

1 **Q. Re: B-7, Upgrade Marine Terminal – Holyrood \$5,859,600 in 2012**

2 In Volume I, Tab 3, page 9, Hydro raises, in section 3.10, concern for the safety of
3 workers due to major deficiencies. As preventative and corrective maintenance on
4 the facility since 1996 has not addressed any of these issues, why is it important
5 that they be addressed at this time?

6
7
8 **A.** The Marine Terminal was designed and built according to the safety standards at
9 the time. Personnel safety appears to be a consideration for man-overboard
10 emergencies but it is not clear if the ladders originally reached the low tide level or
11 if the ladders were intended to provide access to smaller vessels. Man-overboard
12 issues were raised in the past and some mitigation measures implemented to
13 manage these emergencies, such as mandatory use of life vests by workers and the
14 availability of a small vessel that could be deployed in the event of an emergency.
15 Unfortunately no major project was initiated to correct the deficiencies. Past
16 preventative and corrective maintenance were generally aimed at operational
17 assets. Emergency equipment was inspected by local departments or Hydro's
18 safety officer, but no formal records were retained. The Hatch survey was the first
19 Marine Terminal survey completed by a third party to consider safety in comparison
20 with current standards. Modern terminal designs now consider personnel safety
21 with a much higher priority than the past. Designs including non-obstructive safety
22 railing, routes for emergency evacuation and infrastructure for man-overboard
23 rescue are standard. It is important that they be considered at this time as the
24 issues have been clearly identified by the Hatch report.