

1 **Q. (Reference Application, Schedule B, page 5).**  
2

3 **With reference to the location of MUN-T2, it is stated “This area is frequented**  
4 **by students and staff of the University” and para. 5 of the Application states**  
5 **“MUN-T2 cannot be returned to service without exposing the University and**  
6 **public to safety risks.” Do those statements imply that failure of MUN-T2 poses**  
7 **a risk of personal injury to students, staff and the public? Is there not fencing**  
8 **and other protections in place to ensure the safety of individuals in the vicinity**  
9 **of MUN-T2? How is it that NP chose a location to construct this facility in such**  
10 **an area frequented by students and staff, and with exposure to the public and**  
11 **safety risks? Please explain.**  
12

13 **A.** The statements made in the report reflect uncertainties related to the specific failure  
14 mode of MUN-T2.

15  
16 Memorial (“MUN”) Substation is located on land owned by Memorial University as part of  
17 its St. John’s campus. The location of MUN Substation was selected by the university,  
18 Provincial Government and Newfoundland Power in the 1960s. A customer-owned  
19 concrete block wall fence surrounds the substation with chain-link entrance gates.  
20 When all equipment is in normal operation and functioning properly, the substation does  
21 not pose an unreasonable safety risk to the university or its students, staff or the public.  
22

23 MUN-T2 is experiencing a rare form of core deterioration. Newfoundland Power has no  
24 records of experiencing this failure mode in its history. The Company’s transformer  
25 consultant, van Kooy Transformer Consulting Services Inc. (“van Kooy”), has only  
26 observed one other instance of this failure mode in its 35 years of experience. van Kooy  
27 advised that there is currently no standard industry practice used for monitoring core  
28 deterioration. A deteriorating core is a rare condition that cannot be monitored while  
29 the transformer is still in service.<sup>1</sup>  
30

31 Industry experience suggests the insulation material between transformer core  
32 laminations will continue to break down without the ability to monitor the rate of  
33 deterioration. A further decrease of insulation material will likely lead to additional core  
34 vibration. Increased vibrations can cause shifting in the transformer windings, resulting  
35 in an internal fault. The severity of this type of fault ranges from a fault between  
36 windings tripping the transformer protection, to a severe failure.  
37

38 A severe failure could result in an overpressure event, which would lead to a release of  
39 oil from the transformer’s explosion vent. In extreme cases, the overpressure event  
40 could result in the rupture of the transformer tank or bushings, which would release  
41 significant quantities of oil, exposing the substation to the risk of a fire. The two  
42 transformers in MUN Substation are located in close proximity to one another as well as  
43 to other equipment within the substation. A severe failure of MUN-T2 could therefore  
44 cause damage to the MUN-T1 transformer, as well as the adjacent 66 kV structures,  
45 switches, transmission line breakers, and the existing switchgear building. While

---

<sup>1</sup> For additional information, see the *Application, Schedule B, Section 3.0 Risk Assessment*.

1 Newfoundland Power expects the damage would most likely be contained within the  
2 substation, this could not be guaranteed given the unique location of MUN Substation.  
3  
4 Based on these uncertainties, the failure of MUN-T2 necessitates a reasonably cautious  
5 approach to mitigate potential safety risks and further reliability risks. It has therefore  
6 been removed from service.