

Subject: RE: Nexen

Date: Mon, 7 Mar 2005 17:54:46 -0800

From: "Ernie Crist" <ernie_crist@dnv.org>

To: "Bill Maurer" <billm@millsoft.ca>, "Mayor and Council - DNV" <Council@dnv.org>

CC: <fonvca@fonvca.org>, <Cagebc@yahoo.com>

Dear Mr. Maurer:

Politics determines everything so the saying goes and this is certainly true in the District of North Vancouver.

According to a report in the NEWS Councillor Nixon stated that the reason he did not second the motion for discussion on NEXEN is because it was inflammatory. The motion was not inflammatory of course since it merely called for a staff report. In light of this we must assume that Councillor Nixon's statement was politically motivated rather than factual. As for the other points you mentioned I agree.

Ernie Crist

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

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

Sent: Monday, March 07, 2005 5:32 PM

To: Mayor and Council - DNV

Subject: Nexen

I was disappointed that there was no discussion on Nexen in response to Councillor Crist's motion last week. Some residents in the Seymour Valley have had great concerns about this facility for many years. It was annoying to read in the NS News that the reason it wasn't discussed was something to do with the wording of the "Where As" clauses. It doesn't make council look good when the reason for not discussing serious issues is what is perceived to be a technicality. Can't you review each others motions before the night of the council meeting and/or ensure that there is a seconder? It seems like a huge waste of time (and tax dollars) to go through the process of writing, providing, and advertising notices of motion without ensuring that there is at least a seconder.

Back to Nexen: Given the significant development and population growth projected for the area in the Maplewood Local Plan the danger posed by this plant will become more and more of an issue. Given that a plant of this size would probably require many (5?) years of notice to be moved out of the area shouldn't serious discussions regarding this be going on now. In 5 years Maplewood is projected to have a significantly higher population than it has now. Shouldn't finance be planning for a smooth transition from the industrial tax base in the area to the commercial one? There's a lot of work to be done but it won't start without an initiative from council.

The article also mentions that they have to want to leave. The way you do that is to keep increasing their property taxes until it becomes non-viable for them to operate there. The reason you give them is the danger that their operation poses to the increased growth projected for the area, the increased value of the waterfront, and lost tax revenue due to factors which presently limit that growth.

Regards,

Bill Maurer

ps. As per the NS News article can we expect a notice of motion regarding this issue to be submitted by councillor Nixon in the near future?



[winmail.dat](#)

Name: winmail.dat
Type: application/ms-tnef
Encoding: base64