

Subject: TIME FRAME FOR COMPLETION OF ROAD MAINTENANCE & ROAD CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS;

Date: Sat, 26 Feb 2005 10:29:33 -0800

From: "Ernie Crist" <ernie_crist@dnv.org>

To: <fonvca@fonvca.org>, <Cagebc@yahoo.com>

CC: "Mayor and Council - DNV" <Council@dnv.org>, "Senior Management Committee" <managecomm@dnv.org>, "James Ridge" <James_Ridge@dnv.org>

A MESSAGE FROM ERNIE CRIST

In October 2004, I submitted a resolution to Council that road contracts extended by the District to outside contractors contain a clause stipulating a maximum time frame for completion of such projects.

The issue has been raised by residents time and time again as they wanted to know why sometimes it takes inordinately long for a District project to be completed. Some contractors leave a project for a long time and since nobody says why, the public is under the impression that contractors do so to work on another project while the District can wait or so it is suspected. In the eyes of the public this is not only costly but many residents often find it is coupled with personal inconvenience. Also, it reflects poorly on District operations.

But when I made a motion that District Work contracts extended to outside contractors contain a clause stipulating a time frame for their completion, my motion was defeated. Council voted against it as they do most of the time. However, Council did request a staff report on the matter which has now been submitted to Council.


In essence the report denies that such delays exist. Generally it states "there are few delay problems with District projects and most are completed within the time frame as specified by the contractor in the bid documents". It states that "specific deadline dates are outlined and, if delays are encountered, the guidelines provide standard procedures to address the issue".

As an aside but possibly related matter, there is also a District policy for obtaining information under the Freedom of Information Act. However, a reporter has been trying to obtain a copy of the "BEEK Report" commissioned by the District in 1979 dealing with a potential chlorine spill at the Nexen Plant in the District for some time, but so far without success, I was told.

Also, when I recently made a motion that our CAO be asked to begin negotiations with NEXEN for the relocation of this hazardous Chlorine Plant, not only for safety reasons but also because it is a detriment to the economic development of the Maplewood area where the plant is located, my motion was also defeated. Even the Councillors who live in the vicinity where the plant is located voted against it. There is also a citizen who made an FOI request re the Crist harassment matter and how much it cost the District taxpayers to cover the legal costs, also so far without success I am told.

Ernie Crist

Ernie Crist

 winmail.dat	Name: winmail.dat Type: application/ms-tnef Encoding: base64
---	---