

# STREAM BIOLOGICAL CONDITIONS ENVIRONMENTAL AUDITOR REPORT

Version 2.3



<b>Stream ID:</b> S-H37	<b>Crossing Start Date:</b> 11/13/2023	<b>Crossing Completion Date:</b> 11/15/2023
<b>Milepost:</b> 277.7	<b>Pre-Con Assessment Date:</b> 11/11/2023	<b>Post-Con Assessment Date:</b> 11/15/2023
<b>Station:</b> 14673+10	<b>Stream Classification:</b> Ephemeral (Perennial, Intermittent, Ephemeral)	<b>Bankfull Width (ft.):</b> 6
<b>County:</b> Franklin	<b>303(d) Impairment Listing:</b> Not Impaired	<b>Riffle:Pool Complexes Present?</b> No

Item #	Resource Crossing Conditions	N/A	YES	NO
1.	Were all applicable 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		
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.	<b>Predominant Substrate Type (select one):</b> <i>Bedrock, Boulder (&gt;10"), Cobble (2-10"), Gravel (0.1-2"), Sand (&lt;0.1"), Mud/Silt/Clay</i>	Mud/Silt/Clay	Mud/Silt/Clay
16.	<b>Channel Conditions:</b> <b>Rating:</b> 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.	<b>Riparian Buffer Zone within ROW and ≤50 ft. from Stream Top-of-Bank:</b> <b>Rating:</b> 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	3 - Marginal
18.	<b>Instream Habitat Conditions:</b> <b>Examples:</b> 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. <b>Rating:</b> 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.	<b>Channel Alterations:</b> <b>Examples:</b> 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. <b>Rating:</b> 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**

10-27-23: Pre-construction meeting. The Precision Pipeline Foreman is Lance Romberg, and the MVP EI is Bill Leclair. During the meeting the plan to segregate topsoil and subsoil was discussed. The right bank will not be restored to the pre-construction slope and will instead be returned to a 3:1 slope. -T. Snideman

10-28-23 until 11-10-23: No activity at the resource crossing.

11-11-23: Pre-construction meeting prior to beginning the resource crossing. The Precision Pipeline Foreman is Kevin Green, and the MVP EI is Keith Davis. During the meeting it was discussed that the out banks will be graded at a 3:1 slope and soils will be segregated to meet all the permit requirements. -T. Snideman

11-13-23: The dam and pump and energy dissipator were installed. The top 12-inches of the topsoil and stream substrate were excavated and segregated. The subsoil was also excavated. A portion of the bank destabilized while trenching and is being restabilized. The trench was padded for the pipe installation. -T. Snideman

11-14-23: A large section of pipe was installed. Two welds were completed, x-rayed, and coated. -T. Snideman

11-15-23: The second weld was coated. The crew began padding and backfilling the GAS. The impervious trench breakers were installed 25-feet from the top of bank. Test leads were installed. Backfilling was completed and the survey team mapped out the stream contours. The banks were restored to a 3:1 slope. Stream substrate and the topsoil was returned. A riparian seed mix was applied, and straw matting was installed. Filter sock was also installed around the buffer zones. The dam and pump were removed. The resource crossing is now complete. -T. Snideman

No unauthorized discharges or impacts to biological conditions were observed during the crossing.

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>	<b>Traci Snideman</b> <i>Print Name</i>	 <i>Signature</i>	<b>11/15/2023</b> <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:** Conditions of the downstream area outside the ROW during pre-construction assessment.



**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.



# STREAM BIOLOGICAL CONDITIONS ENVIRONMENTAL AUDITOR REPORT

Version 2.3

## Optional Additional Photos



**Photo Description:** Excavation of the topsoil.



**Photo Description:** The topsoil has been segregated and stockpiled.



**Photo Description:** A trench breaker after installation.



**Photo Description:** The environmental crew installing straw matting during restoration.