Wetland

Studies and Solutions, Inc.

a DAVEY € company

Version 2.3

Stream ID: S-E18	Crossing Start Date: 09/26/2023	Crossing Completion Date: 09/27/2023
Milepost: 275.7	Pre-Con Assessment Date: 09/22/2023	Post-Con Assessment Date: 09/27/2023
Station: 14569+14	Stream Classification: Perennial (Perennial, Intermittent, Ephemeral)	Bankfull Width (ft.): 7
County: Franklin	303(d) Impairment Listing: Not Impaired	Riffle:Pool Complexes Present? No

Item #	Resource Crossing Conditions	N/A	YES	NO
1.	Were all applicable resource specific crossing conditions satisfied? Time of Year Restrictions (TOYR)? N/A Fish Relocation? Yes Mussel Relocation? N/A		Х	
2.	Is this resource designated a wild or stockable trout stream?			Χ
3.	Which crossing methods were utilized during the stream crossing? (Select one or more) Dam & Pump, Flume, Cofferdam, Conventional Bore, Horizontal Directional Drill (HDD) Bore?		am & Pun	ıp
4.	Was the top 1-foot (12-inches) of streambed substrate segregated and stockpiled separate from trench spoils?		Х	
5.	Was excess material not needed for backfill removed and disposed of in an upland area?		Х	
6.	Was the top 12-inches of backfill made with clean native stream substrate?		Х	
7.	Was the pre-construction survey data provided and utilized during restoration in attempt to re-establish pre-construction contours?		Х	
8.	Were any field modifications to the stream implemented by project or regulatory personnel to address potential drainage or bank restoration limitations?			Х
9.	Were impervious trench breakers/plugs properly installed within 25-feet of top-of-bank to prevent subsurface erosion to or from the resource area?		Х	
10.	Was permanent seed and stabilization material (straw or matting) applied to riparian areas and stream banks prior to re-establishing flow to the impact area of the channel?		Х	
11.	Was the time of disturbance minimized by conducting resource work continuously to completion?		Х	
12.	Have civil surveys been scheduled to verify as-built conditions meet pre-construction conditions in accordance with the project Mitigation Framework and federal/state permit requirements?		Х	
13.	Are bareroot saplings required and/or scheduled to be planted for the dormant season $(10/1 - 4/30)$?	Х		
14.	Did any unauthorized discharges to unpermitted resources occur during the crossing? If so, explain the corrective actions implemented in the Comments section and include additional photos.			Χ

			,
Item #	Biological Conditions	Pre-Con	Post-Con
15.	Predominant Substrate Type (select one): Bedrock, Boulder (>10"), Cobble (2-10"), Gravel (0.1-2"), Sand (<0.1"), Mud/Silt/Clay	Gravel (0.1-2")	Gravel (0.1-2")
16.	Channel Conditions: Rating: 1-Optimal (80-100% stable banks), 2-Sub-optimal (60-80% stable banks), 3-Marginal (40-60% stable banks), 4-Poor (20-40% stable banks), 5-Severe (0-20% stable banks, highly eroded or unvegetated banks)	2 - Suboptimal	2 - Suboptimal
17.	Riparian Buffer Zone within ROW and ≤50 ft. from Stream Top-of-Bank: Rating: 1-Optimal (60-100% heavy vegetative cover), 2-Sub-optimal (30-60% mixed vegetated coverage), 3- Marginal (<30% vegetative coverage), 4-Poor (Mowed/maintained area or farmland, impervious area, sparsely vegetated coverage, etc.)		3 - Marginal
18.	Instream Habitat Conditions: Examples: Varied substrate sizes, varied combination of water velocities/depths, presence of woody/leafy debris, stable substrate with low amount of mobile particles, low embeddedness, shade protection, undercut banks, root mats, submerged aquatic vegetation. Rating: 1-Optimal (Habitat conditions present in >50% of resource), 2-Suboptimal (Habitat conditions in 30-50% of resource), 3-Marginal (Habitat conditions in 10-30% of resource), 4-Poor (Habitat conditions in 0-10% of resource)	1 - Optimal	2 - Suboptimal
19.	Channel Alterations: Examples: Straightened channel, non-MVP stream crossings, non-native riprap/rock along banks, concrete/gabions/concrete block, manmade embankments, constrictions w/in channel, livestock or agricultural impacts. Rating: 1-Negligible (unaltered/natural stream), 2-Minor (20-40% of resource disrupted by channel alterations), 3-Moderate (40-80% of resource disrupted), 4-Severe (>80% of resource disrupted)	1 - Negligible	1 - Negligible



Version 2.3

Comments/Remarks

9-22-2023: Pre con meeting took place. MVP El Kieth Davis Foreman Kevin Green. Discussed 10' ft buffer and soil managementS. Johnson
9-25-2023: 50' buffer topsoil removed and stockpiled separately from subsoilS. Johnson
9-26 -2023: Dam and pump installed. Energy dissipater installed. 10' buffer top soiled removed and stockpiled. 0"-6"stream substrate removed and stockpiled, 6"-12" of stream bed substrate removed and stockpiled separated. Streambed subsoil removed and separated. Trench excavation complete. Pipe installed and weldedS. Johnson
9-27-2023: Stream sub soil replaced and stream bed roughed in. 10' buffer was replaced and contoured in. 6"-12" of stream sub soil replaced. 0"-6" of stream sub soil replaced. 10' buffer zone was seeded with riparian permanent mix, temporary mix, and stabilized with matting. Rock checks where installed to reduce scour while streamflow resumes in channel. Stream flow restored at approximately 4:15 p.m. Rock checks removed approximately 5:00p.mS. Johnson

This report was written by Samuel Johnson
Print Name

Samuel Johnson
Signature

09/27/2023
Date

In accordance with the Mountain Valley Pipeline Consent Decree, Case No. CL18006874-00, (Issued October 11, 2019) this independent report was completed to document the on-site monitoring of instream invertebrate and fisheries resources during all construction activity

related to waterbody and wetland crossings, and document instream conditions and any impacts to the resources.





Required Photos



Wetland

Studies and Solutions, Inc.

a DAVEY company

Version 2.3

Optional Additional Photos

