

STATE OF VERMONT
PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD

Docket No. 7250

Petition of Deerfield Wind, LLC for a Certificate of Public Good)
authorizing it to construct up to a 45 MW wind generation facility,)
and associated transmission and interconnection facilities,)
comprised of between 15 and 24 wind turbines on approximately 80)
acres in the Green Mountain National Forest, located in Searsburg)
and Readsboro, with turbines to be placed both on the east side of)
Route 8 on the same ridgeline as the existing GMP Searsburg wind)
facility Eastern Project Area), and along the ridgeline to the west of)
Route 8 in a northwesterly orientation (Western Project Area))

PREFILED SUPPLEMENTAL DIRECT TESTIMONY OF
HOPE E. LUHMAN
ON BEHALF OF DEERFIELD WIND, LLC

July 30, 2007

Summary:

Ms. Luhman testifies regarding 10 V.S.A. § 248(b)(5). She discusses her evaluation of the revised project layout and its effect, if any, on her original assessment of potential impacts to historic and archaeological resources.

1 **Q. Please state your name.**

2 Response. Hope Luhman.

3

4 **Q. Have you previously submitted direct testimony in this matter?**

5 Response. Yes.

6

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

8 Response. The purpose of my testimony is an evaluation of the revised project
9 layout and its effect, if any, on my original assessment of potential impacts to historic
10 and archaeological resources.

11

12 **Q. Have you reviewed the revised project layout, consisting of 17 turbines (10 on
13 the western string and 7 on the eastern string)?**

14 Response. Yes, I have.

15

16 **Q. Is the revised project layout within the Project area that you originally
17 investigated?**

18 Response. Yes, it is.

19

20 **Q. Have you performed any additional work in connection with the revised
21 project layout?**

22 Response. Yes, we have been reviewing the viewshed analysis conducted by Mike
23 Buscher and Jean Vissering through the shapefiles provided by T.J Boyle &

1 Associates, Inc., within the area of potential effect (APE) in preparation for our
2 architectural survey. We have recommended an APE of five miles and the Vermont
3 Division of Historic Preservation (VT DHP) is presently considering this proposal.
4 In addition, we reviewed the layout as discussed above in anticipation of fieldwork to
5 assess archaeological sensitivity.

6
7 **Q. Do the changes to the layout and turbines alter your preliminary conclusion**
8 **that the Project is unlikely to have an undue adverse effect on any known**
9 **historic resources or on any significant archaeological resources? Please**
10 **explain.**

11 Response. No, the changes do not alter my prior testimony. Our investigations are
12 not yet complete, but based upon available information, Berger's experience at other
13 projects, and the manner in which similar potential impacts have been addressed by
14 state and federal regulators in the past, it is my opinion that:

- 15 a. The proposed project is unlikely to have an undue adverse effect on any known
16 historic resources. No historic structures will be physically impacted and it is
17 unlikely that the visibility of the Project would demonstrably diminish any
18 aspects of setting that might contribute to the significance of such historic
19 properties. Should mitigation be required, it could be accomplished through
20 vegetative screening around the affected property to limit the extent to which the
21 Project is visible from the resource. Other forms of mitigation may also be
22 employed.

1 b. The proposed project is unlikely to have an undue adverse effect on any
2 significant archaeological resources as any potential effects will be mitigated
3 through data recovery excavation designed in consultation with the Forest
4 Service (FS) and the VT DHP. Should future studies determine that the Project
5 may adversely affect archaeological resources, data recovery excavations are an
6 accepted mitigation measure.

7

8 **Q. What additional work will you be performing in connection with the revised**
9 **layout in order to finalize your conclusions?**

10 Response. As discussed above, Berger will be completing an historic architectural
11 survey for those properties within the APE. In addition, an archaeological resource
12 assessment (ARA) and any requisite follow-up work are also planned.

13

14 **Q. Does this conclude your testimony at this time?**

15 Response. Yes, it does.