

STREAM BIOLOGICAL CONDITIONS ENVIRONMENTAL AUDITOR REPORT

Version 2.3



Stream ID: S-NN11	Crossing Start Date: 04/18/2025	Crossing Completion Date: 04/18/2025
Milepost: 214.8	Pre-Con Assessment Date: 04/16/2025	Post-Con Assessment Date: 04/18/2025
Station: 11352+97	Stream Classification: Intermittent (Perennial, Intermittent, Ephemeral)	Bankfull Width (ft.): 5
County: Giles	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?	Cofferdam		
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>	Gravel (0.1-2")	Gravel (0.1-2")
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)	4 - Poor	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	2 - Suboptimal
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

04/16/2025: WSSI staff were notified of the void in stream S-NN11. Pre-construction photos were taken and the pre-construction assessment was completed. A temporary cofferdam was observed within the stream in order to restore flow to supply water to downstream cattle. -A. Breeding

04/18/2025: A pre-construction meeting was held with MVP, WSSI, and TRC representatives present. The temporary cofferdam was removed for a larger cofferdam to be installed. Once the cofferdam was installed, the void was excavated, with soils properly segregated, to determine the extent of the problem. Safety concerns arose when the excavation of the void progressed closer to the existing pipe. DCR was called to verify additional potential future repairs and examine the excavated void. The void was layered with bentonite and subsoil and tamped in to seal off the void. Once the void was repaired, topsoil was restored and seed applied. ECM was installed and properly keyed in. The cofferdam was removed and full flow restored to the stream. Post construction photos were taken and post-construction assessment was completed. There were no impacts to biological conditions observed during restoration efforts. -A. Breeding

Item #8: The bank was pulled back and excavated with hand tools, and the void repaired with backfilling the subgrade with layers of bentonite and native subsoil.

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>	Alyson Breeding <i>Print Name</i>	 <i>Signature</i>	04/18/2025 <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: A void appeared in stream S-NN11 that was channeling the stream underground.



Photo Description: A cofferdam was installed and soil properly segregated.



Photo Description: Void was excavated and layered with bentonite and native soil to repair.



Photo Description: ECM was installed and properly keyed in.