

STREAM BIOLOGICAL CONDITIONS ENVIRONMENTAL AUDITOR REPORT

Version 2.3



Stream ID: S-C29	Crossing Start Date: 07/10/2023	Crossing Completion Date: 07/13/2023
Milepost: 229.6	Pre-Con Assessment Date: 07/08/2023	Post-Con Assessment Date: 07/14/2023
Station: 12132+73	Stream Classification: Ephemeral	Bankfull Width (ft.): 1.2
County: Montgomery	303(d) Impairment Listing: Not Impaired	Riffle:Pool Complexes Present? No

Item #	Resource Crossing Conditions	N/A	YES	NO
1.	If applicable, were all resource specific crossing conditions satisfied? Time of Year Restrictions (TOYR)? <u>N/A</u> Fish Relocation? <u>N/A</u> Mussel Relocation? <u>N/A</u>	X		
2.	Is this resource designated a wild or stockable trout stream?			X
3.	Which crossing methods were utilized during the stream crossing? (<i>Select one or more</i>) Dam & Pump, Flume, Cofferdam, Conventional Bore, Horizontal Directional Drill (HDD) Bore?	Dam & Pump, Flume		
4.	Was the top 1-foot (12-inches) of streambed substrate segregated and stockpiled separate from trench spoils?		X	
5.	Was excess material not needed for backfill removed and disposed of in an upland area?		X	
6.	Was the top 12-inches of backfill made with clean native stream substrate?		X	
7.	Was the pre-construction survey data provided and utilized during restoration in attempt to re-establish pre-construction contours?		X	
8.	Were any field modifications to the stream implemented by project or regulatory personnel to address potential drainage or bank restoration limitations?			X
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?		X	
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?		X	
11.	Was the time of disturbance minimized by conducting resource work continuously to completion?		X	
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?		X	
13.	Are bareroot saplings required and/or scheduled to be planted for the dormant season (10/1 – 4/30)?			X
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.			X

Item #	Biological Conditions	Pre-Con	Post-Con
15.	Predominant Substrate Type (select one): <i>Bedrock, Boulder (10"), Cobble (2-10"), Gravel (0.1-2"), Sand (0.1"), Mud/Silt/Clay</i>	Mud/Silt/Clay	Mud/Silt/Clay
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)	1 - Optimal	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-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.)	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)	4 - Poor	4 - Poor
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

**STREAM BIOLOGICAL CONDITIONS
ENVIRONMENTAL AUDITOR REPORT**

Version 2.3



Comments/Remarks

MVP EI for crossing is Chris Seymour.

7/10-13/23: Dam and pump on-site during the day, stream was flumed overnight. No stream flow was observed for the duration of the crossing. DEQ/MBP inspectors were on-site for each day of the crossing. – T. Cullop

7/10/23: Some subsoil was stored within the 50 ft. buffer zone with a 6in straw barrier between fill dirt and existing topsoil. – T. Cullop

7/10/23: Excess fill material was stored in proper upland area. – T. Cullop

7/11/23: Pipe was lowered into ditch and welded. – T. Cullop

7/12/23: Trench breakers were installed, and backfilling has begun. – T. Cullop

7/13/23: MVP EIs Chris and Dustin.

Flume was in-place from previous night. Stream roughed in. Encompass staked CL. Banks staked. Left bank brought to grade with topsoil. Right bank subsoil removed and brought to grade with topsoil. Spread H FERC inspector on site. Encompass on-site for survey stake out/as-built. - J. Greene

7/13/23: Final grade on stream completed and the stream was stabilized using proper riparian seed mix and matting. Perimeter controls are installed – T. Cullop

7/14/23: Storm event over night with approximately 1.8 inches of rainfall. – T. Cullop

7/14/23: Perimeter controls and stream stabilization have held up and functioning properly following the storm event. – T. Cullop

7/14/23: Stream has a small amount of stormwater flowing with minimal erosion. – T. Cullop

7/14/23: Downstream biological conditions appear unimpacted from construction activities. – T. Cullop

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.

<i>This report was written by</i>	Tanner Cullop <i>Print Name</i>	 <i>Signature</i>	07/14/2023 <i>Date</i>
-----------------------------------	---	----------------------	----------------------------------

STREAM BIOLOGICAL CONDITIONS ENVIRONMENTAL AUDITOR REPORT

Version 2.3

Required Photos



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



Photo Description: Downstream view of conditions outside the right-of-way during pre-construction assessment.



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



Photo Description: Downstream view of conditions outside the right-of-way during post-construction assessment.

STREAM BIOLOGICAL CONDITIONS ENVIRONMENTAL AUDITOR REPORT

Version 2.3

Optional Additional Photos



Photo Description: Topsoil removal.



Photo Description: Trenching.



Photo Description: Trench breakers being installed.



Photo Description: Stream material returned to the stream bed and fine grading.