

**Subject: FW: Mountain View Park Open House Comments**

**Date:** Mon, 3 Nov 2003 12:25:29 -0800

**From:** "Ernie Crist" <ernie\_crist@dnv.org>

**To:** "Susan Rogers" <Susan\_Rogers@dnv.org>, "Mayor and Council - DNV" <Council@dnv.org>, "Senior Management Committee" <managecomm@dnv.org>

**CC:** "FONVCA (E-mail)" <fonvca@fonvca.org>, <mecraver@shaw.ca>

Ms Rogers:

I was taken aback by the recent statement that the strategic alternative re this issue will not be completed until the year 2005. This is not what we promised the people who are at the receiving end of what is essentially "a square peg in a round hole solution". As you can see from the e-mail below it does not go over well with many of the people affected and I happen to agree with them.

Ernie Crist

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

From: M E Craver \_\_\_\_\_]

Sent: November 3, 2003 12:06 PM

To: Mayor and Council - DNV

Cc: Senior Management Committee

Subject: Mountain View Park Open House Comments

Dear Mayor, Councillors, and Management:


For the past few months I have tried to build up a case for why mountain biking should not be allowed in Mountain View Park. At the open house two options, both which allowed mountain bike use through the park. I was told that only five? people from the community did not wish mountain bike access in the park. This is where the democratic process fails. I did my homework before making a decision. I sent my findings to the people involved in making the final decisions. Sometimes for the good of something we have to override the wishes of the people. Some mountain biker writes that if we cannot have the park, we should have it closed to anybody else. If it means protection and restoration of an environmentally sensitive natural wetland area---I could live with that. But we realize that it is not realistic. Natural wetlands are important ecosystems that are disappearing day by day due to destruction of habitat, and development. Wetlands harbour unique flora and fauna---like Mountain View Park's "species at risk" (due to habitat destruction) Red-Legged Frog. Other amphibians spotted have been the Northwestern salamander, the Long-toed salamander and unidentified newts. An environmental assessment should have been done before decisions were made to allow community input. Without proper information, how can people who do not do their homework make valid decisions? The mountain biking folk and others seem to think the Red-Legged Frog lives in the pond. It breeds and develops into a juvenile froglet which can take five to six months from egg stage to froglet. Salamanders and newts also breed in and around the pond. But the frog's habitat ranges up to 200-300 metres from its birthplace, hiding in vegetation, under logs and in old animal burrows. It's cousin in California is endangered and a red-listed species. One councillor has put a motion forth to save the Rockfish, but has shown no interest in perserving the crucial habitat of a "species at risk" in a small wetland park. Another councillor continues to paint mountain biking as a benign family sport. A ride in the park does not entail full body "armour", Motocross style bikes and helmets to match. Finally, this whole "democratic process" has just pitted neighbour against neighbour and for my efforts to show what is at stake in the park, have been harrassed verbally, etc. Had Parks and Environment done an environmental assessment before the community process, I feel the stakes would have been in favour of protection. Instead the whole process has been hijacked by the mountain biking community at large. This is the same group who suggested the "swamp" be paved over as a parking lot, in March 2003 open house. This is a common reason for wetlands disappearing all over the world. The ecosystem of a wetland is very important for preventing flooding due to the ecosystem's ability for immense water absorption---whereas the recent flooding in BC can be attributed to the development over such wetlands. In the park, dogs should also be on-leash also. My dog is just as happy on-leash in the park under full control, as she is off-leash in our fenced backyard. The whole east side of the Gravel Service Rd at Mtn. Hwy. is a wetland area due to the Thames Creek tributary. But for now we need to rethink where the future of Mountain View Park is heading. Please do the right thing for the park, pond, flora and fauna. It's not too late. The mountain bikers have plenty of places to ride and it is the right of Parks and Environment to determine where they ride,

not vice versa. The bikers should be thankful they are given any place in our mountains to turn into a giant amusement park at the expense and disturbance of the flora and fauna in there. Remember, the NSMBA brags in their "History of Fromme" how they came in the back door without permission or knowledge of the landowners and managers of our forests. They just took over. This history was written by Sharon Bader, the President of the NSMBA, herself. Also I wish to remind Parks and Environment again that two pilot projects failed as far back in 1996 regarding our park and mountain biking. Should failure be rewarded? If failure is rewarded then the kingdom is lost, and there is really nothing more I can do, is there? I would like to hear some honest feedback on these comments. Thank you in advance.

PS. If anybody wishes to view my "homework", please do not hesitate to contact me.

Monica Craver, speaking for Mountain View Park

---

 <a href="#">winmail.dat</a>	<b>Name:</b> winmail.dat <b>Type:</b> application/ms-tnef <b>Encoding:</b> base64
---	---