

---

**From:** Reynolds, Steve  
**Sent:** 02 July 2007 08:46  
**To:** David Crawley  
**Subject:** RE: Critical Issues Letter DEV-COR-512

Many thanks once again for your pragmatic stance on this David.

Steve

Stephen C Reynolds  
Director

PB  
Manchester Technology Centre  
Oxford Road, Manchester, M1 7ED

Direct  
Mobile  
Fax



---

**From:** David Crawley [mailto:David.Crawley@tie.ltd.uk]  
**Sent:** 29 June 2007 13:34  
**To:** Reynolds, Steve  
**Cc:** Matthew Crosse; Dolan, Alan; Tony Glazebrook; Ayres, Greg; Geoff Gilbert  
**Subject:** RE: Critical Issues Letter DEV-COR-512

Steve,

... and for the avoidance of any possible doubt, I agree with and accept your interpretation.

David

---

**From:** Reynolds, Steve [mailto:ReynoldsS@pbworld.com]  
**Sent:** 29 June 2007 13:16  
**To:** David Crawley  
**Cc:** Matthew Crosse; Dolan, Alan; Tony Glazebrook; Ayres, Greg; Geoff Gilbert  
**Subject:** RE: Critical Issues Letter DEV-COR-512

David

Thank-you for this clarification. Let me first of all confirm that I am remobilising those areas of design activity which have been held and having received the formal instruction from **tie** yesterday I have a special meeting planned Tuesday morning to review current status and pick up on any special instructions which may be required to enforce action and indeed, where feasible, to accelerate progress.

The concern in my mind was, as we discussed yesterday, that the Instruction as received did not correlate closely with the intent that I had perceived from the meeting on the 21st. Specifically my stance, certainly after the forceful presentation by Willie at the last DPD, had been along the lines of it's now nearly twelve months since the PD was delivered - tomorrow is in fact the 12 month anniversary date - and with the extended consultation on design options through that period we have to recognise that what has been submitted is likely so close to optimum that there is nowhere else to go. Without doubt the major risk right now is not that the design may be 99% optimum rather than 100%; the fact is that even if it were possible to reach the theoretical 100% it would take so long to achieve that the programme would be extended to the point where the scheme would be cancelled. Interpreting the "Note" as part of the Instruction and taking at face value the direction to "... optimise where practicable the design further as a result of

observations arising from the modelling exercise...." would put us back to square one with unacceptable programme extension and costs either due to rework or due to delay awaiting CEC modelling results.

I shall respond more formally as part of the wrap-up reply to your letter dated 26 June but we are now moving on the basis of our collective agreement that we have reached what must be close to the best design solution. It's also with flagging here my understanding that should it be decided subsequently to revisit the design (other than due to reasons of non-compliance with standards), then this is a risk that **tie** is taking - with the observation once again that any subsequent rework for what could be termed preferential engineering can only add to the programme delay.

Thank you once again for your intervention to unlock this particular problem so quickly.

Steve

Stephen C Reynolds  
Director

PB  
Manchester Technology Centre  
Oxford Road, Manchester, M1 7ED

Direct  
Mobile  
Fax

---

**From:** David Crawley [mailto:David.Crawley@tie.ltd.uk]  
**Sent:** 29 June 2007 09:31  
**To:** Reynolds, Steve  
**Cc:** Matthew Crosse; Dolan, Alan; Tony Glazebrook  
**Subject:** Critical Issues Letter DEV-COR-512

Steve,

You and I discussed this today. (Matthew, you and I discussed yesterday),

For the avoidance of doubt, wherever the letter referenced above provides an instruction to "confirm that the arrangement detailed can be accommodated within the design standards and constraints which form part of the SDS contract" the subsequent use of a 'Note' in the text below has the status of information provision and does not form part of the instruction and does not modify the instruction.

I hope this helps to clarify matters and allows us to proceed rapidly.

David

<HRsize=2 width="100%" align=center>

The information transmitted is intended only for the person to whom it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail please notify the sender immediately at the email address above, and then delete it.

E-mails sent to and by our staff are monitored for operational and lawful business purposes including assessing compliance with our company rules and system performance. TIE reserves the right to monitor emails sent to or from addresses under its control.

No liability is accepted for any harm that may be caused to your systems or data by this e-mail. It is the recipient's responsibility to scan this e-mail and any attachments for computer viruses.

Senders and recipients of e-mail should be aware that under Scottish Freedom of Information legislation and the Data Protection legislation these contents may have to be disclosed to third parties in response to a request.

tie Limited registered in Scotland No. SC230949. Registered office - City Chambers, High Street, Edinburgh, EH1 1YT.

---

**NOTICE:** This communication and any attachments ("this message") may contain confidential information for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, disclosure, viewing, copying, alteration, dissemination or distribution of, or reliance on this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, or you are not an authorized recipient, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message, delete this message and all copies from your e-mail system and destroy any printed copies.