

1 **Q. Project C-3: Replace Site Facilities - Bay d’Espoir**

2 With reference to section 3.3, “Development of Alternatives”, page 25 of the
3 Report at Tab 1, Volume II, states:

4 “As part of the development of the cost benefit analysis, the following items
5 were added to the analysis, in addition to the construction cost estimate:

- 6 • Construction cost of a new 8625 sqft building as outlined above;
- 7 • Demolition costs of the existing three buildings; and
- 8 • Residual benefit of the new buildings at the end of the 25 year study
9 period.”

10 Please provide full details of the referenced construction costs, demolitions costs
11 and of the residual benefits analysed.

12

13

14 **A.** The section referenced in the question above relates to the option of replacing the
15 maintenance garage, carpentry shop and warehouse with new separate buildings.

16 During the development of the cost benefit analysis (CBA), costs were added to the
17 analysis so that all the costs for development of each option are captured in the
18 CBA.

- 19 • Demolition costs were added to the CBA for both option 1 (Replace Existing
20 Buildings with a New Consolidated Building) and option 2 (Replace Each
21 Building) since for these two options, the existing buildings would be
22 demolished prior to construction of any new buildings. Option 3 (Refurbish
23 Buildings) would not require demolition since Hydro would retrofit and re-
24 use the existing buildings. A cost estimate of \$250,000 was obtained from a
25 demolition contractor to demolish and remove all three buildings. This

1 amount was added to the CBA for option 1 and 2 as an additional cost to the
2 construction cost estimate.

- 3
- 4 • Residual value was included as a benefit in the CBA to capture the life
5 remaining in each building for each option after the study period. The
6 refurbishments (option 3) were estimated to last another 25 years beyond
7 their existing 50 years. To recognize the value associated with having a
8 newer building(s) in the Replace Options (options 1 and 2), the analysis
9 includes a benefit equal to the residual value based on the undepreciated
10 capital cost at the end of the 25 year analysis period, assuming a 75 year
11 useful life. For both options, the residual value was calculated as 50 years of
12 life remaining out of a 75 year life expectancy. For option 2, the residual
13 value would be $(50/75) \times \$13,636,500 = \$9,091,000$ in 25 years. For option
14 3, the residual value would be $(50/75) \times \$11,981,300 = \$7,987,533$ in 25
15 years.

- 16
- 17 • The needs assessment, attached in Vol II, Tab 1, Appendix B, determined
18 that the warehouse and maintenance garage did not meet the functional
19 needs of the maintenance operation for the Bay d’Espoir plant. A
20 conceptual design was developed to house the functions of the three
21 buildings and consolidate services into one location. This resulted in an
22 increase in building area from 20,300 sqft to 28,925 sqft as noted in Table 6,
23 page 23. As noted in sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2, a new building with an area
24 equal to the difference between the conceptual building area and the
25 functional areas of the existing buildings was added to the cost benefit
26 analysis. The difference in area is 8625 sqft. To recognize the value

1 associated with this increase in floor area in option 1 and to compare size
2 equivalent options, the cost to construct an 8625 sqft building was included
3 in the CBA for option 2. See section 3.3.2, page 25. The cost estimate for
4 the 8625 sqft building was developed using RS Means and was determined
5 to be \$2,531,529.