

1 Q. **Refurbishment of the Fuel Oil Storage Facility, Holyrood Thermal Generating**
2 **Station**

3 If NLH has opened and inspected the tank during or after 2009, please provide a
4 summary of the report. If not, please provide the reasons why not.
5
6

7 A. The tank has not been opened and inspected during or after 2009. Because of the
8 large cost of performing an internal inspection it was considered to be cost effective
9 to perform the internal inspection during the same year that refurbishment work
10 would take place. With consideration to the SGE Acres report dated 2006, the full
11 tank farm needed refurbishment in the immediate coming years. This included each
12 of the four storage tanks and also the dyke system. Hydro decided to proceed by
13 applying to the Board on an annual basis for approval to perform a specific piece of
14 work for each of five years. One tank would be refurbished each year and the dyke
15 system refurbished in a separate year. The scope of work for each year would be
16 decided so that the most urgent needs would be addressed first. The priorities were
17 decided as follows:

- 18 a. 2008: Refurbish Tank 2
 - 19 b. 2009: Refurbish Dyke System
 - 20 c. 2010: Refurbish Tank 4
 - 21 d. 2011: Refurbish Tank 3
 - 22 e. 2013: Refurbish Tank 1
- 23

24 It was decided to spread the tank farm refurbishment program over five years
25 because of the overall high capital cost and the need to schedule the work to meet
26 outage schedules. Items a, b, and c above have been approved by the Board
27 through previous applications and the projects are now complete. Tank 2 was

1 ranked as the highest priority because it had developed problems whereby it had to
2 be taken out of service. It was decided that refurbishment of the dyke in 2009
3 would slow the rate of bottom corrosion for all tanks and reduce the risk of failure
4 of other tanks to an acceptable level until the earliest time that the remaining tanks
5 could be scheduled for refurbishment. Prior to the dyke refurbishment, bottom
6 corrosion of the storage tanks was taking place faster than normal because of
7 standing water inside the dyke, due to poor drainage. After dyke refurbishment was
8 completed Tank 4 was considered to be the next priority, with work to be
9 completed in 2010, because of its poor floor condition. Tank 3 is then the next
10 priority and scheduled for 2011 approval. The scope of work includes opening up
11 the tank and cleaning it so that an internal inspection could take place at an
12 estimated cost of \$375,000. The inspection report would then determine the details
13 of the refurbishment work that would then take place while the tank was still open
14 and clean. To open the tank in a year earlier to 2011 for the sole purpose of
15 cleaning and inspection would cost approximately \$375,000. That same cost would
16 have to be incurred again in 2011 to prepare the tank for internal refurbishments
17 (i.e. steel installations). By performing all work in one year, Hydro avoids cost
18 duplication of opening and cleaning the tank.