

1 Q. **Re: p. B-13** With reference to page 17, Section 8.0 of the foregoing Report,  
2 in respect of stated disadvantages of phased replacement, have additional  
3 costs associated with the upgrade of the existing penstock in 2006 been  
4 included in the costing of phased replacement set out at page 15, Section 7.3  
5 of the Report? If so, provide a breakout of these additional costs, and if not,  
6 what is the estimate of these additional costs?

7

8

9 A. Detailed cost estimates were not carried out but allowances were included  
10 for the following significant cost items:

11

- |    |  |   |          |
|----|--|---|----------|
| 12 | • Bulkhead Gate                          | - | \$10,000 |
| 13 | • Moisture Control of the Wood           | - | \$10,000 |
| 14 | • Cut Off Dam                            | - | \$20,000 |
| 15 | • Annual Maintenance for Wooden Penstock | - | \$20,000 |

16

17 There was no cost assumed for water leakage that might result when  
18 returned to service, which has been experienced in the past whenever the  
19 penstock was drained for maintenance.