

NON-CONFIDENTIAL

Request IR-1:

The total project cost submitted in this application is estimated at \$2,426,669, compared to the 2025 ACE plan estimate of \$927,528. Please explain the factors contributing to this increase in projected costs.

Response IR-1:

The 2025 ACE Plan carryover estimate of \$927,528 was based on preliminary inspection findings and an initial onsite contractor estimate. This Unforeseen and Unbudgeted (U&U) project was originally initiated in April 2024, and was estimated at that time to be less than \$1 million. That preliminary estimate was based on refurbishing the existing structure of the wharf rather than full replacement. Please refer to NS Power's application, Attachment 1, page 11 of 80 in the section titled "Replacement vs Rehabilitation" for a full explanation of why refurbishing the existing structure was ultimately deemed not feasible.

NON-CONFIDENTIAL

Request IR-2:

Given that the wharf capacity has already been derated, what mitigation measures are in place to ensure safety and continuity of operations until replacement completion?

Response IR-2:

The main operational use of the wharf is for receiving shipments of Heavy Fuel Oil (HFO). Tufts Cove is unable to receive a HFO vessel until the wharf is replaced; however, there are no planned deliveries of HFO to Tufts Cove during the project. Due to the deteriorated condition, the capacity of the wharf platform had been derated to only allow six (6) people on the wharf at any time. Additionally, access to the wharf access bridge was locked with signage that indicated the reduced load capacity. The wharf access bridge has since been removed to facilitate the replacement.

NON-CONFIDENTIAL

Request IR-3:

(a) In the application NS Power states that two design alternatives were evaluated. Please provide more detail on the life cycle cost comparison, including differences in maintenance, expected service life, and resilience to environmental factors such as corrosion and sea level rise.

(b) How was the “more economical” option determined? Was this based on initial capital cost or the total lifecycle cost of the asset?

Response IR-3:

(a) Both design options meet the desired design criteria of an asset service life of 25+ years to align with the lifecycle of Tufts Cove. Maintenance requirements were not a significant differentiator between the two design options as the wharf access bridge is an asset that requires minimal maintenance and costs between both options would be similar. The steel framing and timber deck option was designed with galvanized structural elements to increase resilience to environmental factors such as corrosion. The environmental resilience is similar between both design options proposed. Sea level rise is not considered to be an issue for either design option.

(b) The more economical option was determined based on initial capital cost using estimated costs from the preliminary design options as seen in Attachment 2 of the Application, page 12, Table 6: Cost Comparison of Design Alternatives. Other than initial estimated capital cost it was determined that there were more schedule and cost risks associated with the pre-stressed concrete option. The primary reasons for going with the steel girder with timber deck versus pre-stressed girders were the following:

The steel girder with timber deck design option provided weight savings to ensure that the substructure components would not need to be upgraded. The steel girder with timber deck

NON-CONFIDENTIAL

1 option would be significantly lighter than the concrete prestressed girder option, which
2 would likely require additional girders for each span, and have a concrete deck. All of
3 which would add weight on the existing substructure and potentially require upgrades or
4 reinforcing at an additional cost.

5
6 There is potential schedule risk associated with the pre-stressed concrete option that would
7 require the fabrication of the concrete girders, followed by a cast in place concrete deck
8 which would require formwork and working over water. With the steel and timber option,
9 common steel section sizes were selected to ensure they would be readily available. Given
10 that each of the spans are supported by 2 primary girders running between the piers and the
11 shore cell and end cell, it meant that each of the spans could almost be fully assembled off
12 site and floated into position for installation being temporarily supported at the two primary
13 girders. It is anticipated that if a similar installation option for the pre-stressed girders was
14 utilized, it would be more labour intensive as there would be additional girders.

NON-CONFIDENTIAL

Request IR-4:

What design features or provisions are being incorporated to ensure the wharf's future adaptability, such as accommodating changes in vessel configurations or addressing sea level rise?

Response IR-4:

The scope of this project is limited to the replacement of the wharf access bridge and does not include any changes to the berthing arrangement to accommodate new vessel configurations. The current wharf can accommodate several vessel configurations and NS Power is not expecting significant change in vessels in the future operation of the wharf. As noted in IR-3, sea level rise is not considered to be an issue for either design option.

NON-CONFIDENTIAL

Request IR-5:

(a) Given that concrete condition is a key uncertainty, what is the plan for managing potential scope growth if deterioration proves worse than expected during demolition?

(b) Based on current market and economic conditions, does NS Power anticipate any material changes to project costs related to steel pricing, supply volatility, tariffs, surtaxes, and duties that could affect the final project price?

(c) Are there any regulatory, environmental, or permitting risks that could affect schedule or cost?

Response IR-5:

(a) The scope of this project was reduced to include only the rehabilitation of the pile caps to minimize the potential for schedule and cost risks. Additionally, the pile caps have been visually inspected from all sides except for the top bearing surface, which is inaccessible until the wharf access bridge is removed. No major structural concerns have been identified that could lead to schedule delays. Any rehabilitation of the top surface of the pile caps will need to be complete before the new bridge is installed, so the schedule has been optimized to allow sufficient time for inspection and rehabilitation of the concrete without delaying the overall schedule. The supporting structure (the pile jackets) can be rehabilitated with the wharf access bridge in place and is not included in the scope of this project.

(b) Materials have already been procured, and NS Power does not anticipate any material changes to project costs related to steel pricing, supply volatility, tariffs, surtaxes, or duties that would affect the final project price.

CI C0067183 TUC Wharf Access Bridge Replacement (NSEB M12420)
NSPI Responses to NSEB Information Requests

NON-CONFIDENTIAL

- 1 (c) There are no regulatory or permitting risks expected to impact the schedule or cost. The
2 primary environmental risk associated with this project was the removal of the 20” heavy
3 fuel oil (HFO) pipe spanning the wharf access bridge, which has already been completed
4 without any cost increases or schedule delays.

CONFIDENTIAL (Attachment Only)

Request IR-6:

Please explain how the contractor was selected, including the type of procurement process used, how costs and project risks were evaluated.

Response IR-6:

An expression of interest was sent out to seven proponents and two responded that they were interested in bidding. The request for proposal (RFP) was sent to three proponents and all three responded. The winning proponent was selected through the RFP process to ensure competitive pricing. Please refer to Partially Confidential Attachment 1 in which all proponent bids were all evaluated based on pricing, schedule and delivery, safety and environment planning, and comprehension of scope.

TUFTS COVE WHARF REPLACEMENT
Recommendation RFP-03/2025-467
July 2025



Project Details	
Reference ID	RFP-03/2025-467
Project Name	Tufts Cove Wharf Replacement
Project Owner	Michelle Sampson
Project Type	RFP
Department	Power Production - Tufts Cove & CTs
Budget	
Project Sub-Type:	New Agreement
Project Description	NSPI is looking to engage a Contractor for the Tufts Cove Wharf Bridge Replacement Project. This work will include the removal and replacement of the Tufts Cove wharf access bridge. The commencement of the work is expected to start May 2025 and be completed by November 2025; this schedule is subject to change.
Open Date	Apr 02, 2025 4:00 PM ADT
Intent to Bid Due	May 12, 2025 2:00 PM ADT
Close Date	Jun 16, 2025 4:00 PM ADT

Submitted to:

- Andrea Mackay Procurement Operations Manager
- John MacDonald Senior Manager, Procurement & Supply Chain
- Josh Hyslop Senior Plant Manager, Tufts Cove
- Lynne Drover Senior Director, Power Production
- Marie MacLean VP Power Production Energy & Risk Management

**TUFTS COVE WHARF REPLACEMENT
Recommendation RFP-03/2025-467
July 2025**



Prepared by:

- Michelle Sampson Procurement Specialist

Evaluation Team:

- Connor Lebens Mechanical Engineer
- Neil Gallant Project Manager
- Kyle Ryan Manager, Projects and Engineering

Risk Reviewers:

Through the use of Emera's Third-Party Risk Management (TPRM) Evaluation Scorecard, elevated environmental and safety risks were identified due to working near heavy fuel line, working near water and lifting. The following mitigation measures were put in place:

- Emptying and removal of fuel line by NSPI staff prior to scope execution.
- Requested ISNetworld Grade A or B
- Requested Insurance Coverage as identified by Corporate Risk department:
 - Minimum of [REDACTED] each:
 - CGL
 - Auto
 - Contractors Pollution Liability
 - Marine Liability
 - Marine Physical Damage

It is the objective of NSPI to enter into a service arrangement for Tufts Cove Wharf Replacement with a Service Provider who:

- a) Is competitive from a quality and cost perspective.
- b) Has the ability to meet required project timelines.
- c) Meets the required specifications.

Recommendation:

The Evaluation Team recommends NSPI awards the TUFTS COVE WHARF REPLACEMENT via Services Agreement and Purchase Order to:

- **CHERUBINI METAL WORKS LIMITED**

Total CAD expenditure from this Recommendation:

TUFTS COVE WHARF REPLACEMENT
Recommendation RFP-03/2025-467
July 2025



PO DETAILS			
DESCRIPTION	ACCOUNT NUMBER	CURRENCY	VALUE
Tufts Cove Wharf Replacement	C0067284	CAD	
THIS RECOMMENDATION			
Capital or Operating?	Capital		
Total Expenditure of this Recommendation is			
Total Budgeted for this Scope of Work is:			
Difference Between Recommended Expenditure and Budgeted Amount is:			
TOTAL PROJECT INFORMATION			
Total Project Budget is:			
Total Committed to Date is: (included this scope of work)			
Total Spent to Date is:			
Total Project Value Remaining:			
If Value Remaining is Negative has Project Received Approval to Overspend?	PE is approved to overspend for		

Process Overview:

On April 2nd, 2025, a Request for Proposal for Tufts Cove Wharf Replacement was issued to the following companies:

Contacted and Proposal Submitted

Cherubini Metal Works Limited

Contacted and Did Not Respond or Declined

Upon the Close Date, June 16, 2025, the evaluation of the Proposals focused on the following Key Selection Criteria:

- Pricing
- Speed and efficiency of project plan, availability and delivery
- Safety & Environmental performance record and past Regulatory History, Safety Plan
- Understanding of Specification and ability to provide an innovative and acceptable solution

Technical and Commercial Evaluation:

Evaluation of all Proposals received based on the defined Key Selection Criteria:

The Evaluation Scorecard is a compilation of all scores and associated comments completed by the Evaluation Team. The criterion weighting must be established prior to Proposal review and is determined based on project requirements and priorities. The proponent with the highest score is the one recommended for award.

Project Criteria:

TUFTS COVE WHARF REPLACEMENT
Recommendation RFP-03/2025-467
July 2025



Criteria	Points
A - Commercial and Technical Evaluation	
A-1 - Pricing	
A-2 - Speed and efficiency of implementation (or project) plan, availability and delivery	
A-3 - Safety & Environmental performance record and past Regulatory History, Safety Plan	
A-4 - Understanding of Specification and ability to provide an innovative and acceptable solution	
B - Corporate Risk	
B-1 - ISNetworld Company Grade:	
B-2 - Insurance / Certifications	
Total	

RFP-03/2025-467 - Tufts Cove Wharf Replacement
Scoring Summary

Active Submissions

	Total	A-1 - Pricing	A-2 - Speed and efficiency of implementation (or project) plan, availability and delivery	A-3 - Safety & Environmental performance record and past Regulatory History, Safety Plan	A-4 - Understanding of Specification and ability to provide an innovative and acceptable solution	B-1 - ISNetworld Company Grade:	B-2 - Insurance / Certifications
Supplier							
Cherubin Metal Works Limited							

TUFTS COVE WHARF REPLACEMENT
Recommendation RFP-03/2025-467
July 2025



[REDACTED]

Cherubini Metal Works –

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Recommendation:

The evaluation team confidently presents this Recommendation and believes the process was both competitive and transparent and requests your approval.

NON-CONFIDENTIAL

1 **Request IR-7:**

2
3 **Will the contractor be responsible for both demolition and reconstruction under a single**
4 **contract?**

5
6 **Response IR-7:**

7
8 Yes – the contractor is responsible for the demolition, fabrication, and installation under a single
9 contract. The only aspect of removal and reinstallation that the contractor is not responsible for is
10 the 20” Heavy Fuel Oil Pipe that spans the entirety of the wharf access bridge and the electrical
11 and communications cables which have already been removed by NS Power.

NON-CONFIDENTIAL

Request IR-8:

(a) What environmental risks have been identified and how will these be mitigated during construction?

(b) How will environmental responsibilities and compliance be allocated between NS Power and the contractor, particularly for areas excluded from the contractor's scope?

Response IR-8:

(a) The most significant environmental risk was the removal of the 20" pipe containing Heavy Fuel Oil (HFO). The pipe was removed successfully by draining the pipe, isolating upstream sources of HFO, permitting out the system, and inserting dry ice into the piping to significantly increase the viscosity of the HFO. An environmental contractor was present on site for the entire removal process to ensure safe handling and compliance.

(b) NS Power and the Contractor agreed to terms under NS Power's Contractor Safety Management Program, which defines roles and responsibilities related to safety and environmental compliance within the project scope. NS Power will have a site representative at Tufts Cove for the duration of the project to ensure compliance with the agreed upon terms. NS Power will procure services from a vetted environmental contractor for high-risk activities related to this project.