

**From:** [pharrington@lowerchurchillproject.ca](mailto:pharrington@lowerchurchillproject.ca)  
**To:** [lanceclarke@lowerchurchillproject.ca](mailto:lanceclarke@lowerchurchillproject.ca)  
**Cc:** [Brian Crawley](#); [Jason Kean](#); [Steve Pellerin](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Plan for next week  
**Date:** Sunday, January 17, 2016 1:51:07 PM

---

Lance

We will steer them towards the forward looking scope of work this week. Their agenda is to find anything they can to justify the review, but we are keeping our guard up and a couple of times on Friday we saw the "cloven hoof" exposed. So that warning needs to be heeded.

You did a great job on Friday - however I agree with you that is enough on Astaldi history. The contract we have with them is the contract we are managing , there is no need for them to rake over the coals of the decisions that were made when the contract was placed .

Regards Paul

**Paul Harrington**

**Project Director**

**PROJECT DELIVERY TEAM**

**Lower Churchill Project**

t. 709 737-1907 c. 709 682-1460 f. 709 737-1985

e. [PHarrington@lowerchurchillproject.ca](mailto:PHarrington@lowerchurchillproject.ca)

w. [musktratfalls.nalcorenergy.com](http://musktratfalls.nalcorenergy.com)

You owe it to yourself, and your family, to make it home safely every day. What have you done today so that nobody gets hurt?

Lance Clarke---01/17/2016 12:05:22 PM---From: Lance Clarke/NLHydro To: Steve Pellerin/NLHydro@nlhydro

From: Lance Clarke/NLHydro

To: Steve Pellerin/NLHydro@nlhydro

Cc: Paul Harrington/NLHydro@nlhydro, Jason Kean/NLHydro@nlhydro, Brian Crawley/NLHydro@nlhydro

Date: 01/17/2016 12:05 PM

Subject: Re: Plan for next week

---

A few thoughts:

1) Jim is unavailable as he is at the table with me;

2) I believe they likely have a definition of Brians role that is based on his title- Integration, so I suggest clarification on that with them;

3) I would defer the risk discussion until next week to allow Jason more time to complete our risk work, which by the way we told them was in progress so they should understand. Either that or meet with them to discuss Risk process and historical risk and leave the go forward risk discussion for next week;

4) Cost and schedule and Rebaseline are basically the same, they are trying to divide and conquer to see if they get different answers. Tell them it will be one meeting with Ed Bush at both;

5) Pats scope looks good with one exception, Claims is really Bruce, not Pat, and I want to be in on the claims meeting as well. They will argue we need a % in contingency for claims.

I have stewed over the weekend on the Friday Astaldi discussion and I am not happy with what I saw. They are too focused on the past and need to quickly be brought back to their scope from Monday to Wednesday. Finish the "Deep Dives" to provide context but I would stop passing opinions as to why something happened or whether it could have been done better. Historical context should be factually based only, not discussions on why or what if.

Thoughts?

Sent from my iPad

On Jan 17, 2016, at 10:03 AM, Steve Pellerin <[StevePellerin@lowerchurchillproject.ca](mailto:StevePellerin@lowerchurchillproject.ca)> wrote:

It appears they did some planning yesterday and outlined their aspirations for their short week here. I have already responded that I'll try my best to organize, and made a couple suggestions on consolidating elements of their plan. If you have any thoughts on this, please advise.

**Stephen Pellerin**

**Special Projects & 3rd Party Coordination Manager**

**PROJECT DELIVERY TEAM**

**Lower Churchill Project**

t. (709) 570-5969 c. (709) 725-7308 f. (709) 754-0787

e. [StevePellerin@lowerchurchillproject.ca](mailto:StevePellerin@lowerchurchillproject.ca)

w. [muskratfalls.nalcorenergy.com](http://muskratfalls.nalcorenergy.com)

----- Forwarded by Steve Pellerin/NLHydro on 01/17/2016 09:58 AM -----

From: Tim Calver <[tim.calver@sky.com](mailto:tim.calver@sky.com)>  
To: "[StevePellerin@lowerchurchillproject.ca](mailto:StevePellerin@lowerchurchillproject.ca)" <[StevePellerin@lowerchurchillproject.ca](mailto:StevePellerin@lowerchurchillproject.ca)>, "[swolyniec@uk.ey.com](mailto:swolyniec@uk.ey.com)" <[swolyniec@uk.ey.com](mailto:swolyniec@uk.ey.com)>, "[ThieuHue.Lam@ca.ey.com](mailto:ThieuHue.Lam@ca.ey.com)" <[ThieuHue.Lam@ca.ey.com](mailto:ThieuHue.Lam@ca.ey.com)>, "[emiliano.mancini@ca.ey.com](mailto:emiliano.mancini@ca.ey.com)" <[emiliano.mancini@ca.ey.com](mailto:emiliano.mancini@ca.ey.com)>, Richard Noble <[richard.noble@ca.ey.com](mailto:richard.noble@ca.ey.com)>  
Date: 01/16/2016 02:28 PM  
Subject: Plan for next week

---

Hi Steve,

As promised, I'm sending you some information on how we would like to organise next week (Monday through Wednesday) – please see attached.

The first slide is a set of 1:1 discussions that we would like to hold.

Then we've identified a few areas where we would like to have a deep-dive session to build on the information we received this week. To help our preparation we have included some structure and timing for the discussions, as well as suggested attendees – open to your feedback on this to get the right set up for the sessions.

We've included a deep-dive on RFI and RFO – these are areas we feel that we didn't cover so far in the presentations this week, so the request here is for a similar introductory session to the component sessions.

We will be reviewing dataroom documents as we get them, so will also collect some specific topics for each discussion.

Hope this makes sense – feel free to contact me at any point to discuss.

Have a good weekend

Tim

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

*(See attached file: LCP - Round One Discussions - Draft V3.0 [363704].pptx)*

<LCP - Round One Discussions - Draft V3.0 [363704].pptx>