

Subject: [Fwd: Re: Public Meeting - What the GVRD does NOT want you to know!!!]

Date: Sun, 29 Feb 2004 15:03:10 -0800

From: Brian Platts <bplatts@shaw.ca>

To: Corrie Kost <kost@triumf.ca>

Subject: Re: Public Meeting - What the GVRD does NOT want you to know!!!

Date: Sun, 29 Feb 2004 13:54:22 -0800

From: Maureen Bragg <m.bragg@shaw.ca>

To: andersen@sagafc.com, "FONVCA (E-mail)" <fonvca@fonvca.org>, John Fair <jfair@shaw.ca>, Bill Maurer <billm@millsoft.ca>, Barbara Murray <murrlaw@shaw.ca>, Dan Ellis <ellis7880@shaw.ca>

CC: Mayor and Council - DNV <Council@dnv.org>, Blueridge Community Association <bca@capilano.com>, gvrddcommunications@gvrdd.bc.ca, Alf Cockle <aacockle@telus.net>, Dave Peake <davepeake@shaw.ca>, "Don S. Williams" <dswill@shaw.ca>, Rick Greenwell <rickgreenwell@estart.com>

The GVRD attended two Lynn Valley Community Association General Meetings held in the last four months with maps and information regarding the shaft going in to Lynn Canyon Park. I think there will be some of our members attending this meeting. I have maps and reports if any one needs them and answers to various questions that were asked at these meetings. The LVCA will also be reconfirming requests of the membership re compensation etc for using park land. The GVRD in all fairness have sent out reams of information.

We have requested they re-habilitate everything disturbed except for the absolute minimum needed for ongoing maintenance and access, such that the visual impact from the road is near zero in the long term. Provide something substantial in the way of east side trail rehabilitation. Pr-build road crossings to minimize area cleared. This will cost but should be done.

These requests from the LVCA were originally sent by e-mail to Mayor and Council, copied to Susan Rogers, Richard Boulton, Paula Huber and Phil Chapman.

The Lynn Valley Community Association would appreciate support in these requests. They are not unreasonable taking into consideration that Lynn Canyon Park is a very special place and every effort must be taken in the protection of it. There should be substantial compensation made that can be put back in to the maintenance of the park.

Sincerely Maureen Bragg

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

From: "Eric Andersen" <andersen@sagafc.com>

To: "FONVCA (E-mail)" <fonvca@fonvca.org>; "John Fair" <jfair@shaw.ca>;

"Bill Maurer" <billm@millsoft.ca>; "Barbara Murray" <murrlaw@shaw.ca>;

"Maureen Bragg" <m.bragg@shaw.ca>; "Dan Ellis" <ellis7880@shaw.ca>

Cc: "Mayor and Council - DNV" <Council@dnv.org>; "Blueridge Community Association" <bca@capilano.com>; <gvrddcommunications@gvrdd.bc.ca>; "Alf

Cockle" <aacockle@telus.net>; "Dave Peake" <davepeake@shaw.ca>; "Don S.

Williams" <dswill@shaw.ca>; "Rick Greenwell" <rickgreenwell@estart.com>

Sent: Sunday, February 29, 2004 12:42 PM

Subject: Public Meeting - What the GVRD does NOT want you to know!!!

> Dear all,

>

>

> The communities around the Seymour Access Shaft (which would logically
> include: Lynn Valley, the Seymour Valley, Blueridge-Seymour Heights,
> Lynnmour & Inter-River and possibly Maplewood) would have received a
> notification in the mail a week or so ago announcing the following:

>

> 'Public Meeting

> Tunnels: Seymour Access Shaft

>

> Attend this meeting to learn more about the Seymour access shaft for the
> twin tunnels - part of the Seymour-Capilano Filtration Project underway on
> the North Shore. Construction of the shaft, to be located in Lynn Canyon
> Park in the District of North Vancouver (DNV), is expected to begin in
> summer 2004.

>
> Wednesday, March 3, 2004 6-7 PM Open House
> 7-8.30 PM Presentation and Questions
> Holiday Inn
> 700 Old Lillooet Road'

>
> No more factual information about what is on the agenda that night. The
> above announcement is so tame and boring that only the most devoted
> (fanatical?) people would attend such a meeting - and that is undoubtedly
> the intention.

>
> THE WORK REQUIRED TO CREATE THE SHAFTS IS BASICALLY A MINING OPERATION,
> THEREFORE ONE THAT GENERATES NOISE.

>
> The GVRD told the NVD that quote they wanted to ensure that any
> neighbourhoods that would be affected particularly by the noise of the
> proposed activity are consulted with unquote.

>
> I have attached below some correspondence that I had with a planner at the
> North Vancouver District in this respect.

>
> I do not know the decibel-level involved, and it could be that it is not a
> big issue, but the fact that the GVRD wants to 'consult' with the
> neighbouring communities implies that this might not be all that quiet.

>
> Instead of being upfront and advertize the true intentions of the meeting,
> the GVRD staff chose to come up with a meeting invitation that is so tame
> that nobody will show up. Truthfully the GVRD staff will be able to turn
> around to management and claim that only a few people attended and that
> the
> noise was really not a real concern for the community as a whole. This is
> plain and simple unethical and underhanded.

>
> This is a meeting that is VERY important particularly for the residents of
> Seymour Valley, Lynnmour & Inter-River and Lynn Valley.

> I hope that you will be able to spread the word to your respective
members.

> Unfortunately the meeting is the very same night as FONVCA will be meeting
> with the North Vancouver District Council, so a number of the community
> association executives may not be able to attend.

>
> Best regards,

>
>
> Eric G. Andersen
> Chair Blueridge Community Association
> 2589 Derbyshire Way
> North Vancouver, B.C.
> V7H 1P9
> 604 929 6948

>
>
>
>
> Eric,
> The emails are yours to do with as you wish. As mentioned in them, the
> noise issue will definitely be addressed at the meeting. If you have
> other
> specific issues you would like to see addressed at the meeting, you can
> forward them and we will convey them to the GVRD.

>
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Eric Andersen [<mailto:andersen@sagafc.com>]
> Sent: Thursday, February 26, 2004 11:52 AM
> Subject: RE: Your voice-mail msg
>
>
>
>
> Thanks for the work you have done for us (I fully appreciate that this is
> NOT your ad), but you have to admit that by NOT telling people what will
be
> discussed at the meeting (the 'MEAT' of the meeting!) you are not going to
> get the masses out.
> This ad, which I assume you have seen, is so tame that with basically
> nothing on the agenda, they will get very few people showing up.
> Result: 'we held a public meeting about the Seymour shaft - few people
> showed up - barely any concerns about the noise level - let's go ahead and
> proceed'.
> Quite frankly I find this unethical. No wonder there is to trust
> in the GVRD when they are using such underhanded tactics.
>
> If you don't have a problem with it, I would like to send the below
> messages to FONVCA (including the Seymour Valley Community Association)
and
> the BCA to inform them of the upcoming meeting. Somebody must stress what
> will be on the agenda, since the GVRD have tried to avoid the issue.
> Kindly let me know if this is acceptable to you.

> Rgds/Eric

>
> -----Original Message-----
>
> Sent: Thursday, February 26, 2004 11:31 AM
> To: andersen@sagafc.com
> Subject: RE: Your voice-mail msg
>
>
> Eric,
> I verified with the Planner on this project that this is indeed the ONE
> meeting. Apparently there is a noise report (and others) that will be
> discussed at the meeting, along with mitigative measures and other issues.
> Hope this is clear. Thanks

>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Eric Andersen [<mailto:andersen@sagafc.com>]
> Sent: Thursday, February 26, 2004 10:42 AM
> Subject: RE: Your voice-mail msg
>
>
> Thanks,
>
> I don't think that I made myself clear: when you advertize a meeting and
> billing it as 'tunnels: Seymour Access Shaft', but NO MENTION at all about
> what potential problems (such as noise) that this could/will result in, it
> is tantamount to false advertizing. By NOT highlighting the
> pitfalls/problems you are simply not going to get anybody out.
>
> Reading the GVRD notice I had a hard time believing that this is
advertizing
> a meeting that could potentially be controversial. If the residents out

> there *KNEW* (but they are *NOT* being told) that this could equal the noise
> of
> a mining operation, you would probably get many more people out. Instead
> you
> are advertizing a meeting with no 'meat' at all on the agenda. Who in
> their
> right mind, other than a possible few fanatics, would even attend such a
> meek affair, the way it's advertized?
> I know that you have nothing to do with it (the ad) and I am not blaming
> you, but you have to admit that this is not right. I sure hope you don't
> condone such cowardly approach!
> After the meeting the GVRD staff will turn around and report back to the
> head quarters that nobody objected to the noise (because it was never
> brought to the residents' attention!).
>
> If you are sure that this is the one and only meeting about the noise, I
> will inform our community association accordingly, stressing what was not
> stressed in the GVRD ad.
> You may want to give the other groups a heads-up, too, in all fairness.
>
> Thanks and rgds/Eric
>
>
>
>
> -----Original Message-----
> To: andersen@sagafc.com
> Subject: RE: Your voice-mail msg
>
>
> Eric,
>
> As for the GVRD question you raise, I think you're asking if the noise
> issue
> will be addressed at the advertised meeting. I would presume so, but
> you're
> right, this issue is not specifically mentioned in the ad. My
> understanding
> is that the work required to create the shafts is basically a mining
> operation, therefore one that generates noise. When we were asked to
> advise
> the GVRD who should be directly informed of the meeting (apart from the
> newspaper and general announcements) we thought of it, in part, as who
> might
> be affected by the byproducts (noise, activity, traffic) of the project.
> I
> imagine this will be one of many issues covered at the meeting. We'll find
> out on the 3rd, I guess.
>
> Thanks,
>
>
>
>