

**THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
BEFORE THE
NEW HAMPSHIRE
SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE**

DOCKET NO. 2010-01

**APPLICATION OF GROTON WIND, LLC
FOR A CERTIFICATE OF SITE AND FACILITY**

**SUPPLEMENTAL PREFILED TESTIMONY OF
HOPE E. LUHMAN
ON BEHALF OF
GROTON WIND, LLC**

October 12, 2010

1 **Qualifications**
2

3 **Q. Please state your name, business address and qualifications.**

4 A. My name is Hope E. Luhman. My business address is: The Louis Berger
5 Group, Inc., 20 Corporate Woods Blvd., Albany, New York 12211. My qualifications
6 have not changed from what was described in my March 2010 prefiled testimony.

7 **Q. Who is your current employer and what position do you hold?**

8 A. I am employed by The Louis Berger Group, Inc. ("Berger") as an
9 Assistant Director for Cultural Resources and Senior Archaeologist.

10 **Purpose of Testimony**

11 **Q. What is the purpose of your supplemental prefiled testimony?**

12 A. The purpose of this testimony is to update the information contained in my
13 prefiled direct testimony submitted with the Application in this docket on March 26,

1 2010. That testimony concerns the potential impacts of the Groton Wind, LLC wind
2 project (“the Project”) on historic sites.

3 **Impact on Historic Sites**

4 **Q. Since the time of your prefiled direct testimony, have you performed**
5 **additional work and/or studies to determine the Project’s impacts on historic sites?**

6 A. Yes. Berger completed a Project Area Form (“PAF”) regarding
7 architectural resources within the area of potential effect (“APE”) and the Phase IB
8 archaeological survey. The APE is the geographic area(s) within which an undertaking
9 (such as the Project) may directly or indirectly effect historic properties, if such
10 properties are found to exist. For the Project, the APE for the architectural survey is the
11 viewshed within a three-mile radius of the Project. For the archaeological survey, it is
12 defined as that area where ground disturbance is expected to occur. The PAF provides
13 historical and architectural information for the APE and offers an opinion as to the need
14 for further work, if necessary. The Phase IB archaeological survey evaluates the
15 sensitivity model developed by the Phase IA through subsurface and additional
16 reconnaissance survey of the APE.

17 **Q. Please summarize the results of your additional studies.**

18 A. The Phase IB archaeological survey fieldwork has been concluded. No
19 historic properties were identified that will be impacted by the proposed Project. It is
20 Berger’s opinion that no further archaeological survey is warranted. The Phase IB report
21 is currently in preparation, but the end-of-field (“EOF”) letter is submitted with the

1 Applicant's supplemental filing as Appendix 50. The USACE and the NH DHR will
2 review the EOF and the subsequent Phase IB report.

3 The PAF is still under review by the lead federal agency, the U.S. Army Corps of
4 Engineers ("USACE") in consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office, known
5 as the New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources ("NH DHR"). Pending further
6 review by the USACE in consultation with the NH DHR, it is Berger's opinion that
7 further survey is necessary for two properties in West Plymouth and further survey in the
8 form of a *Historic District Form* for Rumney. As defined by NH DHR, a Historic
9 District Form "summarize[s] the history, architecture and significance of a group of
10 resources that could be designated as a local historic district or listed in the National or
11 New Hampshire State Registers of Historic Places. The area discussed in a historic
12 district area form is defined by a cluster of historically or architecturally related
13 resources."

14 **Q. Have you had any meetings with state or federal agencies since March**
15 **26, 2010 regarding the Project's impacts on historic sites?**

16 A. Yes. A meeting was held with NH DHR, USACE and the Applicant at the
17 NH DHR on April 5, 2010 to discuss the Project and resolve discussions concerning APE
18 for the architectural survey. I had a follow-up telephone conversation with John Eddins
19 of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation on April 6, 2010 and the substance of
20 this conversation was relayed to the attendees of the April 5th meeting. As a result of
21 these communications, it has been determined that the viewshed within a three-mile
22 radius of the Project would define the APE. There have been no formal meetings since

1 that time, but productive discussions among the parties have continued via telephone and
2 electronic mail. This continued communication continues to move consideration of the
3 Project's historic properties forward.

4 **Q. Has your opinion that this Project will not have an unreasonable**
5 **adverse effect on historic sites changed since the time your prefiled direct testimony**
6 **was submitted in this docket?**

7 A. No. It is Berger's opinion that the Project will not have an unreasonable
8 adverse effect on any historic properties. Any adverse impacts determined by the USACE
9 in consultation with NH DHR will be mitigated in a manner deemed appropriate by the
10 USACE in consultation with the NH DHR.

11 **Q. Does this conclude your supplemental prefiled testimony?**

12 A. Yes.

13

14 696251_1.DOC