COR/2018/02880
August 16, 2018

Dear Applicant:

Re: Your request for access to information under Part II of the Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act [Our File #: TW/052/2018]

On July 19, 2018, the Department of Transportation and Works received your request for access to the following records:

Any and all communications to or from the minister's office related to the ferry MV Gallipoli from Feb. 12, 2018 to present.

I am pleased to inform you that a decision has been made by the Deputy Minister for Transportation and Works to provide access to some of the requested information.

Please note: a portion of responsive records corresponding to your request have already been released under ATIPP request TW/036/2018 and are not included in this package. Once it’s publicly available, you can access TW/036/2018 at: http://www.atipp-search.gov.nl.ca/

Access to the remaining records, and/or information contained within the records, has been refused in accordance with the following exceptions to disclosure, as specified in the Access to Information and Protection of Privacy Act (the Act):

Subsection 40(1) - The head of a public body shall refuse to disclose personal information to an applicant where the disclosure would be an unreasonable invasion of a third party’s personal privacy.

As required by 8(2) of the Act, we have severed information that is unable to be disclosed and have provided you with as much information as possible. In accordance with your request for a copy of the records, the appropriate copies have been enclosed.

Please be advised that you may appeal this decision and ask the Information and Privacy Commissioner to review the decision to provide partial access to the requested information, as set out in section 42 of the Act (a copy of this section of the Act has been enclosed for your reference). A request to the Commissioner must be made in writing within 15 business days of the date of this letter or within a longer period that may be allowed by the
Commissioner. Your appeal should identify your concerns with the request and why you are submitting the appeal. The appeal may be addressed to the Information and Privacy Commissioner is as follows:

Office of the Information and Privacy Commissioner  
2 Canada Drive  
P. O. Box 13004, Stn. A  
St. John’s, NL. A1B 3V8

Telephone: (709) 729-6309  
Toll-Free: 1-877-729-6309  
Facsimile: (709) 729-6500

You may also appeal directly to the Supreme Court Trial Division within 15 business days after you receive the decision of the public body, pursuant to section 52 of the Act (a copy of this section of the Act has been enclosed for your reference).

Please be advised that responsive records will be published following a 72-hour period after the response is sent electronically to you or five business days in the case where records are mailed to you. It is the goal to have the responsive records posted to the Completed Access to Information Requests website within one business day following the applicable period of time. Please note that requests for personal information will not be posted online.

If you have any further questions, please contact me by telephone at 709-729-5351 or by email at ATTW@gov.nl.ca.

Sincerely,

Angela McIntyre
ATIPP Coordinator
Disclosure harmful to personal privacy

40. (1) The head of a public body shall refuse to disclose personal information to an applicant where the disclosure would be an unreasonable invasion of a third party's personal privacy.

(2) A disclosure of personal information is not an unreasonable invasion of a third party's personal privacy where

(a) the applicant is the individual to whom the information relates;

(b) the third party to whom the information relates has, in writing, consented to or requested the disclosure;

(c) there are compelling circumstances affecting a person's health or safety and notice of disclosure is given in the form appropriate in the circumstances to the third party to whom the information relates;

(d) an Act or regulation of the province or of Canada authorizes the disclosure;

(e) the disclosure is for a research or statistical purpose and is in accordance with section 70;

(f) the information is about a third party's position, functions or remuneration as an officer, employee or member of a public body or as a member of a minister's staff;

(g) the disclosure reveals financial and other details of a contract to supply goods or services to a public body;

(h) the disclosure reveals the opinions or views of a third party given in the course of performing services for a public body, except where they are given in respect of another individual;

(i) public access to the information is provided under the Financial Administration Act;

(j) the information is about expenses incurred by a third party while travelling at the expense of a public body;

(k) the disclosure reveals details of a licence, permit or a similar discretionary benefit granted to a third party by a public body, not including personal information supplied in support of the application for the benefit;

(l) the disclosure reveals details of a discretionary benefit of a financial nature granted to a third party by a public body, not including
(i) personal information that is supplied in support of the application for the benefit, or

(ii) personal information that relates to eligibility for income and employment support under the *Income and Employment Support Act* or to the determination of income or employment support levels; or

(m) the disclosure is not contrary to the public interest as described in subsection (3) and reveals only the following personal information about a third party:

   (i) attendance at or participation in a public event or activity related to a public body, including a graduation ceremony, sporting event, cultural program or club, or field trip, or

   (ii) receipt of an honour or award granted by or through a public body.

(3) The disclosure of personal information under paragraph (2)(m) is an unreasonable invasion of personal privacy where the third party whom the information is about has requested that the information not be disclosed.

(4) A disclosure of personal information is presumed to be an unreasonable invasion of a third party's personal privacy where

(a) the personal information relates to a medical, psychiatric or psychological history, diagnosis, condition, treatment or evaluation;

(b) the personal information is an identifiable part of a law enforcement record, except to the extent that the disclosure is necessary to dispose of the law enforcement matter or to continue an investigation;

(c) the personal information relates to employment or educational history;

(d) the personal information was collected on a tax return or gathered for the purpose of collecting a tax;

(e) the personal information consists of an individual's bank account information or credit card information;

(f) the personal information consists of personal recommendations or evaluations, character references or personnel evaluations;

(g) the personal information consists of the third party's name where

   (i) it appears with other personal information about the third party, or
(ii) the disclosure of the name itself would reveal personal information about the third party; or

(h) the personal information indicates the third party's racial or ethnic origin or religious or political beliefs or associations.

(5) In determining under subsections (1) and (4) whether a disclosure of personal information constitutes an unreasonable invasion of a third party's personal privacy, the head of a public body shall consider all the relevant circumstances, including whether

(a) the disclosure is desirable for the purpose of subjecting the activities of the province or a public body to public scrutiny;

(b) the disclosure is likely to promote public health and safety or the protection of the environment;

(c) the personal information is relevant to a fair determination of the applicant's rights;

(d) the disclosure will assist in researching or validating the claims, disputes or grievances of aboriginal people;

(e) the third party will be exposed unfairly to financial or other harm;

(f) the personal information has been supplied in confidence;

(g) the personal information is likely to be inaccurate or unreliable;

(h) the disclosure may unfairly damage the reputation of a person referred to in the record requested by the applicant;

(i) the personal information was originally provided to the applicant; and

(j) the information is about a deceased person and, if so, whether the length of time the person has been deceased indicates the disclosure is not an unreasonable invasion of the deceased person's personal privacy.
Access or correction complaint

42. (1) A person who makes a request under this Act for access to a record or for correction of personal information may file a complaint with the commissioner respecting a decision, act or failure to act of the head of the public body that relates to the request.

(2) A complaint under subsection (1) shall be filed in writing not later than 15 business days

(a) after the applicant is notified of the decision of the head of the public body, or the date of the act or failure to act; or

(b) after the date the head of the public body is considered to have refused the request under subsection 16 (2).

(3) A third party informed under section 19 of a decision of the head of a public body to grant access to a record or part of a record in response to a request may file a complaint with the commissioner respecting that decision.

(4) A complaint under subsection (3) shall be filed in writing not later than 15 business days after the third party is informed of the decision of the head of the public body.

(5) The commissioner may allow a longer time period for the filing of a complaint under this section.

(6) A person or third party who has appealed directly to the Trial Division under subsection 52 (1) or 53 (1) shall not file a complaint with the commissioner.

(7) The commissioner shall refuse to investigate a complaint where an appeal has been commenced in the Trial Division.

(8) A complaint shall not be filed under this section with respect to

(a) a request that is disregarded under section 21;

(b) a decision respecting an extension of time under section 23;

(c) a variation of a procedure under section 24; or

(d) an estimate of costs or a decision not to waive a cost under section 26.

(9) The commissioner shall provide a copy of the complaint to the head of the public body concerned.
Direct appeal to Trial Division by an applicant

52. (1) Where an applicant has made a request to a public body for access to a record or correction of personal information and has not filed a complaint with the commissioner under section 42, the applicant may appeal the decision, act or failure to act of the head of the public body that relates to the request directly to the Trial Division.

(2) An appeal shall be commenced under subsection (1) not later than 15 business days

(a) after the applicant is notified of the decision of the head of the public body, or the date of the act or failure to act; or

(b) after the date the head of the public body is considered to have refused the request under subsection 16 (2).

(3) Where an applicant has filed a complaint with the commissioner under section 42 and the commissioner has refused to investigate the complaint, the applicant may commence an appeal in the Trial Division of the decision, act or failure to act of the head of the public body that relates to the request for access to a record or for correction of personal information.

(4) An appeal shall be commenced under subsection (3) not later than 15 business days after the applicant
From: Minister, TW
Sent: Tuesday, March 6, 2018 4:47 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: MV Gallipoli
Attachments: [REDACTED] 00786.pdf

COR/2018/00786

Re: Concerns about the MV Gallipoli Refit

Dear [REDACTED]

Thank you for your correspondence regarding the refit of the MV Gallipoli.

The Department of Transportation and Works procurement processes follow the Public Tender Act, which awards work to the lowest compliant bid, in this case that was the Burry Group.

The Sound of Islay refit was different. That vessel's refit was undertaken at Newdock because that company won the tender for that work. The length of time for that particular refit was based on the amount of steel work that was required on that vessel.

The Gallipoli refit has taken longer than anticipated due to the amount of unforeseen steel work that was required once the refit began. Prior to starting the refit, the Burry Group provided certification from an independent engineering firm that the lift in question was capable of handling the Gallipoli.

Please be assured that due diligence will be performed if the Gallipoli is re-docked in Clarenville. We look forward to the completion of the Gallipoli and its return to service.

Thank you for sharing your concerns.

Sincerely,

STEVE CROCKER, MHA
Carbonear-Trinity-Bay de Verde
Minister

"Lead the way, safety today."

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2018 9:50 AM
To: Minister, TW
Cc: Inquiries, Justice General
Subject: MV Gallipoli

Quote: "Just an unfortunate incident. These things happen".
Really, Minister Crocker??
It may be just an unfortunate incident to you, but to us who live in Ramea, and depend on the Gallipoli, it is devastating news.

5th September 2017    That's when the Gallipoli left Ramea for a 90 day refit in Clarenville. Everyone knows that, not only is the shipyard cradle not big enough to handle the Gallipoli, but they also know that there is not sufficient work force in Clarenville to do the much needed work on the Gallipoli.

We don't need to be a minister in government to know that it was politics that put the Gallipoli in Clarenville, leading to the predicament that she is now in. We don't really care about politics, we just want the Gallipoli out of that situation, in "ship shape" condition, and back where she belongs.

And once she's out of that cradle, and in the water, you state that she will be put back up there again! Mr. Crocker, you have got to be kidding...........
   Why would she have to go back up there again, weren't they putting her in the water???????????????

You state that you trust this contractor, sorry, but we don't. It's been our understanding right from the start, that once the Clarenville shipyard is done with her, that she will have to go to St. John's to finish up. If I recall correctly, that's what was done with the Sound of Islay.
   Wasn't it just as well that she had gone to St. John's in the first place. Politics.

   This is unbelievable.

   We hope that the Gallipoli situation is not going to be a repeat of the Beaumont Hamel situation, in which that particular vessel was in Newdoc for a year.

   As for the Sound of Islay being here on this run, she can't do the runs like the Gallipoli can; check your stats and see how many days she's been tied to the dock since she's been here. She is a very uncomfortable boat, seating leaves a lot to be desired, and absolutely nowhere to lie down if a passenger needs to. We are not all sailors.

   The Gallipoli has done refits in St. John's and Marystown, and was never sent to Clarenville in all the years she's been operating. The reason?? The dockyard is not suitable for the size of the vessel, and the type of work required to be done. Politics.

   A 90 day refit has now turned into over 170 days, and the "work is over 50 percent completed". Your words, sir. How in the world can you justify this. Only 50 percent, and double the days.

   The Sound of Islay was removed from the Clarenville shipyard and sent to St. John's shipyard to finish up the refit before she was brought to Ramea. Why was that????????????

   As you can tell, frustration abounds. In a couple of months time, we hope to have our fish plant up and running again, and the Sound of Islay can't do the work now. What happens then, when we have fish trucks on the dock waiting to go, along with the every day traffic. At the rate things are going, this "refit" won't be finished any time soon. Frustrated now?? This will be small stuff when these trucks get on the move.

   We need the Gallipoli. And we need her yesterday.

   Get the work done. If it can't be done in Clarenville, send her somewhere where it can be done. Soon.

   We are taxpayers as well as those in "town", and we have lives that are just as important as those anywhere.
I dare to say that there would be a lot more in the news about this situation if it involved one of the Bell Island ferries. Thank heavens for CBC.

Have a wonderful day.

Ramea
Re: Concerns about the MV Gallipoli Refit

Dear [Name]

Thank you for your correspondence regarding the refit of the MV Gallipoli.

The Department of Transportation and Works procurement processes follow the Public Tender Act, which awards work to the lowest compliant bid, in this case that was the Burry Group.

The Sound of Islay refit was different. That vessel's refit was undertaken at Newdock because that company won the tender for that work. The length of time for that particular refit was based on the amount of steel work that was required on that vessel.

The Gallipoli refit has taken longer than anticipated due to the amount of unforeseen steel work that was required once the refit began. Prior to starting the refit, the Burry Group provided certification from an independent engineering firm that the lift in question was capable of handling the Gallipoli.

Please be assured that due diligence will be performed if the Gallipoli is re-docked in Clarenville. We look forward to the completion of the Gallipoli and its return to service.

Thank you for sharing your concerns.

Sincerely,

STEVE CROCKER, MHA
Carbonear-Trinity-Bay de Verde
Minister

"Lead the way, safety today."
Hi Andrew,

I write to you on behalf of the Ramea Town Council.

We had a good get together today with Council and our ferry Committee. We relayed information from your earlier phone calls and the frustration with the situation.

From the meeting today, we are requesting a meeting with you and Minister Crocker, concerning ongoing ferry issues.

Especially we would like to discuss, Status of the MV Gallipoli., status of the Beaumont Hamel, and ongoing issues with the Sound of Islay.
Hope you can arrange this as soon as possible.

Thanks.

Sincerely,

Clyde D.,
Mayor

“This email and any attached files are intended for the sole use of the primary and copied addressee(s) and may contain privileged and/or confidential information. Any distribution, use or copying by any means of this information is strictly prohibited. If you received this email in error, please delete it immediately and notify the sender.”
Re: Ramea Ferry Situation

Dear [name]

Thank you for your correspondence regarding the ferry service to Ramea.

The safety of passengers and crew is paramount to the Department of Transportation and Works. The Captains of our vessels have the authority to make the call to sail if they have concerns about weather or safety. Marine headquarters in Lewisporte does not have the real time local knowledge to make these decisions and cannot do so based on a weather forecast. The Captains of our vessels are experienced in the different seas conditions in this particular area.

The issue with the refit of the Gallipoli and the lift is currently being investigated and we hope to have a decision on the status of the Gallipoli in the coming weeks.

Thank you for sharing your concerns.

Sincerely,

STEVE CROCKER, MHA
Carbonear-Trinity-Bay de Verde
Minister

"Safety – A small investment for a rich future"

cc. Hon. Andrew Parsons, MHA Burgeo-LaPoile

From: [name]
Sent: Wednesday, April 11, 2018 10:12 PM
To: Minister, TW; Marine, TW
Cc: Parsons, Andrew; Crocker, Steve
Subject: Ramea Ferry Situation

To whom it may concern,

We live in Ramea and we have serious concerns about the ferry situation that is happening with our town...
The Gallipoli was sent on a 3 month refit to a shipyard which wasn't equipped to handle the work required on her, all to save the government a few bucks, however it is just ending up costing more and leaving the people of Ramea without adequate transportation...

The captains on the Sound of Islay are inexperienced with the waters in our area, therefore cancels run for the least amount of wind... But no matter what the weather is like on crew change day, they will most certainly make the run to get off shift. Yesterday was a prime example of how poor judgement affected our town and the people here, the captain felt it was too bad to make the last run from Ramea and back again when the winds had decreased and on top of that a local fisherman went across to Burgeo in his much smaller fishing boat, that is just plain sad.
This continues to happen because the powers at be allows this to happen without any consideration for the people of Ramea. If another boat cannot be brought to our town then maybe its time to replace the captains of the Sound of Islay with more confident ones.

If you listen to the captains Ramea gets 25-35 knots of southwest winds every day, however the gages at the lighthouse tells a different story... That is just an excuse for the captain not to make his runs...

The bottom line is, something has to be done about this situation one way or another... Its not fair to the town of Ramea and it's residence the way we are being treated.

Thank You

s. 40(1)

Ramea, NL.

Sent from my LG Mobile
Re: Ramea Ferry Situation

Dear [Redacted]

Thank you for your correspondence regarding the ferry service to Ramea.

The safety of passengers and crew is paramount to the Department of Transportation and Works. The Captains of our vessels have the authority to make the call to sail if they have concerns about weather or safety. Marine headquarters in Lewisporte does not have the real time local knowledge to make these decisions and cannot do so based on a weather forecast. The Captains of our vessels are experienced in the different seas conditions in this particular area.

The issue with the refit of the Gallipoli and the lift is currently being investigated and we hope to have a decision on the status of the Gallipoli in the coming weeks.

Thank you for sharing your concerns.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

STEVE CROCKER, MHA
Carbonear-Trinity-Bay de Verde
Minister

“Safety – A small investment for a rich future”

cc. Hon. Andrew Parsons, MHA Burgeo-LaPoile
Re: Ramea’s Ferry Service

Dear [Name]

Thank you for your correspondence regarding the ferry service to Ramea.

The safety of passengers and crew is paramount to the Department of Transportation and Works. The Captains of our vessels have the authority to make the call to sail if they have concerns about weather or safety. Marine headquarters in Lewisporte does not have the real time local knowledge to make these decisions and cannot do so based on a weather forecast.

The issue with the refit of the Gallipoli and the lift is currently being investigated and we hope to have a decision on the status of the Gallipoli in the coming weeks.

Sincerely,

STEVE CROCKER, MHA
Carbonear-Trinity-Bay de Verde
Minister

"Don't learn safety by accident"

cc. John Baker, Assistant Deputy Minister Air and Marine Services

Sent from my Samsung Galaxy Tab® S

To whom it may concern;
Below are two videos that show what the conditions were like here in Ramea late this afternoon when the ferry cancelled her last trip to Burgeo. This is an 35 foot fishing boat going to Burgeo from Ramea while our ferry, the Sound of Islay, was tied on the wharf claiming it was too stormy to sail. It states on the government website that it was cancelled because it was focasting high winds when in reality the marine forecase was saying the winds were dropping to 25 and then to light. There were several people in Burgeo waiting to come home who then had to get a room for the night at a cost of $99.00 plus meals. The captain of the Sound of Islay appears to be making his own rules about when he sails and when he doesn't. A member of our ferry committee has been keeping a record of days the ferry has been "stormbound" and as of now it has been 69 days since September. Granted sometimes it has been warranted but many times it was not. We are at the mercy of our ferry when it comes to keeping doctor's appointments and other appointments in Burgeo, Corner Brook and elsewhere or just to visit relatives anywhere off our little island. We have heard that the Beaumont Hamel is coming here and we hope that will happen and she will give better service than we are now experiencing, but our main concern is about our own ferry, the Gallipoli. When will she be returning to service Ramea and Grey River? We would like an update on the work being done and when it will be finished. She left here in September for what was supposed to be 90 days..we are used to delays when it comes to government jobs but this is rediculous. We know some delay were due to the problems with the lift but why did that situation drag on so long? We would like answers and are tired of getting the runarounds. I would appreciate it if you could get back to me as soon as possible.

Sincerely, [Redacted]

[Redacted] concerned citizen of Ramea

https://www.facebook.com/wade.durrford/videos/1899010223606628/

https://www.facebook.com/victor.kendall/videos/101560637591125389/

Sent from my LG Mobile
Re: Ramea's Ferry Service

Dear [Redacted]

Thank you for your correspondence regarding the ferry service to Ramea.

The safety of passengers and crew is paramount to the Department of Transportation and Works. The Captains of our vessels have the authority to make the call to sail if they have concerns about weather or safety. Marine headquarters in Lewisporte does not have the real time local knowledge to make these decisions and cannot do so based on a weather forecast.

The issue with the refit of the Gallipoli and the lift is currently being investigated and we hope to have a decision on the status of the Gallipoli in the coming weeks.

Sincerely,

STEVE CROCKER, MHA
Carbonear-Trinity-Bay de Verde
Minister

"Don't learn safety by accident"

cc. John Baker, Assistant Deputy Minister Air and Marine Services
From: Parsons, Andrew
Sent: Tuesday, May 8, 2018 6:57 PM
To: Crocker, Steve
Subject: Fwd: Ramea

See below -anything? Feel free to call
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: <redacted>
Date: May 8, 2018 at 6:39:26 PM NDT
To: "Parsons, Andrew" <andrewparsons@gov.nl.ca>
Subject: Ramea

Hi Andrew

we are having a ferry committee tomorrow @ 3:30pm is there anything you can pass on to me in terms of the gallipoli refit any decisions etc what we can expect

please e mail me with anything you have

Thank you
Just FYI

Andrew K. Parsons, QC  
MHA, District of Burgeo-La Poile

From: Paul Green  
Sent: Friday, May 11, 2018 5:51 PM  
To: Parsons, Andrew  
Subject: Fwd: Gallipolio

--------------- Forwarded message --------------

From: Paul Green  
Date: Fri, May 11, 2018 at 5:49 PM  
Subject: Gallipolio  
To: twminister@gov.nl.ca

Minister Crocker

It has come to the attention of the Ramea Ferry Committee that the M.V. Gallipoli is scheduled to be at the St. John's Dockyard by June 1, 2018 to have the necessary repairs completed to put the vessel back into service. This information is now a week old and there has been nothing done with vessel to make it ready for the voyage to St. John's. The Committee and the people of Ramea and Grey River are real concerned by the lack of progress on getting the vessel ready and who is responsible for this task. We know that Transport Canada needs to be consulted and they will identify what needs to be done to get the vessel safely to St. John's. Sir, I know that you are a busy man and has plenty of other items on your plate but can you please instruct your official within your office to get this in motion so that the vessel gets sent to St. John's so the repairs can be completed and finally returned to her home port to service the Ramea-Burgeo-Grey River Run. Thank you for your considering this request and we await a positive response.

Paul Green  
Secretary Ramea Ferry Committee
From: Parsons, Andrew  
Sent: Saturday, May 12, 2018 1:27 PM  
To: 'Clyde Dominie'; Crocker, Steve; Minnie Organ; Anderson, Eilanda; King, Tracy  
Cc: RE: MV Gallipoli

Thanks for the email Clyde. I know Steve and the Dept have been working tirelessly to get this process moving and that they will continue to do so. Appreciate all your patience with this, and we will keep you posted as we find out more. Take care,

AP

Andrew K. Parsons, QC  
MHA, District of Burgeo-La Poile

From: Clyde Dominie  
Sent: Saturday, May 12, 2018 9:51 AM  
To: Crocker, Steve; Parsons, Andrew; Minnie Organ; Anderson, Eilanda; King, Tracy  
Subject: MV Gallipoli

Good Day, Minister Crocker,

I am writing you on behalf of the Town of Ramea with regards to the continuing refit of the MV Gallipoli.

I wish to thank you and your Department for the decision to move the refit process to St. John’s for completion.

I understand the process of preparing the Gallipoli will take at least two weeks. We are concerned that since the announcement this work has not, as of yet, been started.

I respectfully ask you to push to have this work completed as soon as possible.

As you are very much aware, ferry services, for our residents, in the past eight months has not been to the standard we are accustomed to with the Gallipoli.

Whatever your Department can do to expedite the return of the MV Gallipoli to the Ramea run it will be much appreciated.

Thank you for your anticipated positive response to this important matter.

Sincerely,
Clyde Dominie, Mayor  
Town of Ramea
From: Burden, Nancy  
Sent: Friday, May 18, 2018 4:09 PM  
To: Crocker, Steve  
Subject: FW: Gallipoli Contract  

Minister, FYI.

From: Minister, TW  
Sent: Friday, May 18, 2018 4:08 PM  
To: Holloway, Colin  
Cc: Premier of NL; King, Tracy  
Subject: RE: Gallipoli Contract

COR/2018/01650 - ICOR2018/2050

Mr. Colin Holloway, MHA  
District of Terra Nova  
ColinHolloway@gov.nl.ca

Dear MHA Holloway:

I am writing to you today regarding your email on May 16, 2018, in which you expressed concerns with the department’s decision to move the MV Gallipoli from Burry’s Shipyards in Clarenville to NewDock in St. John’s.

As we have kept you informed throughout, we remind you of the following details that left the department with no other option but to move the vessel.

On three occasions following the incident with the slipway on February 12, department officials contacted Burry’s Shipyards, requesting revised timelines on when repairs to the vessel would be completed. Following each subsequent reply from Burry’s Shipyards, department officials maintained that the amount of work remaining on the vessel was unachievable.

On the latter two replies from Burry’s, an independent consultant, Seashore Marine, was hired to review the timelines and agreed with the department’s marine officials that given the amount of work remaining on the vessel, the proposed timelines were unacceptable. Please see attached letters.

Among their observations, Seashore Marine noted that:
• The repairs to the slip are already behind schedule, causing further delays.
• Burry’s has not demonstrated they have the human resources to complete their work in the timeframe they’ve indicated.
• Completing that work in that timeframe would require a 200% increase in productivity compared to the other work they’ve done.
• Once the repairs to the slipway are complete, it is uncertain if it will be certified to bring the vessel back onto shore.

Further, the stop work order was issued in February due to information from the shipyard that it planned to send underwater divers under the vessel to repair damages. Given the unstable condition of the cradle and vessel at the time, the department was concerned for the safety of the workers. The safety of workers is a top priority for the Department of Transportation and Works.

With regards to your claim that Burry’s Shipyards will go out of business as a result of its contract with government being cancelled, as you are well aware government has already paid $1.8 million to Burry’s on an original contract value of $1.7
million. Burry’s has been paid more than they would have originally budgeted over the same period of time.

Based on these payments, any claim that cancelling this contract will solely result in the closure of Burry's Shipyard is completely without merit.

Furthermore, to your erroneous claim that the Premier stated the vessel would not be moved, I remind you that the Premier actually stated that the vessel would not be moved until government had completed its due diligence. That due diligence has now been completed and the decision has been made to cancel the contract with Burry's Shipyard for the many reasons stated above.

Please be assured that our department has maintained a positive working relationship with the shipyard and made every effort to have the repairs to the vessel completed at Burry’s Shipyard, however the department’s need to have the vessel return to service as quickly as possible left no choice but to move the vessel to NewDock.

We wish the shipyard well and encourage them to bid on vessel refits in the future.

Sincerely,

HON. STEVE CROCKER
Minister of Transportation and Works

From: Holloway, Colin
Sent: Wednesday, May 16, 2018 4:28 PM
To: Crocker, Steve
Cc: Premier of NL; King, Tracy
Subject: Request to Reconsider the Decision to Cancel Gillipoli Contract

Dear Minister Crocker,

I am writing to request that the Department of Transportation and Works reconsider its decision to cancel the repair contract with Burry’s Shipyard in Clarenville.

As you are aware, I have followed the process surrounding this contract with great interest. The contract to conduct repairs to the Gallipoli Ferry, a Department of Transportation and Works asset, commenced in September, 2017. The contract was delayed in starting due to the late arrival of the vessel to Clarenville.

Throughout the fall, Burry’s Shipyard staff worked to effect repairs as per the scope of work as outlined in the original contract. The timeline was further hampered by Transportation and Works staff who refused to allow Burry’s Shipyard to work after dark. As you can appreciate, with falling temperatures, whenever is was being completed on metal, flashing occurs thus causing work to be repeated time and time again. Some people would describe the uselessness of this approach similar to pushing a boulder up hill, stopping at night, only to have the boulder resting further down the hill the next day.

As most are aware, in February 2018, the Gallipoli was being hauled into drydock at Burry’s Shipyard; however, due to a mechanical failure of the slipway, there was a failure and the vessel became stuck.

In response, Department of Transportation and Works staff called in officials at Occupational Health and Safety and a Stop Work Order was issued. This Order remained in effect for several weeks. During that time,
with temperatures below freezing, and no heat on the vessel, additional damage resulted (e.g., pipes bursting, interior water damage). I agree with Mr. Burry that these additional damages are a result of the decision not to proceed with the work schedule.

I should point out that it is my understanding, based on the report of underwater divers who inspected the haul, no damage was visible to the exterior as a result of the failure of the mechanical slipway.

Early in March, I was invited to a meeting at Burry’s Shipyards to discuss the incident and the scope of work that was remaining, including any additional work that resulted from the slipway failure. Representation at this meeting included Mr. Glenn Burry, several members of his staff, officials from the Department of Transportation and Works, a representative of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador’s Insurance (Lloyd’s of London) and a private contractor (brought on to assess the incident and the scope of work as a result of the February incident).

During the meeting, it was made very clear to everyone present, including the GNL Insurance Company Representative (Lloyd’s of London), that Burry’s Shipyards should be granted permission to return to work and that the Stop Work Order be lifted. I recall asking Mr. Darryl Hawkins, Engineer with the Department of Transportation and Works, what advice he would be giving to his supervisor. Mr. Hawkins responded by saying that he was not at liberty to give that information.

I was concerned to hear that within the detailed cost analysis there was a budget item for the towing the Gallipoli to St. John’s. I found this decision to be premature and unwarranted.

During this meeting, it was agreed that a review of the work plan would occur in St. John’s the very next day aimed to assess what work was needed to finalize the contract and have the Gallipoli placed back into service on the South Coast of this Province.

Following the Saturday meeting, I received a call with an update. I was informed that a Department of Transportation and Works official was heard saying with respect to towing the vessel to St. John’s that “the decision to keep the Gallipoli in Clarenville will come down to which MHA is more effective”. I can tell you that I was advocating on behalf of my constituents. I am unaware which other MHA was advocating for a different decision and outcome.

For several weeks, Mr. Burry has requested permission from officials at the Department of Transportation and Works to resume work. I have publicly supported a decision to grant permission to Burry’s Shipyards to resume the contract.

Based on conversations I have held with you and your Senior Officials, I was told there are two outstanding issues regarding a decision to grant permission to Burry’s Shipyards to finish the contract: (1) the timeline must support the scope of work; and (2) there must be a recertification of the mechanical slipway. The slipway is rated for 650 tonne and the Gallipoli weighs approximately 624 tonne.

**Issue 1: Timeline.** Initially Burry’s Shipyards had submitted a 12-week schedule but was advised by officials at the Department of Transportation and Works that a 9-week schedule was preferred since the ferry was expected back in service on the South Coast by June, 2018. Burry’s complied and re-developed the timeline
to meet the 9-week schedule only to be told that schedule was unachievable. To further complicate matters, your department engaged a private consultant who also agreed that the 9-week schedule was unachievable. To help clarify matters, Burry’s Shipyard hired this same Consultant who did a site visit and verbally agreed that Burry’s Shipyard was capable of completing the contract within a 12-week schedule. However, three days later, the same Consultant provided a 3-page report indicating that Burry’s Shipyard was not capable of doing the work within the proposed schedule. Obviously, something doesn’t add up.

**Issue 2: Recertification of the Mechanical Slipway.** I appreciate there is concern that once repairs are made to the slipway, adequate certification may not be achieved. In discussions held in your office with Senior Officials, I asked if there was any means of finding out if certification for 650 tonne life capacity can be achieved before repairs are made. Your ADM, John Baker, indicated this was not possible.

In trying to find a possible solution, I further asked you, your senior officials and the Premier, for a compromise. I proposed that permission be granted to Burry’s Shipyard to complete any work required on land as well as on the vessel which does not require drydocking. While this was going on, repairs would be made to the mechanical slipway and certification could be assessed before there was a need to drydock the vessel. Should the mechanical slipway not achieve the 650 tonne rating, there would be less work left in the scope of work should the vessel need to go to New Dock. I felt this was a win-win solution. I was told repeatedly this was not possible.

In a telephone conversation with the Premier in April, I raised my concerns about the notion of towing the Gallipoli to St. John’s. He stated that this would not happen; a statement that was later denied during a meeting with you and me.

Last week, Burry’s Shipyard was informed that the Department of Transportation and Works was invoking its right to cancel the contract and arrangements were being made to tow the Gallipoli to New Dock in St. John’s.

As you can appreciate, the cancellation of this contract with Burry’s Shipyard will have dire consequences for the owner and his 150 employees. These employees live in communities throughout the Terra Nova District and their families rely on these incomes to feed their families and support other businesses in their respective communities. Burry’s Shipyard also supports, through procurement opportunities with building supply companies and marine centres, other businesses in the Clarenville area.

Mr. Burry has stated to me that the cancellation of this contract will likely result in a closure of his family’s 125 year old business.

In a telephone conversation with ADM John Baker last week, I asked how long it will take New Dock to complete all remaining repairs to the Gallipoli. I was told it would be 12 weeks. I find it ironic that this was the same amount of time Burry’s Shipyard had initially proposed and that timeline was turned down due to the urgency in getting the vessel back into service.

It has now come to my attention that the media is reporting the Gallipoli will not go back into service until October, 2018. Based on the Burry’s Shipyard schedule, the Gallipoli would be ready for service before the end of August, 2018.
It is obvious to me that the decision to cancel this contract with Burry’s Shipyards is more than about timelines and costs; it now seems that politics is at play. The decision to cancel the contract with Burry’s Shipyard is not the right decision.

I remain confident that Burry’s Shipyards can complete the remaining scope of work as proposed in the 12-week schedule and I urge you to re-consider this decision. The future of this shipyard and its employees are at risk.

Regards,

Colin

Colin W. Holloway, B.A.
MHA- District of Terra Nova
Parliamentary Secretary to Minister for Municipal Affairs and Environment

Telephone: (709) 466-4165 Clarenville Office
Toll Free Line: 1-800-514-9073.
F. (709) 466-4178
E. colinholloway@gov.nl.ca
May 6th, 2018

Ms. Tracy King
Deputy Minister of Transportation and Works
Government of Newfoundland and Labrador

Dear Ms. King,

Upon the request of the department TW-Marine, Seashore Maritime Services Limited has been asked to review the latest version of Burry Shipyards Inc. (BSI) schedule and associated documentation for the M/V Gallipoli that was received May 4th, 2018. The scope is to assess the validity of the new refit schedule (R0), review past documentation provided by the department and to provide recommendations on a foregoing basis for vessel completion. Documentation provided encompasses the refit from September 2017 to February 2018.

As noted in our previous letter dated April 25th, 2018, Seashore Maritime Services Limited has attempted to undertake an unbiased assessment of the work carried out to date by Burry’s Shipyards Inc. This assessment forms, and informs, the bulk of this review and technical assessment of the BSI schedule R0 and associated documentation. This review takes into the account issues associated with the conduct of the refit to date and attempts to extrapolate the information to comment on and critique the overall past performance and recommend the ways forward to completion of the vessel with a timely and financially prudent outcome.

During this review, not only was the past performance of the BSI on this refit evaluated, but an evaluation of the latest schedule BSI R0 was also completed with the viability of the vessel being delivered by July 27th, 2018. This review will commence with the comparison of Refit schedules V27 received April 25th, 2018 and R0 received May 4th, 2018.

To begin with, an effective schedule should:

- reflect the contractual obligations of the contract;
- comprise of the entire scope of the project;
- comply with the level of detailed required;
• contain activity durations that are reasonable;
• have well defined activity relationships;
• be resource loaded;
• assign an owner to each task; and
• show a critical path that makes sense.

BSI schedule V27 only met one of these requirements, the new Burry Schedule V0 meets all the above requirements and there are no additional comments to be made on the structure and logic lay out in the schedule.

Our further assessment took into the account the following:

1. Schedule Performance and Management. The ability for BSI to perform to the schedule and meet scheduled dates. We refer to schedule V27, received April 25th, 2018 showing the cradle repair completion of May 9th, 2018 and version R0, received May 4th, 2018 showing a slip in this completion date.

2. Resource Availability and Management. The resource loading provided with this documentation show resources peaking up to 44 persons per shift based on 7 days, and with 2 shifts per day. This is equivalent to 88 persons per day with additional requirements for extra personnel to fill in gaps where workers refuse or are unable to work 7 days a week. Further compounding this resource issue is the additional work to the vessel for "grit" contamination and damages incurred during the slip failure. In the documentation provided, BSI has stated that additional work will be scheduled on a third shift per day with additional resources. Historical data has shown that BSI has had a maximum of 45 people working on a single day and less than 20 percent of this on weekends. The recent documentation of May 4th, 2018 does not show how the yard will address this issue.

The TW-Marine refit management team has identified supervisors that were on the day shift for welding, painting, and general labour, however there was no identified supervisors on the second shift prior to the “stop work”. The yard has not addressed in the documentation of May 4th, 2018 the supervision required for the second shift and the third shift when needed. Where resource loading is as high as 44 on the second shift, the lack of experienced, competent supervision has to be addressed by the yard and to date has not been.
3. This refit has become very complex. There are many small tasks to be managed in a very narrow time frame and with the additional work for “grit” and cradle damages these tasks could increase two-fold. This adds additional requirements and pressures to management in the areas of scheduling, quality and quality control and with safety becoming the up most importance if the project is to be kept on schedule. In the documentation of May 4th, 2018 BSI did not address their management structure and responsibilities to the project. Who is responsible in quality management, scheduling management, safety management and what are their experience and qualifications?

4. Infrastructure details. BSI are continuing work on the repair and re-certification to their lift. Originally it was slated to be finished May 9th, 2018 however it was pushed further out in May on their latest schedule R0. BSI hasn’t provided any status and documentation to ensure confidence to the department that the lift will be completed and certified for the vessel docking for the scheduled finish date of July 27th, 2018.

It is far from unusual for shipyard costs and time required to significantly increase during refits. The preparation of a detailed description of the work required, and the development of a detailed project plan mitigates, but does not eliminate, these risks of cost escalation and delivery delays. The deficiencies that are evident from the historical documentation, and noted in this review makes it very difficult to predict with any certainty the remaining course of the refit. With these areas of concern not being addressed in a timely manner, it is evident that the refit schedule date will slip. Secondly, with no surety that the lift can be completed and certified, a major impact on project completion is also possible.

Best Regards,

[Signature]

President
April 25th, 2018

Mr. Darrell Hawkins
Marine Superintendent
TW Marine
Government of Newfoundland and Labrador

Dear Mr. Darrell Hawkins:

Seashore Maritime Services Limited has attempted to undertake an unbiased assessment of the work undertaken to date by Burry’s Shipyard Inc. and that assessment forms, and informs, the bulk of this review and technical assessment of the BSI schedule V27. This review takes into account issues associated with the conduct of the refit to date and attempts to extrapolate the information to comment on and critique the BSI Schedule V27.

During this review, not only was the past performance of the BSI Group on this refit evaluated, but issues with this latest schedule also undermine the viability of the vessel being delivered by June 18, 2018. The V27 schedule contains sufficient flaws that make it ineffectual for the management of this complex refit.

To begin with, an effective schedule should:

- reflect the contractual obligations of the contract;
- comprise of the entire scope of the project;
- comply with the level of detailed required;
- contain activity durations that are reasonable;
- have well defined activity relationships;
- be resource loaded;
- assign an owner to each task; and
- show a critical path that makes sense.

Should reflect the contractual obligations of the contract – The contract clearly states that the schedule should reflect all activities and change orders and any change in scope from the original to any late start of a task or any delay in a completion date should show the effect on the overall completion date. In some incidences, no effect on overall project completion date will occur and in others the schedule shows a delay that BSI can effectively manage by "optimizing" the task, add more resources, or accepting the delay and revising a new completing date. Many activities in this schedule show no dependencies and are not connected to major milestones such as docking, undocking, Harbour Acceptance Trials and Sea Acceptance Trials. Dependencies are logical links of activities to milestones. This V27 is not capable of monitoring, informing and managing delays to the project.

Should comprise of the entire scope of the project – The V27 Schedule does reflect the entire scope of contractual work.

Should comply with the level of details required – An effective schedule should have some level of detail that is manageable and reflects the quality level of the activity to be performed. Work breakdown structures define the task at hand, has necessary instructions to the worker to perform the task as required by the client, as required by regulatory entities and as required by the Yards internal 9001 Quality Management procedures. To date this has not been practiced by the Yard and the new V27 schedule does not reflect these requirements at the necessary level of detail.
Should contain activity durations that are reasonable - Durations should be based on quantities and resource availability (labor, equipment, material). It is not realistic to expect a 300% increase in productivity, which is what would be required to meet this new schedule provided by BSI. In the past, productivity compared to work approved and scheduled was well below that is required and it is unlikely that the proposed time frame of 8 weeks would be achieved.

Should have well defined activity relationships – The relationships in some cases between the activities in this schedule are defined under the summary levels where sub tasks are logically connected, however they do not finish with a relationship to a major milestone such as docking, undocking, HAT or SAT and do not meet the criteria as laid out in the contract. If these tasks have delayed completions, and are not logically related to a major milestone, they do not effectively update project completion dates.

Should be resource loaded - Tasks are resource loaded however some resources show an over-allocation in the resource graphs. Without enough resources there will be schedule delays and completion dates will not be met.

Should assign an owner to each task – For an effective schedule, the activities should be communicated to the workers via supervisors who are assigned to the activity. Nowhere in this schedule, or previous schedules, have activities been assigned to a person in charge to whom the activity/task can be communicated and where the client can monitor and communicate issues to the applicable persons involved. Activities in the schedule assigned to qualified responsible people can be further detailed into a work breakdown structure and better managed at the tradesperson level.

Should show a critical path that makes sense – The foundation of both critical path analysis and critical path method is the idea that you cannot start a task until a previous one has been finished. When you string these dependent tasks together from start to finish you get your critical path. Reviewing this critical path of events allows project managers to prioritize and allocate resources to get the most important tasks done and reschedule any lower priority jobs that may be clogging up your team’s bandwidth. This way, changes can be made to optimize work without delaying the end results. This V27 shows no critical path.

It is far from unusual for shipyard costs and time required to significantly increase during refits. The preparation of a detailed description of the work required, and the development of a detailed project plan mitigates, but does not eliminate, these risks of cost escalation and delivery delays. The deficiencies that are evident in the BSI schedule and lack of a plan, considered in combination with the company’s contract performance to date, makes it very difficult to predict with any certainty the remaining course of the refit.

Best Regards,

President

Enclosure: Review of Burry’s Shipyard Gallipoli Schedule V27
Potential copyright material

If you wish to obtain a copy please contact the ATIPP Office at (709) 729-7072 or atipoffice@gov.nl.ca.
Re: Ramea Health Services Committee Concerns about Ferry Service

Dear [Name]

Thank you for your correspondence on behalf of the Ramea Health Services Committee regarding the repairs being undertaken on the MV Gallipoli.

The safety of passengers and crew is of top priority for the Department of Transportation and Works. This is particularly important in cases where people have serious medical issues as noted in your correspondence. In order to expedite the repairs to the Gallipoli, this vessel is being moved to St. John’s.

Unfortunately, the Gallipoli is the only vessel with the sick bay set up that you mentioned. Please be assured that we will be working with contractors to get this vessel back into service as quickly as possible.

Thank you for sharing your concerns.

Sincerely,

STEVE CROCKER, MHA
Carbonear-Trinity-Bay de Verde
Minister

"Don't be safety blinded, be safety minded."

cc. Hon. Andrew Parsons, MHA Burgeo-La Poile
Please find attached a letter from the Ramea Health Services Committee with regard to the MV Gallipoli and our current ferry service.

Thanks,

>>> 

Ramea Health Services Committee  
Ramea, NL  
A0N 2J0  

April 13, 2018

Honourable Steve Crocker,  
Minister of Transportation and works  
Government of Newfoundland and Labrador  

Dear Minister Crocker,  

I write to you on behalf of the Ramea Health Services Committee.  
As you are no doubt aware, the ferry service at Ramea is a vital link in health care for our residents. With the MV Sound of Islay on the crossing, the situation for medical evacuation is much more challenging.

A patient on a stretcher is placed in a very small lounge causing great difficulty for accompanying medical personnel to attend to the patient. There is a strong possibility, on a regular crossing, there will be members of the general public in the next seat to the stretcher. There is absolutely no privacy, and staying in the emergency vehicle is not an option. This is not only dangerous but strictly prohibited.

The MV Gallipoli was purposely designed for Ramea with an onboard sickbay, including washroom, and total privacy.

We are respectfully requesting you, without further delay, to move the MV Gallipoli to St. John to complete its much prolonged refit so she can return to Ramea.

In the interim, we ask that a suitable vessel that would alleviate the above noted issue be sent to Ramea.

Thank You, in advance, for your anticipated positive response to this urgent matter.

Sincerely,

[redacted] Chairperson, Ramea Health Services Committee

c.c. Honourable Andrew Parsons,  
Minister of Justice and Public Safety, MHA
COR/2016/01593

Chairperson
Ramea Health Services Committee
Via Clyde Dominie

MAY 29 2018

Re: Ramea Health Services Committee Concerns about Ferry Service

Dear [Name],

Thank you for your correspondence on behalf of the Ramea Health Services Committee regarding the repairs being undertaken on the MV Gallipoli.

The safety of passengers and crew is of top priority for the Department of Transportation and Works. This is particularly important in cases where people have serious medical issues as noted in your correspondence. In order to expedite the repairs to the Gallipoli this vessel is being moved to St. John’s.

Unfortunately, the Gallipoli is the only vessel with the sick bay set up that you mentioned. Please be assured that we will are working with contractors to get this vessel back into service as quickly as possible.

Thank you for sharing your concerns.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

STEVE CROCKER, MHA
Carbonear-Trinity-Bay de Verde
Minister

"Don’t be safety blinded, be safety minded."

cc. Hon. Andrew Parsons, MHA Burgeo-La Poile
Good morning John,

I am writing to request a reconsideration of the decision to move the MV Gallipoli out of Clarenville thus cancelling the refit contract with Burry’s Shipyard.

Based on our previous meetings and telephone conversations, you have advised the reasons for cancelling the contract related to two issues:

1. Time to complete the remaining repairs
2. Uncertainty in recertification of the mechanical slipway.

Since making the decision to cancel the contract, I have learned that the revised schedule in completing the work at New Dock in St. John’s indicates the MV Gallipoli will not return to service until the end of October, 2018. If the existing contract with Burry’s Shipyard had been approved, the return to service date would be 12 week from re-start. If a re-start was approved for June 4, 2018, the anticipated completion date would be about August 24, 2018; more than two months ahead of the New Dock proposed schedule.

Yesterday, I was made aware that the mechanical slipway has achieved certification for a maximum tonnage of 650 tonne. I am told that a copy of the Letter of Certification from Acuren Inc. was submitted to the Department of Transportation and Works on Thursday. I have attached a copy of the letter for your reference.

In summary, given the two outstanding issues have been addressed, I again ask that a re-consideration of the decision to cancel the contract at Burry’s Shipyard.

I have complete confidence in this company to finish this contract as agreed.

Regards,

Colin

Colin Holloway, MHA
District of Terra Nova
Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Environment
Office of Climate Change and Fire and Emergency Services
Telephone: (709) 466-4165
Fax: (709) 466-4178
Toll Free: 1-800-514-9073
May 31st, 2018

Burry’s Shipyard
3 Wharf Road
Clarenville, NL, A6A 2B2
Attention [redacted]

Reference: 650 Ton Marine Haulout - Recertification

Dear Sir:

Per your recent request, this is to confirm that Acuren Group Inc. has reviewed the repairs completed to your marine haul out structure following an incident that occurred on February 12th, 2018. Our review included site visits to monitor repairs, and complete non-destructive testing on the following dates:

- May 2nd, 2018
- May 23rd, 2018
- May 26th, 2018
- May 31st, 2018

Based upon our completed site visits, non-destructive testing, and review of design sketches for completed repairs, the Marine Cradle Structure is capable of returning to service with a maximum loaded capacity of 650 tons, provided the load is equally distributed over a minimum of fifteen (15) transverse beams.

The certification shall be valid for a period of one year and expires on May 31st, 2019. Prior to recertification, the marine cradle shall be inspected as directed by the undersigned.

Should you have any further requirements, please contact the undersigned.

Best Regards,

[Signature]

P. Eng
Manager, NL/NS Operations
Eilanda Anderson, B. Comm, B.A. | Executive Assistant

To the Hon. Steve Crocker
Minister of Transportation and Works
MHA District of Cartier - Trinity - Bay de Verde
Government of Newfoundland & Labrador
5th Floor, West Block, Confederation Building
P.O. Box 8700, St. John's NL A1B 4J6

709-729-5884 | EilandaAnderson@gov.nl.ca

Confidentiality Warning: This message and any attachments are intended only for the use of the intended recipient(s), are confidential, and may be privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, retransmission, conversion to hard copy, copying, circulation or other use of this message and any attachments is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail, and delete this message and any attachments from your system. Thank you.

From: King, Tracy
Sent: Saturday, June 2, 2018 4:02 PM
To: Anderson, Eilanda <EilandaAnderson@gov.nl.ca>; Crocker, Steve <SteveCrocker@gov.nl.ca>; Scott, Brian <BrianScott@gov.nl.ca>
Subject: Fwd:

Gallipoli leaving Clarenville.

Tracy King
Deputy Minister
Transportation and Works
(709)729-3676

The safe way is the only way.

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Cuff, Greg" <GregCuff@gov.nl.ca>
Date: June 2, 2018 at 4:01:10 PM NDT
To: "King, Tracy" <TracyKing@gov.nl.ca>, "Baker, John (TW)" <JBaker@gov.nl.ca>
Good morning Minister Crocker;

Well, I complained to you when the Gallipoli was sent to Clarenville, and during that whole fiasco, so I thought it only fair that I compliment you on getting her now into the St. John's dockyard. Finally!

So now, I guess the actual work begins, and I refer back to what I said earlier about the Beaumont Hamel, which was in the drydock for nearly a year; the Gallipoli is now in the same predicament, right? Right. Sad.

Sad because of the money and time that has been wasted; I'm just glad that I don't run my household like that. And that's only one boat. But I guess it's ok for the department because it's only taxpayers money.

The owner of Burry's has been quoted as saying, that he "feels for the poor people of Ramea, having to do without the Gallipoli for all this time". Brought a smile to a lot of people, actually! Not because it's so funny, but because if he cared so much about the "poor people of Ramea", he could have seen to it that the Gallipoli was cared for in the proper way. He also refers to 100-150 workers at his shipyard, to my knowledge, there has never been that number of people working there.

So thank you for getting the Gallipoli in the right shipyard, please see that she is done in a proper time frame and made seaworthy in the shortest possible time. The only thing that would make me really happy right now is to see her sailing back into Ramea harbour!

Sincerely,

s. 40(1)
Thanks folks much appreciated

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 11, 2018, at 3:27 PM, King, Tracy <TracyKing@gov.nl.ca> wrote:

Minister,
We will make this change for this season until the Gallipoli returns to service.

Regards,
Tracy

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Parsons, Andrew
Sent: Friday, June 8, 2018 1:09 PM
To: Baker, John (TW) <JBaker@gov.nl.ca>
Cc: King, Tracy <TracyKing@gov.nl.ca>
Subject: Fwd: Schedule change.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Paul Green [REDACTED]
Date: June 6, 2018 at 10:26:50 AM NDT
To: "Parsons, Andrew" <AndrewParsons@gov.nl.ca>
Subject: Fwd: Schedule change.

--------- Forwarded message ---------

From: Paul Green [REDACTED]
Date: Wed, Jun 6, 2018 at 10:26 AM
Subject: Schedule change.
To: "Tremblett, Glenn" <GlennTremblett@gov.nl.ca>

Hi Glenn

This is a proposal from the Ramea Ferry Committee concerning a schedule change for Saturdays and Sundays.

We are asking if it would be possible to reinstate the middle run Departing Ramea 3:30 PM and Departing Burgeo at 5:00 PM for the period of time that the Gallipoli remains on drydock.
This would be the peak time of the year when tourists visit the Island and many of the walk on passengers like to return to Burgeo before the late run to have the light of day to travel the Burgeo Road.
This also would help with the traffic left behind from the first run out of Ramea because most times the Islay does not make return trips outside of the schedule.

Thank you for considering this request and hope to receive a positive response.
Paul
Secretary Ramea Ferry Committee
From: King, Tracy  
Sent: Wednesday, July 4, 2018 3:54 PM  
To: Crocker, Steve

The MV Gallipoli arrived at BSI in Clarenville on September 5, 2017. The following is a timeline of events since that date:
  o September 20, 2017: The vessel was placed on dry dock on Rail slipway.
  o November 14, 2017: Glenn Burry, President BSI, wrote to Minister Crocker outlining concerns that due to the different arrival date of the vessel (September 5) versus the date from BSI’s original bid (early August) financial overruns were occurring.
  o November 2017: Due to lack of schedule performance, TW requested BSI provide resources per shift.
  o November 14, 2017, TW retained Seashore Maritime Service to assist with the re-fit scheduling, resource planning and reviewing schedules submitted by BSI.
  o January 4, 2018: TW issued a change order which necessitated a re-docking of the vessel.
  o January 7, 2018: BSI provided a revised schedule showing an un-docking of February 6 and a re-docking date of February 10.
  o January 10, 2018: The un-docking and re-docking schedule was not approved until February 1, 2018 as BSI did not submit a docking plan for review until late January.
  o February 12, 2018: TW emailed BSI to notify of non-compliance and of their failure to meet schedule dates for the re-docking. BSI was provided five days to supply a revised schedule. In response, BSI unsuccessfully tried to re-dock the vessel, resulting in structural failure of the Railway Slip and stranding the vessel partially afloat on the slipway.
  o February 15, 2018: TW issued a stop work order on the BSI repair effort as it involved divers working under the failed lift. TW referred the issue to GNL’s Occupational Health and Safety (OHS) division, which issued a stop work order within one week. No work has been completed on the vessel since this date.
  o April 10, 2018: BSI supplied TW with a revised schedule.
  o April 13, 2018: TW’s Deputy Minister and managers from Marine Services met with BSI to discuss concerns with the revised schedule and advised the schedule was not acceptable to the department.
  o April 17, 2018: BSI supplied TW with another revised schedule which was reviewed by TW and Seashore Maritime Services.
  o April 25, 2018: Seashore Maritime Services advised BSI’s schedule “contains sufficient flaws that makes in ineffectual for management of this complex refit... The deficiencies that are evident in the BSI schedule and lack of a plan, considered in combination with the company’s contract performance to date, makes it very difficult to predict with any certainty the remaining course of the refit.”
  o April 26, 2018: TW’s Deputy Minister wrote BSI informing them the scheduling provisions of the contract have been substantially violated and provided five days to correct the defaults or TW will terminate the contract.
  o May 4, 2018: BSI provided a revised schedule which was sent to Seashore Maritime for assessment.
  o May 6, 2018: Seashore Maritime advised TW that it was “difficult to predict with any certainty the remaining course of the refit” and indicated “it is evident that the refit schedule date will slip...and with no surety that the lift can be completed and certified, a major impact on project completion is also possible.”
  o May 7, 2018: TW’s Deputy Minister informed BSI the schedule provided was not acceptable to the department and their contract was terminated.

Tracy King  
Deputy Minister  
Transportation and Works  
Government of Newfoundland and Labrador  
(709) 729-3676

The safe way is the only way.