
From: Gary Herd
Sent: Friday, November 12, 2010 12:18 PM
To: David Taylor; Ron Curle; Evan Vokes
Cc: Mark Yeomans
Subject: RE: this is where i was going

Dave,

No problem. Please nominate a call in number and Ron & I will call in at 2:00PM. Ron can receive emails, but not send.

Thank you,

Gary

From: David Taylor
Sent: Friday, November 12, 2010 12:16 PM
To: Gary Herd; Ron Curle; Evan Vokes
Cc: Mark Yeomans
Subject: RE: this is where i was going

Gary, Ron,
Can we set up a conference call (amongst ourselves) to deal with the letter below. Evan and I have talked at length this morning on the issue and are drafting up a resolution we want to propose to you both.

Can you both be available at 2:00 pm this afternoon (mst). I can set up a conference call from my office phone – just need the numbers to call.

Ron, do you want to come over to my office to participate in the call?

Dave

From: Gary Herd
Sent: Friday, November 12, 2010 9:30 AM
To: David Taylor
Subject: FW: this is where i was going

Ron requested we forward a copy of Evans email to your attention.

Congratulations, on the 2 deer!

Gary

From: Gary Herd
Sent: Thursday, November 11, 2010 3:39 PM
To: Joanne Unger

Cc: Ron Curle; Mark Yeomans; Ken Sortland
Subject: RE: this is where i was going

I would like to caution everyone about over reacting to this email. We are working through the process of review with RTD and there is content herein that did not need to be stated.

Gary

From: Evan Vokes
Sent: Thursday, November 11, 2010 2:58 PM
To: Gary Herd
Cc: Ron Curle; Mark Yeomans; Joanne Unger; Ken Sortland; dhodgkinson@telus.net
Subject: FW: this is where i was going

Hello Gary
Further to our conference call with Dave Hodgkinson today:

I must remind everyone that the purpose of having Dave Hodgkinson assess the spread one data was to establish if there was a systemic problem as there was no effective onsite TC review of the data and anomalies were noted during the field visit. This assessment's scope did not separate out a list of rejectable welds but was to assess the extent of systemic problems noted with the gate settings and the operator's ability to separate out features. The probability we have an injurious defect is very low but the review shows that we have a code compliance issue. If the scope of this review was to audit for how many welds are rejectable to code, the list will be extensive. The goal of the audit request to Mark Werner is to ensure TransCanada will not expect to have liability for work that RTD had completed early in the project. A review will likely turn up a weld (s) that will have to be repaired but that is a risk.

From Dave's assessment, he gave us guidance for the methodology and resolution.

If by using data from all root sequences including TOFD, Applus RTD can confirm that full volumetric coverage of the welds has been achieved then the Applus RTD senior level III ultrasonic (AUT) specialist must sign off on the final assessment for record and regulator purposes. Applus RTD must supply a full accounting of all welds which do not have 100% volumetric coverage or do not meet the API 1104 defect acceptance criteria.

Directions for Mark

What Bison needs from Mark Werner is a confirmation that under his guidance, a review of the data was complete and he can accept full technical responsibility for the data such that any injurious defects have been found and the scans are defensible to the regulator. This audit must include the spread ½ SMAW weld data and should extend to the other spreads to confirm the approach is consistent. Particular attention needs to be paid to accumulation defects and scans completed with short gate times. The final assessment should indicate that the data was less than perfect but is acceptable and why.

If we can arrange the conference call tomorrow once he understands what we need.

Thank you
Evan