

THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
BEFORE THE
NEW HAMPSHIRE SITE EVALUATION COMMITTEE
DOCKET NO. 2015-06

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

IN SUPPORT OF THE
APPLICATION OF NORTHERN PASS TRANSMISSION LLC
AND PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
D/B/A EVERSOURCE ENERGY
FOR A CERTIFICATE OF SITE AND FACILITY TO CONSTRUCT A NEW
HIGH VOLTAGE TRANSMISSION LINE AND RELATED FACILITIES IN
NEW HAMPSHIRE

April 17, 2017

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

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

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

6 A. The purpose of my testimony is to provide an update on the work completed since
7 October 2015 to assess the potential effects of the Northern Pass Transmission Project
8 (“Northern Pass” or the “Project”) on archeological resources and, as a result of that completed
9 work, to affirm my previous opinion that the Project will not have an unreasonable adverse effect
10 on such resources.

11 **Q. Have you conducted any additional studies or analyses since the submission**
12 **of your previous testimony on October 16, 2015?**

13 A. Yes. My staff at Victoria Bunker, Inc. and I conducted Phase I-B surveys in
14 twenty-four towns and at the Franklin Converter Terminal site along the overhead portion of the
15 Project, and we have completed the Phase I-B surveys in ten towns along the underground
16 portion of the Project. The results of the Phase I-B survey have been presented in reports to
17 Division of Historical Resources (“DHR”). We have also completed Phase II evaluation at eight
18 sites. The Phase I-B effort and the Phase II evaluation include archeological survey at areas
19 identified by me and my team and those identified by SEARCH, the contractor who performed
20 work for the U.S. Department of Energy for this Project.

21 **Q. What reports have you prepared since your original pre-filed testimony in**
22 **October 2015?**

23 A. We have completed Phase I-B survey reports as follows:

- 24 • *Results of Phase I-B Archeological Survey -- Existing ROW Corridor Deerfield, NH*
25 *(2016) (Approved by DHR 8-16-16);*
- 26 • *Results of Phase I-B Archeological Survey -- Existing ROW Corridor Allenstown, NH*
27 *(2016) (Approved by DHR 8-16-16);*
- 28 • *Results of Phase I-B Archeological Survey -- Existing ROW Corridor Pembroke, NH*
29 *(2016) (Approved by DHR 8-16-16);*

- 1 • *Results of Phase I-B Archeological Survey -- Existing ROW Corridor Concord, NH*
2 *(2016) (Approved by DHR 9-2-16);*
- 3 • *Results of Phase I-B Archeological Survey -- Existing ROW Corridor Canterbury, NH*
4 *(2016) (Approved by DHR 9-2-16);*
- 5 • *Results of Phase I-B Archeological Survey -- Existing ROW Corridor Northfield, NH*
6 *(2016) (Approved by DHR 9-22-16);*
- 7 • *Results of Phase I-B Archeological Survey -- Existing ROW Corridor Franklin, NH*
8 *(2016) (Approved by DHR 10-5-16);*
- 9 • *Results of Phase I-B Archeological Survey -- Existing ROW Corridor Franklin*
10 *Converter, NH (2016) (Approved by DHR 9-2-16);*
- 11 • *Results of Phase I-B Archeological Survey -- Existing ROW Corridor Hill, NH (2016)*
12 *(Approved by DHR 9-2-16);*
- 13 • *Results of Phase I-B Archeological Survey -- Existing ROW Corridor New Hampton,*
14 *NH (2016) (Approved by DHR 12-22-16);*
- 15 • *Results of Phase I-B Archeological Survey -- Existing ROW Corridor Bristol, NH*
16 *(2016) (Approved by DHR 9-22-16);*
- 17 • *Results of Phase I-B Archeological Survey -- Existing ROW Corridor Ashland, NH*
18 *(2016) (Approved by DHR 1-3-17);*
- 19 • *Results of Phase I-B Archeological Survey -- Existing ROW Corridor Bridgewater,*
20 *NH (2016) (Approved by DHR 12-22-16);*
- 21 • *Results of Phase I-B Archeological Survey -- Existing ROW Corridor Bethlehem, NH*
22 *(2016) (Approved by DHR 10-17-16);*
- 23 • *Results of Phase I-B Archeological Survey -- Existing ROW Corridor Whitefield, NH*
24 *(2016) (Approved by DHR 12-22-16);*
- 25 • *Results of Phase I-B Archeological Survey -- Existing ROW Corridor Dalton, NH*
26 *(2016) (Approved by DHR 9-2-16);*
- 27 • *Results of Phase I-B Archeological Survey -- Existing ROW Corridor Lancaster, NH*
28 *(2016) (Approved by DHR 12-22-16);*

- 1 • *Results of Phase I-B Archeological Survey -- Existing ROW Corridor*
2 *Northumberland, NH (2016) (Approved by DHR 12-22-16);*
- 3 • *Results of Phase I-B Archeological Survey -- Existing ROW Corridor Stark, NH*
4 *(2016) (Approved by DHR 12-22-16);*
- 5 • *Results of Phase I-B Archeological Survey -- Existing ROW Corridor Dummer, NH*
6 *(2016) (Approved by DHR 10-17-16);*
- 7 • *Results of Phase I-B Archeological Survey -- Existing ROW Corridor Millsfield, NH*
8 *(2016) (Approved by DHR 12-22-16);*
- 9 • *Results of Phase I-B Archeological Survey -- Existing ROW Corridor Dixville, NH*
10 *(2016) (Approved by DHR 10-17-16);*
- 11 • *Results of Phase I-B Archeological Survey -- Existing ROW Corridor Stewartstown,*
12 *NH (2016) (Approved by DHR 12-22-16);*
- 13 • *Results of Phase I-B Archeological Survey -- Existing ROW Corridor Clarksville, NH*
14 *(2016) (Approved by DHR 1-3-17);*
- 15 • *Results of Phase I-B Archeological Survey -- Existing ROW Corridor Pittsburg, NH*
16 *(2016) (Approved by DHR 9-22-16);*
- 17 • *Results of Phase I-B Archeological Survey – Underground Route*
18 *(2017) (Approved by DHR 3-21-17)*
 - 19 ○ *US Route 3 -- Plymouth, Campton, Thornton, and Woodstock NH*
 - 20 ○ *NH Route 112 -- Woodstock and Easton, NH*
 - 21 ○ *NH Route 116 -- Easton and Franconia, NH*
 - 22 ○ *NH Route 18 -- Sugar Hill and Bethlehem, NH*
 - 23 ○ *US Route 302 -- Bethlehem, NH*
 - 24 ○ *NH Route 145 – Clarksville, NH*
 - 25 ○ *US Route 3 -- Clarksville and Pittsburg, NH.*

26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34 These confidential reports are on the Applicants' Track 2 Exhibit List.
35

1 In addition to Phase I-B surveys, Phase II field investigation has been completed for eight
2 archeological sites (three post-contact sites and five pre-contact sites) for the overhead portion of
3 the Project. I anticipate that the analysis and report writing for that work will be completed by
4 May 15, 2017.

5 **Q. Has DHR reviewed the Phase I-B surveys?**

6 A. Yes. DHR has reviewed each of the Phase I-B reports listed above and has
7 concurred with the management recommendations presented in those reports. DHR's letters of
8 concurrence for the Phase I-B reports are on the Applicants' Track 2 Exhibit List.

9 **Q. Please describe the Project's ongoing consultations with DHR and DOE.**

10 A. In addition to the Phase I-B and Phase II submittals described above, we continue
11 to consult extensively with DHR. Pursuant to the terms of the Memorandum of Understanding
12 ("MOU") between Northern Pass and DHR, we provide a monthly report with updates on the
13 status of our cultural resource evaluation work. Those monthly reports are included in the
14 Applicants' updated DHR correspondence exhibit. We have exchanged numerous e-mails and
15 letters with DHR. Project personnel also met with DHR on March 24, 2016 and October 12,
16 2016 regarding methodology for Phase II field strategy, and also met many times with DOE and
17 DHR as part of the Section 106 consultation. Project personnel have also met quarterly with
18 DHR, per the terms of the MOU.

19 A copy of post-October 2015 correspondence with DHR and DOE is provided on the
20 Applicants' Track 2 Exhibit List.

21 **Q. Please explain the results of the Phase I-B and Phase II surveys you have**
22 **conducted since your previous testimony of October, 2015.**

23 A. During our Phase I-B survey work, we identified a total of 22 potentially eligible
24 archeological sites. Twenty potentially eligible archeological sites (eleven pre-contact; nine
25 post-contact) were identified for the overhead portion of the Project. Three of these potentially
26 eligible post-contact sites will be avoided by the Project. Of the remaining seventeen potentially
27 eligible sites along the overhead route, Phase II evaluation has been conducted at eight sites

1 (three post-contact and five pre-contact sites). With one exception¹, none of the Phase II surveys
2 completed to date has indicated a basis for recommending further archeological investigation.
3 Phase II archeological study will be conducted at the remaining sites along the overhead route as
4 early as possible this spring.

5 In addition, during our Phase I-B survey work we identified two potentially eligible
6 archeological sites (one pre-contact and one post-contact) along the underground route. Phase II
7 archeological study will be conducted at these two sites along the underground route as early as
8 possible this spring unless site avoidance is feasible.

9 **Q. You mention “site avoidance” in the answer above. What has Northern Pass**
10 **been able to do to avoid impacts to potential archeological sites that you identified since**
11 **October 2015?**

12 A. Avoidance will be achieved at the three post-contact sites by moving the access
13 road at each site and creating a 25-foot buffer around each site – as identified during Phase I-B
14 survey and evident in the location of features and artifact distributions. Avoidance will be
15 achieved in the same manner at one pre-contact site in Clarksville that lies within an expanded
16 archeological survey Area but outside the Project site location. NPT is considering this and
17 other avoidance measures at the Cold Brook site in Canterbury.

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

20 A. Yes. We will complete the Phase II work at all remaining sites as soon as
21 possible this spring, starting, I expect, on April 17. I anticipate that reports documenting the
22 Phase II evaluation results from last fall will be submitted to the DHR by May 15, and reports
23 documenting this spring’s Phase II evaluation results will be submitted to the DHR as soon as
24 possible after the conclusion of the fieldwork. We will consult with DHR regarding any possible
25 Phase III data recovery recommendations upon confirmation that the Project will be unable to
26 avoid impact to the site(s) in question

27 Phase I-B archeological survey will also be completed for the underground route in the
28 towns of Stewartstown and Clarksville, as well as archeological sensitivity areas along off right

¹ That exception is the Cold Brook site in Canterbury that, based on a partially complete Phase II survey, appears to be a National Register-eligible archeological site. The Project design team is determining whether that site can be avoided. If avoidance is not feasible, a Phase III survey will be recommended.

1 of way access roads in northern New Hampshire. If archeological sites are identified, Phase II
2 survey will be continued for any sites that are considered potentially eligible and cannot be
3 avoided.

4 **Q. Has your opinion changed regarding whether this Project will have an**
5 **unreasonable adverse effect on archeological resources?**

6 A. No. My opinion remains that the Project will not have an unreasonable adverse
7 effect on archeological resources.

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

9 A. Yes.