

Subject: RE: Fiduciary Responsibility?

Date: Sat, 22 Dec 2001 10:02:06 -0800

From: Ernie Crist <CristE@district.north-van.bc.ca>

To: "Phil Holland" <phil.holland@attglobal.net>, Ernie Crist <CristE@district.north-van.bc.ca>, "Willy Schuurman" <willy_schuurman@hotmail.com>, "Bill Maurer" <billm@millsoft.ca>

CC: "FONVCA (E-mail)" <fonvca@fonvca.org>

To all concerned:

We have now exchanged ideas about speed humps and various other topics at length. I will now wait until the results of the District survey comes in early in the new year as decided by Council last Monday.

In the meantime I wish you all the very best for the holiday season. I will keep you informed on issues as they come up, including the 2002 District Budget.

All the best

Sincerely

Ernie Crist

-----Original Message-----

From: Phil Holland [<mailto:phil.holland@attglobal.net>]

Sent: Saturday, December 22, 2001 2:13 AM

To: 'Ernie Crist'; 'Willy Schuurman'; 'Bill Maurer'

Cc: 'Mayor and Council - DNV'; 'FONVCA (E-mail)'; 'Directors Team'; 'Richard Zerr'; 'Gavin Joyce'; speedhumps@seymourvalley.ca

Subject: Fiduciary Responsibility?

Councilor Crist:

Mr. Crist, you stated that "the number one responsibility of elected officials is public safety".

In recognition of manpower and budget limitations you must prioritize your actions and address the highest safety concerns first. Unless there are studies showing Riverside Drive is the most dangerous street in the District, shouldn't you be worrying about those areas where District time and taxpayers money would be better spent?

Mr. Crist, you have a duty to the safety of the community as a whole but it seems you have chosen Riverside Drive as a traffic calming implementation area because the head of the Seymour Valley Community Association has asked for traffic calming. Before proceeding did you:

1. Determine if this the so call head of the SVCA did in fact represent the Seymour Valley Residents? How much due diligence did you do?
2. Determine by the use of studies that Riverside Drive should be a high priority for traffic calming?
3. Check the accident history to determine that Riverside is one of the Districts most dangerous collector roads?
4. Follow approved policy to start a traffic calming study?

Mr. Crist, your words and actions seem contradictory. It seems to me that you and our other elected officials are banning birthday candles to lower pollution and giving out sugar cubes to cure cancer.

Phil Holland

PS Please have District Staff bring the safety studies that show why Riverside is such a high priority for traffic calming to the next citizens group meeting.

-----Original Message-----

From: Ernie Crist [<mailto:CristE@district.north-van.bc.ca>]

Sent: December 21, 2001 7:47 PM

To: 'Willy Schuurman'; Bill Maurer; Ernie Crist

Cc: Mayor and Council - DNV; FONVCA (E-mail); Directors Team; Richard Zerr; Gavin Joyce; speedhumps@seymourvalley.ca

Subject: RE: rule of the automobile is being challenged

Hello:

Take it easy. I am a car driver myself - I am not a fanatic neither am I against cars which are here to stay and neither am I against the people on Riverside or any other Drive who have two or even three cars etc. Of course they need cars what else are they going to do. This is hardly the issue. What I did say is that our automobile mentality is on a collision course with barbarism. I also said that the people are increasingly challenging the supremacy of the automobile in favor of livability. They are reclaiming their neighborhoods. They want peace and quiet and good air.

What I also said is that our priorities are all haywire. We spend billions to accommodate the automobile but we don't have enough money to treat our storm waters. Our marine life is being poisoned while our cancer wards are

bursting at the seams. We are yelling for more concrete hoping that we will get to work faster when in fact the opposite is true. We are demanding more money for bridges not realizing that without the complimentary infrastructure on both sides of the inlet costing hundreds of millions of dollars such an effort is unproductive. It has not sunk in yet that the more concrete, the more traffic and the more traffic the greater the problem. We don't even have enough money to build sidewalks but in our arrogance, we assume that the people of Vancouver will spend hundreds of millions of dollars and say yes to more pollution, more noise and more traffic jams just to keep us happy. Well they will not.

Riverside Drive is just a minute example of our car culture. We want to zoom at 60, 70 and 80 km to the next bottleneck, and then wait in the lineup and inhale fumes. We have been asked by our neighbors to slow down for a few seconds on our own street but instead of joining to address the problem, real or perceived, we vow revenge. I think there is something wrong here.

I look forward to seeing how the Riverside neighborhood will solve this problem, whether it will be on the basis of I'm alright Jack or something a little more neighborly.

Ernie Crist

[Ernie Crist] -----Original Message-----

From: Willy Schuurman [mailto:willy_schuurman@hotmail.com]

Sent: Friday, December 21, 2001 3:19 PM

To: Bill Maurer; Ernie Crist

Cc: Mayor and Council - DNV; FONVCA (E-mail); Directors Team; Richard Zerr; Gavin Joyce; speedhumps@seymourvalley.ca

Subject: rule of the automobile is being challenged

Councilor Crist said: Still, the people are trying to make their neighborhoods more livable.The unrestricted rule of the automobile is being challenged.

With time, eventually everyone's position comes out. I won't apologize for becoming a two car family after moving into this neighbourhood. I moved here from East Vancouver where I used a bicycle, my feet and public transit frequently. I've logged tens of thousands of miles on a bike as a primary mode of transportation for about 8 years. I moved to this neighbourhood for the same reason that many of the people who want speed humps did. One of the only negative aspects of living here is I knew I'd have to rely more on the automobile but that's the price you pay when moving to an isolated community. This is not the city we live in.

Instead of providing negative incentives against car drivers, governments should provided appealing alternatives. I presume the district developed this remote corridor and put in about 300 homes for a good reason. You can't now make us to be the bad guys just because we have to use the auto to get to schools, shops, community centre etc.

This challenge to automobiles that you are making is the same challenge I'm feeling from my neighbours who imposed speed humps on me. I sense that they are telling me that I should not trespass with my car through their neighbourhood. Sorry, but I'm not buying it. I am not the bad guy and Mr. Crist nor the current SVCA nor the fanatical group called "the bike people" will not successfully pin that label on me. I will continue to defend my right to drive an automobile in a safe manner down Riverside drive unimpeded. And I think this is the crux of the issue. People with the "lets take back our community" have wrapped themself in the safety issue for too long, but the issue goes way deeper. I'm glad its finally coming out.

Thank you.

Willy Schuurman

- Supporter of flat roads

- Guilt free user of the automobile.

----- Original Message -----

-----Original Message-----

From: Ernie Crist [<mailto:CristE@district.north-van.bc.ca>]

Sent: Thursday, December 20, 2001 7:55 PM

To: 'Bill Maurer'

Cc: Mayor and Council - DNV; FONVCA (E-mail); Directors Team; Richard Zerr;

Gavin Joyce

Subject: RE: Comments on FONVCA site

Bill:

I am trying to get you involved as I think this is the only solution to this and many other problems. If you take over THE SVCA YOU WILL PROBABLY AGREE TO LEAVE THE HUMPS BUT WITH SOME MODIFICATIONS I VENTURE TO SAY. Traffic calming measures are nothing new in the world and they are spreading including in North Vancouver. Yes I do blame the CCA endorsed District Council for much of the present debacle. Not to do things right has become a culture in the District. This includes the Lynn Valley Core Plan where they promised a Pedestrian Oriented Town Center and delivered a regional car mall. What they did not understand is that there is a difference and that Pedestrian Oriented Town Centers are the wave of the future and that wherever they exist they are more successful than Car malls. In any case why promise something and then do the opposite. That was politics pure and simple. Our staff became the willing pawns in this conspiracy against the public.

Still, the people are trying to make their neighborhoods more livable. It is unstoppable. The unrestricted rule of the automobile is being challenged. It is a slow process but it is coming. The hegemony of the automobile is giving way to pedestrians. It is a trend Bill. Though exceedingly slow on the uptake politicians reflect this trend. Though here to stay, the automobile is becoming the very opposite of what it started out to be. It has become a "hostile" and an expression of the self centered alienation of society. Imagine for a minute everybody in your neighborhood getting excited because people are asking to slow down a bit.

The lady who was expecting and spoke last Monday night as well as Mrs. Smith were in the minority but they spoke with the authority of a hundred because history is on their side. How Bill are you going to argue with a woman with children pleading for more safety? Also keep in mind that the original idea for the speed humps came from the SVCA. We installed them only after our survey indicated majority (slight) approval. It was not my idea and I did not force it on you. In fact three years ago I voted against it because there had been no survey done.

Ernie

-----Original Message-----

From: Bill Maurer [<mailto:billm@millsoft.ca>]

Sent: Wednesday, December 19, 2001 8:54 PM

To: Ernie Crist

Cc: speedhumps@seymourvalley.ca

Subject: Comments on FONVCA site

I was reviewing some of your responses on the FONVCA site regarding the Riverside Speed Humps and I've noticed a common theme. Whenever someone expresses the majority "remove" interest you point to the minority "keep" residents as the problem.

We're already operating like a community association should operate. Everyone's included in our mailouts and all viewpoints are being expressed in meetings. We even have over-representation of the minority viewpoint in our meetings. Don't you understand that it is okay to have differences of opinion on issues? That doesn't make one side or the other the bad side and certainly doesn't mean our community is divided.


The real problem is that council is oppressing the majority interest in its rulings. This is undemocratic and interference. This makes council the bad guy, not our residents. I am going to begin pointing this out whenever I see these kind of divisive responses coming from councillors. Our web site now also reflects this.

The problem is council, not our community. The issue of the speed humps has been resolved by our community and we are demanding that they be taken out. Council, including you, are not listening. We have not achieved the impossible state of unanimity but we have an incredibly strong consensus. The perceived problem of speed will be dealt with by other means.

Our problem is council interfering with internal issues which it cannot relate to. And believe me, if you're not driving over speed humps getting home every day then you can't relate to the problem.

Councillors need to start facing the residents they're oppressing by coming to advisory meetings or holding community meetings of their own if they insist on meddling in our affairs like this. You're all working in a bubble right now and using staff to shield you from personal involvement.

Bill

	Part 1.2	<p>Type: application/ms-tnef Encoding: base64 Download Status: Not downloaded with message</p>
---	--------------------------	---