION I-495 & I-270 MANAGED LANES STUDY P3 PROGRAM CA-5 STREAM RESTORATION SEMI-FINAL (65%) DESIGN- NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION RESTORATION ESC PLAN DECEMBER 2021 CONTRACT NO. AW073B12 COUNTY MONTGOMERY LOGMILE HORIZONTAL SCALE MORTED
REVISIONS SEMI-FINAL REVIEW DECEMBER 2021 HIS DOCUMENT/PLAN IS DRAFT AND JBJECT TO CHANGE. IT IS AN ITERAGENCY/INTRA-AGENCY DELIBERATIVE OMMUNICATION THAT IS NOT FOR JBLIC DISCLOSURE UNDER MD. GENERAL ROVISIONS CODE ANN. § 4-344 MARYLAND PUBLIC INFORMATION ACT).	MARYLAND DEPARTMENT MARYLAND DEPARTMENT STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION SCALE1" = _20' DESIGNED BY DATE DESIGNED BY CJN CHECKED BY KSK MDE/PRD 168251/20-PR-0040-4 DRAWING NO. ES-	DATUM: NAD 83(2001) Horizontal NAVD 88 Vertical HIGHWAY HYDRAULICS DIVISION I-495 & I-270 MANAGED LANES STUDY P3 PROGRAM CA-5 STREAM RESTORATION SEMI-FINAL (65%) DESIGN- NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION RESTORATION ESC PLAN DECEMBER 2021 CONTRACT NOAW073B12 COUNTY MONTGOMERY LOGMILE HORIZONTAL SCALE 01 VERTICAL SCALE O4 OF 09 SHEET NO. 16 OF 76



ING				SUPER SILT FE	NCE (SSF)			
QTY (SY)	STREAM	TO (STA.)	OFFSET (LF)	FROM (STA.)	OFFSET (LF)	QTY	(LF)	STREAM
78.78	MAINSTEM 1	21+51.69	40.88 RT.	22+68.90	37.35 RT.	7	1	MAINSTEM 1
632.89 MAINSTEM 1		22+79.89	58.95 RT.	22+81.46	37.78 RT.	24	4	MAINSTEM 1
				DIVERSION F	ENCE (DF)			
		TO (STA.)	OFFSET (LF)	FROM (STA.)	OFFSET (LF)	QTY	(LF)	STREAM
		22+44.07	69.78 RT.	22+79.89	58.95 RT.	8	4	MAINSTEM 1
					SANDBAG DI	VERSION	(SD)	
				STREAM	SANDBAG DIV	ERSION	SANDE	BAG TOP ELEV. (FT)
				POND OUTLET	SD-10 PO	ND		315.0
				MAINSTEM 1	SD-11 U	S		313.5
				MAINSTEM 1	SD-10 D	S		312.0
				MAINSTEM 1	SD-12 U	S		304.0
				MAINSTEM 1	SD-11 D	S	1	303.5



PLOTTED: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 AT 11:00 AM FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pES-P006_CA5.dgn

	SUPER SILT FENCE (SSF)							
TO (STA.)	OFFSET (LF)	FROM (STA.)	OFFSET (LF)	QTY (LF)	STREAM			
23+13.70	30.75 RT.	24+91.07	39.04 RT.	47	MAINSTEM 1			
24+94.05	37.34 RT.	24+95.10	53.26 RT.	17	MAINSTEM 1			
5+03.85	55.76 RT.	5+22.00	55.88 RT.	39	MAINSTEM 2			
SEE ES-07 FOR STC	JCKPILE AREA 9 SSF 7	TABLE						

TO (STA.)	OFFSET (LF)	FROM (STA.)	OFFSET (LF)	QTY (LF)	STREAM
24+12.81	44.60 RT.	24+95.10	53.26 RT.	55	MAINSTEM 1

TEMPORARY BRIDGE (TB)						
TO (STA.)	OFFSET (LF)	FROM (STA.)	OFFSET (LF)	QTY	STREAM	
24+35.75 RT.	5.48 LT./ 17.22 RT.	24+50.00	25.95 RT.	1	MAINSTEM 1	

MULCH MATTING					
TO (STA.)	O (STA.) FROM (STA.)		STREAM		
24+09 RT.	24+48 RT.	85.33	MAINSTEM 1		
3+85 RT.	5+47 RT.	234.56	MAINSTEM 2		

HEAVY DUTY MULCH MATTING						
TO (STA.)	FROM (STA.)	QTY (SY)	STREAM			
24+48 RT.	25+91 RT.	126.89	MAINSTEM 1			

SANDBAG DIVERSION (SD)						
STREAM	SANDBAG DIVERSION	SANDBAG TOP ELEV. (FT)				
MAINSTEM 1	SD-13 DS	305.2				
MAINSTEM 1	SD-12 DS	305.0				

NOTES:	
1. EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL	
WILL BE STRICTLY ENFORCED.	
2. REFER TO KEY MAP (SHEET KM-01)
FOR PARCEL INFORMATION.	
3. ENTIRE LOD SHOULD BE	
DEMARCATED USING TREE	
PROTECTION FENCE, OTHER THAN	
LOCATIONS WHERE THERE IS SUPER	
SILT FENCE OR DIVERSION FENCE	
ALONG THE LOD.	
4. SPECIAL CONDITIONS REGARDING	
FLOOD ACTION PLAN REQUIREMENTS	3
MAY BE INCLUDED IN THE PERMIT.	
5. ALL TREES WITHIN THE LOD NOT	
MARKED FOR REMOVAL WILL	
RECEIVE TREE PROTECTION FENCE	
(TPF) AND TREE PLANKING (TP).	
CLUSTERS OF TREES MAY RECEIVE	
TPF AND TP AROUND THE CLUSTER	
INSTEAD OF EACH INDIVIDUAL TREE.	
6. INSTALL TPF AND TP BY HAND ON	
ALL TREES MARKED ON PLAN.	
7. WHERE POSSIBLE, FLUSH CUT	
TREES DESIGNATED FOR REMOVAL	
AND LEAVE ROOTBALL IN PLACE.	
M-NCPPC MAY PROVIDE FEEDBACK	
ON WHERE FLUSH CUTTING OR	
REMOVAL IS APPROPRIATE PRIOR TO	
CONSTRUCTION.	
8. NO OUTLET PROTECTION IS	
REQUIRED FOR DIVERSION FENCE.	

		20' <u>0</u> 20' 40'		
		SCALE: 1" = 20' DATUM: NAD 83(2001) Horizontal NAVD 88 Vertical		
	MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION	HIGHWAY HYDRAULICS DIVISION I-495 & I-270 MANAGED LANES STUDY P3 PROGRAM CA-5 STREAM RESTORATION SEMI-FINAL (65%) DESIGN- NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION		
REVISIONS	CA–5 STREAM	RESTORATION ESC PLAN		
	SCALE <u>1" = 20</u> DATE	DECEMBER 2021 CONTRACT NO. AW073B12		
SEIVII-FINAL KEVIEVV DECEMBER 2021 THIS DOCUMENT/PLAN IS DRAFT AND SUBJECT TO CHANGE. IT IS AN INTERAGENCY/INTRA-AGENCY DELIBERATIVE COMMUNICATION THAT IS NOT FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE UNDER MD. GENERAL	DESIGNED BY <u>SCN</u> DRAWN BY <u>CJN</u> CHECKED BY <u>KSK</u> MDE/PRD <u>168251/20-PR-0040-C</u>	COUNTY MONTGOMERY LOGMILE		
PROVISIONS CODE ANN. § 4-344 (MARYLAND PUBLIC INFORMATION ACT) .	DRAWING NO. ES -	•06 OF 09 SHEET NO. 18 OF 76		



FILE: G:\Active/2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pES-P007_CA5.dgn

SUPER SILT FENCE (SSF)							
OFFSET (LF)	FROM (STA.)	OFFSET (LF)	QTY (LF)	STREAM			
25.95 RT.	1+16.78	39.63 RT.	159	MAINSTEM 2			
46.34 RT.	2+84.61	78.50 RT.	233	MAINSTEM 2			
	OFFSET (LF) 25.95 RT. 46.34 RT.	SUPER SILT FE OFFSET (LF) FROM (STA.) 25.95 RT. 1+16.78 46.34 RT. 2+84.61	SUPER SILT FENCE (SSF) OFFSET (LF) FROM (STA.) OFFSET (LF) 25.95 RT. 1+16.78 39.63 RT. 46.34 RT. 2+84.61 78.50 RT.	SUPER SILT FENCE (SSF) OFFSET (LF) FROM (STA.) OFFSET (LF) QTY (LF) 25.95 RT. 1+16.78 39.63 RT. 159 46.34 RT. 2+84.61 78.50 RT. 233			

	A	DIVERSION F	ENCE (DF)		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
) (STA.)	OFFSET (LF)	FROM (STA.)	OFFSET (LF)	QTY (LF)	STREAM
+45.31	96.81 RT.	1+09.02	85.92 RT.	56	MAINSTEM 2
+12.40	88.48 RT.	1+28.27	109.09 RT.	163	MAINSTEM 2

MULCH MATTING					SANDBAG DIVERSION	(SD)
(STA.)	FROM (STA.)	QTY (SY)	STREAM	STREAM	SANDBAG DIVERSION	SANDBAG TOP ELEV. (FT)
-07 RT.	3+85 RT.	595.89	MAINSTEM 2	MAINSTEM 2	SD-13 US	315.2

	MULCH M	ATTING	
TO (STA.)	FROM (STA.)	QTY (SY)	STREAM
10+20 LT.	14+20 LT.	616.22	MAINSTEM 1

5

0

NOTES:
1. EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL
WILL BE STRICTLY ENFORCED.
2. REFER TO KEY MAP (SHEET KM-01)
FOR PARCEL INFORMATION.
3. ENTIRE LOD SHOULD BE
DEMARCATED USING TREE
PROTECTION FENCE, OTHER THAN
LOCATIONS WHERE THERE IS SUPER
SILT FENCE OR DIVERSION FENCE
ALONG THE LOD.
4. SPECIAL CONDITIONS REGARDING
FLOOD ACTION PLAN REQUIREMENTS
MAY BE INCLUDED IN THE PERMIT.
5. ALL TREES WITHIN THE LOD NOT
MARKED FOR REMOVAL WILL
RECEIVE TREE PROTECTION FENCE
(TPF) AND TREE PLANKING (TP).
CLUSTERS OF TREES MAY RECEIVE
TPF AND TP AROUND THE CLUSTER
INSTEAD OF EACH INDIVIDUAL TREE.
6. INSTALL TPF AND TP BY HAND ON
ALL TREES MARKED ON PLAN.
7. WHERE POSSIBLE, FLUSH CUT
TREES DESIGNATED FOR REMOVAL
AND LEAVE ROOTBALL IN PLACE.
M-NCPPC MAY PROVIDE FEEDBACK
ON WHERE FLUSH CUTTING OR
REMOVAL IS APPROPRIATE PRIOR TO
CONSTRUCTION.
8. NO OUTLET PROTECTION IS
REQUIRED FOR DIVERSION FENCE.

		^{20'} 0 20' 40' SCALE: 1" = 20' DATUM: NAD 83(2001) Horizontal NAVD 88 Vertical
	MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION	HIGHWAY HYDRAULICS DIVISION I-495 & I-270 MANAGED LANES STUDY P3 PROGRAM CA-5 STREAM RESTORATION SEMI-FINAL (65%) DESIGN- NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION
REVISIONS	CA–5 STREAM	RESTORATION ESC PLAN
SEMI-FINAL REVIEW DECEMBER 2021 THIS DOCUMENT/PLAN IS DRAFT AND SUBJECT TO CHANGE. IT IS AN INTERAGENCY/INTRA-AGENCY DELIBERATIVE COMMUNICATION THAT IS NOT FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE UNDER MD. GENERAL	SCALE $1" = 20'$ DATEDESIGNEDBYSCNDRAWNBYCJNCHECKEDBYKSKMDE/PRD168251/20-PR-0040-	DECEMBER 2021 CONTRACT NO. AW073B12 COUNTY MONTGOMERY LOGMILE HORIZONTAL SCALE
PROVISIONS CODE ANN. § 4-344 (MARYLAND PUBLIC INFORMATION ACT)	DRAWING NO. ES	-08 OF 09 SHEET NO. 20 OF 76

PLOTTED: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 AT 11:01 AM FILE: G:\Active/2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pES-P009_CA5.dgn

	STAE	ILIZED CONSTRUCT	ION ENTRANCE (SCE	E)	
TO (STA.)	OFFSET (LF)	FROM (STA.)	OFFSET (LF)	QTY	STREAM
12+60.43	554.86 LT.	12+60.66	561.37 LT.	1	MAINSTEM 1
	МШСНА	ATTING			
TO (STA)	EROM (STA)		STREAM		

XISTING	CHANNEL
	NOT TO SCALE

RIFFLE GRADE CONTROL N	1IX
CLASS 0 RIPRAP	20%
CLASS I RIPRAP	40%
CLASS II RIPRAP	20%
NATURAL CHANNEL MATERIAL	20%

PLOTTED: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 AT 11:01 AM FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pSD-D002_CA-5.dgn

NOTES:

CONCRETE PANELS TO EXTEND BEYOND BANKFULL

1. INSTALL PIPE PROTECTION UNDER RIFFLE GRADE CONTROLS WHERE INDICATED ON THE PLANS. AT THE DIRECTION OF THE ENGINEER, INSTALL PIPE PROTECTION AT ANY LOCATION WHERE A UTILITY BECOMES EXPOSED DURING CONSTRUCTION. 2. REMOVE ANY LOOSE OR UNSTABLE BED MATERIAL FROM AROUND THE EXPOSED PIPE. DO NOT DISTURB ANY COMPACTED BED MATERIAL ENCASEMENT OR BEDROCK THAT IS SUPPORTING THE PIPE. CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY DAMAGE TO THE PIPE. THE SIZE OF EXPOSED AREA WILL VARY IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE UTILITY OWNERS' DIRECTIVE. THE EXPOSED PIPE TO BE SUPPORTED AT ALL TIMES BY THE CONTRACTOR. 3. THE EXPOSED PIPE, PLUS 6" (MIN) IN EACH DIRECTION, SHALL BE BACKFILLED WITH

NO. 57 STONE. THE NO. 57 STONE SHALL EXTEND SIX (6) INCHES ABOVE THE CROWN OF THE EXPOSED PIPE AND FILL ALL VOIDS AND SUPPORT THE PIPE. 4. ROCK SILLS AND VANES UPSTREAM AND DOWNSTREAM OF THE CROSSING SHALL BE ORIENTED PERPENDICULAR TO CHANNEL IRRESPECTIVE OF PIPE DIRECTION. THE

EXPOSED PIPE TO PREVENT FURTHER EXPOSURE. THE TOP ELEVATION OF THE RGC AT PIPE SHALL BE AT MINIMUM 18 INCHES (AT THE THALWEG) ABOVE THE PIPE CROWN UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.

SHALL BE BACKFILLED WITH RGC MIX PER THE RIFFLE GRADE CONTROL DETAIL. 6. PARKS RESERVES THE RIGHT TO ADJUST THE LOCATION /ANGLE, SIZE /EXTENT OR ELEVATION OF THE PROPOSED STRUCTURE.

7. HARVEST AND REUSE EXISTING STREAMBED MATERIALS TO EXTENT POSSIBLE. OFFSITE STREAMBED MATERIAL SHALL BE USED TO CHOKE BOTTOM LAYERS OF ROCK WITH SALVAGED MATERIAL SAVED FOR TOP LAYERS.

	COMMON BORROW
BANKFULL	
_OPE 0 – 1%	

NOT TO SCALE

	MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION	HIGHWAY HYDRAULICS DIVISION I-495 & I-270 MANAGED LANES STUDY P3 PROGRAM CA-5 STREAM RESTORATION SEMI-FINAL (65%) DESIGN- NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION
REVISIONS	STREAM RES	TORATION DETAILS
	SCALE <u>NTS</u> DATE <u>DE</u>	CEMBÉR 2021 CONTRACT NO. <u>AW073B12</u>
DECEMBER 2021	DESIGNED BY <u>SCN</u>	COUNTY MONTGOMERY
HIS DOCUMENT/PLAN IS DRAFT AND	DRAWN BYCJN	
JBJECT TO CHANGE. IT IS AN TERAGENCY/INTRA-AGENCY DELIBERATIVE	CHECKED BY KSK	HORIZONTAL SCALE
OMMUNICATION THAT IS NOT FOR JBLIC DISCLOSURE UNDER MD. GENERAL	MDE/PRD <u>168251/20-PR-0040-01</u>	VERTICAL SCALE
ROVISIONS CODE ANN. § 4-344 MARYLAND PUBLIC INFORMATION ACT).	DRAWING NO. SD-04	OF 09 SHEET NO. 25 OF 76

FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pSD-D005_CA-5.dgn

FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pSD-D006_CA-5.dgn

FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pSD-D007_CA-5.dgn

	MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION	HIGHWAY HYDRAULICS DIVISION I-495 & I-270 MANAGED LANES STUDY P3 PROGRAM CA-5 STREAM RESTORATION SEMI-FINAL (65%) DESIGN- NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION			
REVISIONS	STREAM R	ESTORATION DETAILS			
	SCALE <u>NTS</u> DATE _	DECEMBER 2021 CONTRACT NO. AW073B12			
DECEMBER 2021	DESIGNED BY <u>SCN</u>	COUNTY MONTGOMERY			
IS DOCUMENT/PLAN IS DRAFT AND IBJECT TO CHANGE. IT IS AN FERAGENCY/INTRA-AGENCY DELIBERATIVE MMUNICATION THAT IS NOT FOR IBLIC DISCLOSURE UNDER MD. GENERAL	DRAWN BY <u>CJN</u> CHECKED BY <u>K\$K</u> MDE/PRD <u>168251/20-PR-0040-0</u>	LOGMILE HORIZONTAL SCALE VERTICAL SCALE			
OVISIONS CODE ANN. § 4-344 MARYLAND PUBLIC INFORMATION ACT).	drawing no. SD-	08 OF 09 SHEET NO. 29 OF 76			

FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pSD-D009_CA-5.dgn

HIGHWAY HYDRAULICS DIVISION I-495 & I-270 MANAGED

SEMI-FINAL (65%) DESIGN-

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

<u>NTS</u> DATE <u>DECEMBER 2021</u> CONTRACT NO. <u>AW073B12</u> MONTGOMERY

PLOTTED: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 AT 11:01 AM FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pSR-P001_CA5.dgn

			ROC	K CASCAI	DE (RC)					ROCK
DC #		RIFFLE- START			RIFFLE - END			CTDEANA	RJH #	THALWE
RC #	STA.	ELEV. (FT)	OFFSET (FT)	STA.	ELEV. (FT)	OFFSET (FT)		STREAM	RJH-1	0+53.00
RC-1	5+90.70	359.19	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	6+50.99	357.01	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	13	TRIB 1	RJH-2	0+74.00

			RIFFLE GRADE	CONTRO	L (RGC)				
DCC #		RIFFLE-	START		RIFFLE - END				
KGC #	STA.	ELEV. (FT)	OFFSET (FT)	STA.	ELEV. (FT)	OFFSET (FT)			
RGC-1	0+33.52	356.72	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	0+53.00	355.97	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	MS 1		
RGC-2	1+07.11	355.22	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	1+44.14	354.00	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	MS 1		
RGC-3	1+64.00	354.00	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	2+01.50	352.77	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	MS 1		

PLOTTED: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 AT 11:01 AM FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pSR-P002_CA5.dgn

	2							
	PCC #	RIFFLE- START			RIFFLE - END			CTDEANA
ROCK CASCADE	CADE RGC #	STA.	ELEV. (FT)	OFFSET (FT)	STA.	ELEV. (FT)	OFFSET (FT)	
	RGC-4	2+19.36	352.57	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	2+48.25	351.62	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	MS 1
	RGC-5	2+65.15	351.62	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	2+97.88	350.54	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	MS 1
	RGC-6	3+15.98	350.24	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	3+49.08	349.15	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	MS 1
	RGC-7	3+69.03	349.15	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	3+99.89	348.13	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	MS 1
	RGC-8	4+18.03	348.13	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	4+43.08	347.33	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	MS 1

PLOTTED: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 AT 11:01 AM FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pSR-P003_CA5.dgn

	T_	POPLAR			
RIFFLE GRADE CONTROL (RGC)					07E
ART		RIFFLE	- END	STDEAM	T POPLAR T POPL
OFFSET (FT)	STA.	ELEV. (FT)	OFFSET (FT)	JINLAIVI	T PORLAR
7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	9+77.00	333.34	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	MS 1	
7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	10+21.50	332.39	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	MS 1	12 THOPLAR
7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	10+69.72	331.38	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	MS 1	
.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	13+03.77	325.88	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	MS 1	
7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	13+50.38	324.93	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	MS 1	N 233420
BUCK CA	SCADE /R	<u>()</u>			

-	START		RIFFLE - END			TOE LOG (TL)							
)	OFFSET (FT)	STA.	ELEV. (FT)	OFFSET (FT)	STREAM		WORKING POINT A			WORKING POINT B			
	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	7+92.81	338.17	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	MS 1	ті #		MIN	TOP		MIN.	TOP	
1	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	8+89.52	335.69	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	MS 1	15 11		OFFSET	ELEV.		OFFSET	ELEV.	1.2
	11.25 LT. / 11.25 RT.	11+63.50	329.04	11.25 LT. / 11.25 RT.	MS 1		STA.	(FT)	(FT)	STA.	(FT)	(FT)	LENGTH (FT)
	11.25 LT. / 11.25 RT.	12+09.57	328.07	11.25 LT. / 11.25 RT.	MS 1	TL-1	9+72.49	2.00 LT	333.40	9+96.67	2.00 LT	333.40	43.3
ļ	11.25 LT. / 11.25 RT.	12+54.84	327.02	11.25 LT. / 11.25 RT.	MS 1	TL-2	10+76.11	2.00 RT	331.20	10+92.66	2.00 RT	331.20	40.6
ĺ	11.25 LT. / 11.25 RT.	1+09.39	334.59	11.25 LT. / 11.25 RT.	TRIB 2	TL-3	11+26.31	2.00 LT	330.20	11+33.90	2.00 LT	330.20	26.5
	11.25 LT. / 11.25 RT.	1+75.27	331.07	11.25 LT. / 11.25 RT.	TRIB 2	TL-4	11+63.50	2.00 RT	329.04	11+81.73	2.00 RT	329.04	27.3
1	11.25 LT. / 11.25 RT.	2+27.57	328.21	11.25 LT. / 11.25 RT.	TRIB 2								_


PLOTTED: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 AT 11:01 AM FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pSR-P004_CA5.dgn

BED MAPLE	ROCK J-HOOK	(RJH)
Contraction RE	RJH # THALWEG STA. E	LEV.(FT) STREAM
PLE	RJH-20 16+01.66	319.91 MS 1
	RJH-21 10+40.72	318.93 IVIS I
PINE	RJH-22 10+79.59	317.85 IVIS 1
7-6 RED MARQED MAPLE	RJH-23 17+24.38	215 42 MS 1
	KJH-24 1/+/0.18	515.42 1015 1
POPLAR		
312.64'		
t2,		
- 315.69		
315 82,		
B I FOR THE MARE A		
RED MAPLE		
TRAVE PMACEMI1		
RGC-26 - V		
EENT CENT		
aC-25 +		
315 50)5	
18+.		
RED A	С. С	
	F	
RED MAPLE		
	Ï	
	S	
	Щ	
	\leq	
NVS	1111日の11日の11日の11日の11日の11日の11日の11日の11日の1	NOTE:
	\mathcal{Q}	1. REFER TO KEY MAP (SHEET KM–01)
	Γ <u></u>	FOR PARCEL INFORMATION.
" CONCRETE SEWER	\geq	2. ALL TREES WITHIN THE LOD NOT MARKED FOR REMOVAL WILL
IVERT ELEV. 313.66		RECEIVE TREE PROTECTION FENCE
ROM ÁVAILABLE AS-BUILTS,		(TPF) AND TREE PLANKING (TP).
IOT FIELD VERIFIED)		CLUSTERS OF TREES MAY RECEIVE
		INSTEAD OF EACH INDIVIDUAL TREE.
		3. INSTALL TPF AND TP BY HAND ON
		ALL TREES MARKED ON PLAN.
		TREES DESIGNATED FOR REMOVAL
		AND LEAVE ROOTBALL IN PLACE.
		M-NCPPC MAY PROVIDE FEEDBACK
		UN WHERE FLUSH CUTTING OR REMOVAL IS APPROPRIATE PRIOR TO
		CONSTRUCTION.
		20' 0 20' 40'
		SUALE: I = 20
		DATUM: NAD83(2001) Horizontal
		NAVD 88 Vertical
		HIGHWAY HYDRAULICS DIVISION
		I-495 & I-270 MANAGED
		P3 PROGRAM
	OF TRANSPORTATION	
	STATE HIGHWAY	STREAM RESTURATION
	ADMINISTRATION	SEMI-FINAL (65%) DESIGN-
		NUT FOR CONSTRUCTION
REVISIONS	CA–5 STREAN	A RESTORATION PLAN
SEMI-FINAL REV/IFW/	SCALE <u>1" = 20'</u> DATE <u>[</u>	DECEMBÉR 2021 CONTRACT NO. <u>AW073B12</u>
DECEMBER 2021	DESIGNED BY SĈN	COUNTY MONTGOMERY
	DRAWN BY CJN	
THIS DOCUMENT/PLAN IS DRAFT AND SUBJECT TO CHANGE. IT IS AN	CHECKED BY K\$K	HORIZONTAL SCALE
NTERAGENCY/INTRA-AGENCY DELIBERATIVE	MDE/PRD <u>168251/20-PR-0040-01</u>	VERTICAL SCALE
PUBLIC DISCLOSURE UNDER MD. GENERAL PROVISIONS CODE ANN. § 4-344		
(MARYLAND PUBLIC INFORMATION ACT)	DRAWING NO. SR-(J4 OF UY SHEET NO. 34 OF 76

			218	N. S.	315 di	RED MADE CAN RED MADE CAN LOGIO CAN I.CS CLE I.CS CLE I.CS CLE	PBFLAR TORE	RGC-30	ABANDONED FARM	COORD IMPLEM POND DEBRIS AREA ED MAPLE TON TON TON TON
		MATCHLINE SPACE	RED M		ABED MAPLE MABED MAPLE MABED MAPLE MABED MAPLE MABED MAPLE MABED MAPLE MABED MAPLE MAPLE MABED MAPLE M	RGC		RJH-25	ARC-29 POPLAR AR CA- B CO TOPLAR AR CA- B CO TOPLAR TOPLAR AR CA- B CO TOPLAR TOPLAR	RGC-31, TO PLAR 5 MAINSTEM OF CONSTRU
			-		~	RIFFLE GRADE	CONTROL	(RGC)		
			RGC #	CTA	RIFFLE-	START	CTA		- END	STDEANA
	1 Francisco		RGC-27	19+20.11	312.99	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	19+43.88	312.37	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	MS 1
			RGC-28	19+61.73	312.37	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	19+87.24	311.78	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	MS 1
			RGC-29	20+06.44	311.78	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT. 7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	20+31.24	310.74	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT. 7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	MS 1
			RGC-31	20+86.35	310.74	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	21+21.89	310.03	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	MS 1
	$ \vdash]$		RGC-32	12+39.90	310.03	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	21+66.69	309.5	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	MS 1
			RGC-33 RGC-34	21+82.59	309.08	7.35 L1. / 7.35 RT. 7.35 LT. / 7 35 RT	22+03.17	309.08	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT. 7.35 LT. / 7 35 RT	MS 1
\rightarrow			RGC-35	22+56.75	308.64	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	22+81.83	308.04	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	MS 1
-(-)-			RGC-36	22+99.18	308.04	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	23+18.30	307.47	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	MS 1
I			RGC-37	23+35.98	307.47	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	23+64.28	306.62	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	MS 1
	THE COASTAL RESOURCES INC.	LEGEND TREE TREE TREE OXBC TOE RIFFL CLAY	REMOVAL PLANKING PROTECTI W WETLA LOG E GRADE CHANNEL	VTREE PRO ON FENCE ND CONTROL M BLOCK	TECTION F		STON ROCK	E TOE J-HOOK		ROCH

PLOTTED: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 AT 11:01 AM FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pSR-P005_CA5.dgn



SHEET NO. 35 OF 76

DRAWING NO.

				ROCK SI	LL (RS)				a
RS #	WORKING POINT	STA.	OFFSET (FT)	ELEV.(FT)	WORKING POINT	STA.	OFFSET (FT)	ELEV.(FT)	STREAN
RS-1	A	0+21.00	9.00 LT.	312.70	В	0+21.00	9.00 RT.	312.70	POND OUTLET

				TOE LOO	G (TL)			
	WO	RKING POI	NTA	WO	RKING POI			
ті #		MIN		1	MIN.			
16#		OFFSET	ТОР		OFFSET	TOP	1.0.7	
	STA.	(FT)	ELEV. (FT)	STA.	(FT)	ELEV. (FT)	LENGTH (FT)	STREAM
TL-5	21+21.90	2.00 RT.	310.03	21+39.88	2.00 RT.	310.03	27.9	MS 1
TL-6	22+40.55	2.00 RT.	308.64	22+56.69	2.00 RT.	308.64	25.3	MS 1



PLOTTED: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 AT 11:01 AM FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pSR-P006_CA5.dgn

			RIFFLE GRADE	CONTROL	. (RGC)		
DCC #		RIFFLE-	START	1	- END		
RGC #	STA.	ELEV. (FT)	OFFSET (FT)	STA.	ELEV. (FT)	OFFSET (FT)	STREAM
RGC-39	24+25.94	305.78	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	24+54.32	304.93	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	MS 1
RGC-40	24+69.90	304.93	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	24+91.24	304.29	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	MS 1
RGC-41	25+07.25	304.29	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	25+30.24	303.60	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	MS 1
RGC-42	25+47.52	303.6	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	25+73.82	302.81	7.35 LT. / 7.35 RT.	MS 1
RGC-52	4+04.00	308.03	7.50 LT. / 7.50 RT.	4+16.00	307.83	7.50 LT. / 7.50 RT.	MS 2
RGC-53	4+43.00	307.83	7.50 LT. / 7.50 RT.	4+56.00	307.48	7.50 LT. / 7.50 RT.	MS 2
RGC-54	4+67.00	307.48	7.50 LT. / 7.50 RT.	4+86.00	306.96	7.50 LT. / 7.50 RT.	MS 2
RGC-55	5+01.00	306.46	7.50 LT. / 7.50 RT.	5+22.00	305.9	7.50 LT. / 7.50 RT.	MS 2
RGC-56	5+42.00	305.4	7.50 LT. / 7.50 RT.	5+54.00	305.05	7.50 LT. / 7.50 RT.	MS 2
RGC-57	5+78.00	304.55	7.50 LT. / 7.50 RT.	5+95.00	304.11	7.50 LT. / 7.50 RT.	MS 2

	ROCK J-HOOK (RJH)										
RJH #	THALWEG STA.	ELEV.(FT)	STREAM								
RJH-26	4+86.00	306.96	MS 2								
RJH-27	5+22.00	305.9	MS 2								
RJH-28	5+54.00	305.05	MS 2								

	KNICKPOINT TREATMENT (KPT)												
КРТ ССВ #	WORKING POINT A			WORKING POINT B					CTDEANA				
	STA.	OFFSET (FT.)	TOP ELEV.	STA.	OFFSET (FT.)	TOP ELEV.	WIDTH (FT)	QIT (CT)	SIKEAW				
KPT 2 (CCB-1)	25+85.09	43.31 RT.	306.00	25+87.32	35.78 RT.	306.00	3	6	MS 1				
KPT 2 (CCB-2)	26+01.64	48.23 RT.	305.00	26+01.17	40.20 RT.	305.00	3	6	MS 1				

ROCK CROSS VANE (RCV)										
RCV #	THALWEG STA.	ELEV. (FT)	STREAM							
RCV-1	25+73.82	302.81	MS 1							

COMPOUND ROCK CROSS VANE (CRCV)										
	MS-1	MS-1	MS-2	MS-2						
CRCV #	THALWEG STA.	ELEV. (FT)	THALWEG STA.	ELEV. (FT)	STREAM					
CRCV-1	25+30.24	303.60	5+95.00	304.11	MS-1/MS-2 CONFLUENCE					

	TOE LOG (TL)													
	WORKING POINT A			WO	RKING POI		_							
TL #		MIN OFFSET	ТОР		MIN. OFFSET	ТОР								
	STA.	(FT)	ELEV. (FT)	STA.	(FT)	ELEV. (FT)	LENGTH (FT)	STREAM						
TL-7	24+52.48	2.00 LT.	304.93	24+72.20	2.00 LT.	304.93	28.4	MS-1						
TL-8	24+90.79	2.00 RT.	304.29	25+08.22	2.00 RT.	304.29	24.2	MS-1						
TL-9	3+86.41	2.00 RT.	308.03	4+04.20	2.00 RT.	308.03	23.1	MS-2						
TL-10	4+55.66	2.00 LT.	307.48	4+67.01	2.00 LT.	307.48	14.1	MS-2						

	STONE TOE (ST)											
ст #	S	TART		END	QTY	STDEANA						
51 #	STA.	OFFSET (FT)	STA.	OFFSET (FT)	(LF)	SIREAN						
ST-16	4+16.03	7.50 LT.	4+43.01	7.50 LT.	33	MS-2						

			CLA	Y CHANN	EL BLOCK (CC	CB)			
CCB #	V	WORKING POINT A			ORKING POIN	IT B			CTREAM
	STA.	OFFSET (FT.)	TOP ELEV.	STA.	OFFSET (FT.)	TOP ELEV.			STREAM
CCB-6	25+43.23	12.45 LT.	305.00	25+62.34	9.54 LT.	305.00	16.5	21	MS 1



NOTE:

1. REFER TO KEY MAP (SHEET KM-01) FOR PARCEL INFORMATION. 2. ALL TREES WITHIN THE LOD NOT MARKED FOR REMOVAL WILL RECEIVE TREE PROTECTION FENCE (TPF) AND TREE PLANKING (TP). CLUSTERS OF TREES MAY RECEIVE TPF AND TP AROUND THE CLUSTER INSTEAD OF EACH INDIVIDUAL TREE. 3. INSTALL TPF AND TP BY HAND ON ALL TREES MARKED ON PLAN. 4. WHERE POSSIBLE, FLUSH CUT TREES DESIGNATED FOR REMOVAL AND LEAVE ROOTBALL IN PLACE. M-NCPPC MAY PROVIDE FEEDBACK ON WHERE FLUSH CUTTING OR REMOVAL IS APPROPRIATE PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION.

20'	0	20'	4
	SCAL	E: 1" = 20'	

DATUM: NAD83(2001) Horizontal NAVD 88 Vertical

	HIGHWAY HYDRAULICS DIVISION	
	I-495 & I-270 MANAGED LANES STUDY P3 PROGRAM CA-5STATE HIGHWAY	
	ADMINISTRATION SEMI-FINAL (65%) DESIGN- NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION	
REVISIONS	CA-5 STREAM RESTORATION PLAN	
	SCALE <u>1" = 20</u> DATE <u>DECEMBÉR 2021</u> CONTRACT NO. <u>AW073B12</u>	
DECEMBER 2021	DESIGNED BY <u>SCN</u> COUNTY <u>MONTGOMERY</u>	
THIS DOCUMENT/PLAN IS DRAFT AND	DRAWN BYCJN LOGMILE	
SUBJECT TO CHANGE. IT IS AN NTERAGENCY/INTRA-AGENCY DELIBERATIVE	CHECKED BY K\$K HORIZONTAL SCALE	
COMMUNICATION THAT IS NOT FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE UNDER MD. GENERAL	MDE/PRD <u>168251/20-PR-0040-01</u> VERTICAL SCALE	
PROVISIONS CODE ANN. § 4-344 (MARYLAND PUBLIC INFORMATION ACT) .	DRAWING NO. SR-06 OF 09 SHEET NO. 36 OF 76	;



PLOTTED: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 AT 11:01 AM FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pSR-P007_CA5.dgn

	QTY	CTDEANA
ET (FT)	(LF)	STREAM
O RT.	90	MS 2

BOCK	CASC
RUUN	CASC

RIFFLE GRADE CONTROL (RGC)							
DCC #		RIFFLE-	START	S. G	RIFFLE	- END	
RGC #	STA.	ELEV. (FT)	OFFSET (FT)	STA.	ELEV. (FT)	OFFSET (FT)	SIREAN
RGC-43	0+00.00	311.00	7.50 LT. / 7.50 RT.	0+27.00	310.59	7.50 LT. / 7.50 RT.	MS 2
RGC-44	0+44.00	310.59	7.50 LT. / 7.50 RT.	0+64.00	310.35	7.50 LT. / 7.50 RT.	MS 2
RGC-45	0+82.00	310.35	7.50 LT. / 7.50 RT.	1+06.00	309.99	7.50 LT. / 7.50 RT.	MS 2
RGC-46	1+23.00	309.99	7.50 LT. / 7.50 RT.	1+49.00	309.67	7.50 LT. / 7.50 RT.	MS 2
RGC-47	1+66.00	309.67	7.50 LT. / 7.50 RT.	1+91.00	309.18	7.50 LT. / 7.50 RT.	MS 2
RGC-48	2+63.00	309.17	7.50 LT. / 7.50 RT.	2+79.00	308.94	7.50 LT. / 7.50 RT.	MS 2
RGC-49	2+93.00	308.94	7.50 LT. / 7.50 RT.	3+15.00	308.61	7.50 LT. / 7.50 RT.	MS 2
RGC-50	3+34.00	308.61	7.50 LT. / 7.50 RT.	3+52.00	308.29	7.50 LT. / 7.50 RT.	MS 2
RGC-51	3+70.00	308.29	7.50 LT. / 7.50 RT.	3+87.00	308.03	7.50 LT. / 7.50 RT.	MS 2



PLOTTED: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 AT 11:01 AM FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pSR-P008_CA5.dgn

SHEET SHOT	NOT 1. RE FOR 2. AI MAF REC (TPF CLU TPF UNST 3. IN ALL 4. W TRE ANC M–N ON REIV CON	E: FER TO KEY MAP (SHEET KM-01) PARCEL INFORMATION. L TREES WITHIN THE LOD NOT KED FOR REMOVAL WILL EIVE TREE PROTECTION FENCE AND TREE PLANKING (TP). STERS OF TREES MAY RECEIVE AND TP AROUND THE CLUSTER EAD OF EACH INDIVIDUAL TREE. ISTALL TPF AND TP BY HAND ON TREES MARKED ON PLAN. HERE POSSIBLE, FLUSH CUT ES DESIGNATED FOR REMOVAL LEAVE ROOTBALL IN PLACE. ICPPC MAY PROVIDE FEEDBACK WHERE FLUSH CUTTING OR IOVAL IS APPROPRIATE PRIOR TO ISTRUCTION.
	20' DAT	0 20' 40' SCALE: 1" = 20' UM: NAD83(2001) Horizontal NAVD 88 Vertical
λ	MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION	HIGHWAY HYDRAULICS DIVISION I-495 & I-270 MANAGED LANES STUDY P3 PROGRAM CA-5 STREAM RESTORATION SEMI-FINAL (65%) DESIGN- NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION
REVISIONS	CA–5 STREAM RES	STORATION PLAN
SEMI-FINAL REVIEW DECEMBER 2021 B DOCUMENT/PLAN IS DRAFT AND JECT TO CHANGE. IT IS AN	SCALE 1" = 20' DATE DECEMBER DESIGNED BY SCN	2021 CONTRACT NO. <u>AW073B12</u> COUNTY <u>MONTGOMERY</u> LOGMILE HORIZONTAL SCALE
INVICATION THAT IS NOT FOR LIC DISCLOSURE UNDER MD. GENERAL VISIONS CODE ANN. § 4-344 ARYLAND PUBLIC INFORMATION ACT)	MDE/PRD <u>168251/20-PR-0040-01</u> DRAWING NO. SR-08 OF	VERTICAL SCALE



 $-\bigcirc$

		LIVE STAKES			
	AREA (AC)		1.13		6
Quantity	Botanical Name	Common Name	Indicator Status	Spacing	Planting Dates
3272	Salix nigra	Black Willow	OBL	Maximum	
1091	Cornus amomum	Silky Dogwood	FACW	Waximum	11/1-3/31
1091	Viburnum dentatum	Arrowwood Viburnum	FAC	spacing 3 OC	

		RIPARIA	N PLANTINGS			
2		AREA (AC)		3.3	3	
Quantity	Botanical Name	Common Name	Indicator Status	Size	Rate	Pla
		0	verstory	and second a		1.14
	A	Major De	eciduous Trees	4		
108	Acer rubrum	Red Maple	FAC	5' CG	and the second second	
108	Betula nigra	River Birch	FACW	5' CG	Maximum Spacing 20' OC	Spr
108	Platanus occidentalis	American Sycamore	FACW	5' CG		Fall
108	Quercus bicolor	Swamp White Oak	FACW	5' CG		
		Minor De	eciduous Trees			_
59	Amelanchier arborea	Common Serviceberry	FAC	5' CG	Maximum	Spr
59	Carpinus caroliniana	American Hornbeam	FAC	5' CG	Spacing 15' OC	Fall
59	Magnolia virginiana	Sweetbay Magnolia	FACW	5' CG	Spacing 15 OC	ran
			Shrubs			
70	Alnus serrulata	Hazel Alder	FACW	3 GALLON CG	1. i	
70	Cornus amomum	Silky Dogwood	FACW	3 GALLON CG	Maximum	C
70	Lindera benzoin	Spicebush	FACW	3 GALLON CG		Spr
70	Sambucus nigra ssp. canadensis	American Black Elderberry	FACW	3 GALLON CG	spacing 3 OC	Fall

		OXBOW WE	TLAND PLANTINGS			
		AREA (AC)		0.3	1	1
Quantity	Botanical Name	Common Name	Indicator Status	Size	Spacing	Pla
498	Juncus effusus	Lamp Rush	FACW	PLUG		
332	Peltandra virginica	Arrow Arum	OBL	PLUG		
665	Pontederia cordata	Pickerelweed	OBL	PLUG		
399	Sagittaria latifolia	Duck Potato	OBL	PLUG	Maximum	Cori
166	Nuphar advena	Yellow Pond-Lily	OBL	1 QUART CG	Spacing 2' OC	Spri
399	Carex crinita	Fringe Sedge	OBL	PLUG		Fd
532	Scirpus cyperinus	Cottongrass Bulrush	FACW	PLUG		
332	Schoenoplectus tabernaemontani	Soft-Stem Club-Rush	OBL	PLUG		



DECIDUOUS TREE PLANTING WITH DEER PROTECTION (M-NCPPC DETAIL No. 701) NOTES:

1. STAKES AND WIRES MUST BE REMOVED 12 MONTHS AFTER PLANTING. 2. PLANTING HOLE SHALL BE DUG BY BACKHOE OR OTHER MACHINE AND FINISHED BY HAND. 3. IF SURROUNDING SOIL IS COMPACTED AS DETERMINED BY THE ENGINEER OR QAD, AN AREA UP TO 5 TIMES THE DIAMETER OF THE ROOT MASS SHALL BE EXCAVATED OR ROTOTILLED TO A 1' DEPTH AND SOIL SHALL BE AMENDED. 4. PRUNE ONLY DEAD, DECAYING, BROKEN, CROSSING OR INWARD GROWING BRANCHES. NEVER DAMAGE OR CUT LEADER.

 $-\bigcirc$

 $-\bigcirc$

-



- TIE OFF STRAPS PER MANUFACTURER'S DIRECTION. ALLOW KNOT TO EXPAND AS THE TREE
- STRAPS
- 3/4" WIDE, FLAT, WOVEN POLY PROPYLENE EQUAL. LOOP STRAPS AROUND LOWEST BRANCHES OF TREE
- EXISTING ADJACENT GRADE
- OF TREE PIT
- 18" HARDWOOD STAKE, DRIVEN 12" INTO UNDISTURBED GROUND, 2 FEET PER TREE. SECURE STRAP TO STAKE WITH 1" ROOFING NAIL OR KNOT. 2"-3" SHREDDED MULCH, KEEP 6" AWAY FROM ROOT FLARE
- 2"-3" SHREDDED MULCH, KEEP 6" AWAY FROM ROOT FLARE
- REMOVE BURLAP AND WIRE BASKET ENTIRELY TO THE EXTENT FEASIBLE. DO NOT LEAVE WIRE BASKET OR BURLAP IN HOLE
- COMMON BORROW





 $-\bigcirc$

 $-\bigcirc$

 $-\bigcirc$

PLOTTED: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 AT 11:01 AM FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pLD-P001_CA5.dgn





LIVE ST.	AKES
AREA (AC)	0.22
AREA (SF)	9766.15
AREA (SY)	1085.13

OXBOW WETLAND PLANTINGS				
AREA (AC)	0.03			
AREA (SF)	1472.33			
AREA (SY)	163.59			

RIPARIAN PLANTINGS				
AREA (AC)	0.74			
AREA (SF)	32277.96			
AREA (SY) 3586.				

LOWLAND MEADOW SEED	
AREA (AC)	0.97
AREA (SF)	42044.11
AREA (SY)	4671.57

WET MEADOW SEED	
AREA (AC)	0.03
AREA (SF)	1472.33
AREA (SY)	163.59

NOTE: REFER TO KEY MAP (SHEET KM-01) FOR PARCEL INFORMATION.

SCALE: 1" = 20'

DATUM: NAD 83(2001) Horizontal NAVD 88 Vertical

LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE DIVISION I–495 & I–270 MANAGED LANES STUDY P3 PROGRAM CA-5 STREAM RESTORATION

SEMI–FINAL (65%) DESIGN– NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION

SHEET NO. 43 OF 76

TREAM RESTO	ORATION LANDSCAPE PLAN
<u>= 20</u> DATE <u>DEC</u>	CEMBÉR 2021 CONTRACT NO. <u>AW073B12</u>
Y SĆN	COUNTY MONTGOMERY
CĴN	
YK\$K	HORIZONTAL SCALE
168251/20-PR-0040-01	VERTICAL SCALE



тні
SUE
PR
I (M





PLOTTED: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 AT 11:02 AM FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pLD-P006_CA5.dgn

LIVE STAKES	
AREA (AC)	0.15
AREA (SF)	6425.10
AREA (SY)	713.90

RIPARIAN PLANTINGS	
AREA (AC)	0.31
AREA (SF)	13503.60
AREA (SY)	1500.40

LOWLAND MEADOW SEED	
AREA (AC)	0.46
AREA (SF)	19928.70
AREA (SY)	2214.30

OXBOW WETLAND PLANTINGS	
AREA (AC)	0.02
AREA (SF)	746.97
AREA (SY)	83.00

LOWLAND MEADOW SEED	
AREA (AC)	0.10
AREA (SF)	4525.88
AREA (SY)	502.88

		20' 0 20' 40' SCALE: 1" = 20'
		DATUM: NAD 83(2001) Horizontal NAVD 88 Vertical
	MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION	LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE DIVISION I-495 & I-270 MANAGED LANES STUDY P3 PROGRAM CA-5 STREAM RESTORATION SEMI-FINAL (65%) DESIGN- NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION
REVISIONS	CA–5 STREAM RESTC	RATION LANDSCAPE PLAN
SEMI-FINAL REVIEW DECEMBER 2021 IIS DOCUMENT/PLAN IS DRAFT AND JBJECT TO CHANGE. IT IS AN TERAGENCY/INTRA-AGENCY DELIBERATIVE DMMUNICATION THAT IS NOT FOR JBLIC DISCLOSURE UNDER MD. GENERAL	SCALE $1" = 20'$ DATEDECDESIGNEDBYSCNDRAWNBYCJNCHECKEDBYKSKMDE/PRD168251/20-PR-0040-01	EMBER 2021 CONTRACT NO. <u>AW073B12</u> COUNTY <u>MONTGOMERY</u> LOGMILE HORIZONTAL SCALE VERTICAL SCALE
ROVISIONS CODE ANN. § 4-344 MARYLAND PUBLIC INFORMATION ACT).	DRAWING NO. LS-06	OF 09 SHEET NO. 46 OF 76

NOTE: REFER TO KEY MAP (SHEET KM-01) FOR PARCEL INFORMATION.







LIVE STAKES	
AREA (AC)	0.14
AREA (SF)	6098.40
AREA (SY)	677.60

RIPARIAN PLANTINGS	
AREA (AC)	0.62
AREA (SF)	27007.20
AREA (SY)	3000.80

LOWLAND MEADOW SEED	
AREA (AC)	0.76
AREA (SF)	33105.60
AREA (SY)	3678.40

LOWLAND MEADOW SEED	
AREA (AC)	0.15
AREA (SF)	6734.38
AREA (SY)	748.26

TURFGRASS ESTABLISHMENT	
AREA (AC)	0.01
AREA (SF)	435.60
AREA (SY)	48.40



TURFGRASS ESTABLISHMENT	
AREA (AC)	0.16
AREA (SF)	6934.75
AREA (SY)	770.53





 $-\bigcirc$

PLOTTED: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 AT 11:02 AM FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pLD-P009_CA5.dgn







'n

 $-\bigcirc$

PLOTTED: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 AT 11:02 AM FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pDP-V001_CA5.dgn





4+00 370 — 360 — APPROXIMATE LOCATION ----18" F.M. SEWER PIPE ELEV. UNKNOWN 350 — 3.2% 3.3% 340 ——— 33 4 94 346.41 347. 44 09 0 4+ STA. 330 —

LEGEND

4+00

----- PROPOSED GROUND ------ EXISTING GROUND

PLOTTED: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 AT 11:02 AM FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pDP-V002_CA5.dgn

'n

 $-\bigcirc$









'n

PLOTTED: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 AT 11:02 AM FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pDP-V003_CA5.dgn







LEGEND

----- PROPOSED GROUND ------- EXISTING GROUND

'n

PLOTTED: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 AT 11:02 AM FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pDP-V004_CA5.dgn







'n

 $-\bigcirc$

— —

PLOTTED: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 AT 11:02 AM FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pDP-V005_CA5.dgn







'n

 $-\bigcirc$

-

PLOTTED: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 AT 11:02 AM FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pDP-V006_CA5.dgn



24 + 00

330 -

320 -

NOTE: UTILITY ELEVATIONS UNKNOWN. STREAM CROSSING LOCATIONS APPROXIMATED FROM FIELD SURVEY AND GIS DATA. UTILITY TEST PITS HAVE NOT YET BEEN PERFORMED. EXACT STATION AND ELEVATIONS OF CROSSINGS WILL BE INDICATED ONCE DATA IS AVAILABLE.



LEGEND

----- PROPOSED GROUND ------- EXISTING GROUND

STA

'n

 $-\bigcirc$

PLOTTED: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 AT 11:02 AM FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pDP-V007_CA5.dgn







'n

 $-\bigcirc$

PLOTTED: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 AT 11:02 AM FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pDP-V008_CA5.dgn





'n

PLOTTED: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 AT 11:02 AM FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pDP-V009_CA5.dgn





LEGEND

----- PROPOSED GROUND

------- EXISTING GROUND

m

PLOTTED: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 AT 11:02 AM FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pDP-V010_CA5.dgn

CA-5 TRIBUTARY 1 PROFILE

SCALE: 1" = 20' DATUM

8' 🗖

40' 0 SCALE: 1" = 4' A: NAD 83 (2001) Horizontal NAVD 88 Vertical	HIGHWAY HYDRAULICS DIVISION I-495 & I-270 MANAGED LANES STUDY P3 PROGRAM CA-5 STREAM RESTORATION SEMI-FINAL (65%) DESIGN- NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION
REVISIONS	CA-5 STREAM RESTORATION PROFILE
SEMI EINAL DEV/IEW/	SCALE <u>1" = 20</u> DATE <u>DECEMBÉR 2021</u> CONTRACT NO. <u>AW073B12</u>
DECEMBER 2021	DESIGNED BY SCN COUNTY MONTGOMERY
HIS DOCUMENT/PLAN IS DRAFT AND UBJECT TO CHANGE. IT IS AN ITERAGENCY/INTRA-AGENCY DELIBERATIVE OMMUNICATION THAT IS NOT FOR UBLIC DISCLOSURE UNDER MD. GENERAL	DRAWN BY CJN LOGMILE CHECKED BY KSK HORIZONTAL SCALE 1" = 20' MDE/PRD 168251/20-PR-0040-01 VERTICAL SCALE 1" = 4'
ROVISIONS CODE ANN. § 4-344 MARYLAND PUBLIC INFORMATION ACT).	DRAWING NO. DP-10 OF 12 SHEET NO. 59 OF 76



LEGEND

----- PROPOSED GROUND ------ EXISTING GROUND

'n

PLOTTED: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 AT 11:02 AM FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pDP-V011_CA5.dgn







CA-5 POND OUTLET PROFILE

313.50

0+00

72 72

NOTE: UTILITY ELEVATIONS UNKNOWN. STREAM CROSSING LOCATIONS APPROXIMATED FROM FIELD SURVEY AND GIS DATA. UTILITY TEST PITS HAVE NOT YET BEEN PERFORMED. EXACT STATION AND ELEVATIONS OF CROSSINGS WILL BE INDICATED ONCE DATA IS AVAILABLE.



LEGEND

330 _____

APPROXIMATE POND BOTTOM ELEV. 312.4

320 —

310 —

300 —

290 —

-1+00

----- PROPOSED GROUND ------ EXISTING GROUND

m

———

PLOTTED: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 AT 11:02 AM FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pDP-V012_CA5.dgn



SCALE: 1" = 20'

DATUM

8' 🔳

4' 5 SCALE: 1" = 4' A: NAD 83 (2001) Horizontal NAVD 88 Vertical	HIGHWAY HYDRAULICS DIVISION I–495 & I–270 MANAGED LANES STUDY P3 PROGRAM CA–5 STREAM RESTORATION SEMI–FINAL (65%) DESIGN– NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION
REVISIONS	CA-5 STREAM RESTORATION PROFILE
	SCALE <u>1" = 20'</u> DATE <u>DECEMBER 2021</u> CONTRACT NO. <u>AW073B12</u>
SEIVII-FINAL REVIEV DECEMBER 2021 HIS DOCUMENT/PLAN IS DRAFT AND UBJECT TO CHANGE. IT IS AN ITERAGENCY/INTRA-AGENCY DELIBERATIVE OMMUNICATION THAT IS NOT FOR UBLIC DISCLOSURE UNDER MD. GENERAL POVISIONS CODE ANN. 8.4.244	DESIGNED BY SCN COUNTY MONTGOMERY DRAWN BY CJN LOGMILE
MARYLAND PUBLIC INFORMATION ACT)	DRAWING NO. DP-12 OF 12 SHEET NO. 61 OF 76



STA 1+50.00



 $- \bigcirc -$

 $-\bigcirc$

LEGEND

PROPOSED GROUND ------- EXISTING GROUND

PLOTTED: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 AT 11:02 AM FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pHC-X001_CA5.dgn













STA 4+50.00



 $- \bigcirc -$

 $-\bigcirc$

LEGEND

PROPOSED GROUND ------- EXISTING GROUND

B PLOTTED: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 AT 11:02 AM FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pHC-X002_CA5.dgn















STA 7+50.00



 $- \bigcirc -$

<u></u> –

 $-\bigcirc$

LEGEND

PROPOSED GROUND ------- EXISTING GROUND

PLOTTED: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 AT 11:02 AM FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pHC-X003_CA5.dgn









MAINSTEM 1





- \bigcirc -

 $-\bigcirc$

B PLOTTED: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 AT 11:02 AM FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pHC-X004_CA5.dgn

DRAWING NO.

SHEET NO. 65 OF 76



STA 13+50.00



 $- \bigcirc -$

— — —

 $-\bigcirc$

LEGEND

PROPOSED GROUND ------- EXISTING GROUND

B PLOTTED: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 AT 11:02 AM FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pHC-X005_CA5.dgn









MAINSTEM 1



STA 16+50.00



 $- \bigcirc -$

 $-\bigcirc$

LEGEND

PROPOSED GROUND ------- EXISTING GROUND

PLOTTED: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 AT 11:02 AM FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pHC-X006_CA5.dgn















STA 19+50.00



 $- \bigcirc -$

— — —

 $-\bigcirc$

LEGEND

PROPOSED GROUND ------- EXISTING GROUND

PLOTTED: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 AT 11:02 AM FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pHC-X007_CA5.dgn









MAINSTEM 1



STA 22+50.00



 $- \bigcirc -$

 $-\bigcirc$

LEGEND

PROPOSED GROUND ------- EXISTING GROUND

PLOTTED: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 AT 11:02 AM FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pHC-X008_CA5.dgn









MAINSTEM 1


STA 25+50.00



 $- \bigcirc -$

 $-\bigcirc$

LEGEND

PROPOSED GROUND-------EXISTING GROUND

 INC.

 PLOTTED: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 AT 11:02 AM

 FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pHC-X009_CA5.dgn









MAINSTEM 1

10[°]____





STA 1+58.00

COASTAL RESOURCES INC.

 $- \bigcirc -$

 $-\bigcirc$

LEGEND

PROPOSED GROUND ------- EXISTING GROUND

B PLOTTED: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 AT 11:02 AM FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pHC-X010_CA5.dgn















STA 4+50.00



 $- \bigcirc -$

 $-\bigcirc$

LEGEND

PROPOSED GROUND ------- EXISTING GROUND

PLOTTED: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 AT 11:02 AM FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pHC-X011_CA5.dgn













STA 0+30.00



LEGEND

----- PROPOSED GROUND ------ EXISTING GROUND

В

— —









STA 0+50.00

TRIBUTARY 1

10' 20' CALE: 1" = 10'	MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION	I–495 & I–270 MANAGED LANES STUDY P3 PROGRAM CA–5 STREAM RESTORATION SEMI–FINAL (65%) DESIGN– NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION
REVISIONS	CA-5 STREAM REST	ORATION CROSS SECTION
	SCALE <u>1" = 10</u> DATE <u>DEC</u>	EMBÉR 2021 CONTRACT NO. <u>AW073B12</u>
DECEMBER 2021	DESIGNED BY <u>SCN</u>	COUNTY MONTGOMERY
HIS DOCUMENT/PLAN IS DRAFT AND JBJECT TO CHANGE. IT IS AN TERAGENCY/INTRA-AGENCY DELIBERATIVE OMMUNICATION THAT IS NOT FOR JBLIC DISCLOSURE UNDER MD. GENERAL	DRAWN BY <u>CJN</u> CHECKED BY <u>KSK</u> MDE/PRD <u>168251/20-PR-0040-01</u>	LOGMILEHORIZONTAL SCALE $1" = 10'$ VERTICAL SCALE $1" = 10'$
ROVISIONS CODE ANN. § 4-344 MARYLAND PUBLIC INFORMATION ACT).	DRAWING NO. XS-12	OF 15 SHEET NO. 73 OF 76



STA 0+30.00

0

-10



LEGEND

----- PROPOSED GROUND -----------------------EXISTING GROUND

10

20

30

В

— —

300

-50

-30

-40

-20







POND OUTFALL

10' 20' SCALE: 1" =10'	MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION STATE HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION	I–495 & I–270 MANAGED LANES STUDY P3 PROGRAM CA–5 STREAM RESTORATION SEMI–FINAL (65%) DESIGN– NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION
REVISIONS	CA-5 STREAM REST	ORATION CROSS SECTION
	SCALE <u>1["] = 10</u> DATE <u>DEC</u>	EMBÉR 2021 CONTRACT NO. <u>AW073B12</u>
SEIVII-FIINAL REVIEVV DECEMBER 2021	DESIGNED BY <u>SĈN</u> DRAWN BY CJN	COUNTY <u>MONTGOMERY</u>
HIS DOCUMENT/PLAN IS DRAFT AND UBJECT TO CHANGE. IT IS AN ITERAGENCY/INTRA-AGENCY DELIBERATIVE OMMUNICATION THAT IS NOT FOR UBLIC DISCLOSURE UNDER MD. GENERAL	CHECKED BY <u>K\$K</u> MDE/PRD <u>168251/20-PR-0040-01</u>	HORIZONTAL SCALE $1" = 10'$ VERTICAL SCALE $1" = 10'$
ROVISIONS CODE ANN. § 4-344 MARYLAND PUBLIC INFORMATION ACT).	DRAWING NO. XS-13	OF 15 SHEET NO. 74 OF 76



STA 1+25.00



 $-\bigcirc$

LEGEND

PROPOSED GROUND ------- EXISTING GROUND

PLOTTED: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 AT 11:02 AM FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pHC-X014_CA5.dgn













 $-\bigcirc$

LEGEND

----- PROPOSED GROUND

PLOTTED: Tuesday, March 08, 2022 AT 11:02 AM FILE: G:\Active\2017-29 BCS 2015-05A Design-Construction, WRA\Task 25 CA-5 Phase II design\Mapping\CAD\pHC-X015_CA5.dgn

TRIBUTARY 2

10' 20' SCALE: 1" = 10'	I-495 & I-270 MANAGED LANES STUDY P3 PROGRAM CA-5 STREAM RESTORATION SEMI-FINAL (65%) DESIGN- NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION	
REVISIONS	CA-5 STREAM RESTORATION CROSS SECTIO	Ν
SEMI-FINAL REVIEW DECEMBER 2021	SCALE <u>1" = 10'</u> DATE <u>DECEMBÉR 2021</u> CONTRACT NO. <u>AW073B12</u>	_
	DESIGNED BY <u>SCN</u> COUNTY <u>MONTGOMERY</u>	_
HIS DOCUMENT/PLAN IS DRAFT AND UBJECT TO CHANGE. IT IS AN NTERAGENCY/INTRA-AGENCY DELIBERATIVE OMMUNICATION THAT IS NOT FOR UBLIC DISCLOSURE UNDER MD. GENERAL	DRAWIN BT CJN LOGIVILE CHECKED BY KSK HORIZONTAL SCALE 1" = 10' MDE/PRD 168251/20-PR-0040-01 VERTICAL SCALE 1" = 10'	_ _
ROVISIONS CODE ANN. § 4-344 (MARYLAND PUBLIC INFORMATION ACT)	DRAWING NO. XS-15 OF 15 SHEET NO. 76 OF 76	