

**THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
BEFORE THE
SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE
DOCKET NO. 2015-04**

PRE-FILED DIRECT TESTIMONY OF ANN E. PEMBROKE

**APPLICATION OF PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
D/B/A EVERSOURCE ENERGY
FOR A CERTIFICATE OF SITE AND FACILITY FOR CONSTRUCTION OF A
NEW 115 kV TRANSMISSION LINE**

THE SEACOAST RELIABILITY PROJECT

April 12, 2016

1 **Qualifications and Purpose of Testimony**

2 **Q. Please state your name and business address.**

3 A. My name is Ann E. Pembroke. My business address is 25 Nashua Rd.,
4 Bedford, NH 03110.

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

6 A. My current employer is Normandeau Associates, an environmental
7 consulting firm. I am Vice President and Technical Director of the Marine Group.

8 **Q. Briefly summarize your educational background and work
9 experience.**

10 A. I have been employed as a marine biologist for my entire professional
11 career. I received my Bachelor of Science in Biology from Hobart and William Smith
12 College in 1973 after which I attended the College of Marine Studies, University of
13 Delaware, receiving my Master of Science in Marine Studies (Biology) in 1976.
14 Subsequently, I worked for the environmental consulting firm Pandullo Quirk Associates
15 and then for the University of Delaware.

16 I have previously worked on many projects similar to the current proposed
17 Project. I have worked with NextEra, as the Project Manager, to provide technical
18 expertise on the potential effects of electromagnetic fields emitted from a proposed
19 HVDC cable between islands in Hawaii. I also served as the Project Manager and
20 Benthic Ecologist for the Block Island Wind Farm project in Narragansett, RI. I assisted
21 in developing specialized study plans to characterize and assess impacts to benthic,
22 shellfish, and fisheries resources. A complete list of the previous projects I have worked
23 on is contained in my *curriculum vitae*, which is attached hereto. See Attachment A.

24 **Q. Have you testified before the New Hampshire Site Evaluation
25 Committee previously?**

26 A. No, I have not.

27 **Q. Are you familiar with the Seacoast Reliability Project (the “Project”)?**

28 A. Yes, I am familiar with the Project.

29 **Q. Please describe your role in the Project.**

30 A. On behalf of the Applicant, Public Service Company of New Hampshire
31 d/b/a Eversource Energy (“PSNH”), I prepared the characterization and impact

1 assessments for marine resources, including sediment, benthos, shellfish, and
2 aquaculture. I designed site specific surveys for shellfish (and participated in the field
3 effort) and benthic infauna. I oversaw the characterization and impact assessment for
4 Essential Fish Habitat (“EFH”) and other fishes. I directed and oversaw a water quality
5 modeling effort that was implemented by a subconsultant and was conducted to evaluate
6 the effects of the proposed submarine cable installation methods. I initiated coordination
7 with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (“NOAA”) Fisheries
8 regarding EFH and protected resources under the Endangered Species Act and with the
9 New Hampshire Fish and Game Department.

10 **Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?**

11 A. The purpose of my testimony is to support the marine resource
12 information described in PSNH’s Application for a Certificate of Site and Facility. I have
13 provided technical expertise related to effects of in-water construction on
14 marine/estuarine resources and developed site-specific investigations for those resources.
15 My testimony describes the resources mapped and evaluated for impacts within the
16 proposed crossing in Little Bay. These resources include substrate, water quality,
17 eelgrass, macroalgae, benthic infauna, benthic epifauna (e.g. lobsters and horseshoe
18 crabs), shellfish, finfishes, and aquaculture. Sarah Allen’s testimony describes salt marsh
19 habitat in the Project area. My testimony describes the Applicant’s efforts to reduce
20 impacts to marine resources and identifies the unavoidable impacts resulting from the
21 final design. Additionally, I describe the Applicant’s proposed compensatory mitigation
22 for those unavoidable impacts.

23 **Q. Please describe the assessment of wetland resources completed for the**
24 **Little Bay cable crossing.**

25 A. Normandeau conducted four site-specific surveys relevant to the in-water
26 resources along the Little Bay cable crossing. A survey using vibrocore, a technology for
27 collecting core samples for underground sediments and wetland soils, was conducted to
28 examine the sediments along the route. The primary purpose of this study was to provide
29 samples for cable engineers to determine their thermal properties. The study was also
30 completed to characterize the types of sediments through which the cables will be
31 installed.

1 A towed video survey was conducted to examine the shallow subtidal zone in the
2 vicinity of the eastern cable landing for evidence of eelgrass to confirm findings of the
3 annual aerial survey conducted for the Piscataqua Region Estuaries Partnership
4 (“PREP”). The Project’s eelgrass video survey was conducted in mid-October 2013, after
5 the period of peak productivity but before winter die-off. *See* Natural Resources Existing
6 Conditions Report, Appendix 7.

7 A benthic infauna survey was conducted along three transects running
8 perpendicular to the cable crossing to characterize the invertebrate community that would
9 be disturbed during cable installation. The survey of each transect included five sampling
10 locations including two that were outside the cable area shown on NOAA chart 13285
11 and three that were within the area that would be disturbed by cable installation. This
12 sampling design provided data that placed the impact area information in context with
13 nearby areas in Little Bay. This sampling also provided data that was useful for
14 evaluating the potential duration of temporary impacts to benthic infauna. A visual
15 survey of the western tidal flat was conducted by canoe at low tide to document the
16 presence of infaunal shellfish species in the Project area. The purpose of this survey was
17 to characterize resources in the Project area. *See* Natural Resources Existing Conditions
18 Report, Appendix 7.

19 In addition to site studies, Normandeau engaged RPS ASA, a global science and
20 technology solutions company, to conduct modeling to characterize the effects of the
21 proposed cable installation methods on water quality and nearby substrates where
22 sediments suspended by the installation will resettle.

23 Two in-water installation methods will be used for the Project, jet plowing across
24 the majority of the crossing and diver-assisted hand-jetting nearshore. Jet plowing will be
25 used for the majority of the crossing. Jet plowing simultaneously trenches and buries the
26 cables to the required depth (3.5 feet nearshore and 8 feet in the channel). Burial by
27 divers using handheld water jets will occur at either end of the cable lay as it approaches
28 the shoreline. Very close to both shores, the submarine cable will be buried using an
29 excavator working from timber mats in the Project corridor as the cable transitions to
30 land.

1 I directed the modeling prepared by RPS ASA. The results of this model were
2 used to evaluate impacts to living estuarine resources in the water column and on the
3 substrate.

4 **Q. Please explain the results of your sediment studies.**

5 A. The vibracore survey provided visual descriptions of the sediments present
6 throughout the depth of the substrate that will be affected by cable installation. Results
7 generally confirmed observations made during collection of benthic grabs samples in the
8 Project area and sediment data collected by UNH south of the Project area. Sediments on
9 the western tidal flat were predominantly silt-clay and sediments in the channel and
10 eastern channel slope were predominantly sand. Sediments in Welsh Cove, where the
11 eastern cable landfall is located, were sandy clay.

12 **Q. Please explain the results of your eelgrass survey.**

13 A. Water clarity during the eelgrass video survey was good and substrate
14 conditions were very discernable. There was no evidence of attached (viable) eelgrass
15 plants along the five transects conducted. This corroborated the conclusions of the PREP
16 aerial survey for eelgrass in the Project Area.

17 **Q. Please explain the results of your benthic and shellfish studies.**

18 A. The benthic infaunal survey provided characterization of the invertebrate
19 community that would be affected by cable installation. Findings included the following:

- 20 • Infaunal abundance was generally highest at the stations on the western
21 tidal flat, most variable in the channel, and most consistent along the channel slope.
- 22 • Total number of taxa was most consistent on the tidal flat and most
23 variable among the stations in the channel and along the channel slope.
- 24 • Within each of the three depth zones, eight or nine taxa together
25 comprised more than 90% of the total abundance in each zone.
- 26 • Four taxa were among the dominants in each of the three depth zones;
27 other dominants differed among the three depth zones.
- 28 • The dominant taxa are a mixture of short-lived, rapidly reproducing,
29 surface dwelling species that are indicative of habitats experiencing regular perturbations
30 and longer-lived, deeper dwelling species that indicate a relatively stable habitat. This

1 combination of taxa provides a resiliency to the community and indicates it is likely to
2 recover from environmental disturbances.

3 The visual inspection of the western tidal flat for shellfish had two primary
4 results:

- 5 • Softshell clams and razor clams are present on the flat.
- 6 • No oysters were observed on the flat and the areas examined did not
7 provide preferred habitat (hard substrate) for this species.

8 **Q. Please explain the results of your evaluation of the water quality**
9 **impacts from the installation of the submarine cable.**

10 A. The water quality modeling characterized both excess suspended
11 sediments (“SS”) (i.e., those in addition to ambient levels) generated by jet plowing and
12 by hand jetting as well as re-deposition of these sediments suspended by both
13 construction activities on the estuary floor. The jet plow model was run using spring tides
14 to identify the greatest potential extent of the plume and using a conservative advance
15 rate (100 meters per hour) to identify the longest potential duration of the plume. The
16 model results indicate that excess SS concentrations would be highest directly above and
17 adjacent to the jet plow and the plume would essentially follow the jet plow across Little
18 Bay. That is, the plume would be narrow and run downcurrent (generally north during
19 ebb tides and south during flood tides) from the jet plow. Highest SS concentrations
20 would occur directly above the substrate and concentrations would decrease higher in the
21 water column and with horizontal distance from the jet plow. The model also showed that
22 the highest levels of excess SS would dissipate within an hour and that virtually all
23 evidence of the jet plow passage would disappear within less than two hours after the
24 completion of each cable installation. Most of the SS is predicted to be re-deposited on
25 the estuary floor in the immediate vicinity of the installed cable. The installation of the
26 three cables required for the Project is predicted to result in a layer of sediments 10 to
27 >50 mm (0.4 to > 2 inches) thick being deposited over a 5.9 acre area. A layer of
28 sediments 0.1 to >0.5 mm (0.004 to 0.02 inch) thick is likely to be deposited over an 87.9
29 acre area. Because these sediments will not be consolidated, they may be re-suspended

1 and redistributed by currents. *See* Appendix 35 for a copy of the RPS ASA Suspended
2 Sediment Modeling Report.

3 It is possible, according to Caldwell Marine Inc., that the substrate conditions
4 along the crossing will allow a higher advance rate. If this happens, more of the crossing
5 will occur during ebb tide and the resulting suspended sediment plume will flow
6 primarily to the north. Suspended sediment concentrations in the plume would likely be
7 higher but the areal extent of the plume would likely be smaller than the model predicted.

8 A portion of the cable route on each side of Little Bay will not be accessible for
9 the jet plow. All of this work on the west side and along the section of the cable route
10 within Welsh Cove will be conducted inside a silt curtain enclosure to contain suspended
11 sediments. In these locations there will be virtually no sediment plume outside of the silt
12 curtains and sediments suspended during burial will be redeposited within the enclosure.
13 There is another section of the cable route offshore of Welsh Cove requiring burial by
14 divers where the tidal currents are too swift for silt curtains to be used effectively. The
15 diver burial activity in this area will generate a small sediment plume flowing towards the
16 north because the work must be conducted around slack high tide. Suspended sediments
17 will be redeposited primarily in the immediate vicinity of the cables.

18 It may not be feasible to achieve the required burial depth for the cables in the
19 sections of the Little Bay crossing adjacent to the rocky shorelines. In this case,
20 articulated concrete mattresses will be installed over the cables to provide the necessary
21 protection. This will result in the permanent conversion of habitat from unconsolidated
22 substrate to hard substrate. Over time, it is likely that the artificial hard substrate will be
23 colonized by macroalgae (similar to adjacent shoreline) and associated invertebrate
24 fauna.

25 Normandeau used the results of these studies and of desktop studies, researching
26 estuarine resources of Little Bay, to evaluate the potential impacts associated with the
27 installation and operation of transmission cables within the seafloor. These are described
28 later in this testimony.

29 **Q. Please describe the consideration that the Applicant and its**
30 **consultants have given to marine issues associated with the Project.**

1 A. The Seacoast Reliability Project team has engineered and designed the
2 Project to avoid and minimize impacts to aquatic and marine resources. Siting the cable
3 crossing in a previously identified cable area will limit the impacts to a previously
4 disturbed area. Reduction of the number of cables from six to three by increasing the size
5 of individual cables further minimizes the temporary footprint of the Project within Little
6 Bay. The selection of jet plowing as the preferred primary installation method will
7 minimize the duration of in-water construction. The cables will be buried to a shallower
8 depth (3.5 feet) on the tidal flats compared to the channel (8 feet), reducing the amount of
9 sediment disturbance. In the nearshore areas, the cables will be angled together to reduce
10 the footprint in the salt marsh and rocky shore. Installation of the cables during the fall
11 will avoid impacts to horseshoe crabs and winter flounder during their critical spring
12 spawning periods.

13 **Q. Will the Project monitor suspended sediments produced by the cable**
14 **installation?**

15 A. Yes, to ensure that the installation of the Project is in line with the
16 modeled estimates, PSNH has proposed a water quality monitoring plan to be
17 implemented during the jet plow installation of the cables. The plan has been
18 incorporated as part of the Section 401 Water Quality Certification request, Appendix 14.
19 The plan includes decision criteria for determining if the installation is in compliance
20 with water quality standards and a protocol for implementing changes in installation
21 procedures if needed.

22 **Q. What steps has PSNH taken to mitigate permanent impacts of the**
23 **Project on estuarine wetlands?**

24 A. Permanent conversion of up to about 0.15 acre of intertidal
25 unconsolidated bottom to artificial hard substrate (concrete mattresses) may be necessary
26 and would require mitigation. This is included in the in-lieu fee calculation for the
27 Project. For additional information on the in-lieu fee calculation, please reference the pre-
28 filed testimony of Sarah Allen.

29 **Q. In your opinion will this Project have a significant adverse effect on**
30 **marine and estuarine resources?**

- 1 A. In my opinion, this Project will not have a significant adverse effect on the
2 resources of Little Bay along the cable crossing.
- 3 • Jet-plowing minimizes the surface area directly disturbed during
4 installation and that disturbance will be temporary.
 - 5 • Water quality effects from jet-plowing are temporary and limited in space.
 - 6 • Benthic infaunal species that would be disturbed are widespread in the
7 general area and are, therefore, highly likely to repopulate the disturbed sediments
8 quickly.
 - 9 • The only potential permanent impact would be conversion of habitat from
10 unconsolidated bottom (“mud”) to hard substrate (concrete mattresses) in two small
11 areas, if the required burial depth cannot be achieved. Concrete, although manmade, is a
12 surface that is readily colonized by organisms such as macroalgae, mussels, and oysters
13 so it is expected that this artificial substrate will provide some habitat value.
 - 14 • There are no established eelgrass beds in the immediate Project area so
15 there will be no direct impacts to this important resource.
 - 16 • The closest eelgrass beds to the Project are located in Great Bay, beyond
17 the farthest reach of the suspended sediment plume predicted by the model so there will
18 be no indirect impacts to these beds.
 - 19 • Impacts to macroalgae will be minimal, primarily restricted to the rocky
20 shoreline. Once cable installation has been completed and the shoreline restored to its
21 preconstruction physical condition, the hard substrate will be available for recolonization
22 by macroalgal species common in this habitat in Little Bay.
 - 23 • Major natural oyster beds or restored oyster beds will not be impacted by
24 the Project because the sediment plume created by the jet plow will not reach them.
25 Smaller, unmapped, oyster beds may be exposed to the sediment plume but the
26 ephemeral nature of the plume will result in there being negligible effects to these
27 resources.
 - 28 • Although the sediment plume may come near or intersect with oyster
29 farms (Joe King Oyster Cooperative, Fat Dog Shellfish Co., and Bay Point Oyster
30 Company), exposure of the aquaculture stock at these operations to sediment plumes will

1 be extremely limited in both concentration and duration. Impacts to these resources will
2 be minor for two reasons. First, the suspended sediment concentrations to which the
3 oysters would be exposed are predicted to be only slightly higher than typical ambient
4 conditions. Second, the duration of exposure to the sediment plume will be very short.
5 Research has shown that elevated suspended sediments do not cause detrimental effects
6 in oysters at the exposure levels (concentration times duration) predicted to occur during
7 jet plowing in the vicinity of the aquaculture farm.

8 • The jet plow will require water withdrawal from the Bay to operate. The
9 volume of water required is less than 0.3% of the volume of Little Bay and entrainment
10 of planktonic organisms, such as early life stages of shellfish and fishes will, therefore,
11 result in insignificant losses to these species.

12 • Impacts to EFH of demersal fishes, fishes dwelling at or near the bottom
13 of Little Bay, will be negligible because the substrate will recover to its preexisting
14 condition quickly.

15 • Impacts to EFH of pelagic fishes, fishes in the water column not
16 specifically associated with the substrate, will be negligible because the sediment plume
17 will be limited in duration and spatial extent.

18 • Although diadromous fishes, fishes that spend time in both fresh and salt
19 water, may be in the vicinity of the proposed crossing during cable installation and, thus,
20 may be exposed to elevated levels of suspended sediments, this exposure is very unlikely
21 to cause significant effects because of the limited spatial and temporal extent of the
22 plume. The most likely response of individual diadromous fishes would be a short-term
23 avoidance of the plume. This is unlikely to impede passage of the fish through Little Bay
24 because the plume will never encompass the width of the Bay.

25 In sum, the short duration and small footprint of jet plow installation, the primary
26 technology to be used, minimizes potential effects to marine resources.

27 **Q. Does this conclude your pre-filed testimony?**

28 A. Yes.