Wetland

Studies and Solutions, Inc.

a DAVEY € company

Version 2.3

Stream ID: S-D2	Crossing Start Date: 11/04/2024 Crossing Completion Date: 11/	
Milepost: 284.8	Pre-Con Assessment Date: 10/31/2024	Post-Con Assessment Date: 11/05/2024
Station: 15044+79	Stream Classification: Perennial (Perennial, Intermittent, Ephemeral)	Bankfull Width (ft.): 18
County: Pittsylvania	303(d) Impairment Listing: 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? N/A Mussel Relocation? N/A		Х	
2.	Is this resource designated a wild or stockable trout stream?	Х		
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?		N/A	
4.	Was the top 1-foot (12-inches) of streambed substrate segregated and stockpiled separate from trench spoils?			
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?			
7.	Was the pre-construction survey data provided and utilized during restoration in attempt to re-establish pre-construction contours?			
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.			Х

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-Suboptimal (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)	4 - Poor	3 - Marginal
17.	Riparian Buffer Zone within ROW and ≤50 ft. from Stream Top-of-Bank: Rating: 1-Optimal (60-100% heavy vegetative cover), 2-Suboptimal (30-60% mixed vegetated coverage), 3- Marginal (<30% vegetative coverage), 4-Poor (Mowed/maintained area or farmland, impervious area, sparsely vegetated coverage, etc.)	2 - Suboptimal	2 - Suboptimal
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)	3 - Marginal	3 - Marginal
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)	2 - Minor	2 - Minor

Wetland

Studies and Solutions, Inc.

a DAVEY € company

Version 2.3

Comments/Remarks

10/31/2024: Pre-construction assessment was conducted for a bank repair of S-D2. Damage to the banks was a result of Hurricane HeleneN. Fillip
11/01/2024 through 11/03/2024: Bridge installation over the resource and establishing access to the resource. Crew prepping to complete the workN. Fillip
11/04/2024: Controls were placed along the damaged slope and a turbidity curtain was placed within the resource around the work area to limit material from moving off site. Once controls were in place the banks were regraded to a 3:1 slope. Stabilization and ECDs were re-installed along the banks and buffers of the resource and the crew began pulling out of the areaN. Fillip
Item #8: Field modification to the right bank was implemented to address the erosion and provide a stable angle of repose for long-term stabilization goals.
11/05/2024: The bridge was removed from over the resource and the post construction assessment was completed. No unauthorized discharges or impacts to biological conditions were observed during the bank repairsN. Fillip

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.

This report was written by	Natasha Fillip	Edm M	11/05/2024	
	Print Name	Signature	Date	

Wetland

Studies and Solutions, Inc.

a DAVEY € company

Version 2.3





Photo Description: Downstream view of permitted impact area during post-construction assessment.

Photo Description: Conditions of the downstream area outside the ROW during post-construction assessment.

Version 2.3



Optional Additional Photos



Erosion control matting installed properly.

stable and no improvements were made or needed.