

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

AMENDED PRE-FILED DIRECT TESTIMONY OF SARAH D. ALLEN

**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

March 29, 2017

1 **Qualifications and Purpose of Testimony**

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

3 A. My name is Sarah D. Allen. 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. I am employed by Normandeau Associates Inc. as a Senior Principal
7 Wetland Scientist in the Wetland/Terrestrial Group. I am Normandeau's Project Manager
8 for the Seacoast Reliability Project ("SRP").

9 **Q. Please describe your background, experience and qualifications.**

10 A. My background and qualifications were included in my direct pre-filed
11 testimony filed with the NH SEC Application dated April 12, 2016 and have not changed
12 since then.

13 **Q. What is the purpose of this amended testimony?**

14 A. The purpose of my testimony is to provide additional information to the
15 SEC regarding the air and water resources, and wildlife habitat information in support of
16 PSNH's Amendment to the original Application dated April 12, 2016. I also provide
17 supplemental information that has become available since the original SEC filing on
18 April 12, 2016.

19 **Q. Have you reviewed the amended Project design submitted to the SEC?**

20 A. Yes, I have.

21 **Q. Does the amended Project design change anything in your previously
22 filed testimony?**

23 A. Yes. As described further below, the amended design modification
24 resulted in changes in wetland impacts, and thus the in-lieu fee wetland mitigation
25 estimates have been updated based on new impact numbers. My testimony also includes
26 supplemental information on a small pond in the Flynn Pit which was reclassified as a
27 vernal pool based on 2016 field information, and two potential permittee-responsible
28 mitigation projects for the Towns of Durham and Newington to substitute for the in-lieu
29 fee contribution if acceptable to the agencies. The amended and supplemental
30 information is described in more detail below.

1 **Q. Please describe any changes to natural resource impacts as a result of**
2 **the Project design amendment.**

3 A. Several changes to wetlands resulted from the proposed Project design
4 changes. Overall, permanent wetland impacts declined by 28 square feet from the
5 original design, and temporary impacts increased by 2,578 square feet. The decline in
6 permanent impacts occurred at multiple locations as structures were shifted in response to
7 municipal and resident requests. The two largest areas of change to temporary impacts
8 were in Newington at the area commonly referred to as the Flynn Pit, the Newington
9 Center Historic District and the Hannah Lane residential neighborhood. In the Flynn Pit,
10 temporary impacts declined by 2,087 square feet after the Town approved a new right-
11 of-way to allow the Project to go underground around a small pond and the associated
12 wetland. At the location of the newly proposed underground segment across the
13 Newington Center Historic District and Hannah Lane residential neighborhood,
14 temporary impacts increased by 18,013 square feet because of burial of the cable and
15 associated work roads across seven wetlands in the corridor. Most other changes resulted
16 in a decline in temporary impacts as engineering and construction requirements were
17 modified in response to design changes.

18 Cable burial across the Frink Farm also resulted in an additional 84 square feet of
19 temporary impact to a small perennial stream resulting from a stream diversion needed to
20 install the underground duct bank.

21 At the Flynn Pit, the small pond was reclassified as a vernal pool based on 2016
22 field observations (discussed below). The new underground cable route around the
23 vernal pool and its associated wetland avoids impacts to the vernal pool but results in an
24 impact to the vernal pool envelope immediately adjacent to the pool. The envelope is
25 defined by the US Army Corps of Engineers as a 100-foot band immediately adjacent to
26 the high water mark of the pool to provide shade to the vernal pool and peripheral habitat
27 for amphibians metamorphosing to terrestrial conditions. The proposed underground
28 cable will result in temporary impacts to 7,377 square feet in the vernal pool envelope, of
29 which approximately 2,950 square feet (0.07 acres) will be temporary and allowed to
30 recover, and 4,427 square feet (0.10 acres) will be maintained as permanent right-of-way.

1 **Q. Please describe the principal functions and values of the impacted**
 2 **wetland resources under the amended Project design.**

3 A. A qualitative assessment of 13 wetland functions and values using the USACE
 4 Highway Methodology found that, while multiple functions were provided to some
 5 degree by most wetlands, the principal functions were the distinguishing features among
 6 the wetland types. The most common principal functions include: floodflow alteration,
 7 fish and shellfish habitat, production export, sediment/toxicant/pathogen retention, and
 8 wildlife habitat.

9 The functional value of the water body in the Flynn Pit is considered moderate
 10 because its vernal pool functions are limited by its mostly permanent hydrology, and its
 11 permanent pond functions are limited because it occasionally dries up.

12 **Q. Please describe the effects of the amendment on the proposed in-lieu**
 13 **fee for the SRP.**

14 A. Although wetland impacts generally declined as a result of the amended
 15 design, the updated values for the 2016 Aquatic Resource Mitigation equalized values
 16 increased for most of the towns. This resulted in an increase of \$8,479 in the revised cost
 17 estimate for in-lieu fee mitigation, as shown by municipality in the following table:

Municipality	Original Compensatory Mitigation Cost	Amended Compensatory Mitigation Cost	Difference between Original and Amended
Madbury	\$6,488.92	\$6,501.15	\$12.23
Durham	\$213,547.82	\$224,217.15	\$10,669.33
Newington	\$81,747.24	\$79,152.49	(\$2,594.75)
Portsmouth	\$8,187.14	\$8,579.60	\$392.46
Total	\$309,971.11	\$318,450.38	\$8,479.27

18 **Q. In your opinion, will this Project as amended have an unreasonable**
 19 **adverse effect on air and water quality and the natural environment?**

20 A. No, the Project will not have an unreasonable adverse effect on air and
 21 water quality and the natural environment. I also rely on the assessments and pre-filed
 22 testimony of my colleague, Ann Pembroke, at Normandeau Associates on marine
 23 resources and water quality. The Project has carefully considered air quality, water
 24 quality and natural resource issues and minimized impacts where feasible and reasonable.

1 In 2016, we observed additional vernal pool indicators, namely, fairy shrimp and
2 blue spotted egg masses, along with indicators of permanent hydrology, such as second-
3 year green frog tadpoles and leeches. No fish have been observed to date. While the
4 pond has held water throughout the summer in previous years, it dried up in August of
5 2016, which has been classified as Extreme Drought in coastal NH. This water body
6 appears to function as both a permanent pond and a vernal pool, supporting primary
7 indicators of vernal pools (fairy shrimp, wood frogs, spotted salamanders and blue
8 spotted salamanders), and permanent pond species (green frog larvae and leeches). The
9 Applicant now considers the pond a vernal pool for regulatory purposes, but recognizes
10 its dual functionality as both a vernal pool and a permanent pond. The functional value
11 of the pond is only moderate because its vernal pool functions are limited by its mostly
12 permanent hydrology, and its permanent pond functions are limited because it
13 occasionally dries up.

14 **Q. Please describe any supplemental information regarding**
15 **compensatory wetland mitigation for the SRP.**

16 A. Since the SRP SEC permit application was submitted on April 12, 2016,
17 the Towns of Durham and Newington have developed permittee-responsible mitigation
18 projects, summarized below. Both concepts have merit for compensation for different
19 aspects of wetland resource impacts by the SRP if the regulatory agencies concur.

20 ***Durham - Wagon Hill Farm***

21 The Town of Durham has proposed a shoreline stabilization project to reduce the
22 amount of erosion from the Wagon Hill Farm shoreline bordering the Great Bay Estuary
23 and the Oyster River and restore salt marsh that has already eroded. Wagon Hill Farm is
24 Town-owned conservation land consisting of 139 acres with 1,100 feet of tidal frontage
25 on the Little Bay, Oyster River and Smith Creek. The project has two primary objectives:
26 1) design and build a living shoreline that has both structural and biological elements to
27 minimize erosion, and 2) re-establish the degraded salt marsh to further protect the
28 shoreline. Preliminary estimates suggest that approximately 10,000 square feet of salt
29 marsh, plus approximately 1,100 linear feet of adjacent shoreline could be restored.

30 The Wagon Hill Farm shoreline stabilization project provides the opportunity for
31 the SRP to compensate for unavoidable wetland impacts in Durham by restoring

1 deteriorated or fully eroded salt marsh, and reducing the loss of shoreline habitats and the
2 associated sediment loading into critical estuarine habitats. The Applicant proposes to
3 contribute to the construction, monitoring, and maintenance of this project. The total
4 cost for construction, 5 years of monitoring, and maintenance is currently estimated as
5 \$375,000, although final costs will vary depending on the final design. The costs for
6 construction, monitoring and maintenance will be funded through a mix of money from
7 the Lois Brown Trust, the Town of Durham general fund, and the SRP compensatory
8 mitigation contribution. The Lois Brown Trust has up to \$100,000 available for this
9 project. The Town of Durham voted to approve approximately \$84,000 for this project as
10 part of the 2016 annual budget, pending regulatory permit approval for the PSNH
11 contribution. PSNH proposes to contribute the dollars calculated for the In-Lieu Fee
12 contribution for wetland impacts in Durham towards construction costs. Under the
13 current amended proposal, the value of that contribution is approximately \$224,000,
14 although that may change during final design and the SEC permitting progress.

15 ***Newington Conservation Easement***

16 The Newington Conservation Commission (NCC) is pursuing a 10- acre
17 conservation easement on a 13-acre parcel on Old Post Road (Map 17 Lot 15) that
18 borders an existing conservation parcel and encompasses a section of the Knights Brook
19 Prime wetland. PSNH is working with the Town of Newington to develop a permittee-
20 responsible compensatory mitigation project that would offset the wetland functional
21 impacts of the Seacoast Reliability Project, and meet the town's goal of protecting this
22 valuable parcel for wetland and wildlife habitat. The parcel is adjacent to, or in close
23 proximity to, existing protected lands along the Knights Brook corridor totaling
24 approximately 100 acres, including the Frink Farm. A Letter of Intent was signed
25 between the landowner and the NCC, dated September 1, 2016, to commit to the
26 purchase of the conservation easement.

27 The Newington Conservation Easement project provides the opportunity for the
28 Project to compensate Newington for unavoidable permanent impacts caused by SRP
29 structures in freshwater wetlands (approximately 362 square feet), up to 1,786 square feet
30 of permanent impact from concrete mattresses on tidal flats and rocky shore, and
31 conversion of forested wetlands and stream buffers as a result of tree removal within the

1 SRP project corridor. The 2016 appraisal value of the conservation easement is \$260,000.
2 PSNH proposes to contribute the dollars calculated for the In-Lieu Fee contribution for
3 wetland impacts in Newington towards the purchase of the easement. Under the current
4 amended proposal, the value of that contribution is approximately \$79,000, although that
5 may change during final design and the SEC permitting progress. The NCC has
6 committed \$100,000 from their conservation fund, and will request the remaining monies
7 (estimated as \$81,000) to be raised at through a special warrant article at the 2017 Town
8 Meeting.

9 ***In-Lieu Fee Reversion***

10 PSNH will continue to work with the applicable parties to develop a mitigation
11 package that will be acceptable to NHDES and USACE. In the event that a town
12 proposal does not come to fruition, or develop within an acceptable schedule for the
13 agencies, PSNH agrees that the SRP compensatory mitigation funds will revert to the
14 State In-Lieu Fee program to be dispersed by DES under the general Aquatic Resource
15 Mitigation Fund grant program for the Salmon Falls-Piscataqua Rivers Service Area.

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

17 **A. Yes.**