13 Legends Drive Hooksett, NH 03106



October 2, 2019

Mr. David Price NHDES Wetlands Bureau, Pease Office 222 International Dr., Suite. 175 Portsmouth, NH 03801

Re: Seacoast Reliability Project - SEC Docket 2015-04 Wetlands Permit Amendment Request Minor Construction-Related Change Submarine Cable Re-alignment

Dear Mr. Price,

Public Service Company of New Hampshire d/b/a Eversource Energy ("Eversource") hereby submits to the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services ("Department" or "NHDES") a request for a minor modification to the Department's October 29, 2018 Revised Final Decision, which authorized Eversource to construct portions of the Seacoast Reliability Project ("SRP" or "Project") in Little Bay. Eversource and its submarine contractors have identified a need to make a micro adjustment to the submarine cable alignment within the existing NOAA charted cable area in Little Bay to avoid newly formed and identified obstructions caused by tidal currents. The result of the micro-adjustment will result in an increase length of each of the threes cables in the Bay of eight (8) feet and shift a portion of the cables in the channel a maximum distance of 96-feet from the current alignment. Attached to this request is Eversource's **Description and Technical Justification** for the required minor submarine cable realignment in the channel of Little Bay

On January 31, 2019, the New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee (SEC) issued a Certificate of Site and Facility to Eversource to construct the Project (the "Certificate"). The Certificate provides that:

NHDES is authorized to monitor the construction and operation of the Project to ensure that the terms and conditions of the Wetlands Permit, the Alteration of Terrain Permit, the Shoreland Protection Permit, and the Certificate are met;

NHDES is authorized to specify the use of any appropriate technique, methodology, practice or procedure approved by the Subcommittee within the Certificate, as may be necessary, to effectuate conditions of the Certificate, the Wetlands Permit, the Alteration of Terrain Permit, and the Shoreland Protection Permit; . . .

NHDES is authorized to specify the use of any appropriate technique, methodology, practice or procedure approved by the Subcommittee within the Certificate, as may be necessary, to effectuate conditions of the Section 404 General Permit (the New Hampshire Programmatic General Permit)....

The Department has previously authorized prior minor modifications to its October 29, 2018 Revised Final Decision. Specifically, on September 10, 2019, the Department recommended approval of nine changes in



temporary wetlands impacts.¹ Letter from DES Assistant Director Rene Pelletier to SEC Administrator Pamela Monroe, Docket 2015-04 (Sept. 10, 2019). Based on the foregoing, the Department is authorized to review and approve the requested micro-adjustment as a minor modification pursuant to the wetlands approval and the Certificate.

The micro-adjustment, as described in the attached *Description and Technical Justification*, only slightly increases the overall permitted temporary impacts in Little Bay, namely, by 360-sq ft, and does not alter the permitted permanent wetland impact. The Project is currently approved through the September 10, 2019 amendment with 601,561 square feet of total impacts (592,091 square feet of temporary impacts and 9,470 square feet of permanent impacts). This minor construction related change results in an increase the temporary impact in Little Bay from 269,987 square feet to 270,347 which represents a 0.13% increase of impact in Little Bay and a 0.06% increase in total project impacts. As discussed further in the *Description and Technical Justification*, the proposed micro-adjustment does not rise to the level of a significant amendment of the NHDES Revised Final Decision pursuant to NH RSA 482-A:3, XIV(e) because the requested minor modification: (1) does not increase the proposed acreage or dredge area by 20 percent or more; (2) does not alter the location of the permitted footprint because all temporary wetland impacts are within the existing NOAA charted cable corridor; and (3) does not introduce new or different impacts to a new or different prime wetland or surface water. In addition, the minor route alignment will not impact a wetland of a different classification as originally permitted and will not require permits for filling or dredging in non-wetland areas.

Based on the foregoing, and pursuant to the Certificate and the NHDES Revised Final Decision, Eversource respectfully requests that the Department approve this micro route adjustment as a minor modification under the Certificate and wetland approval.

If you have any questions regarding this notification, please contact Sarah Allen (<u>sallen@normandeau.com</u>, 603-637-1158) or me (kurt.nelson@eversource.com, 603-634-3256).

Sincerely,

Eversource Energy

hall !!!!

Kurt I. Nelson Sr. Licensing and Permitting Specialist

Cc: Gregg Comstock, NHDES Ted Diers, NHDES Pam Monroe, SEC Administrator

¹ The Department's recommended approval was adopted by the SEC Administrator on September 25, 2019 and approved as a minor modification consistent with RSA 162-H:4, III-a and page 3 of the Certificate that contains a condition authorizing the NHDES to specify the use of any appropriate technique, methodology, practice or procedure approved by the Subcommittee within the Certificate, as may be necessary, to effectuate conditions of the Certificate, the Wetlands Permit, the Alteration of Terrain Permit, and the Shoreland Protection Permit. Letter from SEC Administrator Pamela Monroe to Attorney Barry Needleman, Docket 2015-04 (Sept. 25, 2019).



13 Legends Drive Hooksett, NH 03106

SEACOAST RELIABILITY PROJECT SUBMARINE CABLE REALIGNEMNT DESCRIPTION AND TECHNICAL JUSTIFICATION

October 2, 2019

McLaneDOCS\32110\97870\14989925.v1-10/2/19



SEACOAST RELIABILITY PROJECT SUBMARINE CABLE REALIGNEMNT DESCRIPTION AND TECHNICAL JUSTIFICATION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
2.0 BATHYMETRIC SURVEY	1
3.0 ASSESSMENT OF ALTERNATIVES	3
4.0 SUBMARINE CABLE REALIGNMENT	5
5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT OF CABLE REALIGNMENT	6
6.0 CONCLUSIONS	12

FIGURES

Figure 1	2013 Cable crossing route bathymetric survey
Figure 2	2019 Bathymetric survey within the charted cable corridor
Figure 3	Cable realignment within the charted cable corridor
Figure 4	Vibracore sediment sample locations 2016 and 2017
Figure 5A	Cable realignment vibracore sample locations 2019
Figure 5B	Close view of cable realignment vibracore sample locations 2019
Figure 6	2019 Preconstruction benthic sample locations near the proposed cable realignment

TABLES

Table 1Sediment Grain Size Analysis

APPENDICIES

- A. Amended Engineering Drawings Seacoast Reliability Project, Circuit F107, Little Bay Crossing, Newington 115kV Underground Transmission Line
- B. Amended Environmental Maps (Sheets 20, 21, 22)
- C. Vibracore Logs and Sediment Laboratory Analytical Reports
- D. RPS Memorandum on Sediment Dispersion Model and Mixing Zone



SEACOAST RELIABILITY PROJECT SUBMARINE CABLE REALIGNEMNT DESCRIPTION AND TECHNICAL JUSTIFICATION

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In the course of the approval process through the NH Site Evaluation Committee (NHSEC), Eversource conducted a thorough and comprehensive assessment of the submarine cable crossing area of Little Bay for the Seacoast Reliability Project (SRP). Recent preconstruction bathymetric survey data conducted in August and September 2019 show the presence of sand drifts (or waves) in the current alignment that are problematic for the jet plow installation.

The Eversource project team has assessed viable alternatives to address the sand wave issue and determined that a micro cable realignment to avoid problematic sand wave formations, which is common industry practice, will mitigate this issue. Specifically, the proposed cable realignment will shift a portion of the three conductors a maximum horizontal distance of 96-ft south in the channel of Little Bay while remaining with the NOAA charted cable corridor. No change is required with the cable landing in the near shore areas. The realignment will add an approximate linear distance of eight (8) ft for each of the cables.

As presented herein, Eversource has evaluated current survey and assessment data in the Little Bay cable corridor, including, the results of the jet plow trial, evaluation of the sediment dispersion model, mixing zone boundary, water quality monitoring plan, sediment characterization data, bathymetric survey, benthic monitoring and eel grass survey results, which demonstrate that sufficient preconstruction assessments have been conducted to allow for the cable realignment.

In addition, as a conservative measure, sediment sampling was conducted along the route realignment to confirm consistency with previous assessment data.

Eversource requests that the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services ("Department" or NHDES") allow for a minor modification to the Wetland Bureau October 28, 2019 (amended September 10, 2019) Revised Final Decision included in Appendix I of the Site Evaluation Committee (SEC) January 31, 2019 Decision and Order Granting Application for Site and Facility for this cable realignment.

2.0 BATHYMETRIC SURVEY 2019

Bathymetric Surveys

During the period 20-23 April 2013, a marine geophysical investigation was conducted by Ocean Surveys, Inc. (OSI) within a charted cable corridor across Little Bay. This investigation was performed under contract to Power Engineers, Inc. and was designed to aid in the planning of the proposed Little Bay cable crossing.

As shown on Figure 1, the 2013 bathymetric survey showed that significant sand ripple topography was evident in the channel in the southern half of the corridor. At the time, large sand waves were not observed.



13 Legends Drive Hooksett, NH 03106



Figure 1: 2013 Cable crossing route bathymetric survey

On 28 August 2019, OSI performed a pre-construction bathymetric survey along the permitted cable alignments. A 230-meter corridor centered on the original cable alignment was surveyed using a multibeam echosounder. During this survey, sand waves were observed as large as 12-ft, and an 8-ft high sand wave was observed on the cable route as shown on Figure 2. Side slopes on the sand wave were estimated to be at least 30°. Subsequent bathymetric surveys were performed on September 15, 16 and 17, 2019. All subsequent surveys showed that the sand waves had not changed substantially in size or position.





Figure 2: 2019 Bathymetric survey within the charted cable corridor

Explanation of Sand Waves

Sand waves typically occur in shallow estuaries and are induced by tidal currents. The interaction of the oscillatory tidal flow along areas of sand leads to a steady streaming of sediment that forms waves of sand along the seabed. When the displacement of the sediment dragged by this steady streaming is directed toward the crests of smaller mega ripples, the amplitude of the mega-ripples increases and larger sand waves are formed. Sand ripples, mega-ripples and sand waves tend to be mobile and are driven by seasonal tides or storm events.

3.0 ASSESSMENT OF ALTERNATIVES

Review of Alternatives

In the submarine cable installation industry, there are several methods available to avoid sand waves or reduce the height of sand waves to allow target burial below the mean depth of the seabed. The following methods are listed below:

1. Wait for the sand wave to migrate off the cable path.

Sand waves in Little Bay are likely driven by tidal currents and storm events and will change in both size and location over time. A previous cable route survey, performed in 2013, did not indicate sand waves of this magnitude in the vicinity of the cable route. However, an eight (8) ft high sand wave with a 30° slope was first observed on the SRP cable route during a bathymetric survey that was performed on August 28, 2019. Subsequent bathymetric surveys were performed on September 13, 14 and 15, 2019 and again on September 17, 2019. These subsequent surveys showed that the sand wave had remained stationary and there was no indication that the sand wave would move off the route before the scheduled start of installation.



2. Re-route the cables around the sand wave.

Cable route engineers determined that a slight shifting of the cables to the south could avoid the majority of the sand waves and south of the larger, more problematic sand wave in question. This slight realignment added approximately eight (8) ft of submarine cable to each segment and all cables would remain within the charted Cable Area as designated on NOAA nautical chart 13285.

3. Mechanical dredging of the sand wave.

Typical dredging operations using either a towed dredging tool, bucket dredge or water lift could be performed just prior to the installations. The dredged material could be side cast or stored in hopper barges for disposal at an upland facility.

This option would require mobilization of a complete standalone spread and support vessels. This would add significant time to the project, increase turbidity in the bay and require additional permitting.

4. Modify and re-rig equipment to add additional control interface with the jet sled.

This action would require modifications to the installation barge including:

- Adding a section to the crane boom that would allow the barge mounted crane to stabilize the plow with a set of 2-way spreaders hooked to the front skids to prevent the jet sled from tipping on side slopes during burial.
- Adding 1000-lb lift bags to the low side of the jet sled plow to prevent tipping.
- Utilizing a longer jet tool could provide burial in natural bottom along the entire route but would generate more turbidity in the tidal flats and would result in a burial depth that exceeds that allowed by the current SEC Certificate.

This option would require additional mobilization and plow operating time to cross the channel. As well, the larger crane boom would require the removal and temporary storage of the non-active cable reels onto a storage barge or port of convenience. Should a port storage option be selected, the crane would need to be de-rigged and re-rigged for every trip back to port to get the next reel.

Cable burial across severe sand wave formations could result in future cable exposures and suspension with sand wave movements after installation.

Preferred Alternative

Having considered the various options available and their associated impacts, realigning the cable paths around the sand wave was determined to be the most effective and efficient way forward. Avoidance of the sand waves will greatly reduce the risk of damage to the jet sled and/or the cable, allow full burial depth and provide better long-term security for the cables.

4.0 SUBMARINE CABLE REALIGMENT

A proposed reroute of all three cables is shown on the *Amended Engineering Drawings* provided in Appendix A and *Amended Environmental Maps* (Sheets 20 through 22) in Appendix B. The realignment consists of an approximately 4° shift southward from the existing alignment of the three conductors starting in the western



mudflats to a maximum horizontal distance southward of approximately 96 ft in the channel of Little Bay. The alignment then shifts northward approximately 6° meeting with the existing alignment in the eastern mudflats. The proposed reroutes will add approximately eight (8)-ft of cable to each cable segment. Avoidance of the sand wave will greatly reduce the risk of damage to the jet sled and/or the cable, allow full burial depth and provide better long-term security for the cables. All three proposed cable re-routes have been engineered to maintain positioning of the cables within the charted Cable Area corridor a shown in Figure 3 below.



Figure 3: Cable realignment within the charted cable corridor

Allowance for minor variations during installation

To allow for preferential jet plow navigation, there may be minor variations in the horizontal as-laid cable path on the order of approximately ± 10 -ft. These slight variations are routine in the industry, and may be necessary to adjust the jet plow towing angle to maintain heading or pulling the cable inside the angle of an alter course. Alignment variations are achieved through adjustment of cable tension and do not require anchor changes.

Installation Rate of Advancement

Based on operational information obtained during the jet plow trial, current bathymetric conditions and the considerations for cable realignment, and as discussed in the *Seacoast Reliability Jet Plow Trial Summary Report* submitted to the Department on September 18, 2019 with an updated report submitted on October 2, 2019, the following jet plow installation schedule and target rates of advancement are proposed:

- Day #1-3 Position jet sled on west tidal flats, float cable 1st end to shore, pull to riser structure and secure.
- Day #4- Cable burial via jet plow across tidal flats while divers remove cable



floats 1,900 linear ft at 5.6 ft/min rate of advancement (approximately 6.0 hr jet plow duration on ebb tide starting at high slack tide).

- Day #5- **Cable burial** via jet plow across channel 2,735 linear ft at 7ft/min rate of advancement (6.5 hr jet plow duration with intermittent stoppages for anchor cable adjustment.) (**Jet plow burial complete**).
- Day #6- Cable 2nd end floating, land on east shore, pull into man hole.

5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT OF CABLE REALIGNMENT

Eversource has conducted a thorough evaluation of the environmental considerations for the submarine cable realignment and provides the following assessment in support of the submarine cable realignment.

Jet Plow Trial Results

On September 9, 2019, Eversource successfully conducted the submarine cable Jet Plow Trial in Little Bay and provided the results to the Department in a report entitled *Seacoast Reliability Jet Plow Trial Summary Report* dated September 18, 2019. The results of the trial indicate that:

- The jet plow sediment plume model predictions were conservative and predictive of plume migration
- No compliance exceedances of water quality monitoring criteria, as defined under the NHDES approved Water Quality Monitoring Plan, were observed at mixing zone boundary stations.
- Installation of the cables using the jet plow can be accomplished in compliance with State water quality criteria.

An updated *Jet Plow Trial Summary Report* that addresses comments from NHDES will be provided to the Department by October 2, 2019.

Sediment Characterization

A comprehensive sediment sampling effort was conducted along the original cable alignment with two (2) rounds of sampling conducted at twelve (12) vibracore sampling stations (C1 through C12) across the Bay in September 2016 and May 2017. Results of the sediment characterization are summarized in the following reports submitted to the NHDES and the New Hampshire Site Evaluation Committee (NHSEC):

- Characterization of Sediment Quality Along Little Bay Crossing Durham to Newington, NH dated December 1, 2016
- Supplement to Characterization of Sediment Quality Along Little Bay Crossing Durham to Newington, NH dated June 30, 2017

Figure 4, below, from the June 2017 Sediment Quality Report shows the vibracore sample locations across the original alignment.



13 Legends Drive Hooksett, NH 03106



Figure 4: Vibracore sediment sample locations 2016 and 2017

Sediments were sampled for grain size analysis and for several potential contaminants. The results of that analysis determined that there were only two potential contaminants, copper and arsenic, that were conservatively included as compliance analytes in the water quality monitoring plan for jet plow activities to confirm that these analytes are not bio-available at concentrations of concern in the water column.

No exceedances of water quality criteria were exceeded at compliance boundaries a defined by the Water Quality Monitoring Plan during the jet plow trial on September 9, 2019.

Supplemental Sediment Characterization 2019

As conservative measure, sediment sampling was conducted along the route realignment to confirm consistency with previous assessment data. On September 24, 2019 Normandeau conducted vibracore sampling at four (4) locations (COR-1 through COR-4) along the cable realignment route in the Channel of Little Bay as shown on Figure 5A and 5B.



13 Legends Drive Hooksett, NH 03106



Figure 5A: Cable realignment vibracore sample locations 2019



Figure 5B: Close view of vibracore sample locations 2019

Sample penetration depths ranged from 2 to 5.5 feet. Collections were made using a Rossfelder Model P-3, low frequency vibro-percussive vibracore. Coring tubes were 3-inch diameter semi-rigid Cellulose Acetate Butyrate (CAB) tubes with disposable stainless-steel core catchers riveted to the tube. The use of CAB tubes allows samples to be collected without an outer housing or core barrel that needs to be decontaminated between sample locations. Sampling locations were documented using a Trimble GeoXT GPS with an accuracy of < 1 meter.



Each core was documented with boring logs that are provided in Appendix C. Each segment identified for chemical analysis was placed into a disposable aluminum container, homogenized with disposable aluminum utensils and then subsamples were placed into containers provided by the analytical laboratories. Separate equipment was used for homogenizing each sample to eliminate the risk of cross-contamination.

Samples were stored in containers provided by the laboratories on wet ice until delivery to the analytical laboratory. Sediment samples are being tested at Enthalpy Analytical Laboratory in Hampton, NH for typical dredge material analytes (grain size, a suite of metals, specific PAHs, and specific PCBs). Eversource expects to be able to provide these results to the Department on October 4, 2019.

Grain Size Analysis

The laboratory analytical report for grain size analysis is provided in Appendix C. A summary of 2019 grain size results are provided in Table 1. At most stations the percent fines (silt plus clay) in sediment is similar to that reported in 2016 and 2017. Differences observed represent the variability typical of marine substrates.

Station	COR-1/001	COR-2/002	COR-3/003	COR-4A/004	COR4B/005
Penetration Depth (inches)	66	24	25	0-17 of 28	17-28 of 28
Grain size					
% Total Gravel	1	1	9	3	0
% Coarse Sand	3	34	13	22	3
% Medium Sand	31	51	31	63	3
% Fine Sand	41	8	31	9	3
% Silt	15	5	11	2	52
% Clay	9	1	5	1	39

Table 1: Sediment grain size analysis

Bulk Sample Analysis

The sediment chemical analysis is also being conducted at Enthalpy Laboratory in Hampton, NH. The analytical results are anticipated to be complete by October 4, 2019. The analytical results and summary will be forwarded to the Department in a supplement once available.

Water Quality Monitoring Considerations

Eversource has evaluated the submarine cable realignment relative to compliance with the NHDES approved *Seacoast Reliability Project Water Quality Monitoring Plan Revised Final Report* dated September 6, 2019 including the following:

• Changes in the timing of the installation resulting from the cable realignment and by operational information obtained during the Jet Plow Trial on September 9, 2019



- The efficacy and appropriateness of the current mixing zone boundary as defined by existing sediment dispersion models
- Nearfield and compliance boundary monitoring station locations
- The results of the jet plow trial as summarized in the *Jet Plow Trial Summary Report* provided to the Department on September 18, 2019.

The submarine cable realignment is characterized as follows:

- The cable realignment consists of a minor horizontal shift (a maximum distance of 96-ft) southward in the channel of Little Bay.
- The cable installation will remain within the existing NOAA charted cable corridor.
- No alterations to burial depths are proposed.
- Sediment characteristics are similar along the original and realignment route.
- The additional length of burial of approximately 8-ft for each cable is diminis with respect to sediment dispersion model predictions.
- As discussed in Section 4.0, the jet plow installation schedule required for the cable realignment will span a minimum of two calendar days.

Eversource's consultant RPS/ASA, who conducted the sediment dispersion modelling for the project as presented in the following reports provided to NHDES and the NHSEC:

- Modeling Sediment Dispersion from Cable Burial for Seacoast Reliability Project, Little Bay, New Hampshire dated December 15, 2015
- Revised Modeling Sediment Dispersion from Cable Burial for Seacoast Reliability Project, Upper Little Bay, New Hampshire dated June 27, 2017

has reviewed the proposed operational plan relative to the current mixing zone boundary and has provided a technical memorandum provided in Appendix D. RPS' conclusions and recommendations are as follows:

- Based on the combination of modeling results from various scenarios, it is suggested that the permitted mixing zone is suitable for delineating the area where expected excess concentrations would exceed 20 mg/L from jet plow operations regardless of the tide stage at the time of crossing the channel and of the minor deviation from the original route within the channel.
- While there are some model predicted deviations of the 20 mg/L contour outside this mixing zone, they are at the further extents close to where the concentrations drop and are based on conservative assumptions which may have resulted in an overestimate of the plume.
- The assumptions have been observed to be conservative based on comparison of the maximum observed TSS during the jet plow trial which were all considerably lower than the model predicted maximum at these locations.
- Further it is suggested that the route adjustment will not significantly change the model predictions, and therefore the previously completed modeling is deemed a useful proxy for the adjusted route.

Bathymetric Monitoring

In accordance with the NHDES approved *Seacoast Reliability Project Benthic Community Monitoring Plan* dated September 5, 2019, a detailed bathymetric survey was conducted in August 28, 2019 using a multibeam echosounder to map the sediment surface. A 230-meter (755-ft) corridor was mapped along the original cable alignment resulting in an approximately 100-acre survey area. Sufficient preconstruction survey area



exists to characterize the naturally-occurring bathymetric conditions in the project area and can accommodate the relatively minor horizontal shift in a portion of the cable alignment of 96 feet.

Benthic Habitat Monitoring

The original design for the benthic infaunal community monitoring stations as described in the *Seacoast Reliability Project Benthic Community Monitoring Plan* dated September 5, 2019, included four (4) transects in different depth zones. A detail of the benthic sample locations relative to the cable realignment are shown on Figure 6.



Figure 6: 2019 Preconstruction benthic sample locations near the proposed cable realignment.

On each transect, five (5) stations were spaced to represent unaffected habitat both north and south of the cable route as well as impacted habitat (i.e., direct impact of the jet plow and indirect impact from redeposition of sediments disturbed by the jet plow) within and adjacent to the cable route. Three (3) of the four (4) transects are located outside the area that will be affected by the realignment. Along the transect located within the channel (Stations B6 – B10), Stations B7 - B9 were located in the predicted impact area. As a result of the proposed realignment, the route will be slightly farther from Stations B7 and B8 and slightly closer to Station B9 than for the original alignment. All of these impact stations will still be within the area predicted to experience redeposition however, therefore it can be concluded that they will still represent baseline conditions from which to assess from the effects of cable installation through the channel.

Data on benthic infaunal community in the channel collected in 2014 and reported in the Seacoast Reliability Project Madbury, Durham, Newington & Portsmouth, NH Natural Resource Existing Conditions Report Report



dated March 2016 indicated the dynamic nature of the estuarine substrate in the channel. All community indicators (abundance, number of unique taxa, diversity and evenness) were more variable in the channel than either the tidal flat or the channel slope. The dominant taxa in the channel were similar to those on the channel slope although the rank order, based on abundance, differed. The three (3) most abundant species (all polychaetes) are all surface deposit feeders, a feeding strategy that suggests instability in the habitat, such as mobile sediments. The information obtained from the multiple bathymetric surveys conducted in September 2019 that shows frequent movement of surficial sediments in the channel, supports this interpretation.

Given this evidence, relocating impact stations along the channel transect and re-collection of baseline data are unlikely to provide additional insights into pre-construction conditions that would assist in interpretation of post-construction monitoring data.

Eelgrass Survey

There is no eelgrass affected by the cable realignment. The cable realignment is proposed within the channel of Little Bay where eelgrass does not naturally occur, nor has it been observed during pre-construction surveys.

6.0 CONCLUSIONS

Eversource has presented this description and technical justification for a submarine cable alignment needed to navigate problematic bathymetric conditions observed during preconstruction surveys of the cable corridor. Eversource has evaluated current pre-construction survey and assessment data and collected supplemental sediment characteristic data along the cable realignment.

The analyses and data presented above demonstrate that the results of the jet plow trial, evaluation of the sediment dispersion model, mixing zone boundary, water quality monitoring plan, sediment characterization data, bathymetric survey, benthic monitoring, eel grass survey results and supplemental sediment characterization indicate the proposed cable realignment is a minor design change and will have minimal impacts on the water quality and ecology of the Bay.

APPENDIX A

Amended Engineering Drawings – Seacoast Reliability Project, Circuit F107, Little Bay Crossing, Newington 115kV Underground Transmission Line



$\frown \frown \frown$		\frown	\frown
	DRAWING MANIFEST		
DRAWING NO.	TITLE/DESCRIPTION	REVISION	DATE
SHEET 1 OF 13	COVER SHEET, LEGEND, AND DRAWING MANIFEST	2	9-23-19
SHEET 2 OF 13	PLAN AND PROFILE DRAWING STA. 393+00 TO STA. 403+00	1	3-1-19
SHEET 3 OF 13	PLAN AND PROFILE DRAWING STA. 403+00 TO STA. 413+00	1	3-1-19
SHEET 4 OF 13	PLAN AND PROFILE DRAWING STA. 413+00 TO STA. 423+00	2	9-23-19
SHEET 5 OF 13	PLAN AND PROFILE DRAWING STA. 423+00 TO STA. 433+00	2	9-23-19
SHEET 6 OF 13	PLAN AND PROFILE DRAWING STA. 433+00 TO STA. 443+00	2	9-23-19
SHEET 7 OF 13	PLAN AND PROFILE DRAWING STA. 443+00 TO STA. 453+00	1	3-1-19
SHEET 8 OF 13	PLAN AND PROFILE DRAWING STA. 453+00 TO STA. 463+00	1	3-1-19
SHEET 9 OF 13	PLAN AND PROFILE DRAWING STA. 463+00 TO STA. 470+00	1	3–1–19
SHEET 10 OF 13	TRENCH AND JET PLOW DETAILS	1	3–1–19
SHEET 11 OF 13	SPLICE VAULT DETAILS	1	3-1-19
SHEET 12 OF 13	SPLICE VAULT DETAILS	1	3-1-19
SHEET 13 OF 13	SPLICE VAULT MISCELLANEOUS DETAILS	1	3-1-19





DESIGN ENGINEER: JOSEPH SPERRY

POWER ENGINEERS PROJECT ENGINEER: TODD GOYETTE



PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE DBA EVERSOURCE ENERGY $\mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{H}_{1}}$ SEACUAS || | + | | ||AH||UNDERGROUND IRANS 15kV







PRINT DRAWING TO SCALE ON 22"X34" SHEET

NOTES:

- 1. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE INSIDE DIMENSIONS.
- 2. PULLING HARDWARE SHALL BE GOOD FOR 60,000lbs OF TENSION, MINIMUM.
- 3. SUMP SHALL BE CAPABLE OF HANDLING SUMP PUMP, MINIMUM 4" DEEP.
- 4. CABLE & ACCESSORIES CONTRACTOR TO FIELD VERIFY ACTUAL SPLICE VAULT DEPTHS. CONTRACTOR IS RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL SAFETY & ENTRY/EXIT REQUIREMENTS.
- 5. ALL CHIMNEY RINGS SHALL BE MORTARED OR OTHERWISE "KEYED" TO PREVENT HORIZONTAL DISPLACEMENT AND SHALL BE SECURELY MORTARED TO SPLICE VAULT ROOF.
- 6. MANHOLE RING SHALL BE SECURELY FASTENED TO THE SPLICE VAULT ROOF OR CHIMNEY USING INSERTS AND BOLTS OR OTHER MEANS WITH PRIOR APPROVAL.
- 7. REINFORCING STEEL SHALL BE BONDED TO 500kcmil SOFT DRAWN BARE COPPER BONDING JUMPERS.
- 8. MULTISECTION SPLICE VAULTS SHALL INCORPORATE EITHER SHIPLAP OR TONGUE AND GROOVE JOINTS UTILIZING APPROPRIATE SILICONE, POLYMERIC OR ELASTOMERIC SEALANTS.
- 9. ALL EXTERNAL SURFACES OF VAULT SHALL BE SEALED USING SONNEDORN HYDROCIDE 700 OR OWNER APPROVED EQUIVALENT.
- 10. NO STEEL REINFORCING BAR MAY ENCAPSULATE ANY INDIVIDUAL CONDUIT.
- 11. INSTALL CIRCUIT IDENTIFICATION LABELS ON VAULT WALL AND INSTALL DANGER WARNING SIGN IN CHIMNEY.
- 12. CONTRACTOR SHALL PROVIDE RACKING FOR 50' OF DYNAMIC TEMPERATURE SENSING CABLE TO BE COILED ON THE WALL OPPOSITE THE CABLE SPLICES.

APPENDIX B

Amended Environmental Maps (Sheets 20, 21, 22)

APPENDIX C

Vibracore Logs and Sediment Laboratory Analytical Reports

FIELD DATA SHEET		Page of
Project Name: EVER SOURCE - SRP		Proj. #: 23840.039
Address:		Task#: ころ
City: PORTSMONTY	State: ∧ H	Date: 9-24-19
Field Team Leader(s):MKM	Field Team Safety Coordinator	MKM
Field Crew: E5	Arrival & Departure Times: 043<	- 0948
Station ID #: $(OR - \nabla)$	Weather: Clear Cloudy	Rain Other
Photos: Y (N) Photo Nos.:	Wind Conditions (Speed/Direction):	5-10 IV
FIELD DATA		
Water Depth: <u>4</u> ft. Tide: Ebb	Flood Low Slack High Slack	Other NA
PID: N/A Redox Potential: N/A	pH: N/A H ² O Temp.: N/A	Air Temp.: NA
SAMPLE/PUSH #1 Core ID#:CORCoring Time:		Core Recovery:
Sample Method: Ponar / Vibracore Piston Core / Manual	Coring Material: AB Aluminum / SS Core	e Diameter (OD): 2" 3" (4")
Vibracore Type: Rossfelder / PVL / Portable Clamp-on / NA	Sampling Equipment Deconned or Rep	laced: (Y) N
SAMPLE/PUSH #2 Core ID#: Coring Time:	Penetration Depth:	Core Recovery:
Sample Method: Ponar / Vibracore / Piston Core / Manual	Coring Material: CAB / Aluminum / SS Core	e Diameter (OD): 2" 3" 4"
Vibracore Type: Rossfelder / PVL / Portable Clamp-on / NA	Sampling Equipment Deconned or Rep	laced: Y N
SAMPLE/PUSH #3 Core ID#: Coring Time:	Penetration Depth:	Core Recovery:
Sample Method: Ponar / Vibracore / Piston Core / Manual	Coring Material: CAB / Aluminum / SS	Diameter (OD): '2" 3" 4"
Vibracore Type: Rossfelder / PVL / Portable Clamp-on / NA	Sampling Equipment Deconned or Rep	laced: Y N
DGPS DATA Operator: MKM File Name: PR (OR - 1) Lat / N: 2 9 8 15 15 Lon / E: 1 0 9 3 00 .97 PDOP:	Coordinate Units: U.S. Survey Feet Datum: NAD 83 Proj.: <i>N</i> # GPS Serial #: GeoXH 6000	
COMMENTS / NOTES	North	
Coring Tube Used: 7	-	• •
Preparer's Initial: MKM		

NORMANDEAU ASSOCIATES Environmental Consultants

. ¢

1

FIELD DATA SHEET	Page of
Project Name: EUFRSOVRCE - SRP	Proj. #: 23840.039
Address:	Task #: 23
City: PORTS MOVIH	State: Date: 9 - 24 - 19
Field Team Leader(s): MKM	Field Team Safety Coordinator: MKM
Field Crew: ES	Arrival & Departure Times: 0900 -0923
Station ID #: CORC.	Weather: Clear Cloudy Rain Other
Photos: Y (N) Photo Nos.:	Wind Conditions (Speed/Direction): $5 - 10 W$
FIELD DATA	
Water Depth: 4 ft. Tide: Ebb	Flood Low Slack High Slack Other NA
PID: N/A Redox Potential: N/A	pH: N/A H ² O Temp.: N/A Air Temp.: NA
SAMPLE/PUSH #1 Core ID#:COR-Z Coring Time: []]	13 Penetration Depth: 24 Core Recovery: 17
Sample Method: Ponar / Vibracore / Piston Core / Manual	Coring Material: CAB) Aluminum / SS Core Diameter (OD): 2" 3" 4"
Vibracore Type: Ressfelder PVL / Portable Clamp-on / NA	Sampling Equipment Deconned or Replaced (Y) N
SAMPLE/PUSH #2 Core ID#: Coring Time:	Penetration Depth: Core Recovery:
Sample Method: Ponar / Vibracore / Piston Core / Manual	Coring Material: CAB / Aluminum / SS Core Diameter (OD): 2" 3" 4"
Vibracore Type: Rossfelder / PVL / Portable Clamp-on / NA	/sampling Equipment Deconned or Replaced: Y N
SAMPLE/PUSH #3 Core ID#: Coring Time:	Penetration Depth: Core Recovery:
Sample Method: Ponar / Vibracore / Piston Core / Manual	Coring Material: CAB / Aluminum / SS Core Diameter (OD): '2" 3" 4"
Vibracore Type: Rossfelder / PVL / Portable Clamp-on / NA	Sampling Equipment Deconned or Replaced: Y N
DGPS DATAOperator:MKMFile Name: $(OR Z)$ Lat / N: $Z[Q(QQ4, Q)]$ Lon / E: $11QQ4Q4, Q2$ PDOP: $$	Coordinate Units: U.S. Survey Feet Datum: NAD 83 Proj.: バー GPS Serial #: GeoXH 6000
	North
Coring Tube Used: 5'	-
Preparer's Initial: MKM	

•

24.1

FIELD DATA SHEET	Page of
Project Name: FVERSOURCE -SRP	Proj. #: 23840.039
Address: T	Гask#: 25
City: PORTS MOUTH State: NH	Date: 9 - 24 - 19
Field Team Leader(s): MKM Field Team Safety Coordinator: N	NKM
Field Crew: 15.5 Arrival & Departure Times: 0956	-1015
Station ID #: COR-3 Weather: Clear Cloudy	Rain Other
Photos: Y N Photo Nos.: Wind Conditions (Speed/Direction):	
FIELD DATA 20	
Water Depth: <u>51</u> ft. Tide: Ebb Flood Low Slack High Slack	Other NA
PID: N/A Redox Potential: N/A pH: N/A H ² O Temp.: N/A A	Air Temp.: NA
SAMPLE/PUSH #1 Core ID#:COR3 Coring Time:OO Penetration Depth:C	Core Recovery: 2
Vibracore Type: (Rossfelder) / PVI / Portable Clamp-on / NA Sampling Equipment Deconned or Rent	aced: 1 N
SAMPLE/PUSH #2 Coring Time: Penetration Depth: C	Core Recovery:
Sample Method: Ponar / Vibracore / Piston Core / Manual Coring Material: CAB / Aluminum / SS Core	Diameter (OD): 2" 3" 4"
Vibracore Type: Rossfelder / PVL / Portable Clamp-on / NA Sampling Equipment Deconned or Repla	aced: Y N
SAMPLE/PUSH #3 Coring Time: Penetration Depth: C Core ID#: Sample Method: Ponar / Vibracore / Piston Core / Manual Coring Material: CAB / Aluminum / SS Core Vibracore Type: Rossfelder / PVL / Portable Clamp-on / NA Sampling Equipment Deconned or Replace Core	Core Recovery:
DGPS DATA Operator: MKM File Name: COR3 Lat / N: ZIQ FOH 97 Lon / E: III 99 642.71 PDOP: GPS Serial #: GeoXH 6000	ατα αποτείτεται το του στο του του του του του του του του του τ
Coring Tube Used: 5 ¹ / Preparer's Initial: MKM	

ġ.

	NORMANDEAŬ
\sim	
Environr	nental Consultants

FIELD DATA SHEET		Page of (
Project Name: EVERSOURCE - SR P		Proj. #: 23840.039
Address:		Task #: 25
city: PORTS MOVT Y	State: \mathcal{N}_{H}	Date: 9-24-19
Field Team Leader(s):MKM	Field Team Safety Coordinator:	МКМ
Field Crew: <u>F3</u>	Arrival & Departure Times: 1052	- 1045
Station ID #: <u>COR 4</u>	Weather: Clear Cloudy	Rain Other
Photos: Y (N) Photo Nos.:	Wind Conditions (Speed/Direction):	10-13 ~ W
FIELD DATA 25		
Water Depth:ft. Tide: Ebb	Flood Low Slack High Slack	Other NA
PID: N/A Redox Potential: N/A	pH: N/A H ² O Temp.: N/A	Air Temp.: NA
SAMPLE/PUSH #1 Core ID#: <u>COR - 4</u> Coring Time: 10	t Penetration Depth: 28	
Sample Method: Ponar Vibracore) Piston Core / Manual	Coring Material: CAB) Aluminum / SS Cor	e Diameter (OD): 2" 3"
Vibracore Type: Rossfelder / PVL / Portable Clamp-on / NA	Sampling Equipment Deconned or Rep	laced: N
SAMPLE/PUSH #2 Core ID#: Coring Time:	Penetration Depth:	Core Recovery:
Sample Method: Ponar / Vibracore / Piston Core / Manual	Coring Material: CAB / Aluminum / SS Cor	e Diameter (OD): 2" 3" 4"
Vibracore Type: Rossfelder / PVL / Portable Clamp-on / NA	Sampling Equipment Deconned or Rep	laced: Y N
SAMPLE/PUSH #3	Penetration Denth:	Core Recovery:
Sample Method: Ponar / Vibracore / Piston Core / Manual	Coring Material: CAB / Aluminum / SS	e-Diameter (OD): '2" 3" 4"
Vibracore Type: Rossfelder / PVL / Portable Clamp-on / NA	Sampling Equipment Deconned or Rep	laced: Y N
DGPS DATA		
Operator: MKM	Coordinate Units: U:S: Survey Fee	
File Name: COK Y	Datum: NAD 83	
Lon / \Box : 12004337	GPS Serial #: GeoXH 6000 -	
PDOP:	430.	•
COMMENTS / NOTES		
	North	
	Λ/A	
		<i>'r</i> .
Coring Tube Used: 5 '		
Preparer's Initial: MKM		

	PROJECT NUME	BER	BORING NUMBER			
	22040.0	154/24	1 ICUK-L	SHEET U OF L		
<u> </u>	Normandeau Soil Boring Log					
PROJECT : EV	FRGOVREIZ - 5	Rt)	LOCATION : MORTSMOUTH	NH		
ELEVATION : /			DRILLING CONTRACTOR: No PVI/Vibracore/Popar® Sediment Grab/Manually	rmandeau Associates		
WATER LEVELS	: 41		START: 1220 END: 238	LOGGER : MM		
DEPTH BELOW SU	IRFACE (FT)	STANDARD	CORE DESCRIPTION	COMMENTS		
	RECOVERY (FT) #/TYPE	TEST RESULTS 6"-6"-6"-6" (N)	SOIL NAME, USCS GROUP SYMBOL, COLOR, MOISTURE CONTENT, RELATIVE DENSITY OR CONSISTENCY, SOIL STRUCTURE, MINERALOGY.	DEPTH OF CASING, DRILLING RATE, DRILLING FLUID LOSS, TESTS, AND INSTRUMENTATION.		
5"-			Homogeneous throughout.	1 Jar grain size -		
			Sieft -	1 jar archive -		
-			1 gley 5/10 y -	sample time 12:30-		
			fine to medium grain -	-		
-			sands with clay -	-		
4 ²			woody debris and -	-		
			very wet to wet -	-		
-	2		low plasticity -	· -		
-	, n. ∳		cohesire _	·		
-			-	گ		
-				- 		
			-	- - -		
			_	*		
-			-	· -		
_				-		
			· -	. –		
5.9-			-	-		

.

	PROJECT NUMB 72840 .	er 039/27	$\frac{\text{BORING NUMBER}}{(.0R-7)}$	SHEET OF
		Nor	mandeau Soil Bor	ing Log
PROJECT : ÈV	ERSOURIE - S	SRP	LOCATION: PORTS MUTH	NH
ELEVATION : /			DRILLING CONTRACTOR : No	rmandeau Associates
WATER LEVELS	: 41		START: 240 END: 1248	LOGGER : ///
DEPTH BELOW SU	RFACE (FT)	STANDARD	CORE DESCRIPTION	COMMENTS
	L (FT) RECOVERY (FT) #/TYPE	PENETRATION TEST RESULTS 6"-6"-6"-6" (N)	SOIL NAME, USCS GROUP SYMBOL, COLOR, MOISTURE CONTENT, RELATIVE DENSITY OR CONSISTENCY, SOIL STRUCTURE, MINERALOGY.	DEPTH OF CASING, DRILLING RATE, DRILLING FLUID LOSS, TESTS, AND INSTRUMENTATION.
0"_			Homogeneous throughout_	1 Jargrain size -
			Soft -	1 Jar archive -
			1 Gley 5/104 -	sample time 1245
-			fine to medium grain -	
	X		sands with day -	
- - -	د ۲ ۲		woody debris and - shells -	
-			very wet to wet -	- - -
			low plasticity -	-
-			cohesive -	-
-			-	-
-				
-			-	-
- 17 ¹¹				-

<u> </u>	PROJECT NUMB	ER	BORING NUMBER	á .
	23840.0	27 192	5 COR-3	
		Nor	mandeau Soil Bor	ring Log
PROJECT : EL	IER SOURCE -	-SRP	LOCATION: PORTSMOUTH	NH
ELEVATION :			DRILLING CONTRACTOR No.	ormandeau Associates
WATER LEVELS	: 39		START: 250 END: 1258	LOGGER: MM
DEPTH BELOW SU	JRFACE (FT)	STANDARD	CORE DESCRIPTION	COMMENTS
	RECOVERY (FT) #/TYPE	PENETRATION TEST RESULTS 6"-6"-6" (N)	SOIL NAME, USCS GROUP SYMBOL, COLOR, MOISTURE CONTENT, RELATIVE DENSITY OR CONSISTENCY, SOIL STRUCTURE, MINERALOGY.	DEPTH OF CASING, DRILLING RATE, DRILLING FLUID LOSS, TESTS, AND INSTRUMENTATION.
0 ⁶ _ - - -			woody debris	1 Jan grain size - 1 Jan archive -
				Sample time 12:55-
			50FT 1 Qley 2.5/10Y Fine to medium grain Sands With minor clay Some woody debris wet non - plastic non - cohesive	
234			-	-

F		·····							
	PROJECT NUME	BER	BORING NUMBER						
A	0.0090.	V09/2	2 ICUK-4	SHEET OF					
		Nor	mandeau Soil Bor	ring Log					
PROJECT : E	VERSOURCE -S	RP		PORTEMONTH					
ELEVATION :	NA	<u> </u>	DRILLING CONTRACTOR : No	DRILLING CONTRACTOR : Normandeau Associates					
DRILLING MET	HOD AND EQUIPME	ENT USED :	PVL(Vibracore)Ponar® Sediment Grab/Manuall	y-pushed boring					
DEPTH BELOW	SURFACE (FT)	STANDARD	CORE DESCRIPTION	COMMENTS					
INTER	VAL (FT)	PENETRATION							
	RECOVERY (FT)	TEST	SOIL NAME, USCS GROUP SYMBOL, COLOR,	DEPTH OF CASING, DRILLING RATE,					
	#/IYPE	RESULIS	OR CONSISTENCY SOIL STRUCTURE	TESTS AND INSTRUMENTATION.					
		(N)	MINERALOGY.						
0 "			SOFT	1 Jar grain size					
			1 Gley 2.5/101_						
_				1 Jar archive -					
			fine to medium -	sompletime -					
			grain sands -	13:05 -					
			with minor clay -						
-			some wood, debis	-					
-			wet -	- 					
			Non - Plastric -	Ϋ́ -					
			non - cohesive	COR-4A =					
/ブ <u>ー</u>			Soft medium -	COR-4B -					
_		10	1gley 4/5 G -						
			clay -	\vee					
			Naict -						
_			high plasticity -	-					
				_					
2311			cohesive -	_					

Enthalpy Analytical 1 Lafayette Road Hampton, NH 03842 603-926-3345

CHAIN OF CUSTODY DOCUMENTATION

Client:	Normandeau Associates, Inc.		Contact:	Mike	e Ma	e++)	er		Project N	lame:	Seacoast F	Reliability Project	
Report to:	Sarah Allen cc: Ann Pembroke		Address	: 25 Nash	ua Rd, B	edford, N	NH 0311	0	Project N	lumber:	23840.039		
Invoice to:	Normandeau Associates, Inc.		Address	25 Nash	ua Rd, B	edford, N	NH 0311	0	Project N	lanager	Sarah Aller	1	
Voice:	603-637-1158								email:		sallen@nor	mandeau.com	
Protocol:	Protocol: apembroke@normandeau.com												
Lab Number (assigned by lab)	Field ID	Date Sampled	Time Sampled	Sampled By	Grab or ^{Composite} (G/C)	No	Contain Size (mL)	er Type (P/G)	Field Preser- vation	Matrix S=Solid W=Water	Filter N=Not needed F=Done in field L=Lab to do	Analys	es Requested
001/-1	COR-1	9/24/A	1230	MKM	C	2		6	ICE	5	N	Grain Size	Archive
-002/-	02(, OR - 2	\uparrow	1245	1	1	1		\uparrow	\uparrow	1	\uparrow	\uparrow	
- 003/-1	BCOR-3		1255										
-0041.	104COR - 4 4		1305	V	V			V	V	V	V	Ĺ	
-005-	ISCOR-4R	9/24/19	1320	MKM	ċ	2		Ġ	ICE	Ś	N	Grain Size	p / Archive
													· ·
	2 - 27 - 27					_							Temp (C):
Relinquishe	Relinquished By: Date: Time: Received By: Date: Time: Meter ID:												
Relinquishe	elinquished By: The Date: 9/24/19 Time: 1515 Received By: The Date: 09/24/19 Time: 1515 Meter ID: T-292												

SAMPLE RECEIPT AND CONDITION DOCUMENTATION

STUDY NO: 32325 SDG No: Project: Seacoast Reliability Project Delivered via: Client Date and Time Received: 09/24/19 1515 Date and Time Logged into Lab: 09/25/19 0715 Received By: GS Logged into Lab by: RAM Air bill / Way bill: No Air bill included in folder if received? NA Cooler on ice/packs: Yes Custody Seals present? NA Cooler Blank Temp (C) at arrival: 9.3C **Custody Seals intact?** NA Number of COC Pages: 1 COC Serial Number(s): NA COC Complete: Yes Does the info on the COC match the samples? Yes Sampled Date: Yes Were samples received within holding time? Yes Field ID complete: Yes Were all samples properly labeled? Yes Sampled Time: Yes Were proper sample containers used? Yes Analysis request: Yes Were samples received intact? (none broken or leaking) Yes COC Signed and dated: Were sample volumes sufficient for requested analysis? Yes Yes Were all samples received? Were VOC vials free of headspace? Yes NA Client notification/authorization: Not required pH Test strip ID number: NA

				Bottle	Req'd	Verified
Field ID	Lab ID	Mx	Analysis Requested		Pres'n	Pres'n
COR-1	32325-001	S	Grain Size	16oz G	4C	Yes
COR-2	32325-002	S	Grain Size	16oz G	4C	Yes
COR-3	32325-003	S	Grain Size	16oz G	4C	Yes
COR-4 A	32325-004	S	Grain Size	16oz G	4C	Yes
COR-4 B	32325-005	S	Grain Size	16oz G	4C	Yes
COR-1	32325-101	S	Archive	9oz G	4C	Yes
COR-2	32325-102	S	Archive	9oz G	4C	Yes
COR-3	32325-103	S	Archive	9oz G	4C	Yes
COR-4 A	32325-104	S	Archive	9oz G	4C	Yes
COR-4 B	32325-105	S	Archive	9oz G	4C	Yes

Notes and qualifications:

Chain of custody listed samples on a single line, the aliquot for grain size was assigned a different number from the archival sample. RAM 09/25

Page 1 of 1

Client:	Montrose Environmental Group	
Project Name:	32325GZ	
Project Location:		
GTX #:	31679	
Test Date:	10/01/19	
Tested By:	bfs	
Checked By:	emm	

Wentworth Classification

Sample	Boulder,	Cobble, % (-6 to -8 φ)	Gravel, %			Very Fine Sand, % Gravel,						Silt,	Clay,	
ID	(<-8 φ)		Very Coarse (-5 to -6 φ)	Coarse (-4 to -5 φ)	Medium (-3 to -4 φ)	Fine (-2 to -3 φ)	% (-1 to -2 φ)	Very Coarse (0 to -1 φ)	Coarse (1 to 0 φ)	Medium (2 to 1 ¢)	Fine (3 to 2 φ)	Very Fine (4 to 3 φ)	(8 to 4 φ)	(10 to 8 φ)
32325-001	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	31	33	8	15	9
32325-002	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	30	51	7	1	5	1
32325-003	0	0	0	3	4	1	1	2	11	31	17	14	11	5
32325-004	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	6	16	63	7	2	2	1
32325-005	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	1	2	52	39

Client:	Montrose E	Environmental	Group			
Project:	32325GZ					
Location:					Project No:	GTX-310679
Boring ID:			Sample Type:	jar	Tested By:	ckg
Sample ID:	32325-001	L	Test Date:	09/30/19	Checked By:	bfs
Depth :			Test Id:	525227		
Test Comm	ent:					
Visual Desc	ription:	Moist, gray sil	ty sand			
Sample Cor	mment:					

Client:	Montrose E	Environmental (Group			
Project:	32325GZ					
Location:					Project No:	GTX-310679
Boring ID:			Sample Type:	jar	Tested By:	ckg
Sample ID:	32325-002	2	Test Date:	09/30/19	Checked By:	bfs
Depth :			Test Id:	525228		
Test Comm	ent:					
Visual Desc	ription:	Moist, gray sa	nd with silt			
Sample Co	mment:					

	Client:	Montrose E	nvironmental (Group							
	Project:	32325GZ									
ń	Location:					Project No:	GTX-310679				
9	Boring ID:			Sample Type:	jar	Tested By:	ckg				
	Sample ID:	32325-003	5	Test Date:	09/30/19	Checked By:	bfs				
	Depth :			Test Id:	525229						
	Test Comm	ent:									
	Visual Desc	ription:	Moist, gray sil	ty sand							
	Sample Cor	mment:									
٦	rticlo	Cizo	Analyz	nic AC	стм г	777					

	Client:	Montrose E	nvironmental (Group			
	Project:	32325GZ					
d	Location:					Project No:	GTX-310679
9	Boring ID:			Sample Type:	jar	Tested By:	ckg
	Sample ID:	32325-004		Test Date:	10/01/19	Checked By:	bfs
	Depth :			Test Id:	525230		
[Test Comm	ent:					
	Visual Desc	ription:	Moist, gray sa	nd			
	Sample Cor	nment:					
		C:	A			117	
Pa	article	Size	Analys	515 - AS)422	
		C.					

	Client:	Montrose	Environmental	Group			
	Project:	32325GZ					
	Location:					Project No:	GTX-310679
	Boring ID:			Sample Type:	jar	Tested By:	ckg
	Sample ID:	32325-00	5	Test Date:	09/30/19	Checked By:	bfs
	Depth :			Test Id:	525231		
	Test Comm	ent:					
	Visual Desc	cription:	Moist, gray sa	nd			
	Sample Co	mment:					
٦.	- rtiala	Cizo	Analy			1477	

APPENDIX D

RPS Memorandum on Sediment Dispersion Model and Mixing Zone

Date:	October 2, 2019
То:	Sarah Allen (Normandeau Associates Inc.)
From:	Deborah Crowley (RPS) and Craig Swanson (Swanson
	Environmental)
Pages:	12 including this page
Regarding	Seacoast Reliability Project – Sediment Plume

55 Village Square Drive South Kingstown RI 02879 T +1 401 789 6224

1. Introduction

RPS and Swanson Environmental have been supporting Normandeau Associates Inc (Normandeau) in their work conducting the environmental assessment and permitting of cable burial operations associated with the Seacoast Reliability Project which is being pursued by Public Service of New Hampshire d/b/a Eversource Energy. The project includes the construction of an electrical cable system to increase the reliability of the electrical transmission grid in southern New Hampshire. This cable would cross the Little Bay portion of the Great Bay Estuarine System. The crossing would entail burial of three separate but parallel cable bundles by jet plowing and diver assisted methods across a tidal flat and channel.

RPS has previously completed two separate modeling studies evaluating the sediment effects as characterized by the plume of total suspended solids (TSS) above ambient levels and subsequent seabed deposition. These studies listed below are referred to as 'Original' and 'Revised' herein. The revised study reflected new data and new project details and included sensitivity studies.

- Original- Modeling Sediment Dispersion from Cable Burial for Seacoast Reliability Project, Little Bay, New Hampshire (Issued 14 December 2015).
- Revised Revised Modeling Sediment Dispersion from Cable Burial for Seacoast Reliability Project, Upper Little Bay, New Hampshire (Issued 27 June 2017).

Subsequent to these reports the project was granted a permit with a condition of performing a jet plow trial. The jet plow trial includes operating the jet plow (without cable) along a portion of the planned route so the installer can better understand the site and to gauge the effects on water quality. The permit included a mixing zone which was proposed by Normandeau and Eversource based on modeling results from the original study and the base case of the revised study. The mixing zone was defined as the area within which these two model runs had predicted maximum excess TSS less than 20 mg/L. The permit required that monitoring be performed at stations within and at the mixing zone boundary. The jet plow trial took place September 9, 2019 along with water quality monitoring. Normandeau issued a report describing the installation activity and observed water quality conditions. Part of the water quality observations included examining the relationship between turbidity (NTU; the regulated water quality parameter) and TSS, sampling of background conditions, sampling of conditions during the jet plow trial and sampling of conditions after the plow operation ceased.

Also subsequent to these reports and the original permit conditions it was found that a portion of the route in the channel included sand waves on the bottom. The sand waves pose potential operating restrictions to the plow due to localized seabed slope. It is now proposed that a portion of the route deviate slightly to avoid the seabed slope issues local to the sand waves.

www.rpsgroup.com

Date:October 2, 2019Regarding:SRP - TSS

RPS has prepared this memo to comment on the mixing zone relative to the modeling and jet plow trial as well as to provide comment on the route adjustment local to the sand waves.

2. Comment on Mixing Zone Relative to Jet Plow Trial and Modeling

A mixing zone developed as part of the permit was intended to delineate the area where maximum excess concentrations of TSS may exceed 20 mg/L. This mixing zone was delineated based on the union of the 20 mg/L contour from the modeling of the original base case and the revised base case. Both cases had assumed continuous jet plow operations and both reflected a start of the jet plow at the western shore at high tide such that initial plowing will be synchronous with an ebbing current (transporting sediments north). The original case had slower installation (5.47 ft/min [1.67 m/min]) such that the plowing experienced more stages of the tidal currents subsequent to the initial ebb current after high tide to slack at low tide, then flood after low tide, to slack at high tide, then ebb again, whereas the revised modeling had faster installation (~10 ft/min [~3 m/min]) such that the ebb current is experienced along most of the route with it turning to a period of flood currents after slack at low tide near the eastern end of the route.

The jet plow trial installation speeds varied only slightly (5.77 ft/min – 10.38 ft/min [1.76 m/min – 3.16 m/min]) from approximately the installation rate from the original base case modeling to that of the revised base case modeling. However, the installer has indicated that burial operations would have multiple stoppages to relocate the cable pulling barges; therefore operations could occur during any stage of the tidal current. As a result of this change in operation, it was necessary to reevaluate the suitability of the mixing zone area delineation. RPS performed an assessment of the modeling results comparing the original and revised modeling as well as results from an additional scenario carried out specifically to assess the effect of tidal stage and to reflect the currently understood operational scenario. This new scenario was modeled assuming the slow advance rate (5 ft/min [1.52 m/min]) across the mud flats followed by a 3 hour stoppage (time required for anchor changes) and finally resuming installation across the channel at the base advance rate (10 ft/min [3.04 m/min]); the stoppage is such that the resumed activities take place during a flood current. A summary of the model runs (original, revised and new) with their associated key model input values is presented in Table 1.

Maps delineating the 20 mg/L contour from the previously documented original and revised modeling (including sensitivity runs) are presented in Figure 1 and the revised base along with the new start/stop/restart scenario is presented in Figure 2. Reviewing Figure 1 it can be seen that the 20 mg/L footprints from the original and revised modeling primarily remain within the mixing zone except for small areas with the more conservative runs (higher loss rate and faster advance rate). Results from the jet plow trial indicate that neither the higher loss rate nor the faster advance rate scenarios are likely to occur. The 20 mg/L contour from the new run (Figure 2) remains primarily within the mixing zone however with some deviation since this new run captured operations with flood currents in a different manner (starting immediately after the mud flat, rather than partway across the channel, and during close to peak flood current) than the slow advance base case.

The model results were also post-processed to determine the duration that excess TSS concentrations exceeded the 20 mg/L threshold; figures of this metric are presented for the original and the revised base case in Figure 3 and Figure 4, respectively and in Figure 5 for the new case. Reviewing the durations over

www.rpsgroup.com

Date: October 2, 2019 Regarding: SRP - TSS

the 20 mg/L threshold, it is evident that in most locations close to the mixing zone boundary, concentrations of 20 mg/L persist for less than an hour. In fact for the revised base and new (starting, stopping, and resuming) modeling scenarios shown in Figure 4 and Figure 5, this is true even for most locations well within the mixing zone. The durations were greater for the original modeling due to the much more conservative nature of that modeling, as noted in the bullets below:

- Modeled sediments had a higher assumed fraction of fine material
- The modeled trench was deeper in the deep waters
- The modeled trench was assumed 100 percent solid (no account for moisture content since it was not available)

The maximum excess TSS concentrations from model results at the location of the jet plow trial monitoring stations were then extracted and compared to the observed TSS concentrations from the jet plow trial report (Normandeau, 2019). Note that the jet plow trial only took place over a fraction of the route whereas the modeling reflects the entire route. A summary of the observed maximum TSS concentrations and model-predicted maximum excess TSS concentrations at the jet plow trial observation station locations is presented in Table 2. Reviewing Table 2, it is evident that, during the jet plow trial, the observations were primarily much lower than the model predicted excess concentrations. The observed concentrations are total suspended sediment concentration (ambient plus plume) whereas the model concentrations are excess suspended sediment concentrations (plume only); therefore the observations of the plume concentrations due to jet plowing operations are of an even lower magnitude than what was observed since the observed contains the plume plus ambient (represented by the reference station values in Table 2) contributions.

Table 1: Summary of Model Runs.

Original, Revised, or New Model Results	Run Descriptor	Report Date	Jet Duration (hours)	Advance Rate (ft/min)	Loss Rate (%)	Tide	Old/New Sediment	Start Time	Currents As Operations from West to East Occur
Original	Original	Dec-15	13	5.47	25	Mean	Old	High Slack	Ebb-Flood-Ebb
Revised	Revised - Base	Jul-17	7.1	10.00	25	Spring	New	High Slack	Ebb -Flood
Revised	Revised - Slow	Jul-17	14.2	5.00	25	Spring	New	High Slack	Ebb-Flood-Ebb
Revised	Revised - Fast	Jul-17	4.7	15.00	25	Spring	New	High Slack	Ebb
Revised	Revised - High Loss	Jul-17	7.1	10.00	35	Spring	New	High Slack	Ebb -Flood
Revised	Revised - Low Loss	Jul-17	7.1	10.00	10	Spring	New	High Slack	Ebb -Flood
Revised	Revised - Neap	Jul-17	7.1	10.00	25	Neap	New	High Slack	Ebb -Flood
New	Start/Stop/Restart	Oct-19	10.5	5.00 & 10.00	25	Spring	New	High Slack	Ebb -Flood-Ebb

.

Figure 1 Delineation of the 20 mg/L contour from previously reported model runs.

Date: Regarding: October 2, 2019 SRP - TSS

Figure 2 Delineation of the 20 mg/L contour from the updated base case from the revised modeling and that same case with a new case that reflected starting slow (5 ft/min [1.52 m/min]) across the mud flats, stopping for 3 hours and then restarting at the base advance rate (10 ft/min [3.04 m/min]).

Date: Regarding: October 2, 2019 SRP - TSS

Figure 3 Hours over 20 mg/L for the original base case.

Date: Regarding: October 2, 2019 SRP - TSS

Figure 4 Hours over 20 mg/L for the revised base case.

Date: Regarding: October 2, 2019 SRP - TSS

Figure 5 Hours over 20 mg/L for the new case of starting, stopping, and resuming operations.

Table 2: Summary of maximum value from model runs at observations stations.

OBSERVATIONS								Model Predictions								
NAI -Jet Plow Trial Summary Report September 18, 2019 Table 3							Study	Original	Revised	Revised	Revised	Revised	Revised	Revised	New	
							Run Descriptor	Original	Base	Slow	Fast	High Loss	Low Loss	Neap	Start/Stop	
Location		Total Suspended Solids (mg/L) ^a						Report Date	Dec-15	Jun-17	Jun-17	Jun-17	Jun-17	Jun-17	Jun-17	Oct-19
	Station							Jet Duration (hours)	13	7.1	14.2	4.7	7.1	7.1	7.1	10.5
								Advance Rate (ft/min)	5.47	10.00	5.00	15.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00
		Before Trial			During and After Trial			Loss Rate (%)	25	25	25	25	35	10	25	25
								Tide	Mean	Spring	Spring	Spring	Spring	Spring	Neap	Spring
								Original/New Sediment	Original	New	New	New	New	New	New	New
		S	Μ	В	S	М	В		Maximum Time Integrated Excess TSS Concentration (mg/L)							
Nearfield North	11	4.8		6.4	13		7.9-23		95.9	19.0	19.7	19.4	29.1	8.5	22.7	22.7
	11a	9.5		8	13		6.3-15	_	56.5	33.6	154.8	38.4	31.7	17.7	417.7	136.2
	12	16	8.2	7.1	5.8-21	5.6-23	6.4-19		51.9	185.7	0.0	159.6	186.6	116.9	170.2	1.8
	13	7.9	8.2	5.9	7.4-24	7-23	6.7-12	-	6.7	65.6	2.5	101.4	95.1	27.3	85.6	5.9
Nearfield South	16	7.8		6.4	10		5.1-9.5	_	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	17	6.6	7.5	5	5.2-13	5.6-44	7.8-26	4	134.0	0.0	113.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	90.3
	18				9.7-13	5.2-8.8	5.9-25	_	233.9	2.6	26.7	0.0	5.0	1.3	5.4	103.9
Boundary North	22	6.7	12	8.1	5.2-13	5.4-9.6	7.7-10	4	6.5	20.2	5.4	48.2	27.2	11.1	3.5	12.0
	23	4.3		11-13	5.9		4.5-16	-	18.5	9.0	2.8	14.8	14.7	4.0	7.8	3.6
	24	4.4	8.1	7.3	5.5-40	6.1-21	7.2-26	-	2.6	25.0	3.2	31.0	37.7	14.6	7.1	3.3
	25	4.6	7.6	11	7.6-13	6.6-24	5.2-8.6	-	16.0	17.3	2.9	42.1	30.2	7.6	2.8	6.6
Boundary South	27				8.1-12	5.2-11	8.8-14	-	14.7	6.4	2.7	0.0	6.8	2.9	6.0	1.8
	28				8.6-25	6.8-15	11-18	-	17.6	0.0	2.7	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	4.1
	29				6.3-13	9.5-13	12-15	-	24.3	0.0	13.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	24.1
Reference	41	6.6	6.8	10	7.1	7.5	10	-								
	42	7.1		7.1			5	-								
	43	4.6	8.4	4.7	13	9.7	6.9									
Field Blanks	n/a				<1											

3. Comment on Route Adjustment

The cable burial route is proposed to be slightly adjusted to avoid a sand wave area where steeper bottom slopes exist. The adjustment is an offset from the original route for a short distance with a maximum offset of \sim 100 ft (\sim 33 m) (see Figure 6).

The slight route offset will not affect the modeling results due to the small distance change from the original route. The resolution of the sediment transport modeling grid (where the excess sediment concentration and deposition is calculated) is 20 m (66 ft) in the plan view and 0.2 m (8 in) in the vertical. Thus the adjusted route would result in the sediment source (the jet plow) being located only 1-2 grid cells from the original modeled location. Although there will be a shift in the location of the maximum concentrations (>> 20 mg/L) right at and locally surrounding the jet plow, this is not anticipated to have an effect on the modeling results at large, particularly at distances where the 20 mg/L mixing zone area is delineated.

Figure 6 Illustration of adjusted route relative to the modeled route (Source: Normandeau).

Date: October 2, 2019 Regarding: SRP - TSS

4. Conclusions

Based on the combination of modeling results from various scenarios, it is suggested that the permitted mixing zone is suitable for delineating the area where expected excess concentrations would exceed 20 mg/L from jet plow operations regardless of the tide stage at the time of crossing the channel and of the minor deviation from the original route within the channel. While there are some model predicted deviations of the 20 mg/L contour outside this mixing zone, they are at the further extents close to where the concentrations drop and are based on conservative assumptions which may have resulted in an overestimate of the plume. The assumptions have been observed to be conservative based on comparison of the maximum observed TSS during the jet plow trial which were all considerably lower than the model predicted maximum at these locations.

Further it is suggested that the route adjustment will not significantly change the model predictions, and therefore the previously completed modeling is deemed a useful proxy for the adjusted route.

5. References

- Normandeau Associates. Eversource Energy Seacoast Reliability Project Jet Plow Trial Summary Report (Issued 18 September 2019).
- Swanson, J.C, T. Isaji and C. Gallagan. *Modeling Sediment Dispersion from Cable Burial for Seacoast Reliability Project, Little Bay, New Hampshire* (Issued 14 December 2015).
- Swanson, J.C, D. Crowley, D. Mendelsohn, and N. Vinhateiro. *Modeling Sediment Dispersion from Cable Burial for Seacoast Reliability Project, Little Bay, New Hampshire* (Issued 27 June 2017).