

Subject: Re: Bus Depot issue

Date: Tue, 18 Oct 2005 00:54:49 -0700

From: Lyle Craver <lcraver@shaw.ca>

To: Ernie Crist <ernie_crist@dnv.org>, Elizabeth James <cagebc@yahoo.com>, Corrie Kost <corrie@kost.ca>

CC: Cathy Adams <cathyadams@canada.com>, DNVCouncil <DNVCOUNCIL@dnv.org>, Senior Management Committee <managecomm@dnv.org>, cagebc@yahoo.com, hunterjohn@telus.net, pairfofknees@telus.net, bplatts@shaw.ca, fonvca@fonvca.org

Dear Councillor Crist,

Are you SERIOUSLY suggesting (in your third paragraph) that Translink has suggested that they may decide to use less than fully fuel efficient vehicles in their fleet which serves the North Shore if we fail to approve their chosen site? I was under the impression that Translink decides which type of bus is used on which route depends on all kinds of factors concerning the route. For instance the #210 bus which goes by my house typically uses buses with stronger than average engines to get up the Hoskins and Mountain Highway hills.

Is this allegation being made on anything Translink has said or is this merely speculation?

As for your argument that it takes 40 cars to achieve the same commuter efficiency as a single bus that only applies if there are 40 carloads of people wanting to go to the same destination as the bus. Lots of people would take Transit that don't currently if the combination of routes and schedules worked better for them. I drive because Translink routes DON'T meet my needs - in my previous home I used transit all the time.

Councillor Nixon has suggested some of the smaller routes be served by mini-buses as is being experimented with in the Seymour area. Having seen this type of bus commonly used in Pickering, ON (where I lived in the late 80s) and in Hong Kong I'd say that's an experiment we should be encouraging to get both the maximum possible flexibility and efficiency out of the system.

But again - I am deeply disturbed at the implication that Translink might "punish" us by serving us with less than optimal vehicles for the particular route simply because they don't like a decision we may or may not take concerning their depot.

I truly hope I have misunderstood your comments.

Best regards, Lyle Craver

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

From: [Ernie Crist](#)

To: [Lyle Craver](#) ; [Elizabeth James](#) ; [Corrie Kost](#)

Cc: [Cathy Adams](#) ; [DNVCouncil](#) ; [Senior Management Committee](#) ; [cagebc@yahoo.com](#) ; [hunterjohn@telus.net](#) ; [pairfofknees@telus.net](#) ; [bplatts@shaw.ca](#) ; [fonvca@fonvca.org](#)

Sent: Monday, October 17, 2005 4:10 PM

Subject: RE: Bus Depot issue

A MESSAGE FROM ERNIE CRIST;

The argument presented in the name of logic, if I understand it correctly goes something like this - Buses pollute more than automobiles since they are not only bigger but also because they use diesel. This situation is exacerbated when buses are held up in the traffic. If I am correct so far, I have the following comments to make. Buses are indeed bigger than automobiles because they carry up to 100 people whereas the automobile carries only a fraction of that number. Indeed most of the time only one person.

As I understand it, a bus pollutes twice or three times as much as a car which translates into a net clean air benefit of up to SEVERAL THOUSAND %. As for road space - a Bus takes the size of two cars but it takes 40 cars to achieve the same commuter efficiency as one bus.

One of the reasons for the depot is that we will get more modern buses which pollute much less than the old buses we will continue to have if we do not go for this depot.

The third point of logic is the alleged traffic congestion of the effected area. The whole idea of buses is to encourage people to get out of their cars and use buses thus freeing up space presently taken up by cars. The idling and stalled trucks which are being used as an argument for polluting the AIR do so mainly because they are the victims of the cars which are on the road because of the poor public transportation service.

The bottom line is that cars are the single most inefficient form of transportation. They are the main culprits of all the other transportation problems in the urban area. It goes without saying that cars are here to stay and many people simply need cars to get around but the whole idea of public transportation to reduce that number by encouraging people to use public transportation.

The more efficient this public transportation the more people will use it. This is my logic and it is the peoples logic and they will never go against this logic. And there are people who cannot and do not accept this logic which plus poor political leadership is the reason why we have the backward transportation system we have as compared to other cities in the world. As for noise, here again, modern buses have far less impact on noise levels than the old buses we will get if we do not accept this location.

The argument that buses are more dangerous to our health than cars reminds me of the argument that it is the secondary smoke which is deadly to our health rather than the smoking.

As to whether this is the right place? No, of course not. There is no right place because neither the public nor the North Shore politicians will ever manage to find a right place. They haven't for the last 20 years. The people on the North Shore do not elect politicians who would find a right place.

Allow me to summarise my logic. The whole idea of public transportation is to encourage people to use public transportation as opposed to using single vehicle occupant

cars. Some people must use cars for various reasons but there are many who would use public transportation if it were cheap, efficient and convenient and this is why we need a bus depot, so we can accommodate such a system. Technology will deal with both pollution and noise ever more effectively - I wish some of the opponents of this concept would travel to Europe, which is light years ahead of us, ditto with pouring raw sewage into the ocean, streams and rivers

Cheers,

Ernie Crist