Version 2.3



Stream ID: S-G18		Crossing Start Date: 09/28/2023 Crossing Completion		on Date: 09/30/2023		
Milepost: 275		Pre-Con Assessment Date: 09/27/2023	Post-Con Assessment Date: 09/30/2023			
Station: 14531+15 (Per		Stream Classification: Intermittent (Perennial, Intermittent, Ephemeral)	Bankfull Width (ft.): 2			
		303(d) Impairment Listing: Not Impaired	Riffle:Pool Complexe	es Presei	Present? No	
Item #		Resource Crossing Conditions		N/A	YES	NO
1.	Were all applicable resource spe Time of Year Restrictions (TOYR)	ecific crossing conditions satisfied? ? <u>N/A</u> Fish Relocation? <u>N/A</u> Mussel Reloca	tion? <u>N/A</u>		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?			Dam & Pump		
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 min	nimized 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 a	and/or scheduled to be planted for the dormant sea	ason (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		Mud/Silt/Clay
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)		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-Suboptimal (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)	2 - Suboptimal	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)	1 - Negligible	1 - Negligible

/ersion 2.3

Studies and Solutions, Inc.

Comments/Remarks

9-27-23 - Pre con meeting took place. Kieth Davis MVP EI Kevin Green Precision Foreman. E&S management, storm water management, test drilling/ blasting was discussed. Test drilling was conducted. -S. Johnson

9-28-23 - Dam pump and energy dissipater installed. 10' buffer topsoil removed. Stream sub soil removed and segregated. Trench excavated to designed depth. Pipe placed in trench awaiting welds. -S. Johnson

9/29/23 - Pipe welded and completed. Trench breakers installed streambed backfilled. Streambed roughed in. Stream bed surveyed in and fine graded with 12" of native substrate. Stream banks surveyed in and constructed using native topsoil. Stream banks reseeded and stabilized with matting. Temporary rock checks placed and clean water pump around energy dissipater was removed. Stream flow returned. -S. Johnson

9-30-23 - Rock checks removed and post con conditions were assessed. No impact to biological conditions. -S. Johnson

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	Samuel Johnson	A Hollow	09/30/2023	
	Print Name	Signature	Date	

Version 2.3



Required Photos



area during post-construction assessment. area outside the ROW during post-construction assessment. No impacts observed.

Version 2.3



Optional Additional Photos

