

---

**From:** Hawksworth, Keith J.  
**Sent:** 09 October 2007 15:52  
**To:** Reynolds, Steve; O'Neill, Thomas J.; Ayres, Greg  
**Subject:** RE: Gallagher meeting

Thanks Steve

Appreciate your views. Trust all is set up for Jim Rozek review?

Thanks and Regards, Keith

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Reynolds, Steve  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 09, 2007 5:56 PM  
**To:** O'Neill, Thomas J.; Hawksworth, Keith J.; Ayres, Greg  
**Subject:** RE: Gallagher meeting

The sentiments expressed by Willie and his lack of focus on who has responsibility for what echo his comments at recent MUDFA meetings. Whilst his views are entirely understandable from one point of view they carry with them an implication that parties other than tie are accountable for MUDFA delays. In reality the party wholly responsible for managing the MUDFA contract and the interactions with the Utility Companies is tie. This is key to the Draft Business Case which states that "tie is retaining and managing the significant risks associated with the utilities diversions...". This philosophy has been implemented in the MUDFA contract structure via the Legal Agreements between tie and each of the Utility Companies. PB /SDS has the responsibility for completing the designs to construction standard but with the clear proviso that tie has secured the effective collaboration of the Utility Companies in advance. This tie has failed to do.

That said, recovery of the MUDFA programme is clearly key to project success and I shall ensure that I work closely with Willie to provide further assistance to this initiative. Willie's recent decision to invite me to weekly meetings with him to review project issues provides the ideal forum. I shall also ensure, though, that the reference points are re-emphasised in order to protect PB's commercial interests. Over the past month I have had to remind both Matthew Crosse as tie Project Director and Steven Bell, tie's Manager responsible for MUDFA Contract Management, of the true scope of PB's role in relation to Utilities design. I have had to do this with Matthew to counter suggestions from him on three occasions that tie may claim against PB should the MUDFA drawing delivery dates slip seriously. His linking PB responsibility for delivery of drawings with responsibility for driving the Utility Companies to provide information indicates that he was unaware of the tie legal agreements with the Utility Companies.

Regards - Steve

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Hawksworth, Keith J.  
**Sent:** 05 October 2007 14:24  
**To:** O'Neill, Thomas J.; Ayres, Greg; Reynolds, Steve  
**Subject:** Re: Gallagher meeting

Thank you Tom and noted

Good to have an in house independant view on the MUDFA utility contract issues- as I believe Willie -as for previous critical issues -needs to be mobilised along with increased efforts from PB Halcrow Regards Keith

-----

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld

----- Original Message -----

From: O'Neill, Thomas J.

To: Hawksworth, Keith J.; Ayres, Greg; Reynolds, Steve

Sent: Fri Oct 05 22:12:07 2007

Subject: Gallagher meeting

Men - Willie and I met for about two hours yesterday. The meeting had one major point of focus - utility relocations. Willie recognizes that some things are going well, and much is improved over the last year. But he is very concerned and frustrated with the slippage and apparent lack of urgency regarding utility relocations. He asked my help in getting the issue sorted. I said that I would certainly pitch in, but that it had to be a joint effort between SDS and tie. He is not focused on who has responsibility for what, but wants the problem to be addressed and solved. I propose to have one of our most senior project managers review your plan for rectifying the situation and recovering lost ground. I also ask to be kept in the loop regarding progress. I'll write more later when I have a bit more time. Tom