

1 Q. Further to IC-NLH-188 above, Hydro’s 2013 Capital Budget Application, pages D-164
2 to D-165 notes that “[w]hen upgrade work on the rotor and stator was performed
3 in 2008, maintenance staff noticed that the upstairs rail would vibrate when the
4 unit was on line. This was a condition that was not present prior to the
5 refurbishment work.” Please provide details of the 2008 capital project in question,
6 including the nature of the work, who performed the work (Hydro or an outside
7 contractor), who prepared the design, scope and specifications for the work (Hydro
8 or an outside contractor). If an outside contractor or supplier was used for any
9 component of the design, materials or installation, please provide a detailed
10 explanation of all efforts Hydro pursued (including claims against the contractor,
11 lawsuits, retention of holdbacks or bonds, or other performance guarantee
12 mechanisms) to address the substandard job performance resulting in a new
13 vibration issue. Please indicate the value of any recoveries from the contractor
14 related to this performance issue.

15

16

17 A. The 2008 capital project at the Corner Brook Frequency Converter and facility
18 consisted of the following:

- 19 • rewinding the 50 and 60 Hz rotors;
20 • rewedging of the 50 and 60 Hz stators with new wedges;
21 • replacement of the voltage regulators; and
22 • replacement of the starting system (including the liquid rheostat).

23

24 The majority of the work was performed by an outside contractor (Siemens). The
25 design, scope and specifications for the work were prepared by Hydro.

1 There was vibration present immediately following the completion of the 2008
2 work, which was rectified in accordance with Hydro's specifications by the
3 contractor before completing the contract, with no additional charges.

4
5 Despite the vibration being corrected in accordance with the specifications in 2008,
6 Hydro determined the vibration should be further improved and therefore worked
7 with a consultant in 2010 to determine the cause of the vibration and recommend a
8 solution. Hydro then worked with the consultant and contractor over several
9 months to make the required improvements, resulting in the unit operating in an
10 acceptable vibration zone. As shown in Hydro's response to IC-NLH-099
11 Attachment 1, page 6 there are no specifically assigned capital charges for the work
12 completed in 2010.