

GLENDALE HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

LIHI APPLICATION

ATTACHMENT F

CULTURAL RESOURCE PROTECTION

133 FERC ¶ 62,022  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

Littleville Power Company, Inc.

Project No. 2801-030

ORDER APPROVING HISTORIC PROPERTIES MANAGEMENT PLAN

(Issued October 05, 2010)

1. On May 3, 2010, Littleville Power Company, Inc. (licensee), licensee for the Glendale Hydroelectric Project, filed an Historic Properties Management Plan (HPMP), as required by article 407 of the license.<sup>1</sup> The project is located on the Housatonic River, in Berkshire County, Massachusetts.
2. Article 407 directs the licensee to file an HPMP within six months of the effective date of the license. The HPMP is to include an historic overview report of the Glendale Hydroelectric Plant, and photocopies of information showing the existing and proposed project facilities. It is also to include a procedure for submitting any plans for future project construction, demolition, or rehabilitation for review and comment to the Commission, Massachusetts State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), and Stockbridge Historic Preservation Commission (SHPC), prior to beginning the undertaking. The plan shall ensure that new construction or rehabilitation within the project will be completed in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. The HPMP is also to include a stipulation that if the licensee discovers previously unidentified archaeological or historic properties during the course of constructing or developing project works or other facilities at the project, then all land-clearing and land-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the properties shall cease, and the licensee will consult with the SHPO.
3. The proposed HPMP incorporates the stipulations required in article 407 of the license. The plan incorporates *The Historic Overview Report, Glendale Hydroelectric Plant*, prepared by Hartgen Archaeological Associates, Inc. It provides photocopies of the existing and proposed project facilities, and includes drawings showing the licensee's proposed public recreational access improvements. It establishes a process for identifying the nature and significance of historic properties, and impacts to archaeological properties that may be affected by project maintenance and operation. The proposed HPMP also establishes guidelines for routine maintenance, operation activities, proposed improvements to project facilities, and public access. The HPMP defines goals for preserving historic properties, and establishes a decision-making process that outlines procedures for consulting with the Commission, SHPO, and SHPC,

---

<sup>1</sup> *See* Order Issuing Subsequent License, issued August 19, 2009 (128 FERC ¶ 62,123).

concerning the potential effects of the project on historic properties. Finally, if any previously unidentified archaeological or historic properties are discovered during the course of constructing or developing project works or other facilities, the licensee will immediately stop all land-clearing and land-disturbing activities in the vicinity of such features and consult with the SHPO.

4. The licensee sent the draft HPMP to the SHPO and SHPC for review and comment. On May 20, 2010, the SHPO responded that it has no comments on the plan, and looks forward to reviewing plans for submittals, as proposed. No other comments have been received.

5. The HPMP takes into account the effects of project activities on historic properties and archaeological sites within the project area of potential effect. It ensures that no inadvertent alterations of National Register of Historic Places-qualifying characteristics would take place during routine operation and maintenance of the project or ground-disturbing construction activities. The proposed HPMP is consistent with the requirements of article 407 of the license, and should be approved. Upon issuance of this order, the licensee should implement the HPMP.

The Director orders:

(A) The Historic Properties Management Plan for the Glendale Hydroelectric Project, filed on May 3, 2010, is approved and made part of the license.

(B) This order constitutes final agency action. Requests for rehearing by the Commission may be filed within 30 days of the date of issuance of this order, pursuant to 18 C.F.R. §385.713.

Robert J. Fletcher  
Chief, Land Resources Branch  
Division of Hydropower  
Administration and Compliance

*{ EXCERPTS FROM }*

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT  
FOR  
SUBSEQUENT HYDROPOWER LICENSE

Glendale Project

FERC Project No. 2801-027

Massachusetts

Federal Energy Regulatory Commission  
Office of Energy Projects  
Division of Hydropower Licensing  
888 First Street, NE  
Washington, D.C. 20426

March 2009

## **Environmental Effects and Recommendations**

As previously discussed, Littleville Power proposes to increase the minimum flow in the bypassed reach from 10 cfs to 90 cfs to improve aquatic habitat, which is also recommended by Massachusetts DFW and Interior as 10(j) recommendations. Littleville Power also proposes to provide a portage consisting of a stairway/ramp at the bypassed reach and parking.

### *Staff Analysis*

With the exception of the railroad tract on the south side of the river, Route 183 along the north side of the river and some homes located near the Glendale Bridge and along Route 183, there is not a lot of development adjacent to the project boundary. The restrictions placed on development along the Housatonic River and its permanent tributaries by the Town of Stockbridge's Lake and Pond Overlay District provide protection against uncontrolled development. The district provides standards for the management of vegetation, wetlands, and soil and sedimentation. In addition to the district's protection measures, almost half the project's impoundment is permanently protected by the conservation easement at Laurel Hill (Bowkers Woods).

Regarding the proposed minimum flow in the bypassed reach, this will increase the wetted area and amount of pools. The faster flowing water will be more turbulent creating ripples and increasing the sound of the rushing water. Thus, the proposal to increase the minimum flow to 90 cfs will enhance the aesthetic experience of the recreationist using the bypassed reach.

### **Unavoidable Adverse Effects**

A minor, short term increase in erosion, traffic, noise, and visual disturbance could occur during the installation of the minimum flow turbine unit and during construction of the proposed recreation enhancements.

### **3.3.6 Cultural Resources**

#### **Affected Environment**

##### *Area of Potential Effect*

The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation defines an area of potential effect (APE) as the geographic area or areas in which an undertaking may directly or indirectly cause alterations in the character or use of historic properties, if any such properties exist. The APE for the Glendale Project includes: (a) lands enclosed by the project boundary; and (b) lands or properties outside the project boundary which project operations or

project-related actions may cause changes in the character or use of historic properties, if any exist.

### *Historical Background*

The earliest settlers, the Indians, arrived in the project area some 10,000 years ago. They settled along the river's banks, farmed the floodplains, and fished the river. The Mohicans were the local tribe when the English arrived in the 1720s and 1730s. The English made agriculture the major activity throughout the valley for the next century. During the 1700s and 1800s, waterpower played an important role in the development of industry throughout the valley. By the end of the Civil War there were at least 28 paper mills in Berkshire County alone.

### *Historic Properties*

The upper Housatonic Valley is rich in historic resources. The area contains numerous historic sites, districts, and museums. In the town of Stockbridge, there is the Norman Rockwell Museum, the Chesterwood Estate and Museum, the Naumkeag Mission, and the Merwin House (National Park Service, 2002). A portion of the Chesterwood Estate and Museum is located near the project's impoundment. This estate was the 1920s summer home, studio, and garden of sculptor Daniel Chester French (1850-1931), sculptor of the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, DC and the Minute Man statue in Concord, Massachusetts.

In response to an additional information request, Hartgen Archaeological Associates, Inc. prepared an *Historical Overview Report for the Glendale Hydroelectric Project* for Littleville Power. The report was filed with the Commission and the Massachusetts Historical Commission (SHPO) on January 14, 2009.

The Glendale Powerhouse, also known as the Monument Mills Power Station, was added to the National Register of Historic Places (National Register) in 1982. The powerhouse is significant for its engineering and industrial uses from 1900 to 1924. The powerhouse, built in 1906, is a one story, 49-foot by 67-foot rectangular structure on a concrete foundation. It is constructed of coursed random ashlar blocks made of local Stockbridge marble, reportedly salvaged from the Glendale Woolen Mill which stood upstream (Jenkins 1981). The powerhouse has a hipped roof supported by steel trusses and covered with slate shingles. The Glendale Powerhouse is also listed in the Massachusetts State Register of Historic Properties.

### **Environment Impacts and Recommendations**

Littleville Power is not proposing any alterations to the Glendale powerhouse. By letter filed October 30, 2008, the SHPO determined that the proposal will not adversely

affect the significant historic characteristics of the property. The SHPO commented that operation of the powerhouse for its historical purposes also assists in maintaining the historic property.

By letter dated January 27, 2009, the SHPO commented that the Historical Overview Report prepared by Hartgen Archaeological Associates, Inc. is comprehensive and recommended that a copy of the report be provided to the Stockbridge Historical Commission. The SHPO also commended that an HPMP for the project need not be complex. The HPMP could consist of: (1) the Historical Overview Report; (2) photocopies of information showing existing and proposed conditions and plans already prepared for the license application; (3) the requirement that prior to any future undertaking of new construction, demolition, or rehabilitation the plans will be submitted to the Commission, SHPO, and the Stockbridge Historical Commission for review and comment pursuant to 36 CFR Part 800 (2008); and (4) new construction or rehabilitation within the project should be completed in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, 36 CFR Part 67(2008).

#### *Staff Analysis*

The only proposed modification to project facilities is the installation of a new minimum flow turbine at the dam, which is not listed or considered eligible for the National Register. Littleville Power is not proposing any alterations to the powerhouse. Littleville Power has consulted with the SHPO concerning the proposal.

The proposal is not likely to have an effect on the identified historic resources because the proposed project would not involve any new construction (other than the limited construction related to the proposed new recreation facilities) or modification to the existing powerhouse. Therefore, pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106 (16 U.S.C. § 470f (2006) and 36 CFR § 800.5(b) (2008)), we have determined that the proposed project would not have an adverse affect on the Glendale Powerhouse conditioned on developing and implementing an HPMP. An HPMP including the measures recommended by the SHPO would ensure that appropriate consultation occurs prior to any future activity that may affect the historic features of the powerhouse.

## **4.0 DEVELOPMENTAL ANALYSIS**

In this section, we look at the Glendale Project's use of the Housatonic River for hydropower purposes to see what effect various environmental measures would have on the project's cost and power benefits. Consistent with the Commission's approach to economic analysis, the power benefit of the project is determined by estimating the cost of obtaining the same amount of energy and capacity using the likely alternative