

Vivienne Harvey

From: Lee Vandervis
Sent: 28 June 2015 5:16 a.m.
To: Sue Bidrose
Cc: Mayor Cull; Sandy Graham
Subject: reply to Sue

Dear Sue,

Thank you for acknowledging my consistently made whistle-blowing allegations of fraud at the Town Hall Redevelopment project.

I note that you yourself have verbally noted the high monthly cost escalations of this project, and noted that these costs reduced during the months in which you took an active interest, and increased again after your interest was diverted elsewhere.

My substantial Town Hall Redevelopment fraud allegations [like my whole range of Citifleet fraud allegations, seawall ramp and foundation allegations, and mudtank fraud allegations all of which have been belatedly confirmed] require DCC file information as evidence to proceed with investigation, file information much of which you and DCC staff have denied me for many years. [Previous CEO Harland's illegal denial of information requests re the CST for instance have resulted in especially damaging spending for Dunedin.] For example your decision not to give me my LGOIMA requested Town Hall Redevelopment faults file [which complaining contractors assured me would run to hundreds of faults and actually ran well over a thousand], and my then having to apply to the ombudsman and wait a further 11 months before getting the information is just one example of you and DCC staff sitting on the evidence I need to investigate. Justice delayed/denied. I can give you many more examples of DCC staff stonewalling.

I am no longer enamoured of or looking for your mode of investigation.
I simply want information when I ask for it in the public interest.
All you have to do is not hide it from me.

I note that this is the second occasion where you have gone to print with an example of my verbal use of the f***ing F word. If I had a dollar for every time I have heard you use the same word, I would have enough to buy us both dinner. Stones, glass-houses, enough already, and an inappropriate way for a whistleblower contact to respond.

Yet again I say to you, you are sitting on the evidence I need and refusing to provide the DCC file information in many areas that I have requested.

My allegations re Citifleet did amount to serious fraud, yet you failed to involve the SFO 'of course' at the early stages of the investigation. What you say below is false. It was I that involved the SFO by formally requesting their independent investigation of Citifleet, and the SFO confirmed to me in writing that they had had no prior request for any investigation into Citifleet.

Whether there is any evidence of fraud by other DCC staff members or members of the general public re Citifleet remains to be seen.

Now that our local Police have finally concluded their investigation, I have a number of related information requests of you which I hope you and your staff will respond to more completely and closer to mandated timeframes than has been the case this last year or so.

Regards,
Cr. Lee Vandervis
Dunedin City Council.

On 27/06/15 7:25 AM, "Sue Bidrose" <Sue.Bidrose@dcc.govt.nz> wrote:

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

>> On 26/06/2015, at 8:09 pm, Lee Vandervis <lee@vandervision.co.nz> wrote:

>>
>>
>> Hi Sue,
>>
>> Imagine a moment 14 months ago, if you will, of a situation where you
>> decided to directly get the SFO or or other independent body to
>> investigate Citifleet [since the local Police were not keen] and that
>> you asked for a widened investigation to include other alleged DCC
>> fraud complaints that I have forwarded to you eg the Town Hall Redevelopment \$42.5 million.
>> We would have saved ourselves 1/4 million\$ wasted with Deloitte's
>> doing part of an SFO investigation job, even if the SFO were to be as
>> ineffectual as our local Police.
>>
>> What we have now is hideous, and the public are rightly furious.
>>
>> My certainty that we are on the same transparency page has evaporated.
>> Justice delayed has been justice denied.
>> There is now no whistleblower that I can go to with any confidence.
>>
>> I hope that at least you are happy with your result.
>>
>> Cr. Vandervis.
>>

>>

>>> On 22/08/14 1:32 PM, "Sue Bidrose" <Sue.Bidrose@dcc.govt.nz> wrote:

>>>

>>> Hi Lee

>>> I didn't mind your description of the press release as pap. What I
>>> objected to was the implication that I was only playing at wanting transparency.

>>>

>>> This delay is a much worse outcome for me, frankly. I am trying to
>>> drive real changes in process here at Council, and without the
>>> details of the alleged fraud in public, it is much harder for me to
>>> get the staff buy-in I need for the change to be embraced. But the
>>> changes are rolling on anyway - and I am sure you'll all be pleased
>>> to know that many of our staff overtly welcome the new approach.

>>>

>>> The investigation began three months ago (three months ago tomorrow,
>>> specifically). Brent died three months ago yesterday.

>>>

>>> Imagine a moment some months away, if you will, in a situation where
>>> we decided today to ignore the current police and Crown Solicitor
>>> request, and the police announce in public that there will be no
>>> prosecution because, despite their request, we ignored them and went public with the report.

>>> That

>>> would be hideous, and the public would rightly be furious. I am
>>> pretty sure we are all on the same page wanting full transparency ASAP in this.

>>>

>>> We will continue to push for release as soon as we can, as soon as their
>>> initial investigation is complete. But meanwhile, I want anyone that
>>> conspired in the fraud to pay the price (and pay back the
>>> ratepayers), and I know you do too.

>>>

>>> Regards

>>> Sue

>>>

>>> Sue Bidrose

>>> Chief Executive Officer

>>> Dunedin City Council

>>>

>>>> On 22/08/2014, at 1:17 pm, "Lee Vandervis" <lee@vandervision.co.nz> wrote:

>>>>

>>>> 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

>>

>>

>

>

> _____
> 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.

>

> _____
>