

Subject: [Fwd: Notice of Motion - Report Councillor Crist]

Date: Wed, 15 May 2002 14:17:20 -0700

From: Brian Platts <brian_platts@telus.net>

To: Corrie Kost <kost@triumf.ca>

Subject: RE: Notice of Motion - Report Councillor Crist

Date: Tue, 14 May 2002 18:31:22 -0700

From: Ernie Crist <CristE@dnv.org>

To: "Elizabeth James" <cagebc@yahoo.com>, Nathalie Valdes <ValdesN@dnv.org>

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

Dear Ms James:

You asked me whether it is within the power of a municipality to control harmful emissions within municipal boundaries. Yes, it is, at least indirectly, because the municipalities of the region, including the District of North Vancouver, ARE the GVRD. It is a matter of political will and leadership.

There are also the UBCM and FCM which are potentially powerful vehicles to bring about change. But such a change is only possible if appropriate resolutions are submitted by a municipality. As you are aware this present District of North Vancouver Council has, in many instances, refused to allow such resolutions to go forward simply because the member putting forward the resolution was not endorsed by the CCA during the last election. The CCA, as you know, is a political party formed prior to the last election to represent the special interest of a group of citizens residing on the District's waterfront in Deep Cove.

This is not a question of endorsing such motions and/or agreeing with the resolutions themselves but simply to allow them to go forward so they may be considered by the UBCM and/or the FCM.

But to reiterate my original point; yes, municipalities can play a major role in defending the interests of citizens within municipal borders provided they have good and strong leadership. Municipalities share many common concerns and problems and, if they speak with a united voice, they can indeed be a powerful force in bringing about meaningful and people-oriented changes both at the Provincial as well as the Federal level.

Ernie

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

From: Elizabeth James [mailto:cagebc@yahoo.com]

Sent: Tuesday, May 14, 2002 3:14 PM

To: Ernie Crist; Nathalie Valdes

Cc: FONVCA (E-mail)

Subject: Re: Notice of Motion - Report Councillor Crist

14 May, 2002

Dear Clr. Crist:

Thank you for advising us of your intended action with respect to the Mohawk Oil application; we support your motion 100%. In fact, we would suggest that the District should also oppose the GVRD suggestion that companies be allowed to 'buy credits' from companies that are performing well, environmentally-speaking, so that they, themselves, can carry on polluting. This is just not acceptable.

Of course, the idea is not a new one, but is one that, apparently, has been embraced by the Chretien government and, left unchecked, will likely set back the whole idea of Kyoto by many years. Further, while we're on the subject, it was noted in this morning's issue of the Vancouver Sun, that ICBC is not performing the majority of on-the-road air checks on large trucks. Is there any way of enforcing

compliance within municipal boundaries?

We recognize that a large part of the problem, once again, is being caused by the fact that the Chretien Liberals have backed off the oil industry with respect to toughening up regulations on sulphur content of diesel fuels. While doing some of my TransLink 'research' in May of last year, I discovered the following, courtesy of Paul McKay of the Ottawa Citizen and others:

- It is the high sulphur content which causes most of the problems with diesel fuel;
- The fuel of one transport truck - a 'big-rig' - produces as much pollution as 150 automobiles;
- The pollution is of the most carcinogenic kind;
- There are 375,000 'big rigs' plying Canadian roads - equal to **56.25 million** automobiles;
- These rigs also produce **45 million tonnes** of carbon dioxide;
- 2,600 'big rigs' cross the Canadian border in BC every day - equal to 39,000 automobiles;

The above is less than half of the story; read on.....

- Canada Post uses the so-called 'dirty-diesel' in its vehicles;
- TransLink recently opted to use the dirty diesel in its buses in the name of cost-saving [did they factor in health-care costs we wonder?];
- The term 'big-rigs' does not take into account: tour buses, transit buses, dump-trucks, delivery vans, construction vehicles and, yes, some SUV's and heavy pick-up trucks;

Clr. Crist, the foregoing would be understandable if there were no other option available, no solution. Such is not the case. If the Federal Government, which has the overall authority to do so, were to enact legislation to reduce the sulphur content of fuels, it could take place virtually tomorrow. In fact, at last hearing, there already are two oil companies which produce the lower sulphur fuel and we urge that a boycott of the others be initiated.

Is cost the problem? No, it isn't, for only about 1-cent/litre would be added to the cost of diesel fuel. While I recognize constraints already apply to the trucking industry, our contention is that if Canadians want clean air and we believe this is so, then we must be prepared to pay for it in the form of slightly higher cost of goods. As it is, we seem to manage OK when the cost of gas goes up willy-nilly - with no apparent benefits in sight. So, I believe, would we absorb the costs of cleaner fuel.

The question to you then: can the District control, not just the Mohawk emissions, but also the type of fuel used by trucks, buses and other such vehicles plying their trade within the boundaries of our municipality?

In closing, at an upcoming meeting of Council, we plan to present a paper which will recommend a motion be considered that the five North Shore municipal councils determine the costs:benefits of withdrawing from GVRD, period. If that withdrawal could be achieved, then the five Staffs should look at the possibility of enlarging the Blue Bus system to cover the whole North Shore. Further, they could also look at the chances of a PPP for another Seabus.

Last but not least, upon withdrawal, the North Shore municipalities would not be required to subsidize still more SkyTrain which is of absolutely no use to us but, even more importantly, is so very expensive that it will virtually guarantee the North Shore will never get the transportation services it so badly needs; at least not in our lifetime.

Sincerely,

Liz James, Chair
Coalition for Accountability in Government Enterprises
Box 16090, 3017 Mountain Highway,
NORTH VANCOUVER, B.C.
V7J 2P2
[604] 988-2066

P.S. In case you did not receive a copy of my - lengthy - letter of a year ago on this topic, I am sending it on to you. If you already have it, you can consign the new one to the round filing cabinet!

Ernie Crist <CristE@dnv.org> wrote:

Motion - Report Councillor Crist

That the "Mohawk Lubricants Air Discharge Permit Amendment for Increased Emissions" be opposed by Council and that both staff and the District representative to the GVRD accordingly be instructed to provide further specific action in line with District goals of improving the quality of life and health for District residents .

Rationale:

Through a recent staff report it has come to light that "Mohawk" is seeking a permit from the GVRD to increase its present discharge of pollutants in its Maplewood plant in the District of North Vancouver. This flies in the face of District goals of improving the quality of life and health in the community.

In March 2002 the District of North Vancouver DNV Legislative Services received a copy of an application for Permit Amendment under the GVRD Air Quality Management Program for Mohawk Lubricants, located at 130 Forester St. North Vancouver.

According to the District Staff report the application calls for a

27 % in yearly increase in emission of particulates
27% increase in sulphur oxides
33 % increase in lead emissions.
27% increase in hydrogen Chloride.

The District Staff report recommends

- 1) that Mohawk prepare a detailed long term greenhouse gas management plan that addresses the following District concern over increased green house gas emissions and
- 2) a full public hearing, hosted by Mohawk, where the area residents can hear first hand what Mohawk's long term plans are for reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

Notwithstanding the above staff recommendations, this matter is of such a

serious nature that it requires far more than an appeal to Mohawk to have such a meeting. This is a matter for the District Council to address and involve itself directly and to provide leadership on terms suitable for the well being of the residents of the District.

This is not a matter of discussing conditions for increased emissions but a matter of preventing such an increase in emissions period. District residents including parents of children in the Maplewood school have in the past and repeatedly complained about foul air and its effect on local residents including children. This not a time to talk about increased emissions but a time to reverse this trend.

Most of all this is a time of providing strong leadership by District Council.

> ATTACHMENT part 2 application/ms-tnef

Do You Yahoo!?

Get personalised at [My Yahoo!](#).