

# STREAM BIOLOGICAL CONDITIONS ENVIRONMENTAL AUDITOR REPORT

Version 2.3



<b>Stream ID:</b> S-MM13	<b>Crossing Start Date:</b> 10/23/2024	<b>Crossing Completion Date:</b> 11/01/2024
<b>Milepost:</b> 229	<b>Pre-Con Assessment Date:</b> 10/21/2024	<b>Post-Con Assessment Date:</b> 11/01/2024
<b>Station:</b> 12098+44	<b>Stream Classification:</b> Ephemeral (Perennial, Intermittent, Ephemeral)	<b>Bankfull Width (ft.):</b> 5
<b>County:</b> Montgomery	<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>	Cobble (2-10")	Cobble (2-10")
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)	2 - Suboptimal	2 - Suboptimal
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.)	2 - Suboptimal	2 - Suboptimal
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)	2 - Suboptimal	2 - Suboptimal
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	2 - Minor

**STREAM BIOLOGICAL CONDITIONS  
ENVIRONMENTAL AUDITOR REPORT**

Version 2.3



**Comments/Remarks**

10/21/2024: Bridge was not installed at the time of inspection. Sediment trapping measures are installed and functioning as intended. Failed slope is contained above resource. -C. VanEeckhout

10/22/2024: Bridge was installed over the resource and area was prepped for bank repair. -N. Fillip

10/23/2024: Before beginning the bank repair it was established that work would have to be done within the OHWM. The crew established a dam and pump to ensure no material ended up moving off site. Once the dam and pump was established the crew removed the upland material from the bank and the stream substrate was re-established. After completing the repairs within the OHWM, the dam and pump was removed and flow was restored. SSF was placed just above the OHWM to ensure that any loose material from upslope work did not make its way into the resource. -N. Fillip

Item #8: Bank modification with riprap was installed along the repaired bank to ensure long-term stability of the resource.

10/24/2024 through 10/31/2024: Work upslope of the bank continued and the resource remained protected and unimpacted. -N. Fillip

11/01/2024: Work surrounding the resource was completed and the post construction assessment was completed. No unauthorized discharges or impact to biological conditions were observed during the bank repairs. -N. Fillip

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>Natasha Fillip</b> <i>Print Name</i>	 <i>Signature</i>	<b>11/01/2024</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:** Bank repair underway within resource.



**Photo Description:** Upstream dam installed for bank repair



**Photo Description:** Downstream dam installed for bank repair.



**Photo Description:** Overview of repaired slope.