

From: [David Hopkins Consulting](#)
To: [Mike Stannard](#); ["Sherwyn Williams"](#)
Cc: ["Richard Sharpe"](#); [Vicky Newton](#); [Pam Johnston](#)
Subject: Conference Call - Report Comments
Date: Monday, 10 October 2011 10:58:12 a.m.

Mike / Sherwyn

I had a brief look at Clark's new report and Ashley's Report and Derek's. Although they represent a significant improvement, there are still quite a few issues. I tried to join the conference call just now, mainly to listen.

I made the following notes on Clark's Exec Summary:

1. Exec Summary should refer to what happened to the building on 4 Sep, 26 Dec and 22 Feb.
2. %NBS assessment less than 33% is a concern – sounds like hindsight to me.
3. Reasons:
 - Reason 3+ - query the use of "defects"
 - Reason 5 – Ambiguous. Detailing for ductility was not required but was the detailing used sufficient to meet even those requirements?
 - Reason 6 – Concrete strengths. Language needs to be more direct – eg Concrete strengths were lower than specified – Clark has persisted in clouding this issue. Enough said.
 - Reason 7 – The descriptions are rather vague – refer DH list of main points written some time back.
 - Reason 8 – Lack with respect to what?
4. Recommendations
 - The list needs work, especially re-ordering to reflect importance in this context.
 - Rec 1 – OK
 - Rec 2 – A broader review is needed but this Rec should be later
 - Rec 3 – See Rec 2
 - Recs 4 and 5 – put lower in order
 - Recs 6, 7 and 8 – OK but could be more specific and tighter.
 - Rec 9 – This is done now – a bit general.
 - Rec 10 – OK but ..
 - Rec 11 – Good but should be earlier.
 -

Clark's Report Proper (part read – access problems through internet)

- Query %NBS conclusion if it is IEP – I am concerned that their conclusion is questionable. I expected the answer to be much more based on what was presumed to exist. (I am also concerned that Clark and Fraser Thomas have made a meal of this. The report says they did an IEP. That should not take more than a day for one person. I plan to take that up with Clark when I return.)
- P48 – Query "highly torsional response". ITHA analyses do not show this.
- P50 – not sure if Nigel will like the continued reference to SM = 0.8 etc and