

1 Q. **Project C10: Replace Interior and Exterior Protective Coating on Surge Tank 2 - Bay**
2 **d’Espoir**

3 Does Hydro have any information with respect to the inspection and maintenance of the
4 coating system in Tank 2?

5
6
7 A. Inspection: Hydro has completed two exterior inspections and one interior
8 inspection of surge tank 2 in the last five years. The interior inspection report,
9 completed by a consultant, is included in the 2016 Capital Budget Application.

10
11 Maintenance: Upon review of the submission document, it was noted that \$13.605
12 *million* was reported as spent on maintenance over the last 5 years. This is an error
13 and in fact there was \$13.605 *thousand* spent on maintenance of surge tank 2 over
14 the last five years. A cost breakdown for corrective and preventative maintenance
15 over this time period was included in the budget application in Table 1, however,
16 none of this maintenance was related to repairs of the coating system.

17
18 Maintenance of the interior and exterior coating would entail localized (spot)
19 repairs of the coating. As noted in Vol II, Tab 4, section 3.3, page 11, the majority of
20 the cost to complete spot repairs is related to the scaffolding or swing stage setup.
21 As a result, the construction cost to complete a localized repair is about the same
22 cost to complete a full recoating. See Tables 2 and 3 in Vol II, Tab 4, pp. 13 and 15.
23 In addition, the time required to design, approve and install scaffolding in addition
24 to surface preparation, priming and spot coating application would require a 10
25 week outage to complete just the interior coating maintenance which is similar to
26 the outage required for a full recoating. Therefore, maintenance of the coating

- 1 system is very costly and requires a lengthy outage. As a result, there has been no
- 2 maintenance completed on the coating system itself.