

STREAM BIOLOGICAL CONDITIONS ENVIRONMENTAL AUDITOR REPORT

Version 2.3



Stream ID: S-H37	Crossing Start Date: 04/08/2024	Crossing Completion Date: 04/10/2024
Milepost: 277.7	Pre-Con Assessment Date: 04/06/2024	Post-Con Assessment Date: 04/10/2024
Station: 14673+10	Stream Classification: Ephemeral (Perennial, Intermittent, Ephemeral)	Bankfull Width (ft.): 6
County: Franklin	303(d) Impairment Listing: Not 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)? <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.	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-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)	3 - Marginal	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.)	3 - Marginal	1 - Optimal
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)	3 - Moderate	3 - Moderate

**STREAM BIOLOGICAL CONDITIONS
ENVIRONMENTAL AUDITOR REPORT**

Version 2.3



Comments/Remarks

04-06-24: MVP E.I. Keith Davis, and foreman is William R Martin. Dig up for anomaly in pipe and to stabilize banks within the resource. A dam and pump will be utilized during in-stream work, the substrate and topsoil of banks material will be segregated and stockpiled separately. Hog wire will be used during final restoration to keep cows out from impacting the resource banks during vegetation establishment. -D. Fraise

04-08-24: Excavator removed topsoil from left bank 50-foot buffer zone, and stockpiled on top of curlex, the dam and pump was setup to convey stream flow around and pump through a sediment bag and stone energy dissipater. The left and right bank material was stripped and stockpiled on top of vegetation, removed eroded bank material from on top of substrate (approximately 3 inches), then removed resource substrate in two, 6-inch increments. Resource substrate and topsoil were stockpiled on top of timber mats. Subsoils excavation began. -D. Fraise

04-09-24: Hammering ditch for rock excavation of trench. Resource substrate was covered during work activities. A trench box was placed in the trench for pipe assessment. -D. Fraise

04-10-24: Pumped accumulated ditch water to dewatering structure and water released into established vegetation. Contractor coated pipe, placed a trench breaker, and backfilling began. Survey team was on-site shooting in both banks and stream bed. Topsoil was placed back on both banks, and substrate placed back into stream in the same manner it was removed. Both banks' 10-foot buffers were seeded and curlex installed. Removed dam and pump around from stream channel and removed rock checks after streamflow stabilized. Added hog wire on both 10 feet buffer zone to prevent cattle damage to resource impact area. Post-construction auditor assessment completed. -D. Fraise

04-11-24: Left bank 50-foot buffer was restored, seeded and straw mulched. Contractor removed equipment from site and the right bank's 50-foot buffer zone wasn't disturbed. -D. Fraise

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

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>	<u>Darrell Fraise</u> <i>Print Name</i>	<u></u> <i>Signature</i>	<u>04/11/2024</u> <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: Substrate segregation from other soils during work activities.



Photo Description: Dam and pump installed prior to resource disturbance.



Photo Description: Energy dissipater for dam and pump around.



Photo Description: Dewatering structure installed on-site.