

Kelly Taylor

From: Sue Bidrose
Sent: Wednesday, 16 December 2015 06:38 a.m.
To: Sandy Graham
Subject: Re: Information Request Regarding Community Housing Maintenance Contract - additional LGOIMA requests
Attachments: image.png; image.jpg

Hi Lee

When you and I met in my office, I told you I had a rough understanding of the circumstances of the painting situation, but not the details. I told you that outline, but specifically said not to quote me on the details because I was not clear but would find out and ensure you got the information. I said at the meeting that I understood the rough outline to be:

1. The original contractor was awarded the entire maintenance contract , internal and external including painting, after a tendering process
2. At some point the Property manager allowed a parallel contract to be given (I thought without tendering) to Mr Kelly, for work already covered by the contract for the original contractor, for painting, so Mr Kelly was doing the painting not the original tenderer
3. The Property department new management have found this, and given the work back to the original tenderer as per his contract.

At the meeting you asked questions like 'why didn't we get rid of the original tenderer if he was poor at his job' and ' how much did he get paid for work he didn't do' and I said that I did not know if the reason My Kelly was given the work was in any way related to performance, but would find out. I also said I didn't know if there was double payment or payment for work not done - just that there was two contracts for the same work. I told you you would get the answer in your LGOIMA.

I sought answers, and the detail of those circumstances is outlined in the response given to you by Kristy Rusher (who heads the GSO team responsible for LGOIMAs).

The answer to your question, therefore, is that there was no performance issue with DHMC. Mr Kelly was a subcontractor, DHMC was only paid for work they carried out, so there was no double payment.

I will follow up with the contract for DHMC this morning.

Regards
Sue

Sue Bidrose
Chief Executive Officer / Kaiwhakahaere matua
Dunedin City Council / Kaunihera-a-rohe o Otepoti

021378790

On 15/12/2015, at 11:01 PM, Lee Vandervis <lee@vandervision.co.nz> wrote:

Dear Sue,

Finally we have some written answers from my August 21st LGOIMA request, but these answers

from the DCC Lawyer Rusher do not give the more accurate contracting picture that you gave me verbally in your office last Tuesday at our 7.30am meeting.

You confirmed to me verbally that an unacceptable arrangement had been entered into by former CitiProperty employee Rhonda Abercrombie, who was in a position to award contracts and who chose to allow DHMC to not fulfil some of its external painting obligations and to get a second contractor Kelly Painting and Decorating to do some of the work that DHMC was contracted and paid to do. Hence the "parallel contracts" reference below.

In the interests of the ratepayer who has subsequently paid twice for the painting done by Kelly Painting and Decorating, can you please quantify the amounts paid to Kelly Painting and Decorating for work that was already parallel contracted for and paid to DHMC.

Can you also please forward a copy of the original tender maintenance contract document that was put out via Tenderlink in 2011 and which DHMC was successful in securing.

Kind regards,
Cr. Vandervis

----- Forwarded Message

From: Kristy Rusher <Kristy.Rusher@dcc.govt.nz>

Date: Thu, 10 Dec 2015 04:17:50 +0000

To: Lee Vandervis <lee@vandervision.co.nz>

Cc: Sue Bidrose <Sue.Bidrose@dcc.govt.nz>, Sandy Graham <Sandy.Graham@dcc.govt.nz>

Subject: Information Request Regarding Community Housing Maintenance Contract

Dear Cr Vandervis,

In response to your request for information about the DCC maintenance contract, we advise that in 2011 the Council issued a "Registration of Interest" via Tenderlink for general maintenance of Council's community housing portfolio.

When the Registration of Interest closed three companies had responded and these three were invited to tender as at 24 March 2011. The Tender closed 27 April 2011. The same three companies responded. The successful tenderer was Dunedin Housing Maintenance Company (DHMC).

The Tender Report was submitted to the ELT/DCC Tenders Board on 16 May 2011 and approved at that meeting. The successful contractor was notified 18 May 2011. The scope of the contract is to do all required maintenance works for Council's community housing, including painting. The contract term was from 1 July 2011 to 30 June 2014, and provided for a two year renewal period. The renewal has been exercised.

The services to be supplied are property maintenance which includes painting the interior and exterior of buildings and interior fittings/fixtures. The contract has a clause which means that some works may be separated from this contract and tendered. In January 2012 DHMC advised that they wished to add Kelly Painting & Decorating to the list of sub-contractors approved for use on the main contract. After Kelly Painting and Decorating completed a sub-contract on the Will St flats the company principal Mr Kelly approached DCC property maintenance officers to seek inclusion in the list of contractors who are invited to tender for DCC painting contracts. After meeting qualification criteria at that time Kelly Painting and Decorating were added to the list of approved contractors.

The Council has previously separated out the painting component for some of its maintenance works under this clause in the contract. Mr Kelly has been the successful tenderer on some occasions. The Council has in effect been operating parallel contracts for painting services.

In 2014/15 the Council reviewed the mode of service delivery for maintenance of these properties. As a result of that review the Council has identified that it is more effective to have

painting carried out at the same time as repairs are made, and that it is more cost effective to “paint on identified need” rather than on an initial 10 year (later amended to an eight year) rolling schedule as was occurring. This change in how and when maintenance is carried out means that it has not been necessary to separate out a series of painting work packages from the main contract and no tender has been issued for that service this year.

Before the expiry of the contract for maintenance (June 2016), a procurement plan and method will be determined for the maintenance services for the Dunedin City Council Housing Portfolio.

In reply to your particular queries concerning Mr Kelly:

1 – Why has Mr Kelly’s business not been given the opportunity to quote for any Community Housing painting contracts this year when he has done so successfully in the past? For clarity Mr Kelly has not been able to quote in the past but has tendered for separate painting contracts. We understand Mr Kelly’s perception that he did not have a chance to tender for work, or that he has somehow missed out on a tender process. For the reasons outlined above this is not the case. Council makes decisions to tender works on an as needed basis and tendering for painting services has not been necessary this calendar year.

2 – What is the difference between ‘an approved DCC contractor’ and the singular “preferred supplier for painting services” you identify in your ODT response? Please define both. An approved contractor has been assessed as meeting our health and safety standards for carrying out work on our behalf. A preferred supplier is a contractor that has been engaged under a contract for services.

3 – Does the DCC have approximately 900 Community Houses? 954 flats and other miscellaneous residential buildings are owned by the Dunedin City Council.

How many are the subject of the current disputed tender process? The contract for maintenance services applies to the whole of DCC’s community housing and their associated buildings.

4 - Has the contract for the internal painting and decorating been given to the same ‘preferred supplier’ as in 2? The existing contract has always included internal painting and decorating, and the work has been performed by the company awarded that contract.

5 – Is this ‘preferred supplier’ business largely owned by a Mr Tony Bass? The company currently holding the DCC Housing Maintenance Contract is majority owned by Mr Tony Bass.

This information is available on the Companies Office website: www.business.govt.nz

<<http://www.business.govt.nz>>

6 – What other financial contracts/dealings does Mr Tony Bass or his companies have with the DCC? None.

7 – How many businesses were able to tender for the “competitive tender process” you refer to in your ODT response? The competitive tender for the DCC Housing Maintenance Contract undertaken in 2011 was open to the maintenance market as a publicly advertised tender.

8 – Who were the businesses who did quote in the “competitive tender process” you refer to in your ODT response, what were their tender amounts, and has this information been posted on the DCC website? City Care, DHMC, Cook Brothers were the tenderers. The Council did not have in place its current practice of disclosing all tendered prices at the time these tenders were awarded. Therefore the tender amounts for unsuccessful candidates is information supplied under an obligation of confidence and its disclosure is likely to unreasonably prejudice the commercial position of the companies that are the subject of the information. Therefore this part of your

request is declined under section 7(2)(b)(ii) of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987.

The contract for Housing Maintenance is not available on the Council website. It was not at the time that the contract was awarded in 2011 the practice to put the information on the website. However, we are making arrangements to do so given the public interest in this matter. In regard to the documents that you have requested in respect of this matter they are currently being collated, and we expect that they will be made available to you next week.

Mr Taylor is available to discuss any follow up questions you have. His direct dial number is: 474 3730.

Thank you for your patience in receiving a response.

Kristy Rusher
Manager Civic and Legal, Civic
Dunedin City Council

50 The Octagon, Dunedin; P O Box 5045, Moray Place, Dunedin 9058, New Zealand
Telephone: 03 477 4000; Fax: 03 474 3594
Email: kristy.rusher@dcc.govt.nz



<http://www.dunedin.govt.nz/> <image.jpg>

<<http://www.facebook.com/DunedinCityCouncil>> <<http://twitter.com/DnCityCouncil>>

<image.jpg> <<http://www.linkedin.com/company/dunedin-city-council>>

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail

If this message is not intended for you please delete it and notify us immediately; you are warned that any further use, dissemination, distribution or reproduction of this material by you is prohibited.

----- End of Forwarded Message

Kelly Taylor

From: Sue Bidrose
Sent: Wednesday, 16 December 2015 02:41 p.m.
To: Sandy Graham
Subject: FW: reply to Sue

From: Sue Bidrose <Sue.Bidrose@dcc.govt.nz>
Date: 26 June 2015 8:25:52 pm GMT+1
To: Lee Vandervis <lee@vandervision.co.nz>
Cc: Mayor Cull <mayor@dcc.govt.nz>, Sandy Graham <Sandy.Graham@dcc.govt.nz>
Subject: Re: reply to Sue

Hello Lee

I have asked you more than once to provide me with any information you have about your ongoing allegations of fraud at the Town Hall project (or in fact any other project). You have consistently made allegations, but never offered any substance that would enable any form of investigation.

As I have said before, I cannot begin investigations into staff on the basis of allegations but no substance. The last time I asked you for details of your loose allegations about inappropriate behaviour by some un-named staff member, and asked who you were pointing at, you replied "it is the whole f***ing Department". I cannot investigate on that basis.

Lee, I have no incentive whatsoever to enable dishonest staff to remain on staff. Yet again I say to you, if you have anything that is evidence, more than allegations without backup, I would be more than willing to initiate an investigation. And if such an allegation were to be serious fraud, then of course we would involve the SFO - as you are well aware, we involved the SFO at the early stages of the Citifleet investigation - but because Brent was dead, they declined to get involved, as there was no evidence of fraud by any other staff member.

Regards
Sue

Kelly Taylor

From: Sue Bidrose
Sent: Wednesday, 16 December 2015 02:43 p.m.
To: Sandy Graham
Subject: FW: Complaint fao Sarah, further to telephone conversation

Importance: High

*Dr Sue Bidrose
Chief Executive Officer/Kaiwhakahaere Matua
Dunedin City Council/Kaunihera-a-rohe o Otepoti*

50 The Octagon, Dunedin;
P O Box 5045, Moray Place, Dunedin 9058, New Zealand
Telephone: 03 474 3851; Cell: 021 378790
Email: sue.bidrose@dcc.govt.nz; www.dunedin.govt.nz

 Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail

From: Lee Vandervis
Sent: Saturday, 11 October 2014 10:41 p.m.
To: Sara Morris; Sue Bidrose; Sandy Graham
Subject: Re: Complaint fao Sarah, further to telephone conversation
Importance: High

Hi Sara,

The last time the Dunedin Police investigated a DCC fraud they took over three years to do it and would have taken forever with no result had not a new boy arrived in their midst. See ODT article <http://archive.odt.co.nz/Repository/ml.asp?Ref=T0RULzIwMDcvMTEvMTc jQXIwMjgwMA==&Mode=Gif&Locale=english>, one of many [I can supply the others if you are interested] questioning the incredible amount of time Police were dragging the chain on this widely known series of frauds.

<http://archive.odt.co.nz/Repository/ml.asp?Ref=T0RULzIwMDUvMDYvMTg jQXIwMjcwMA==&Mode=Gif&Locale=english> Anecdotal evidence suggested that Police 'investigating' were related to the main fraudster, who had many influential friends.

<http://archive.odt.co.nz/Repository/ml.asp?Ref=T0RULzIwMDUvMDYvMDI jQXIwMjQwMA==&Mode=Gif&Locale=english>

Further anecdotal evidence suggests that John McLachlan came out of jail a very rich man, having taken the fall for several others still in circulation.

We have a similar problem now with an apparent rate-paid whitewash by Deloittes which incredibly fails to find evidence of any other wrong-doers other than the 'suddenly dead' man, and even this is being buried till the Dunedin Police now have a belated look, Police who, following the sudden death told CEO Bidrose they were not interested in investigating the Citifleet frauds and when she pressed them said they 'did not have the resources'. I have this info from two independent sources.

Three months after the 'sudden death', the Dunedin Police now seem to have the resources to insist that all comment on the wide-ranging Citifleet frauds be buried for a further unspecified period of months while they have a look after all.

My sources advise that the Dunedin Police have close relationships with at least two of the four vehicle businesses involved in the various frauds, and that they will find no living accomplices to prosecute.

This is why your out-of-town investigative interest is vital.

If we do not have a comprehensive clean-out of fraudulent DCC staff and associates, Dunedin will continue to suffer the debilitating institutionalised fraud that has long blighted its potential.

Please at least have someone competent and independent have a wee look!
And soon!

Kind regards,
Cr. Lee Vandervis

On 6/10/14 8:25 AM, "Sara Morris" <sara.morris@sfo.govt.nz> wrote:

Dear Mr Vandervis,

Thank you for your email to the Serious Fraud Office (SFO).

The SFO has evaluated this matter and determined that the Police is the appropriate agency to investigate in this instance. Please direct any concerns or queries you may have to the Dunedin Central Investigation Branch (CIB) of the NZ Police.

Yours sincerely,

Sara Morris | Evaluating Investigator | Serious Fraud Office | PO Box 7124, Wellesley Street, Auckland | Level 6, 21 Queen Street, Auckland 1010 | Main Line: 09 303 0121 ext: 783 | M: 027 489 7860 | F: + 64 9 303 0142 |

From: Lee Vandervis [<mailto:lee@vandervision.co.nz>]

Sent: Friday, 22 August 2014 4:37 p.m.

To: SERIOUS FRAUD OFFICE

Cc: Sue Bidrose; Sandy Graham; Andrew Noone; Andrew Whiley; cstaynes@dcc.govt.nz; Doug Hall; Hilary Calvert; jbezett@dcc.govt.nz; Jinty MacTavish; kwilson@dcc.govt.nz; Lee Vandervis; mayor@dcc.govt.nz; Mike Lord; Neville Peat; rthomson@dcc.govt.nz; samandhenry@xtra.co.nz; Aaron.Hawkins@dcc.govt.nz

Subject: Complaint fao Sarah, further to telephone conversation

Hi Sarah,

My complaint in the first instance concerns many years of fraudulent dealings by the CityFleet department manager and some other staff members of the Dunedin City Council.

Attempts to get the DCC CityFleet's manager and others investigated are recorded back to at least 2011, with an investigation only begun this year by our relatively new CEO Sue Bidrose.

Public news of the frauds appeared in wide public view [ODT front pages] in May of this year, but much talk and evidence has been circulating for many years prior.

In May it was admitted that \$1 million worth of fraudulent dealings may be involved, with a recent admission that \$1.5 million may be involved.

The 4 month investigation by Deloitte's accountants into the frauds was supposed to be released today, but Police have apparently asked that it be non-public for another unspecified number of months while the Police "begin investigations".

My concerns as a public representative are detailed in the email trail below:

I am not convinced that the local Police may have the resources or the will to fully investigate this DCC Department, and other DCC departments which may suffer similar cultures of entitlement.

In the public interest, I urge your SFO department to take an active interest in the DCC CityFleet fraud, and other

DCC departments where similar problems may exist.

Kind regards,
Cr. Lee Vandervis

----- Forwarded Message

From: Lee Vandervis <lee@vandervision.co.nz <lee@vandervision.co.nz> >
Date: Fri, 22 Aug 2014 13:18:38 +1200
To: Sue Bidrose <Sue.Bidrose@dcc.govt.nz <Sue.Bidrose@dcc.govt.nz> >
Cc: Andrew Noone <andrew.noone@dcc.govt.nz <andrew.noone@dcc.govt.nz> >, Andrew Whiley <andrewwhiley@hotmail.com <andrewwhiley@hotmail.com> >, Chris Staynes <Chris.Staynes@dcc.govt.nz <Chris.Staynes@dcc.govt.nz> >, Doug Hall <jo@hallbros.co.nz <jo@hallbros.co.nz> >, Hilary Calvert <hcalvert@xtra.co.nz <hcalvert@xtra.co.nz> >, John Bezett <john.bezett@dcc.govt.nz <john.bezett@dcc.govt.nz> >, Jinty MacTavish <Jinty.MacTavish@dcc.govt.nz <Jinty.MacTavish@dcc.govt.nz> >, Kate Wilson <Kate.Wilson@dcc.govt.nz <Kate.Wilson@dcc.govt.nz> >, Mayor Cull <mayor@dcc.govt.nz <mayor@dcc.govt.nz> >, Mike Lord <mike.phil@xtra.co.nz <mike.phil@xtra.co.nz> >, Neville Peat <npeat@clear.net.nz <npeat@clear.net.nz> >, Richard Thomson <Richard.Thomson@dcc.govt.nz <Richard.Thomson@dcc.govt.nz> >, David Benson-Pope <samandhenry@xtra.co.nz <samandhenry@xtra.co.nz> >, Aaron Hawkins <Aaron.Hawkins@dcc.govt.nz <Aaron.Hawkins@dcc.govt.nz> >, Sandy Graham <Sandy.Graham@dcc.govt.nz <Sandy.Graham@dcc.govt.nz> >
Conversation: Fraud: press release at 1pm today: Confidential until then
Subject: Re: Fraud: press release at 1pm today: Confidential until then

Dear Sue,

Thank you for giving me the Crown Solicitor's number.

We have had an extended discussion but I remain unconvinced that 4 months after the front page ODT headlines, Police have not had opportunities to investigate.

I am sorry that you feel personally slighted by my description of your press release as PR pap, but I remain strongly of that view. It is what it is, and I accept there may be a variety of interpretations of it.

The Crown Solicitor's reasons for not allowing public discussion of the fraud 4 months after its ODT front page airing do not weigh heavily enough against the public's right to know at least some of what has been going on.

Assisting the Police to keep dragging an extremely long chain of 'no comment' for several more months till Christmas can hardly be in the public interest.

I am sorry that our perspectives on this important issue are so opposed.

Kind regards,
Lee

On 22/08/14 12:08 PM, "Sue Bidrose" <Sue.Bidrose@dcc.govt.nz <Sue.Bidrose@dcc.govt.nz> > wrote:

> Lee

> Your email about my 'claiming transparency while dishing out PR pap' is
> insulting to my integrity. In your governance role, if you doubt my integrity
> or honesty in these matters, I think it is reasonable that I can expect you to
> behave rather like a member of a 'Board of Governors' member - if you don't
> trust something I send you, I would think you would first ask for information
> without implying improper motive at the outset. As far as I am aware, I have
> never given you any cause to believe I have anything short of a full
> commitment to transparency and honesty, as well as sorting out the process in
> this Council.

>
> To recap, last Thursday we were set to release, in full, the investigation
> report into the alleged fraud in Citifleet, and the council processes that let
> it occur. This intent is a matter of clear internal record with evidence that
> I am happy to show you. There was no holding back. Only names were to be
> redacted so that we were not used, and while the Police decided their action.
> We promised in public that we would go public, the Mayor has repeatedly
> requested it as have you and other elected members. In fact, I have not seen
> anyone acting with any intention otherwise.

>
> Police were given the draft report Wednesday and I talked them through the
> findings. Until then they had received high level verbal briefings but we
> didn't have the report and, obviously, neither did they. Once they received
> the draft report and consulted the Crown Solicitor about prosecutions, they
> asked for our co-operation. At this point, there was a suggestion of our doing
> no press whatsoever - in fact, we have had to work hard to get to a point
> where we have any press release at all that says something about the alleged
> fraud (and points out our lack of process checks and balances) but protects
> the prosecution process.

>
> Whilst I understand your desire to talk publicly about your views of the
> Council shortcomings and the fraud, if assisting the Police and Crown
> Solicitor to get successful prosecutions underway is not 'a very good reason'
> then I fail to see what is.

>
> If you wish to check that it is in fact the Crown Solicitor's "request for
> further silence" not mine (and also that it is not me acting to protect a
> secret desire for lack of transparency, as you suggest) please feel free to
> ring Robin Bate. His number is 03 4717545.

>
> Sue

>
>
>
>
> Sue Bidrose
> Chief Executive Officer
> Dunedin City Council

>
> On 22/08/2014, at 10:45 am, "Lee Vandervis"
> <lee@vandervision.co.nz> <lee@vandervision.co.nz> <<mailto:lee@vandervision.co.nz>>
> <<mailto:lee@vandervision.co.nz%3e>> > wrote:

>
>
> Dear Sue,

>
> After 4 months of investigation and holding our tongues, we now get a crock of
> spin;
> "I want to emphasise that this is an organisation in which people can have
> confidence. The people who work here are overwhelmingly decent, hard-working
> public servants committed to the best interests of the city. We are committed
> to getting to the bottom of any issues and ensuring we have best practice
> across the board. The changes are well underway - in fact it was in making
> these changes that we uncovered the alleged fraud."

>
> Dr Bidrose says the DCC has employment processes underway relating to a small

> number of staff, primarily around the lack of checks and balances which should
> have been in place.
>
> Mayor of Dunedin Dave Cull says the fact these issues have been found now
> after more than a decade shows the Council has been right to push for more
> transparency and tighter processes.”
>
> and are told that we need to keep quiet for a further indefinite period for
> belated Police investigation. Why were Police not on to this months if not
> years ago?
>
> I do not believe it is in the ratepayers’ interest to keep up the charade or
> keep evidence out of the public arena any further.
> Unless you give me some very good reasons by return for further refraining
> from comment after many months, claiming transparency while you dish up PR
> pap, I advise that I do not accept your request for further silence as being
> in the public interest.
>
> Regards,
> Cr. Lee Vandervis
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> “We tasked Sue, and the previous Chief Executive Paul Orders, with reviewing
> DCC practices so any problems or issues could be fixed as part of our
> accountability to ratepayers.
>
> “Paul started with our companies and made a huge improvement in their
> governance and oversight. Now Sue and her staff are having the same impact
> inside the DCC.”
>
>
>
> On 22/08/14 10:06 AM, "Sue Bidrose" <Sue.Bidrose@dcc.govt.nz> <Sue.Bidrose@dcc.govt.nz> >
> wrote:
>
> Hi Councillors
> Attached is a press release that will be going out to the media this afternoon
> at 1pm. Please keep this confidential until that point.
>
> As you may be aware, last Thursday we were preparing to release the full
> Deloitte report to the public and media. When we laid a Police complaint last
> Wednesday and gave them the draft report, they and the Crown Solicitor came to
> us and asked that we not release the report at this time. Their position was
> (and is) that premature release of the report or public comment around it
> could jeopardise the chances of a successful prosecution.
>
> Obviously, we are committed to the open and transparent approach we have been
> taking here, but we also need to maximise the likelihood of people being held
> to account – and of potentially recovering some of the money.
>
> So, we have agreed with the Police and Crown Solicitor that the attached press
> release will be our only public comment at this time. You will note, at their
> request, we are using the term Alleged Fraud while they investigate. We are
> still planning to release the full report when their initial investigatory
> work is complete and they are satisfied it won't undermine their
> investigation. They are aware of our needs for openness and have worked well
> over this in the last week.
>
> They have asked that we work with them on any other public comments around the

> alleged fraud, and we have agreed. Accordingly, we will be making no media
> comment at all other than the words in this press release (which have also
> been issued as a video for broadcast media).
>
> Obviously, it is important that all of DCC takes this line, so I would ask
> that you refrain from public comment about the alleged fraud, in line with the
> request of the Police and the Crown Solicitor.
>
> Kind regards
> Sue

Kelly Taylor

From: Sue Bidrose
Sent: Wednesday, 16 December 2015 02:50 p.m.
To: Sandy Graham
Subject: FW: ODT story tomorrow about poor staff morale

From: Sue Bidrose
Sent: Friday, 27 November 2015 7:19 p.m.
To: Lee Vandervis
Cc: Andrew Noone; Andrew Whiley; Chris Staynes; Doug Hall; Hilary Calvert; John Bezett; Jinty MacTavish; Kate Wilson; mayor@dcc.govt.nz; Mike Lord; Neville Peat; Richard Thomson; samandhenry@xtra.co.nz; Aaron Hawkins
Subject: Re: ODT story tomorrow about poor staff morale

Hello Lee

Actually, your opinions below were not given by any staff as reasons for low morale.

The survey, conducted anonymously by an external agency, talks about the amount of change at Council, and people not feeling communicated with as we have systematically set up best practice processes and procedures throughout the council, undoing a fair amount of 'deferred maintenance' in a short period of time. The changes have also included a strong performance focus on improving the quality of staff advice and reporting, and many of your colleagues have indicated that they have seen this reflected in reliability of information provided by staff.

But this amount of change has come at a cost. It is hard on staff. And that was clear in the survey.

But to be utterly clear, once again. There were NO managers or staff identified as committing corrupt practice other than Brent, through the Citifleet enquiry. None.

Five staff lost jobs as a result of the enquiry, for not putting checks and balances in place to detect the fraud. No-one was protected over that. And I have no incentive whatsoever to protect any corrupt staff member - DCC's response to the small thefts and frauds in the last 18 months since the Citifleet fraud continues to prove (to most people anyway) that we take a zero tolerance approach.

In the last 18 months we have, without fail, investigated allegations of fraud or theft that have been raised (where there is anything other than an unfounded allegation with no support offered such as your below). As I have said many times, if you have evidence of any corruption by any member of staff, we will investigate. It is really not ok to continue to besmirch the reputations of our staff and then not front with any evidence to support your claims.

Sue

Sue Bidrose
Chief Executive Officer / Kaiwhakahaere matua
Dunedin City Council / Kaunihera-a-rohe o Otepoti

021378790

On 27/11/2015, at 5:52 PM, Lee Vandervis <lee@vandervision.co.nz> wrote:

Dear Sue,

An important reason for poor staff morale which does not appear below has been communicated to me in fearful confidence by several staff.

The staff morale issue complained to me of is not reduction in perks, but is having to work alongside staff members and managers who have been involved in corrupt practises but not outed [eg Citifleet], or having to work alongside rank incompetence [eg cycleways]. Surprisingly it has been the recent public exposure and public jibes about cars and cycle-numbers that seem to have been most difficult for them, as they have become accustomed to working alongside such dysfunction for many years.

I believe that clear identification of this morale issue and its causes is vital to it being addressed.

Regards,
Cr. Vandervis

Kelly Taylor

From: Sue Bidrose
Sent: Wednesday, 16 December 2015 02:51 p.m.
To: Sandy Graham
Subject: FW: LGOIMA re-requests

From: Sandy Graham
Sent: Thursday, 24 September 2015 9:48 a.m.
To: Lee Vandervis; Sue Bidrose; Grant McKenzie
Cc: Andrew Noone; Andrew Whiley; Chris Staynes; Doug Hall; Hilary Calvert; John Bezett; Jinty MacTavish; Kate Wilson; mayor@dcc.govt.nz; Mike Lord; Neville Peat; Richard Thomson; samandhenry@xtra.co.nz; Aaron Hawkins; Grace Ockwell
Subject: RE: LGOIMA re-requests

Dear Lee

You have asked for any DCC records relating to vehicles with the registration numbers CTE984 and CTE894. The DCC holds no records relating to either of the vehicles.

I did also do a Motochek search which shows that the DCC has never owned either vehicle.

Regards
Sandy

From: Lee Vandervis
Sent: Tuesday, 15 September 2015 10:36 a.m.
To: Sandy Graham; Sue Bidrose; Grant McKenzie
Cc: Andrew Noone; Andrew Whiley; Chris Staynes; Doug Hall; Hilary Calvert; John Bezett; Jinty MacTavish; Kate Wilson; Lee Vandervis; mayor@dcc.govt.nz; Mike Lord; Neville Peat; Richard Thomson; samandhenry@xtra.co.nz; Aaron Hawkins
Subject: LGOIMA re-requests

Dear Sandy, Sue and Grant,

I have not made any reference to staff in my LGOIMA request.
No further information is needed by you to progress this request.
My long experience of attempting to uncover DCC fraud predates all of you at the DCC, and this experience [as well as more recent 'investigations'] has confirmed my view that the DCC is incapable of properly investigating itself, this being the main reason that current whistleblower provisions are inadequate for me.
Grant's role as Fraud Control Officer has been somewhat eclipsed for me by some of his other roles such as Sincere Apology Appraisal Officer.
I am no longer interested in supplying you details, as in the past I believe that these details have been appallingly misrepresented by some staff and some elected members allowing frauds to go unprosecuted and ratepayers to continue to be defrauded.

My LGOIMA request is simple.

Please forward all and any DCC records relating to the vehicle CTE984. [I am happy to accept the risk that information supplied may be falsified, as I have had plenty of that experience already as well]
Please action this information request with urgency as time is running out for the ratepayers' interest in this particular fraud allegation.

Ditto other related Deloitte and Citifleet investigation information that I have already long requested, which can no longer be withheld because of potential to 'compromise an investigation' as the investigations [Deloitte and Police] are now complete.

Kind regards,
Cr. Lee Vandervis

On 14/09/15 1:25 pm, "Sandy Graham" <Sandy.Graham@dcc.govt.nz> wrote:

Dear Lee

I need some further information to progress this request. Can you please supply any details you have that may relate to any staff who have an interest in this vehicle. This is to ensure that I can then seek the requested information from someone other than the owner. This will help avoid the situation where we are supplied with falsified information.

Further, if you have any specific allegations or information about anything untoward related to a staff member and this vehicle, then you should provide it to Grant in his role as Fraud Control Officer for investigation.

Regards
Sandy

From: Lee Vandervis
Sent: Thursday, 10 September 2015 8:03 p.m.
To: Sandy Graham; Sue Bidrose
Subject: LGOIMA request

Dear Sandy,

Please forward any records available on the following vehicle:

Territory Ghia AWD Wagon reg. no. CTE894

Cheers,
Lee

Kelly Taylor

From: Sue Bidrose
Sent: Wednesday, 16 December 2015 02:51 p.m.
To: Sandy Graham
Subject: FW: Fraud Allegations

From: Lee Vandervis
Sent: Tuesday, 13 October 2015 2:58 p.m.
To: Grant McKenzie
Cc: Sue Bidrose; Sandy Graham; Andrew Noone; Andrew Whiley; Chris Staynes; Doug Hall; Hilary Calvert; John Bezett; Jinty MacTavish; Kate Wilson; Lee Vandervis; mayor@dcc.govt.nz; Mike Lord; Neville Peat; Richard Thomson; samandhenry@xtra.co.nz; Aaron Hawkins
Subject: Re: Fraud Allegations

Dear Grant,

I believe I have fully answered your previous two emails requesting me to "forward to me any information that I need to start an investigation into relating to your allegations of tender fraud at council."
In my email to you, Sandy and Sue and copied to elected representatives of 15/9/15, the relevant parts read:

"My long experience of attempting to uncover DCC fraud predates all of you at the DCC, and this experience [as well as more recent 'investigations'] has confirmed my view that the DCC is incapable of properly investigating itself, this being the main reason that current whistleblower provisions are inadequate for me.
I am no longer interested in supplying you details, as in the past I believe that these details have been appallingly misrepresented by some staff and some elected members allowing frauds to go unprosecuted and ratepayers to continue to be defrauded."

In short, without casting any aspersions on any individuals in Council, my experience of taking DCC fraud allegations to the DCC bureaucracy [eg Citifleet fraud allegations I forwarded in 2011] to be investigated has not resulted in consequences that are of benefit to ratepayers.
I therefore do not wish to trouble you with the many allegations which I have received and continue to receive from Dunedin citizens, preferring to investigate these myself and publicising confirmed allegations where a ratepayer benefit seems likely, or requesting the Police to investigate as an independent body.

I assume that you missed this 15/9/15 response to your request for allegation information, and hope that this now makes my reasons for not forwarding allegations to you or other senior DCC staff completely clear.

Kind regards,
Cr. Lee Vandervis

On 13/10/15 12:12 pm, "Grant McKenzie" <Grant.Mckenzie@dcc.govt.nz> wrote:

Hi Lee,

Following-up on my previous two emails. . Can you please forward to me any information that I need to start an investigation into relating to your allegations of tender fraud at council.

If you have any questions or wish to meet to discuss your concerns please let me know.

Regards

Grant

From: Grant McKenzie
Sent: Saturday, 22 August 2015 9:13 a.m.
To: Lee Vandervis; Lee Vandervis
Subject: FW: Fraud Allegations

Hi Lee,

Following-up on my previous email of 31 July. Can you please forward to me any information that I need to start an investigation into relating to your allegations of tender fraud at council.

If you have any questions or wish to meet to discuss your concerns please let me know.

Regards

Grant

From: Grant McKenzie
Sent: Friday, 31 July 2015 11:33 a.m.
To: Lee Vandervis; Lee Vandervis
Subject: Fraud Allegations

Dear Councillor Vandervis,

At the Council meeting on Monday you made allegations that you have evidence of tender fraud at council and that individual staff have received a benefit from the process.

As Council's fraud control officer under the fraud policy I need to carry out an investigation of these allegations. Can you please provide the evidence that you have for this fraudulent activity.

If you have any questions or require further information please give me a call.

Regards

Grant

Grant McKenzie
Group Chief Financial Officer, Financial Services
Dunedin City Council

50 The Octagon, Dunedin; P O Box 5045, Moray Place, Dunedin 9058, New Zealand
Telephone: 03 477 4000; Mobile: 021 925 196 Fax: 03 474 3594
Email: grant.mckenzie@dcc.govt.nz



DUNEDIN CITY
COUNCIL

<http://www.dunedin.govt.nz/>



<http://www.facebook.com/DunedinCityCouncil>



<<http://twitter.com/DnCityCouncil>>  <<http://www.linkedin.com/company/dunedin-city-council>>



Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail

If this message is not intended for you please delete it and notify us immediately; you are warned that any further use, dissemination, distribution or reproduction of this material by you is prohibited.

Kelly Taylor

From: Sue Bidrose
Sent: Wednesday, 16 December 2015 02:53 p.m.
To: Sandy Graham
Subject: FW: LGOIMA request re Stihl equipment

From: Sue Bidrose
Sent: Tuesday, 3 February 2015 7:46 a.m.
To: Lee Vandervis
Subject: RE: LGOIMA request re Stihl equipment

Hi Lee

From your response to Sandy, it appears to me you are in possession of specific allegations, relating to specific actions and possibly by specific staff. At Audit and Risk recently, I asked you to please provide the details about who and what your concerns about Stihl chainsaw use related to, so that we can properly look at the allegations. You declined, instead saying 'it is the entire ...ing department. They're all in on it'.

Quite specifically, I said to you that we tried to avoid going directly to staff members possibly implicated in an allegation or wrongdoing. This was a new and deliberate change in process following our issues with Aquatics last year where a staff member was asked to provide OIA answers on an issue concerning himself, and his answers proved to be misleading. This was similar to the (earlier in time) problem with your allegations re Citifleet. In that case, you had a complaint and you asked "Did Brent buy a Mazda Bounty?". We asked Brent for all the Mazda Bounty sales. He falsified the information and his manager did not check it. We gave it to you and you did not give us any more information to follow up on. [I am only raising your email about Brent specifically here. You also raised an issue about Jim taking tyres and about Turners saying they had problems with our sales.]

In this Stihl case, until this email to Sandy I was not aware that you had a businessperson who suggested DCC staff were privately taking in Stihl equipment for servicing whilst the warrantee showed it to be in DCC ownership. Given you have this information, I would appreciate it if you would give me the name of the shop (and the staff member if you have it) so that I can follow it up directly. I cannot understand why you would not do this, with the risk that another informant has information that may slip away uninvestigated, because in gathering our responses we may have unwittingly gone to exactly the staff member concerned.

Regards
Sue

*Dr Sue Bidrose
Chief Executive Officer
Dunedin City Council*

50 The Octagon, Dunedin;
P O Box 5045, Moray Place, Dunedin 9058, New Zealand
Telephone: 03 474 3851; Cell: 021 378790
Email: sue.bidrose@dcc.govt.nz; www.dunedin.govt.nz

 Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail

From: Lee Vandervis
Sent: Saturday, 31 January 2015 1:50 p.m.
To: Sandy Graham; Andrew Noone; Andrew Whiley; Chris Staynes; Doug Hall; Hilary Calvert; John Bezett; Jinty MacTavish; Kate Wilson; Lee Vandervis; mayor@dcc.govt.nz; Mike Lord; Neville Peat; Richard Thomson; samandhenry@xtra.co.nz; Aaron Hawkins
Cc: Sue Bidrose; Official Information
Subject: Re: LGOIMA request re Stihl equipment

Hi Sandy,

Thank you for responding to my information request regarding DCC Stihl equipment, chainsaws, weed-eaters, compactors and water-blasters which has been the subject of complaints made that warrantee claims have been made for such equipment by private persons when the warrantee agent has records showing the equipment to be in DCC ownership.

I usually welcome complete responses, but information as below about *DCC departments that do not have such equipment* is surely not asked for in my request.

I will relay your response to the primary complainants concerned as their claims seem not to align with the information you have supplied.

Kind regards,
Lee

On 30/01/15 4:59 PM, "Sandy Graham" <Sandy.Graham@dcc.govt.nz> wrote:

Dear Lee

Further to your questions below, I am now in a position to provide answers. I apologise it has taken some time but the questions required a reasonable amount of work in various areas of the business to ensure we are comprehensive in our response.

In order to gather the requested information, I worked with members of the Senior Leadership Team who each provided a response for the areas of the business that they are responsible for. I restated your questions for them and numbered them as follows, and then was provided the various answers from each area. Rather than collating the responses and answering each question individually, I have provided each response by Group and/or business area.

Questions

1. Can you please advise which DCC departments purchase/use/and or dispose of Stihl chainsaws/weed-eaters/and or powered pole extension tools?
2. In these departments, which managers are responsible for Stihl equipment purchase/disposal?
3. Which DCC departments have purchased/disposed of plate-compactors and water-blasters.
4. Which managers are responsible for purchase/disposal of these kinds of equipment?
5. Have comprehensive records been kept of such DCC equipment purchase/disposal?

Answers

Corporate Services – There has been no equipment of this sort purchased or disposed of by any members of the Corporate Services Group.

Transportation – Contract out all activities that would require the purchase of such equipment.

Enterprise Dunedin – Have not been involved in these purchases or disposals

Customer Services/Regulatory Services - There has been no equipment of this sort purchased or disposed of by any members of these areas.

Libraries, Galleries and Museums - There has been no equipment of this sort purchased or disposed of by any members of these areas.

Parks and Cemeteries – do not own any of these types of assets.

City Property advise as follows:

1. Not Property Dept

2. N/A
3. City Property have purchased water blasters from Mega M10 for the use by the Building Attendants around the Civic complex Civic Centre, Library, Town Hall Dunedin Centre.
4. The Assistant Manager City property has been responsible for the purchase of power equipment for use by Building Attendants.
5. Yes. Purchase orders, Approvals (Approval Plus) Invoice approved as per delegations. Haven't been disposed of as yet.

Community and Development advise as follows:

1. Yes, Events and Community Development purchase and use that equipment for TaskForce Green. They are used and repaired until the end of their useful life.
2. The Events and Community Development Manager is responsible for purchase and disposal. They advise that no equipment has been disposed of in her time as manager.
3. TaskForce Green also has water blasters.
4. The Events and Community Development Manager is responsible for purchase and disposal.
5. We have instigated an annual stocktake of equipment.

The **Botanic Garden** advise as follows:

The Botanic Garden purchases and uses Stihl chainsaws, weed eaters and powered pole extension equipment. It has disposed of weed-eaters all of which have been 'traded in' as credit on replacement purchase of the same equipment. All such trades and the credit associated with them have been recorded on the supplier purchase invoices.

The Botanic Garden has not yet disposed of any chainsaws or powered pole extension equipment.

The Botanic Garden has previously purchased (but not yet disposed of) a water blaster.

The Collections Supervisor and Team Leader have responsibility for purchase and disposal of all Stihl equipment and water blasters.

All equipment disposed of are traded in for a credit on the purchase of replacement equipment and this is recorded on purchase invoice of any new equipment.

The Botanic Garden has never owned nor disposed of any plate compacters.

The Botanic Garden also purchases and disposes of lawn mowers in the manner as described for Stihl equipment above.

Water and Waste provide the following response:

Solid Waste and Asset and Commercial have no such items.

Network Operations Team have

2x husqvarna chainsaws bought about 20yrs and 12yrs ago

1x Stihl concrete cutter bought about 15 yrs ago

1x stihl weed eater bought about 20 years ago

1x Husqvarna weed eater as above

Network Operations/Distribution have not bought or disposed of any equipment for at least 10 years other than

gear that went to City Care as a part of the handover process.

Wastewater Treatment and plant maintenance

Wastewater has 1 Husqvarna chainsaw and 1 Husqvarna weed-eater, both purchased many years ago. Maintenance Team do not have any.

Both Wastewater and Maintenance Team have purchased a water blaster (1 each) within the last couple of years (purchased by Team Leaders with Managers approval).

Wastewater water blaster was purchased in 2013 via capital funding.

Maintenance Team water blaster purchase in 2014 for a dedicated trailer mounted unit, also via capital funding.

As these were capital funded, they would have had capital request forms (a WWS business process), as well as the usual delegations processes.

There have been no disposals in recent years.

WATER TREATMENT

Treatment Section

Q1 In the past, the Treatment section used to do a lot more grounds-type work than we do now, so 95% of our purchases would be more than 10 years ago. As far as the location of the equipment, we used to have chainsaws and weeders at Polwarth Road, Southern Reservoir and Mt Grand. About 10 years ago most of those were handed over to Primary Distribution for gifting to Task Force Green, when the Grounds Maintenance contract resulted in us doing far less with this gear than previously. One chainsaw was kept at Mt Grand and one at Polwarth Road, but that's it. The one from Polwarth Road was sold to a former Treatment Operator in 2008, and we still have a chainsaw here at Mt Grand, but that's it.

Over the years the present Treatment Supervisor has purchased and maintained a number of plant items such as those being asked about. Generally, the chainsaws purchased were Husqvarnas (following the lead of former Treatment Overseers). The present supervisor has purchased three Stihl units, 2 chainsaws and one weedeater/hedge-trimmer (which was used at the old Southern water treatment plant). In addition, several purchases were made at Smiths Saws and Mowers, now called the Stihl shop, and all of the latest ones (the last was in June 2010) were for consumables (chain, oil etc) or safety gear.

The first Stihl saw purchased was an 066 model, which ran for about 6 years before seizing solid, and was deemed by Smiths Saw and Mowers uneconomic to repair. It was replaced with a Husqvarna 365 chainsaw, which is the only chainsaw or weedeater now kept in Treatment.

Dates of purchase or disposal are not currently available.

We still do also have one electric waterblaster, which was originally purchased for cleaning the microstrainers at the old Southern, and now resides at the new Southern for general use in cleaning. The only maintenance that this has had is a replaced hose last year, so it's not costing a lot.

Specifically, as far as the numbered questions go:-

In the last 25 years the present supervisor has purchased 3 Stihl units, 2 chainsaws and one weedeater. As noted above, the biggest and most expensive of these seized and was replaced with a Husqvarna, and the other chainsaw and the weedeater were given to Task Force Green

Q2 The present Water Production Manager has overall responsibility for small plant purchased by the Supervisors under delegated authority.

Q3 The Treatment section have purchased one small electric waterblaster during the same period. We still have and use it, and have never purchased or disposed of any plate compactors.

Q4 The present Water Production Manager has overall responsibility for small plant disposed of by the Supervisors delegated authority. Recently introduced procedures, require that any surplus equipment or goods are disposed of by tender. The supervisor arranges for the Commercial Services Team Leader to dispose of surplus equipment by tender through "Trade Me". A recent example is the disposal of several non-returnable chemical containers.

Q5 The Treatment section does not have a comprehensive record of these purchases, as these are the only 3 items bought by the present supervisor.

Headworks Section

Q1 The Headworks section don't own any Stihl equipment and have never disposed of any Stihl equipment. This section has purchased Husqvarna and Shindaiwa chainsaws from Norwoods Ltd and Len Sinclair Saws Ltd. The Headworks section currently holds 4 Husqvarna chainsaws, 2 Shindaiwa chainsaws, 1 Echo chainsaw, 2 Husqvarna brushtrimmers and 1 Shindaiwa brush trimmer. The chainsaws are of different size and capacity to cover the range of different types of vegetation that has to be dealt with along the pipelines, catchment areas and around dams. The list also details a wide range of other small plant items. Most small plant is held at the Carlyle Road depot, with some items also held at Mt Grand WTP and at Deep Stream.

Q2 The present Water Production Manager has overall responsibility for small plant purchased by the Supervisors under delegated authority.

Q3 The Headworks section owns 2 water blasters, 1 small electric (Mitre 10), and 1 portable (Paterson & Poland-2013). This group has never had any plate compactors.

Q4 The present Water Production Manager has overall responsibility for small plant disposed of by the Supervisors delegated authority. Recently introduced procedures, require that any surplus equipment or goods are disposed of by tender. The supervisor arranges for the Commercial Services Team Leader to dispose of surplus equipment by tender through "Trade Me". A surplus water tank was disposed of by this method a couple of years ago.

Q. 5 The Headworks Supervisor has a list of equipment which details type, make, model, serial number, colour, etc. This was developed so that it is possible to identify the equipment if it was reported stolen. The list does not contain details of date of purchase or disposal. It should also be noted that the list is due for review and updating.

When small plant such as this comes to the end of its useful and economic life, it is either scrapped, dumped or retained for spare parts. Some equipment which was held at Sullivan Dam, was transferred to the Network Maintenance team when some former Headworks staff were transferred as part of an organisational restructure a few years back. It is not known whether that equipment is still at Sullivan Dam or some or all of the equipment was transferred to CCL when that firm took over the maintenance of the 3 Waters network.

THE OLD MIDLAND STREET DEPOT

1. Midland St Operations Centre used chainsaws, weed eaters mostly Husqvarna brand. Some of these were sold to City Care as part of the transfer to the network maintenance contract. This was part of a wider asset disposal with a sale and purchase agreement that required the CEO signature. Those that were retained were distributed to other parts of water and waste and are listed above.

2. I don't believe that any of the items at Midland Street were made by Stihl. Any items would have been purchased under the normal delegations for expenditure.

3. Which DCC departments have purchased/disposed of plate-compactors and water-blasters. As part of the closing down of Midland St, operational plant items used by the team were sold to CCL as part of the transfer. We had a Karcher water blaster but that was transferred to the Ops team and was relocated to Mt Grand.

4. Which managers are responsible for purchase/disposal of these kinds of equipment? Under the Midland St operation, this type of item was purchased by the Supervisors under the Managers authority.

5. Have comprehensive records been kept of such DCC equipment purchase/disposal? Purchases would have been recorded through the purchasing system (Approval plus or its predecessors). With regards to disposal, items such as these were usually scrapped when they failed and were considered to be uneconomic to repair. Decisions to scrap were approved following discussions with the repairer, supervisor and manager. No formal records were kept.

General comments from Water and Waste

Purchasing and disposal of this kind of equipment is subject to the same delegations as any other kind of expenditure. There is no separate approval required. If the item is to be purchased using capital funding, WWS has a 'capital request form' which starts the business case process and prioritisation of capital funding.

Items of this nature are not currently recorded on the asset register or any other comprehensive inventory. This is something we identified as an action late last year but haven't yet addressed.

This covers all the operational areas of the organisation.

Your final question "Have comprehensive records been kept of such DCC equipment purchase/disposal?" was forwarded to the Expenditure Manager who replies as follows:

- Its needs to be remembered that all monies received from the sale of any asset (irrespective of the amount involved) is cash receipted through the cash receipting system. Therefore there is a record of the sale in so much as there is a transaction recorded in the financial system of the sale. A receipt number is issued by the cashiers for every transaction processed and this information is retained in the system for a minimum of 7 years as required by current legislation. For example if we take the annual sale of Library books – there is a record of the monies received from the sale in the financial system however I do not believe there would be a record of the individual books actually sold as these books would have been expensed off and essentially have no dollar value attached to them.

- The current disposal section in the Purchasing & Disposal Manual does not specifically mention record keeping. It alludes to the Asset Disposal Certificate in the Transactional Process & Procedures Manual which should be completed for assets recorded on the Asset Register - see also section 2.8.9 of that same Manual for the "general" statement relating to the Disposal of Assets. This mentions copies of "working papers" being attached to the Asset Disposal Certificate. This document is completed where the value of the asset exceeds \$1000 and is especially important if an asset being sold has not reached its depreciable life.

- For small valued assets we always advise that Departments keep a clear audit trail of any sale ie: copies of any sale notice (if sold via auction) and the receipt of the money when paid into the Council coffers. The responsibility for keeping this details remained with the Dept / Officer selling the asset, but once again you need to remember that the value of the assets have been expensed off and the record would be the cash receipt initiated when the monies are receipted. This relates back to the first point I made above.

- Currently the policies and procedures for disposing of assets is under review. These are being developed with the Audit & Risk Committee and are nearing finalisation.

I trust this answers your enquiry. Again I apologise for the time taken to respond but it took some time to get responses from across the business. As with all Councillor requests, this response will be circulated to all Councillors and published on the website.

Regards
Sandy

From: Sandy Graham
Sent: Wednesday, 5 November 2014 9:57 a.m.
To: Lee Vandervis
Cc: mayor@dcc.govt.nz; Sue Bidrose; Official Information
Subject: RE: LGOIMA request re Stihl equipment

Dear Lee

I am still following up on this request and consulting with the relevant staff across various asset owning departments and will not have completed that within the required 20 working days. Therefore I am extending the time to respond to this request by a further 20 working days pursuant to s14(1)(a) of LGOIMA. Given I have extended the time frame for a response you are able to have the decision to extend the time reviewed by the Office of the Ombudsman pursuant to s27(3) of LGOIMA.

I am hopeful however, that I won't require the full 20 working day extension to complete this request.

Regards
Sandy

From: Lee Vandervis
Sent: Friday, 3 October 2014 11:42 p.m.
To: Sandy Graham; Sue Bidrose; Mayor Cull
Subject: LGOIMA request re Stihl equipment

Hi Sandy,

Can you please advise which DCC departments purchase/use/and or dispose of Stihl chainsaws/weed-eaters/and or powered pole extension tools?
In these departments, which managers are responsible for Stihl equipment purchase/disposal?

Which DCC departments have purchased/disposed of plate-compactors and water-blasters.
Which managers are responsible for purchase/disposal of these kinds of equipment?

Have comprehensive records been kept of such DCC equipment purchase/disposal?

Kind regards,
Lee

If this message is not intended for you please delete it and notify us immediately; you are warned that any further use, dissemination, distribution or reproduction of this material by you is prohibited.
