

1 Q. **Project C-24: Rehabilitate Shoreline Protection – Cat Arm**

2 With reference to Section 3.2.4 - “Historical Information” set out at page 9 of the
3 Report at Tab 7, Volume II, why did Hydro not take action to complete remedial
4 measures to the embankment when recommended by the AMEC assessment in
5 2011?

6
7
8 A. The AMEC assessment noted that the embankment erosion posed no immediate
9 threat to the stability of the existing roadway or to the traffic using it. It did,
10 however, conclude that the erosion is progressive and that the embankment will
11 continue to deteriorate until such time that the shoreline protection is
12 rehabilitated. AMEC recommended that the shoreline protection be completed as
13 soon as possible.

14
15 Upon receipt of AMEC’s recommendations Hydro moved to incorporate the
16 rehabilitation work into its capital plan, so that the recommendations could be
17 implemented. As the investigation and subsequent report were not completed
18 until the fall of 2011, the 2012 budget application had already been filed and the
19 2013 capital plan had advanced through the prioritization process and the
20 subsequent project selection finalized. As there was believed to be no imminent
21 danger to the roadway or its users, Hydro placed the work into its five year plan for
22 application in 2014.

23
24 A budget application was submitted in Hydro’s 2014 application for a two year
25 project to complete the detailed design and construction of the shoreline
26 refurbishments. As per Board Order No. P.U. 42(2013), only the 2014 expenditures

1 for the multi-year project were approved so that an investigation into the most
2 feasible shoreline rehabilitation alternative could be determined. The 2016
3 application builds upon the feasibility study completed in 2014 and will see the
4 detailed design and construction of the selected alternative.