We didn't include on our list of takeaways:

1. Does the extra 20% allowance for labour productivity apply to (1) direct concrete hours only, (2) direct concrete hours plus rebar, or (3) direct concrete hours plus rebar and indirects?

Yes, it apply to all of the Contractors hours. The only area where it does not apply are the Project Site Indirect like, the Camp, the Catering and Housekeeping, the Utilities, the temporary electrical set-up, all the Administration Buildings Garage and workshop, the general maintenance of the camp's roads and the Security and Medical issues.

2. The engineering plan for the temporary building.

There was no engineering plan prepared for the temporary building. I used the same type of structure than Eastmain-1A and used a unit cost per square meter, plus and allocation for the heating and the lighting inside the temporary bldg.
For your information, I am providing you a cross section sketch, showing the arrangement of the temporary structure expected to be done for the Muskrat Falls Powerhouse and a summary sheet of the bids obtained at Eastmain from three bidders and the prices was ranging between $ 12 to $ 18 million, but covers the complete Eastmain Powerhouse, not the Intake, who was at a higher level because of the Francis type of turbines. The capacity though was quite the same as Muskrat Falls 222 MGW, with turbines of 225 MGW. The price range is a little bit higher than the $ 10 million I carried in the estimate, but at Eastmain it covered (3) groups, while my Muskrat Falls estimate, covers (2) groups only. (see my next answer for more detail).

Can you also point me to

3. the estimate for heating and hoarding costs?

The money is shown in my answer at the beginning of this correspondence at item (ii) and stands as follow: $ 8,448,000 for the structure (hoarding) and $ 2,250,000 for the heating and lighting for a total of +/- $ 10.7 million. So if you take the average bid of 15 millions of Eastmain divided by 3 turbines, multiplied by 2 turbines for M.Falls it gives approximately 5 million per group or 10 million for the two, at M.Falls.

4. any justification for the 20% allowance?

The 20 % allowance used is my decision and was meant to allow for ''unavailibilty and unproductivity'' of the labor pool force in Newfoundland since another major project (Hebron Gravity Base Concrete platform, built by Kiewit), was taking place in the almost the same time as Muskrat Falls, so the possibility of having the best of ''the middle top pool workers'' at M.Falls, was substantially affected. Secondly, the ''unproductivity aspect'' was a possible eventuality since I had no record of Newfoundland project performance of this magnitude. So adding 2,000,000 hours to the 10,000,000 contractors hours already in the estimate and above the James Bay factors, was quite substantial and reasonable to me.

5. Any summary sheet for the estimate?

……

Also, we're noticing that there are Eastmain numbers for the spillway. Are they Eastmain-1 or Eastmain-1A? How did Mr. LeMay get those numbers, but no Eastman numbers for the powerhouse?

Mr. Collins, if you look at the date under the Spillway Eastmain ''data sheet'' it show 1978, and since Kiewit was the contractor who has done the Spillway, that's why I have the data. It was done during the first Phase of the James Bay, while Eastmain-1 and Eastmain-1A was done between 2004 and 2010 and that's why I did not have the various data since I had left the project before it ends completely, so I could not have the final production factors.