

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

**SUPPLEMENTAL PRE-FILED DIRECT TESTIMONY OF
VICTORIA BUNKER, Ph.D.**

**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

July 27, 2018

1 **Qualifications and Purpose of Testimony**

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

3 A. My name is Victoria Bunker, Ph.D. My business address is 31 Africa Road,
4 Alton, New Hampshire 03809, with a mailing address of P.O. Box 16, New Durham, New
5 Hampshire 03855.

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

7 A. The purpose of my testimony is to provide an update on the work completed since
8 April 2016 to assess the potential effects of the Seacoast Reliability Project (“SRP” or the
9 “Project”) on archeological resources and, as a result of that completed work, to affirm my
10 previous opinion that the Project will not have an unreasonable adverse effect on such resources.

11 **Q. Have you conducted any additional studies or analyses since the submission
12 of your original pre-filed testimony on April 17, 2017?**

13 A. Yes. My staff at Victoria Bunker, Inc. and I completed Phase I-B surveys for the
14 Project route, and we have also conducted an additional Phase I-A survey for five off-corridor
15 access road locations in Durham. We also completed two “Desk Reviews” for separate laydown
16 areas in Lee and Durham.

17 **Q. What reports have you prepared since your original pre-filed testimony in
18 April 2016?**

19 A. We have completed the following Phase I-B survey reports:

- 20 • *Results of Phase I-B Archeological Survey, Madbury, Durham, Newington*
21 *and Portsmouth, NH (June 2016);*
22
23 • *Phase I-B Supplemental Archeological Survey, Seacoast Reliability Project,*
24 *Durham, NH (Addendum May 2017); and*
25
26 • *Phase I-B Supplemental Archeological Survey, Seacoast Reliability Project,*
27 *Durham Point Road, Durham, NH (Addendum June 2018).*
28

29 In addition to these Phase I-B surveys, we also completed an additional Phase I-A report:

- 30 • *Phase I-A Archeological Survey Off Corridor Survey, Durham, NH (January*
31 *2018) (Addendum to Phase I-A Preliminary Archeological Survey Madbury,*
32 *Durham, Newington and Portsmouth, NH).*
33

34 The two “Desk Reviews” are set forth in these reports:
35

- 1 • *Desk Review, Cheney Pit Laydown Area, Lee, NH (February 2018)*
- 2
- 3 • *Desk Review, Durham Lay Down Yard, Durham, NH (June 2018)*
- 4

5 **Q. Please explain the results of the Phase I-A and Phase I-B surveys you have**
6 **conducted since your previous testimony of April 2016.**

7 A. No new archeological sites and no new zones of archeological resource sensitivity
8 were identified within access road routes or within the corridor Area of Potential Effect (“APE”)
9 in the Phase I-A and Phase I-B surveys completed since April 2016.

10 **Q. Has DHR reviewed these Phase I and Phase I-B surveys?**

11 A. Yes. With the exception of the Supplemental Phase I-B report for the Edgerly
12 Farm area submitted in July 2018, DHR has reviewed each of them, and concurred with our
13 recommendations of no adverse effect to archeological sites in the areas addressed in the reports.

14 **Q. Please describe the Project’s ongoing consultations with NHDHR and**
15 **USACE.**

16 A. The Project has had ongoing communications with both agencies, principally
17 through Mark Doperalski, PSNH’s cultural resources manager. Most importantly, DHR and the
18 Project have developed a Memorandum of Understanding (“MOU”) to address historical
19 resources. That near final draft agreement includes a provision that requires the Project to take
20 certain steps to avoid and minimize impacts to the stone quarry area in the Durham Point
21 Historic district. (The Project and USACE also developed a proposed MOA to address the
22 resolution of adverse effects from SRP. That concerns the cable house in Newington, however,
23 and does not include anything about archeological resources.) The draft MOU can be found at
24 pp. 355-387 of the Supplement to Appendix 33 of the Application, and the mitigation
25 requirements of the MOA at pp. 350-352.

26 **Q. Did DHR reach a conclusion on whether the Project will have an effect on**
27 **archeological resources?**

28 A. Yes. As originally set forth in Nadine Miller’s letter to the SEC dated August 1,
29 2017, DHR found that “no significant archeological resources will be affected by the Seacoast
30 Reliability Project.” Prior to that, DHR had indicated in its letter to the SEC of April 25, 2017
31 that the one potentially significant archeological resource identified in the Phase I-A and Phase I-
32 B surveys was the LaRoche Brook Wetlands Cellar Hole site in Durham (also known as the

1 Coronet Winthrop Smith cellar), which would not be affected so long as the Project avoided
2 impact during construction.

3 **Q. You mention avoidance of impact in the answer above. What will the Project**
4 **do to avoid impacts to the LaRoche Brook Wetlands Cellar Hole site?**

5 A. The Project will avoid impact to this archeological site by placement of an access
6 road and structure location outside the archeological site area. The sensitive area has been
7 marked on project plans and temporary fencing will be erected during construction to avoid
8 inadvertent impacts. Monitoring will be conducted as described in Appendix C of the draft
9 MOU, with procedures defined for the unanticipated discovery of cultural artifacts or features in
10 Section 3.3. See Supplement to Appendix 33 of the Application at 370-387.

11 **Q. What has the Applicant done to avoid impacts to other archeological**
12 **resources?**

13 A. As I stated in my original testimony, the Project has been designed to avoid
14 potential archeological sites. One additional area of interest is a granite quarry within the
15 Durham Point Historic District. The draft MOU provides that physical impacts will be avoided to
16 that part of the area in the SRP corridor that was recorded as an archeological component.
17 (Section B.2.a.iii). Avoidance will be accomplished by rerouting access roads and protecting the
18 surface with timber matting as needed.

19 **Q. Will you be conducting additional work to analyze impacts of the Project on**
20 **archeological resources?**

21 A. None is planned; at the present time the DHR and USACE reviews are complete.
22 I will do additional survey work, of course, if the design changes in any way that might affect
23 areas of the Project that I have not yet surveyed, such as for any newly identified access roads or
24 lay down yards. Moreover, the draft MOU with DHR includes an Unanticipated Discovery Plan.
25 That sets forth procedures to be followed in the event of discovery of potentially significant
26 archeological deposits or human remains during construction or other project-related activities.
27 This entails that qualified personnel such as a Qualified Professional Archeologist (QPA) follow
28 a series of steps for identifying and assessing discovery of cultural artifacts or features as well as
29 human remains.

1 **Q. Have you reviewed the pre-filed testimony submitted by the Durham Historic**
2 **Association (“DHA”) on July 31, 2017 and its Supplemental Testimony filed on July 20,**
3 **2018?**

4 A. Yes, I have.

5 **Q. Are there any archeological resources issues that you would like to address**
6 **relating to the DHA testimony about possible archeological sites in Durham?**

7 A. Yes, the Applicant’s historical resources experts have examined all of them. Our
8 response to DHA’s list of resources is included with Cheryl Widell’s Supplemental Pre-filed
9 Testimony.

10 There are five specific resources on DHA’s list that I want to address here:

- 11 • *Valentine Hill Canal* – This is a contributing feature of the Durham Point
12 Historic District. We completed Phase I-A and Phase I-B survey and found no
13 evidence of archeological artifacts, features or components related to
14 construction, use or abandonment of the canal within the SRP corridor.
15 *Results of Phase I-B Archeological Survey, Madbury, Durham, Newington*
16 *and Portsmouth, NH (June 2016). DHR concurred with our recommendations.*
17
- 18 • *Norton Cellar Hole* – We completed Phase I-A and Phase I-B survey followed
19 by Supplemental Phase I-B survey at the location. We found no evidence of
20 archeological artifacts, features or components related to domestic or
21 residential use at any time in the past. We also noted prior impact at the
22 location. As such, there was no evidence for a cellar hole within the SRP
23 corridor. Results of Phase I-B Archeological Survey, Madbury, Durham,
24 Newington and Portsmouth, NH (June 2016); Phase I-B Supplemental
25 Archeological Survey, Seacoast Reliability Project, Durham, NH (Addendum
26 May 2017). DHR concurred with our recommendations.
27
- 28 • *Edgerly Farm* – We completed Phase I-A and Phase I-B survey in the area of
29 the Edgerly Farm, and conducted Supplemental Phase I-B survey at that
30 location in June 2018. The surveys, including shovel test pit excavation,
31 revealed no artifacts, sites, features, or components, and no evidence of a burn
32 layer of any variety. Results of Phase I-B Archeological Survey, Madbury,
33 Durham, Newington and Portsmouth, NH (June 2016) and Phase I-B
34 Supplemental Archeological Survey, Seacoast Reliability Project, Durham
35 Point Road, Durham, NH (Addendum June 2018). DHR concurred with our
36 recommendations on the Phase I-A and Phase I-B surveys, but has not yet
37 reviewed the Supplemental Phase I-B report.
38
- 39 • *Grave marker at UNH* – We completed Phase I-A survey in the zone
40 recognized by DHA as the Hill grave area. An isolated headstone was

1 observed set in concrete more than 600 feet from the SRP corridor (northwest
2 of the UNH Field House).

3
4 • *Other gravesites* – The Mooney graveyard in Durham was identified outside
5 the corridor. The Davis-Thompson graveyard and the Ryan & Stevens
6 memorials in Durham were identified outside an access road extending from
7 Foss Farm Road. Impacts to these locations will be avoided.

8
9 **Q. Has your opinion changed regarding the question of whether this Project will**
10 **have an unreasonable adverse effect on archeological resources?**

11 A. No. My opinion remains that the Project will not have an unreasonable adverse
12 effect on archeological resources. In fact, due to the Applicant's efforts to avoid impacts, it will
13 not have any adverse effect at all on known archeological sites. Furthermore, DHR concurs in
14 this, as set forth in DHR's Final Report to the SEC dated August 1, 2017.

15 **Q. Does this conclude your supplemental testimony?**

16 A. Yes.