

1 Q. Reference: Replace Accommodations and Septic System, Volume II, Tab 20,

2 Page 9

3 *“Finally, consideration has to be given to the loss in productivity associated with*
4 *flying crew members to and from the site.”*

5 Please provide a description of the consideration, including all economic estimates
6 and assumptions, given to future loss in productivity in Hydro’s decision to
7 construct this \$1,550,800 facility.

8

9

10 A. The loss in productivity is due to the loss of wrench time incurred while crew
11 members are flying to and from site. This is estimated to be in the order of two
12 hours a day, which would result in roughly doubling the number of days to
13 complete any multi-day work. Based on current helicopter costs, this is estimated to
14 total an extra \$64,000 in helicopter costs per year for regular routine work, and an
15 extra \$528,000 in helicopter costs annually between 2017 and 2020, during the
16 planned rehabilitation of the water control structure at this location.

17

18 Furthermore, a daily fly- in fly-out process would be susceptible to work delays
19 when it is deemed to be unsafe to fly the helicopter. Rescheduling maintenance
20 crews to other work during these times will be limited to non-critical path work
21 with reduced efficiencies due to the interruptible nature (required to fly back to
22 Ebbegunbaeg when safe to do so) of the resource availability at that time.

23

24 Were the fly-in/fly-out option pursued, an emergency facility would still be required
25 to ensure that employees have a place to stay should the weather change while
26 they are on-site, preventing them from flying out.