

ronaldpower@ [REDACTED]

**From:** Dr Malcolm Dunstan MD and A <rccdam@ [REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Friday, May 12, 2017 9:14 AM  
**To:** POWER  
**Subject:** Sent to your personal e-mail

Good morning Ron

*(NB. this was drafted last Wednesday before I received your recent email)*

I have spent some time thinking about how you can progress with the North Dam given what seems to be a total lack of understanding of the potential problems by the Contractor (and I am afraid by quite a few others), unless of course he has completely different objectives. Hopefully NALCOR will require a precedent and then changes can be made.

There seem to be three ways forward: –

1. Issue no instructions or directions and let the Contractor “learn from his own mistakes” (unfortunately he has not learnt from any of his mistakes to date). I would estimate that the chances of the North Dam being completed by the end of 2018 to certainly be less than 10% and probably less than 5%.
2. Let the Contractor continue as now on to the end of this season and then when he has only placed 50±% of the 130 000 m<sup>3</sup> he originally planned to place this season, NALCOR takes over the whole placement (and does a proper TDS at the end of this season). Even in this case I would estimate the chances of the North Dam being completed by the end of 2018 to be only 50 to 60%.
3. Take over the placement now (i.e. before the PDS). I know this is impossible, but even if you did, with the present setup, I would estimate the chances of completing the dam on time would only be 80 to 90% (because of the various problems such as the time needed to get to a CreterCrane on site, etc.).

This is not a good position in which to be, as I know you are aware. As you are also aware, even using 1 + 7a + 7b aggregate still does not conform to the Specification because of Pile 1 having not been through the VSI, but I can see this to be a necessary compromise. However I cannot see any benefit at all in even contemplating the use of the 1 + 6 + 8 aggregate (that all fail the Specification and thus sets a very bad precedent).

I have sent this to your private email address rather than through the normal channels for obvious reasons.

Best of luck

