

**Subject: FW: Response to your letter re Billboards;**

**Date:** Tue, 2 Apr 2002 15:46:31 -0800

**From:** Ernie Crist <CristE@dnv.org>

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

I have omitted the name of the recipient of this letter until he has received it in the mail.

> *Dear Mr.....*

>

> *You may be unaware that the District is currently subsidizing the City of North Vancouver through the Recreation Commission.*

>

> *The Commission is in charge of playing fields as well as the recreation facilities per se. While the District has three facilities for every one in the City, the City contributes nothing for the wear and tear of those facilities i.e. they contribute nothing for the capital maintenance. Also, the District has a surplus of playing fields whereas the City has a severe shortage.*

>

> *The Rec. Commission does not distinguish between children in the City and those in the District. This may be a noble gesture but, considering that the District has used its Heritage Fund to the point of extinction, has the highest taxes in the region and has all but liquidated its Reserve Funds while the City is boasting of a Reserve Fund 5 times that of the District and a Heritage Fund several times that of the District and boasts so in public, it simply does not make sense to continue with that policy.*

>

> *Notwithstanding, any and all efforts on my part to rectify this anomaly have failed for purely political reasons. It appears that nobody wants to challenge this setup for fear of antagonizing people associated with the Sports Community and the Field Users who, I might mention, do not care who pays for what as long as they have the use of those facilities for the children. And while I am not blaming them, it is not good business you will agree.*

>

> *I mention all this to make you aware that it is not necessary to do any of the things you have suggested in your letter. Indeed all that is required is for the District to spend its money more wisely. As for the bridge, you may not be aware that it will do absolutely nothing to alleviate the traffic problem it is supposed to alleviate. For one thing the real problem is a lack of access to Second Narrows ( Ironworkers Memorial Bridge) rather than West or Northbound traffic from Seymour onto Highway 1.*

>

> *The new bridge across the Seymour will, in my opinion, do nothing to solve this problem since 13 out of 14 vehicles want to access Second Narrows or going West, link up with either Keith or Main, thus causing the congestion and the bottleneck. This is by the by, of course, but may be of interest to you just the same.*

>

> *All in all it is my contention that there is no need for an additional  
> bridge across the Seymour at that point. There is, however, a great need  
> to start thinking in different terms when it comes to traffic solutions in  
> the region including on the North Shore. I do agree with you that  
> Billboards are bad, in fact, very bad. As far as I am concerned, it shows  
> a very serious lack of judgment to say the least not to mention a further  
> concession to what some people call a collision with barbarism.*

>  
> *I hope that this will shed some light on the issue.*

>  
> *Yours truly,*

>  
> *Ernie Crist*

---

 <a href="#">Part 1.2</a>	<b>Type:</b> application/ms-tnef <b>Encoding:</b> base64
--	---