NOVA SCOTIA ENERGY BOARD

IN THE MATTER OF: **THE PUBLIC UTILITIES ACT**

- and -

IN THE MATTER OF: **AN APPLICATION** by **NOVA SCOTIA POWER INCORPORATED** to approve CI C0084033 – RC SCR Bridge 10.10 Refurbishment - $1,008,941

REDACTED INFORMATION REQUESTS

To:
Lana Myatt
Manager, Regulatory Capital
Nova Scotia Power Inc.
P.O. Box 910
Halifax, NS B3J 2W5
By email: lana.myatt@nspower.ca

From:
Board Staff
Nova Scotia Energy Board

Responses Due: **Tuesday, June 23, 2026**

Copies: 1 electronic copy (PDF searchable)

Contact Person:
Holly Chisholm
Senior Advisor
Nova Scotia Energy Board
3rd Floor, 1601 Lower Water Street
Halifax, NS B3J 3S3
Tel: 902 424 1332
Email: holly.chisholm@novascotia.ca

Issued at Halifax, Nova Scotia, this 2nd day of June, 2026.

Crystal Henwood, Clerk of the Board

Request IR-1:

In the 2026 ACE Plan M12619 Figure 10: 2026 Capital Items Forecast for Subsequent Submittal. This RC SCR Bridge 10.10 Refurbishment $1,353,592 is listed with a different CI number, C0076672. In the Project description, the application stated: “This project is for refurbishment of priority areas of the roof at the Sydney Coal Railway Transportation & Rail Maintenance Centre (Rail Centre)”.

a) Please explain why the CI number has been changed to C0084033.
b) Please explain why the project description for the Bridge 10.10 Refurbishment is unrelated to the roof at the Rail Centre.
c) Does Nova Scotia Power (NS Power) own the property that this project will take place on?
    i. If not, is NS Power required by contract to maintain this infrastructure?
        a. If so, for how long?
    ii. Does NS Power’s property join with property/infrastructure owned by another firm/agency?
    iii. If NS Power owns the entirety of the railway line infrastructure, when will this asset be decommissioned?
d) Will this project negatively impact other operations of the railway?
    i. If so, what is the estimated cost of creating a negative impact on the railway operations?

Request IR-2:

The application states that this project has an estimated useful life of 20 years.

a) How old is this structure?
b) Has this infrastructure reached the end of its useful life?
c) Please list all investments made on this structure in the past 10 years.
d) Does NS Power intend to continue using this infrastructure over the next 20 years?
    i. If so, please explain.
e) Please list all the alternative investments with a shorter useful life that NS Power evaluated and their associated costs.
    i. If NS Power did not evaluate any other investment, please explain why.
    ii. Did NS Power consider replacing trucking in place of this investment?
        a. If so, what was the total cost of using trucks up to the retirement of coalfired generation at Lingan?
        b. If not, why not?

Request IR-3:

Please describe the Transport Canada condition requirements for Bridge 10.10 on Sydney Coal Railway and identify the requirements that Bridge 10.10 does not meet.

a) Please identify the specific tasks that will be performed to adhere to Transport Canada's standards.

Request IR-4:

NS Power states on page 2: "The corrosion deterioration has led to a substantial reduction in the effective cross-section properties, and consequently, the load-carrying capacity of the affected members."

a) Please describe the cross-section properties and how this investment relates to these properties.

Request IR-5:

Why does NS Power seek to meet the American Railway Engineering and Maintenance-of-Way Association (AREMA) standards in addition to Transport Canada's standards?

a) What would this project cost if the investment only targeted Transport Canada's standards?

Request IR-6:

Page 2 of the application states that the structural analysis found that the internal girders did not meet the required member fatigue capacities and that the girders are heavily corroded, which affects the bridge's load rating.

a) To what load rating will this investment deliver?
b) What is the load rating recommended by Transport Canada?
c) What is the load rating required to perform the shipment of coal of Lingan for the remaining useful life of coal-fired generation at Lingan?

Request IR-7:

The Contingency Statement explains that the project risks are likely to be from market and pricing volatility for materials and contracts and additional scope.

a) Please discuss the additional scope that could be found during demolition and inspection phases.

b) If the abutment scope requirements are needed and the cost increases by $344,651, how does the revised project total compare to alternative investments, such as trucking coal?

c) Where did NS Power source the materials from?

Request IR-8:

Was the contract for an inspection and structural analysis awarded through a competitive Request for Proposals?

a) If not, why not?

b) If so, please provide the review of the vendors submissions.

c) Why are the consulting costs confidential?

Request IR-9:

Attachment 2 [redacted]?

a) If not, why?

b) If so, [redacted]?

Request IR-10:

Attachment 3 states that the [redacted]?

a) If not, [redacted]?

b) If not, why did NS Power [redacted]?

c) Please describe the difference between [redacted].

i. [redacted]?

Request IR-11:

[redacted]?

Request IR-12:

Attachment 3 [redacted].

a) [redacted]?

i. If not, why not?

Request IR-13:

Attachment 3, [redacted]?

Request IR-14:

Attachment 3, [redacted].

Request IR-15:

Attachment 3, [redacted].

a) [redacted]?

i. If not, why not?

ii. If so, [redacted]?

Request IR-16:

Page 142, Attachment 4 presents [redacted].

a) Has NS Power [redacted]?