Wetland

Studies and Solutions, Inc.

a DAVEY € company

Version 2.3

Stream ID: S-EF12	Crossing Start Date: 03/21/2025	Crossing Completion Date: 03/21/2025
Milepost: 260.3	Pre-Con Assessment Date: 03/21/2025	Post-Con Assessment Date: 03/21/2025
Station: 13755+73	Stream Classification: Perennial (Perennial, Intermittent, Ephemeral)	Bankfull Width (ft.): 20
County: Franklin	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?		Cofferdam	I
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?			
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	Cobble (2-10")	Cobble (2-10")
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	1 - Optimal
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)	2 - Suboptimal	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	2 - Minor

Wetland

Studies and Solutions, Inc.

a DAVEY company

Version 2.

Comments/Remarks

03/21/2025: Pre-construction meeting was held and pre-construction auditor assessment was completed. A turbidity curtain was installed along the right bank in need of repair. Once the curtain was installed, the stream bank was laid back to a stable angle of repose (~3:1) slope. Geotech fabric was laid out, and keyed in on the bank, and class III riprap was installed. The adjacent bank grades were tied in and CFS was installed. The turbidity curtain was removed, temporary and permanent seed was applied over the disturbed area on the bank, and ECM was installed. The bank restoration was completed and no unauthorized impacts to the resource or biological conditions were observed during the completion of the stream bank repair. Post-construction auditor assessment and photo documentation were completed. -A. Breeding Item #8: Class III riprap was installed along the right bank to provide long term stability to the bank and pipe crossing area.

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	Allie Breeding	and	03/21/2025
	Print Name	Signature	Date

Wetland

Studies and Solutions, Inc.

a DAVEY company

Version 2.3

Required Photos



Version 2.3



Optional Additional Photos

