

counted again. When he gets on SkyTrain in Vancouver he's counted again, and when he hops on a bus to go to somewhere in Delta, he's counted again.....That's how TransLink accumulates ridership numbers! They actually admitted that. And that's how they can dream up pie-in-the-sky projections of 100,000/riders/day for RAV....That's how come they think they can outdo the 20-year old, 4-branch, 97,000/passengers/day Blue Line system in Chicago. Four lines that feed two of the busiest airports in the world, from a population 4-5 times that of GVRD. TransLink was wrong on the Millennium Line and they're wrong today - and we get to pay for it.....all of us.....through the nose.

To end that portion of my rant....WV Clr. Victor Durman, an investment counsellor by trade and Chair of GVRD Finance Committee by appointment said, among many things, "Trouble is, you can never believe anything TransLink tells you," and, "The problem is that TransLink never produces a report based on the same set of assumptions," or, "How can they [TransLink/RAVCO] expect GVRD to make a proper decision on this when even the Chair of its Finance Committee is not allowed to see the [critical] Price Waterhouse report? How can we decide on anything when half the financial information is missing?" So why did they suddenly come around to ask Mayor Sharp to change her vote? It couldn't possibly be a trade-off for WV to get the 4-lane tunnel at Eagle Ridge, now could it? Some people will do anything to get what they want - so long as it's us who pay the bills.

2. The process has never been above-board but now I am prepared to go out on a limb to say that it reached a stage where it is actually illegal. No other organization - not even the District - would get away with returning the same issue to the table time after time. Mayor Sharp's recently proposed "new motion" was already put to the Board on June 18th - by Burnaby Mayor Corrigan. It was voted down - I believe unanimously. How can it be returned to the table only 12 days later? Nothing's changed about the project, nothing that is except that a great deal of vested interests have panicked and leaned all over our "elected, accountable" politicians. How many times do we have to pay their \$100/mtg. stipend, before they give the vested interests the answer they want? The cock crows three times?
3. The so-called "bidding process" never was. Surrey Mayor, TransLink Board Chair McCallum, has talked of the Richmond-Airport-Vancouver project as "SkyTrain" for over two years now. No other company makes a "SkyTrain" - only Bombardier. Bombardier owns around 25% of SNC-Lavalin. There are not 3 companies on the short-list; Siemens doesn't stand a chance and the other two are joined at the hip. By the way, one other Durman comment: "A company making this kind of investment [the \$300 million 'private' share of RAV] would expect somewhere between 10-12% ROI [return on investment]." Therefore, if it was to tap its normal funding sources, TransLink could obtain project capital at considerably less interest. The difference, of course, would be that it would have to open up its books and the project business plan to the lender and, therefore, to us. That would never do. Firstly, because the data would not support that large a loan and secondly, because we cannot be allowed to know the details, else there would be a hue and cry from citizens.

The only time a P.3 deal is good for taxpayers, is when the private partner accepts the risk....and that's not going to happen. Under the RAV proposal the company says it will take the risk but, even if Bombardier shareholders would agree to such a thing, every single cent of the risk will be returned for payback by taxpayers - otherwise the company could not stay in business.....That's not a P.3.

4. The so-called "public consultation" process never was, either. Visits to municipal councils by RAVCO and/or TransLink were no more than Powerpoint sessions to tell elected officials how things were going to be. There was little, if any, serious modification of their plans to take into account municipal concerns - certainly not any North Shore concerns. As for public meetings - yes, members of the public were allowed to comment and ask questions. But can anyone point to any changes that resulted?
5. In the past, when citizens have accused GVRD and TransLink members of being "unelected and unaccountable" the cry has gone up, "We are elected; we were elected in November XXXX. The regional positions are just part of our committee work." OK, so if we concede the argument and they are just doing committee work for which they were elected, then they must still be working under the Local Government Act/Community Charter.

As you know, Clr. Crist, **the LGA/CC requires that citizens be given a counter-petition or referendum opportunity on any project, liability for which commits taxpayers beyond five years. This is not an option; it is a legal responsibility to citizens which has not been met by TransLink - on any of its major capital projects. The legislation also says that the penalty for contravening this section of the legislation is that citizens can hold the decision-makers personally liable and that we can demand their resignation and bar them from holding office for three years.**

So either they are elected/accountable and must allow everyone required to pay the bills an opportunity to decline; or they are not. They can't have it both ways.

In summary, **CAGE is in favour of public transit** projects - but only if we are told the truth, if due process is followed and if the money is being spent to best effect. None of this applies to RAV. SkyTrain cannot do the job required, special interests don't give a darn about who pays the bill - just so long as they get to develop and make their profits.

Have your correspondents made themselves aware as to who has property interests at strategic points down Cambie Street? And what clout they have over RAV decisions? Do they know that the NV Camber of Commerce committed its members to joining the 'Yes' side - without their permission?

Does anyone know that over 4 Kms. of the line will be on YVR - private company - land which, by TransLink's own calculations, means the capital contribution by the Airport falls short of its rightful obligation? The CEO of YVR said on BCTV last night, "RAV is good for the Airport." You bet it is. More to the point, is it good for taxpayers?

Do your correspondents realize that Deputy to the Premier, Ken Dobell, has been the person applying much of the artificial deadline (a) to pressure the project to the starting gate; and, (b) to avoid time for uncomfortable questions - even though the Premier said on many occasions that RAV was not necessary for the Olympics? If anyone is curious about other disturbing connections, she might want to read Letters to the Editor in today's Province.

From the perspective of North Shore taxpayers only, the very worst thing about all of this is that, if RAV is allowed to go ahead, there will be none of our money left over for projects that are capable of getting people out of their cars.....That is, unless we want to pay double, triple or quadruple the amount we have been given to date.

It frustrates me beyond measure that TransLink and the mainstream media will not give the people the truth. That said, if I can win the lottery, or find a sugar daddy/mummy in the next few days, TransLink will find itself in court next week, not around the voting table that passes for democracy in this country.

As Mayor Corrigan said, when asked if he would change his vote, "A bad deal is a bad deal. And RAV is a bad deal." He's right and for many more reasons than P3's and financials. So how will he vote on the 30th? Better not hold your breath, it's impossible to predict.

Sincerely,
Liz James
[604] 988-2066

Ernie Crist <ernie_crist@dnv.org> wrote:

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

From: Ernie Crist

Sent: June 23, 2004 10:58 PM

To: 'Barbara Sharp (Mayor)'; Trudy Horne; Mayor and Council - DNV

Subject: RE: RAV - representation on Translink for the DISTRICT of North Vancouver

Dear Ms Horne:

Mayor Sharpe was following the instructions of the North Shore Councils when she voted against RAV. Although I am a strong supporter of public transportation and public transit in general I could not in good faith support this project. The reasons to urge defeat of RAV were based on the fact that although North Shore residents will pay several hundred millions of dollars towards this project they will receive little to nothing in return.

The plain truth is that the North Shore has been virtually ignored in this long term plan.

There is no provision for a Rapid Transit extension to the North Shore in either the 2010 nor even in the 2021 plan. There is no provision for an additional Sea Bus crossing from Deep Cove and Maplewood to Vancouver nor from Ambleside to Vancouver as was suggested. Indeed there is not even a provision for an additional Sea Bus from the existing crossing at the foot of Lonsdale until 2009. The suggested expansion of the bus fleet serving the North Shore is minimal at best and given the record of Translink it is unlikely that Translink would even keep this promise.

There are not even any major future traffic corridors indicated in the plan which are so essential for long term community planning. These are the reasons why Mayor Sharpe was urged to vote against the plan.

There were many public meetings held on the North Shore when this issue was debated including in the District Hall but nobody spoke in favor of RAV as far as I can remember but there were many people who spoke against it.

I hope this will shed some light on the matter.

Yours truly,

Ernie Crist

--Original Message-----

From: Barbara Sharp (Mayor) [mailto:BSharp@cnv.org]
Sent: June 23, 2004 7:19 PM
To: Trudy Horne; Mayor and Council - DNV
Subject: RE: RAV - representation on Translink for the DISTRICT of North Vancouver

[Mayor Sharp is to represent the region on the Translink Board.](#)

[She has a legal, fiduciary responsibility.](#)

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

From: Trudy Horne [mailto:trudy_horne@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, June 23, 2004 7:01 PM
To: council@dnv.org
Cc: Barbara Sharp (Mayor)
Subject: RAV - representation on Translink for the DISTRICT of North Vancouver

Mr. Mayor and Councillors:

I assume Mayor Sharp is currently meant to represent the entire North Shore on the Translink Board. How then is it that subsequent to a poll showing greater than 70% support for RAV on the North Shore, Mayor Sharp chose to vote against it? Since I cannot vote against her in an election, nor can I actively campaign against her, this is clearly a case of taxation without representation. I hope that I, along with the majority of North Van District residents, can rely upon each of you to actively (and quickly) pursue a change of vote on the part of Mayor Sharp.

I will not take up more of your time by elaborating on the need for and the benefits of this system, since I am sure you are just as familiar with the issues as am I. The strong support on the North Shore for this project should be reason enough for our council to push for the timely completion of RAV. Thank you for your attention to this important issue.

Trudy Horne
3966 Brockton Place
North Vancouver V7G 2L7

(604)924-1671

Trudy_Horne@hotmail.com

Share a single photo or an entire slide show right inside your e-mail [With MSN Premium](#)
Get 2 Months FREE*

This Email may contain confidential and/or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient or have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately and destroy this e-mail. Any unauthorized copying, disclosure or distribution of the information contained in this e-mail is prohibited.

[ALL-NEW Yahoo! Messenger](#) - *sooooo many all-new ways to express yourself*