

**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**

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

December 30, 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 Group,
5 Inc., 20 Corporate Woods Blvd., Albany, New York 12211. My qualifications have not changed
6 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 Assistant
9 Director for Cultural Resources and Senior Archaeologist.

10 **Purpose of Testimony**

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

12 A. The purpose of this testimony is to provide information concerning the potential
13 impacts on historic sites of the proposed voltage step-up facilities which will interconnect the
14 34.5 kV power line from the Groton Wind Project ("the Project") with the regional power grid.

1 These facilities are proposed to be located in Holderness, New Hampshire and are described in
2 the Third Supplemental Prefiled Testimony of Edward Cherian. In addition, I will discuss the
3 status of the Applicant's discussions with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers ("USACE") and the
4 New Hampshire Division of Historical Resources ("NH DHR") to address the issues raised in
5 NH DHR's memorandum dated October 28, 2010 to Attorney Iacopino which has been marked
6 for identification as Exhibit Buttolph 29 in this docket.

7 **Interconnection Facilities**

8 **Q. Since the time of your second prefiled supplemental testimony, have you**
9 **performed additional work and/or studies relative to the potential impact of the Project's**
10 **interconnection facilities upon historic sites?**

11 A. Yes. Berger conducted background research at NH DHR and conducted a site
12 visit to evaluate archaeological sensitivity. Building on this assessment and in consultation with
13 NH DHR, Berger undertook subsurface testing to investigate those areas assessed as
14 archaeologically sensitive.

15 **Q. Please summarize the results of your studies.**

16 A. Berger excavated 34 subsurface shovel tests within three archaeologically
17 sensitive areas. No cultural materials were recovered during the study.

18 **Q. In your professional opinion, will the interconnection facilities have an**
19 **unreasonable adverse effect on historic sites?**

20 A. No, based on the findings of the archaeological survey, it is expected that the
21 interconnection facilities will not have an unreasonable adverse effect on historic properties.
22 However, should there be any effects determined by the USACE in consultation with NH DHR,

1 it is expected that they would be mitigated in a manner deemed appropriate by the USACE in
2 consultation with the NH DHR.

3 **Status of Discussions with DHR and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (“USACE”)**

4 **Q. Please describe the status of your work with DHR and USACE.**

5 A. On November 29, 2010, a meeting was held at NH DHR to discuss next steps for
6 completion of the Project Area Form (“PAF”) for the Groton Wind Project. Since that meeting,
7 an outline has been developed for the PAF that was accepted by the NH DHR. Ongoing
8 dialogue with NH DHR and the USACE continues. It is expected that the PAF will be submitted
9 to the NH DHR on January 19, 2011, for review on January 26, 2011.

10 **Q. Does this conclude your testimony?**

11 A. Yes.

12 719541_1.DOCX