

Subject: Contracts for renewal: Recycling contract

Date: Wed, 5 May 2004 01:00:23 +0100 (BST)

From: Elizabeth James <cagebc@yahoo.com>

To: "Mr. James Ridge, CAO" <james_ridge@dnv.org>

CC: Mayor and Council <council@dnv.org>, FONVCA <fonvca@fonvca.org>

4 May 2004

Dear Mr. Ridge:

This email is to offer some comment on Council's rather confused discussion of a 5-Year contract for provision of recycling services in the District.

It seems that, for whatever reason, both Council and C.U.P.E. were caught short on the issue and I'm glad that the deferral motion succeeded. Certainly, I did not want Council to make a hasty decision just because "the other two North Shore municipalities voted to approve WMI."

What I find disconcerting is that Council only gets to discuss the pros and cons of such a contract on May 3, when the deal needs to be signed, sealed and delivered by June 1st if services are not to be interrupted. Five-year contracts, surely, are serious matters, warranting close examination - by Council as well as by Staff?

As an example, Council was similarly backed against the wall when the Don-Mac Holdings Operations/Maintenance contract for Northlands was due for renewal. By good fortune, Staff was tasked only with "preparation of the contract documents for signature." Thus, enough time elapsed that discovery of the fraud could begin.

The rationale at that time was that it was one of the items that needed to be 'put to bed' before the November election. Now, the reasoning is that Council should move quickly because "the contract needs to be in place by June 1st."

Had last night's deferral motion not intervened, Council would have been given no time to consider the comments from Mrs. Leung [Sp?], nor to examine *closely* why it is WMI feels it can deliver good service, for significantly less dollars - not that I'm against saving money.

Then there is the issue of the additional truck traffic on the roads, and this is not inconsequential. A couple of years ago, the Ottawa Citizen published a series of articles on vehicle emissions studies. It was shown that each diesel-powered transport truck produces emissions equal to that of 150 automobiles. 375,000 of those trucks ply Canadian roads every day and the math is easy. Moreover, the emissions are of the most carcinogenic kind, the CO2 levels are of equal concern - as are the emissions of buses, cement, garbage, recycling and dump trucks.

If District Council really *does* support the two main goals of the Liveable Region Strategic Plan - to reduce pollution and congestion - then it has to do more than just say so.

In this instance, the contract should be gone over with a fine-toothed comb. District Council cannot concede its own responsibility to its citizens by merely adding its signature to decisions made by other councils as they represent communities with differing priorities.

Time should be allowed to gather all available information and to consider contracts from all angles. I'm not sure how it is that Staff reports are not scheduled for Council discussion *at least* two months ahead of the required contract renewal date.

As to how or why it is C.U.P.E. came so late to the table..... Were they asleep at the switch? Does the District need to adopt a system of posting once a month or once a quarter all of the tenders coming up for renewal?

On another tack...why was the recycling contract not taken *in camera* to be thrashed out there? Is that not the usual process when competitive bids are being considered?....Or was it?

In the matter of the recycling contract, my gut tells me that Council should stick with the company that has been performing one of the two best services in the District - garbage collection and recycling pick-up. If the District wants to curb [pun intended] expenses, then I wonder how twice-monthly recycling pick-up would work? As I see it, it is the amount of newsprint that would cause the biggest headache to that idea.

I remain concerned at the amount of time Council spends on discussion of incomplete information only to end up in deferral, or on *recycling* items *ad nauseum* with no resolution - e.g. the Crist:Burrows issue.

On a more upbeat note, your helpful hand is beginning to show positive results in the overall demeanour of Council discussion
.....thank you.

Sincerely,

Liz James
[604] 988-2066

How much free photo storage do you get? Store your holiday snaps for FREE with Yahoo! Photos. [Get Yahoo! Photos](#)