

The Narragansett Electric Company
d/b/a National Grid (Aquidneck Island Reliability Project)
RIPUC Dkt. No. 4614

Rebuttal Testimony of
Daniel McIntyre, P.E.

August 24, 2016

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

2 A. My name is Daniel McIntyre. My business address is 40 Sylvan Road, Waltham,
3 Massachusetts 02451.

4 Q. By whom are you employed and in what position?

5 A. I am employed by National Grid USA Service Company as a Principal Engineer
6 Civil/Structural Engineering Department.

7 Q. What are your responsibilities as Principal Engineer?

8 A. As Principal Engineer I am responsible for design and permitting of substation projects.

9 Q. Please describe your education, training and experience.

10 A. I have a Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering from Worcester Polytechnic Institute
11 and over 30 years of experience in the public utility industry, the last 26 with National
12 Grid. I am a registered professional engineer in Rhode Island as well as Massachusetts
13 and New Hampshire.

14 Q. Are you familiar with National Grid's Aquidneck Island Reliability Project (the
15 "Project")?

16 A. Yes, I have been involved in the preparation of portions of the Environmental Report
17 related to substation site selection, alternatives, design of the new Jepson Substation, and
18 community outreach.

19 SCOPE OF TESTIMONY

20 Q. What is the scope of your testimony in this proceeding?

21 A. In my testimony, I will respond to the prefiled testimony filed on behalf of the Town of
22 Middletown and the Division.

1 Q. Have you reviewed Mr. Cabral's testimony on behalf of the Town of Middletown?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. Have you reviewed Mr. Booth's testimony on behalf of the Division?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. Do you have any comments to Mr. Booth's testimony regarding the proposed Jepson
6 Substation?

7 A. Yes. I have reviewed Mr. Booth's testimony and note that he is in general agreement
8 with the proposed location for the new Jepson Substation. However, I would like to
9 respond to a number of points that he raises about the reuse of the existing Jepson
10 Substation parcel.
11 In our initial design of the Project, we considered the reuse of the existing substation
12 parcel. However, as noted in Section 5.4 of the Environmental Report, there were size
13 constraints, construction challenges, impact challenges for direct abutters, as well as the
14 challenge of locating the new substation in Zone A of the Portsmouth Watershed
15 Protection District because electric substations are not a permitted use in Zone A.
16 Because of these constraints and challenges, the Project team decided that the reuse of the
17 existing substation parcel is not a feasible option. We provided a more detailed
18 explanation of this analysis in Attachment 1F to National Grid's Responses to Division
19 Data Request No. R-II-1, which is attached hereto as Attachment DM-1.
20 Q. In Mr. Booth's testimony he suggests the use of the property to the north of the existing
21 substation parcel as a potential alternative site for the new substation. Was that property
22 considered as a potential alternative?

1 A. Yes. We examined using the parcel to the north but were informed by our legal counsel
2 that the property was restricted by a Deed to Development Rights that limits the use of
3 the property to agricultural uses (See Attachment 1G to National Grid's Responses to
4 Division Data Request No. R-II-1, which is attached hereto as Attachment DM-1). As
5 summarized in Section 5.4.5 of the Environmental Report, removing the restriction would
6 require a demonstration of "extreme need" and "lack of any viable alternative." R.I. Gen.
7 Laws §42-82-6.

8 Q. Would reusing the existing substation parcel mitigate the visual impacts noted in
9 testimony by Mr. Booth and Mr. Cabral?

10 A. No. As noted in Attachment DM-1, reusing the existing substation parcel would require
11 constructing the new substation close to Jepson Lane in the open area in the front of the
12 existing substation parcel (between Jepson Lane and the existing substation). This
13 location would also require installing taller structures to support lines crossing over the
14 existing substation as well as locating the fence and equipment near the property line and
15 an abutting house.

16 Q. Have you made any changes to the proposed new Jepson Substation to mitigate its impact
17 on the surrounding areas?

18 A. Yes. Based on the recommendations of the Visual Impact Assessment, we lowered the
19 height of the A frame structures by five feet and reduced the overall dimensions of the
20 substation to provide additional distance between Jepson Lane and the substation fence.
21 Additional plantings were added along Jepson Lane. In addition, we added the screening
22 wall along a portion of the southern property line. This revised site plan was included in

- 1 the ER but the Visual Impact Assessment was not updated prior to the EFSB filing.
- 2 Attached as Attachment DM-2 are renderings showing the revised landscaping plans
- 3 along Jepson Lane and the southern property line.
- 4 Q. Does this conclude your testimony?
- 5 A. Yes, it does.