Mountain Valley Stream Biological Conditions EA Report							
Project Name H-600 Pipeline S		Spread D <b>AFE</b> 124300132		2 Spread	H-600 Pipeline	-600 Pipeline Spread D	
Contractor Precision		•		Report #	382	32	
Enviror	nmental Auditor Scott Wessel			Date/Time	11/11/2023 8:	56 AM	
Stream ID S-A74		Crossing Start Date 11/11/2023 Crossing Completion Date		ion Date 11/2	22/2023		
Milepost 115.01		Pre-Con Assessment Date 11/11/2023 Post-Con Assessment Date		nent Date 11/2	25/2023		
Station 6072+65		Bankfull Width (	<b>t.)</b> 4.0	Riffle:Pool Complexes	l Complexes Present?		
	State WV	Stream Classification	Ephemeral	•			
С	ounty Nicholas	303(d) Impairment Listi	ng No				
	<u>'</u>	Resource Post-Cro	ssing Condition	ons			
1	Were all applicable resource specific crossing conditions satisfied?				N/A		
'	Time of Year Restrictions (TOYR)? N/A Mussel Relocation? N/A						
2	This question is not applicable in WV.						
3	Which crossing methods were utilized during the stream crossing? (If so select one or more)  Dam & Pump Flume Cofferdam Conventional Bore Horizontal Directional Drill (HDD) Bore						
4	Was the top 1-foot (12-inches) of streambed substrate segregated and stockpiled separate from trench spoils?				Yes		
5	Was excess material not needed for backfill removed and disposed of in an upland area?				Yes		
6	Was the top 12-inches of backfill made with clean native stream substrate?			Yes			
7	Was the pre-construction survey data utilized during restoration in attempt to re-establish pre- construction contours?			Yes			
8	Were any field modifications to the stream implemented by project or regulatory personnel to address potential drainage or bank restoration limitations?			No			
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?				Yes		
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?			Yes			
11	Was the time of disturbance minimized by conducting resource work continuously to completion?			Yes			
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?				Yes		
13	Are bareroot saplings required and/or scheduled to be planted for the dormant season (10/1 - 4/30)?				N/A		
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.			No			
		Biological Condition			Pre-Con	Post-Con	
15	Predominant Substrate Ty (<0.1"), Mud/Silt/Clay	pe (select one):Bedrock, Bould	er (>10"), Cobble (2	-10"), Gravel (0.1-2"), San	d Mud/Silt/Cl ay	Mud/Silt/Cl ay	
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			
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.)				4		

MVP-ENV-14 REV 1 Page 1 of 4

AFE	124300132	Date/Time	11/11/2023 8:56 AM	Report	# 382	
Biological Conditions Continued						Post-Con
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, Varied combination of water velocities, 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
19	Channel Alterations: Examples: Straighte along banks, concrete/gabions/concrete block, r agricultural impacts Rating: 1-Negligible (unalte channel alterations), 3-Moderate (40-80% of	manmade emba ered/natural stre	nkments, constrictions w/in channel, li am), 2-Minor (20-40% of resource dis	vestock or rupted by	1	1

## **Additional Notes**

11/11/23 - Stream S-A74 had no stream flow but a dam and pump around was set up in case of emergency. The top 12" of stream substrate material was removed, put into labeled super sacks, and staged in an upland area. Topsoil for stream banks were removed and segregated from subsoil material in an upland area on the going away side (GAS) of the resource. Solid rock was hit soon after trenching began; therefore blasting was scheduled for the following day.

11/12/23 to 11/13/23 – Blasting operations took place over the next two days on the coming in side (CIS) and GAS of the resource. During this time pipe preparation in the upland area on the CIS was conducted with welding and x-ray operations.

11/14/23 – 11/15/23 – Due to the close proximity of stream S-A74 to stream S-A75, many of the same operations were conducted in conjunction with the adjacent stream. The pipe was being installed across stream S-A75 while trenching operations were being conducted through S-A74 after blasting operations were completed.

11/16/23 to 11/17/23 – The ditch line was padded with sandbags for the pipe to rest on through the section of S-A74 prior to the pipe on the GAS being lowered in and welding operations commencing on the loose end. After the tie-in welds on the loose end were completed, the section of pipe between S-A74 and S-A75 was lowered in and welding operation began. X-ray, blasting, and coating activities took place once the welding was completed.

11/18/23 - The focus shifted to padding the pipe once coating was completed.

11/19/23 - No work was conducted on Sunday.

11/20/23 to 11/21/23 – Once the trench breakers were installed on the CIS and GAS of the resource, padding continued inside the resource area as well as to the tie in section between the two resources (S-A74, S-A75).

11/22/23 – Once the pipe was padded, the trench in the stream area was backfilled to with in 12" of the original grade. The topsoil for the stream banks and buffer zones were replaced prior to the top 12" of the streams substrate being restored. Survey verified that the elevations and contours met preconstruction specifications.

The proper seed mix for the 10' buffer zones was applied and erosion control blankets were installed on the CIS and GAS of the stream. The pump and dam were removed from the channel and flow was restored.

Numbers 17 and 18 were rated "4" and "3" due to lack of vegetation in the impact area following the completion of crossing and restoration efforts. The disturbed area for stream S-A74 was properly stabilized and seeded with the appropriate permanent seed mix in accordance with Appendix B: Restoration Work Plan of the Mountain Valley Pipeline Comprehensive Stream and Wetland Monitoring, Restoration and Mitigation Framework.

In accordance with the Mountain Valley Pipeline Comprehensive Stream and Wetland Monitoring, Restoration and Mitigation Framework, 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.

Name	Signature	Company	Date	
Scott Wessel	Att Idas	SWCA	11/25/2023	

MVP-ENV-14 REV 1 Page 2 of 4



MVP-ENV-14 REV 1 Page 3 of 4



MVP-ENV-14 REV 1 Page 4 of 4