

ATIPPAReview

From: webservices-no-reply@gov.nl.ca
Sent: Thursday, August 20, 2026 1:47 PM
To: ATIPPAReview
Subject: New submission from Contact Us

Categories: Unprocessed Submission, Submission

Name

William Burke

Email

[REDACTED]

Message

In the name of fairness and transparency, the ATIPP office must hear both sides involved in an ATIPP request. If an ATIPP request is to be dismissed or disregarded it is important that the instigator be given a valid reason for denial. If the outcome of the request would affect the outcome of a court case, related public works work reports must be made available when and where requested. A municipality works for the taxpayers that support it and must be transparent when work or lack of work reports would support an individual or group that has suffered financial loss as a result of action or lack of action by a municipality. For example, when I started my law suit against the Town of GFW I asked for work reports and blue prints of the sanitary sewer system in my area of our town. I also asked for a copy of the Smoke Testing Results conducted during the summer of 2022 . Those Smoke Testing Results identified the deficiencies within the infrastructure of the Sanitary Sewer System of our town. The CAO of our town had no problem providing them at that time. Now that I am further along in my law suit against our town, I am being denied work reports that could possibly be of benefit to me in court. Is this a double standard.? Is the town trying to hide information that would benefit me .in court? Where is the transparency here? ATIPP requests demand transparency if the system is to operate as it should.

Regards, William Burke, a concerned citizen of the municipality of Grand Falls Windsor. &.You can reach me by phone at [REDACTED] or by e-mail: [REDACTED]

Sent from my iPad