

Subject: FW: Notice of Motion;

Date: Mon, 17 Jun 2002 23:38:13 -0700

From: Ernie Crist <ernie_crist@dnv.org>

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

A MESSAGE FROM ERNIE CRIST:

The motion printed below was on the Council Agenda on June 17 but was not seconded. Subsequently we will not know the truth about this matter. Indeed I was not even allowed to explain it to the audience.

Ernie Crist

> *From: Ernie Crist*
> *Sent: Saturday, June 01, 2002 12:28 AM*
> *To: Nathalie Valdes*
> *Subject: Notice of Motion;*
>
>
> *Notice of Motion - Report - Councillor Crist.*
>
> *That the report " Lynn Valley Core Road Repairs - Financial Impact on*
> *Taxpayers" be put on a Regular Council Agenda for debate.*
>
> *Reason for Report:*
>
> *In March 2002 Councillor Crist submitted a motion for Council's*
> *consideration that Staff be requested to provide a detailed report*
> *listing the total expenses to District Taxpayers as a result of repeated*
> *road repairs such as openings and subsequent closures of roads to*
> *accommodate new development services requirements in and around the Lynn*
> *Valley Core construction areas.*
>
> *On March 25 -2002 Councillor Crist's motion (not included nor mentioned*
> *in the staff report) was considered and passed by Council. A report*
> *dated May 14-2002 in response to Councillor Crist's motion has now been*
> *submitted by Staff without mentioning Councillor Crist's original report.*
> *This Staff Report answers some of the questions but by no means all,*
> *while a number of relevant questions appear to have been dealt with*
> *without giving adequate detail. The staff report while answering some*
> *questions raises a whole number of additional key questions with*
> *considerable implications for the taxpayers.*
>
> *The report states for instance that "Over the past three years the major*
> *roads in the Lynn Valley Core area have seen a number of new developments*
> *and more are expected in the future". Developers are required to pay for*
> *the upgrading or installation of servicing required for their projects*
> *including the paving of service cuts. Some of these patches are*
> *substandard and are beginning to show minor settlements, and edge cracking*
> *is beginning to appear. Some of the patches are substandard and still*
> *under warranty and the responsible developer will be required to repair*
> *these patches at no cost to the District"*
>

- > *The question is what is the cost to the District of monitoring this on an ongoing basis and are those cost charged against the DCC's?. This is also true for the comment on page 2 of the staff report that "All work by the developers is inspected by a private engineering firm and District Construction inspectors?". And "Cuts and patches in road surfaces contribute to pavement deterioration as settlement and joints allow water to infiltrate and deteriorate the structural gravel base". Are all these costs charged against the DCC's?.*
- >
- > *The report goes on to say " The installation of servicing for these new developments has had a major impact on the condition of the pavement on these streets". An inspection of Mountain Highway, Lynn Valley Road and 27th Street revealed 111 service cuts in the pavement with a total area of 2,428 square meters. Of these cuts 68 area associated with developments. The remaining cuts are mostly repairs to the existing system undertaken by our Utilities department.*
- >
- > *Several key questions remain unanswered in the Staff report.*
- >
- > *1) What was the condition of all these roads before they were cut up repeatedly and what was the expected life span had they not been cut up to accommodate the large reconstruction of the area. This question is important in light of question number 5 listed below.*
- >
- > *2) What is the total cost to the District to accommodate the development in this area and what are the total returns to the District in the form DCC's to compensate such expenses.*
- >
- > *3) What is the exact amount of DCC's collected so far by the District and how much of that amount has been spent and where.*
- >
- > *4) What is meant by the statement "Some of the road repairs due to overlapping and staging of development and staging of development projects in the Lynn Valley area over the past few years some of these patches are beginning to show minor settlements, and edge cracking is beginning to appear".*
- >
- > *5) In light of question number 1 what is the meaning of the statement on Page 2 "These roads would be on the rehabilitation schedule even if the pavement cuts associated with the private developers had not occurred". Does this mean the developers are not paying for the full cost since they roads would have been rehabilitated in any case?*
- >
- > *6 What is the meaning of "Estimated cost of \$ 445,996 for three roads namely Brody site to Lynn Valley Road, Kirkstone Road to Mountain Highway and Lynn Valley Road to Mountain Highway in light of the fact that both roads are dissecting Mountain Highway?.*
- >
- > *7) What is the meaning and what are the implications to the District taxpayers of "Approval of the Inspector of Municipalities in 1998 that permitted the District to include the annual Street Reconstruction Program for use of Development Cost Charges provided that they paid no more then \$ 8.45 % of the cost or street reconstruction"?*
- >

