

Subject: FW:**Date:** Sun, 9 Dec 2001 23:17:14 -0800**From:** Ernie Crist <CristE@district.north-van.bc.ca>**To:** "FONVCA (E-mail)" <fonvca@fonvca.org>

A message from Ernie Crist;

I just wish to remind everybody again of the meeting tomorrow on the REC Commission Bylaw Review. What I think of it is repeated for your perusal below. Keep in mind that there are essentially three major issues.

One - at a time when we have no money to keep our streets clean not to speak of many other important items we are subsidizing the City in the recreation facility area. This has not been addressed in the report. This in itself makes the report to all intents worthless regardless of all the other points it makes.

Two - we also continue to subsidize the City via playing fields - that is not addressed either .

And three - the idea of giving the public more control based on "Parkgate" or similar to it which is crucial is only addressed to the extent that it is to blow more smoke into the face of the public. In summary, the proposals by management are nothing more than maintaining the status quo at the expense of the public. Yet these proposals will be the basis of the meeting tomorrow.

Thus the stage has already been set for another sellout by refusing to accept my motion on the subject for debate. Managements proposals are in my opinion an insult to the intelligence of the residents of the District of North Vancouver bordering on contempt. The only conclusion I can draw is that in their opinion it is safe since they believe that with the exception of a few nobody other than the sports users who don't give a hoot who pays for what will show up much less say anything.

The bottom line - another gigantic snow job at the expense of the District - strongly supported however by special interest groups and their spokesmen.

Ernie Crist

- > *This coming Monday following the regular meeting of Council there will be*
- > *a special public meeting on the North Vancouver Recreation Commission*
- > *Bylaw.*
- >
- > *For years I have been pressing for such a Review. This is a crucial issue.*
- > *In the meantime Staff have come forward with recommendations of their own*
- > *which, fail to address the main issues pertaining to this matter. While*
- > *on the surface it appears that there have been attempts to address some of*
- > *the issues, on the whole the Staff recommendations constitute nothing more*
- > *than an attempt to maintain the status quo - business as usual.*
- >
- > *1) The Rec. Commission is the vehicle through which the District is*
- > *heavily subsidizing the City both in terms of capital contribution to*
- > *facilities upkeep in the District and through the allocation of playing*
- > *fields of which there is a surplus in the District but a severe shortage*
- > *in the City. At a time when there is no money to keep our streets clean*
- > *and at a time when we are selling land to subsidize District operations,*
- > *can we afford to subsidize the City? Should there not be a referendum?*
- >
- > *2) The Rec Commission has become an unwieldy and out of control*
- > *bureaucracy. The solution, in my opinion, is to put all our Rec facilities*
- > *under greater public control. This can be achieved by adopting the*
- > *Parkgate model. Under this model the Rec Commission is effectively under*

> *the control of a locally elected neighborhood Recreation Council.*

>

> *3) I have also proposed that all grants to the Rec Commission cease except*

> *that Council will commit to extend grants to individual neighborhood Rec*

> *Councils for programs in line with the needs of such neighborhoods,*

> *including grants for capital projects and capital maintenance as the case*

> *may be. Another advantage of these Rec. Councils is that they may access*

> *private donations.*

>

> *None of these issues are addressed in the Managers proposals which have*

> *been taken as the guidepost for Monday's discussion. My own motion on this*

> *matter was not debated for lack of a seconder. This means that the*

> *Council, with the assistance of staff, wants to maintain the Status Quo.*

> *This is what is also desired by the sports users since they do not care*

> *who pays for what as long as they have their facilities, including the*

> *sport fields.*

>

> *Any and all attempts to address this issue have met with fierce*

> *resistance. It was part and parcel of the reason why the last Council was*

> *ousted. The Rec. Commission has become a powerful bureaucracy.*

>

> *I urge you, in the strongest possible terms, to avail yourself of this*

> *opportunity and to contribute to the debate this coming Monday.*

>

> *On the side - to insure that there would be no attempt to reform the Rec.*

> *Commission from the inside, I have once again been prevented from being*

> *appointed to that Commission as part of the 2002 appointments. Instead a*

> *Councillor who voted in favor of a 50% plus 4% increase in fees for*

> *Seniors within the span of one year was re-appointed.*

>

> *The incident is comical since the two positions to be filled were*

> *unchallenged until I put my name forward and then all in a sudden the*

> *particular Councilor put his name down virtually in the last second to*

> *prevent me from getting on the Commission. This trick has been repeated*

> *over and over again by the CCA endorsed Council. To divert attention from*

> *this the Mayor suggested I put my name on the GVRD list of committees*

> *which is controlled by Chair Puil who will only make appointments if the*

> *appointees have been endorsed in secret by the Mayor. Since the CCA*

> *elected its Council, all my requests for GVRD appointments in the past*

> *have been nixed. So much for the clumsy efforts to mislead.*

>

> *As for the PARKGATE model - it has proven to be extremely successful.*

> *This should not come as a surprise since the public has control more or*

> *less. It is no wonder also that when at the time of the Parkgate opening*

> *the people of Seymour demanded this scenario, there were strong attempts*

> *to derail it. Fortunately the people of East Seymour were steadfast in*

> *their demands.*

>

> *You have all received my previous e-mail on this matter. However, it is*

> *available by calling 604-990-2424 and ask for a copy of Councillor*

> *Crist's motion of Dec. 3-2001 on reforming the North Vancouver Rec.*

> *Commission "Special Meeting of Council -Recreation Commission Joint Bylaw*

> *Review". As to the motion itself, there was no seconder, subsequently*


> *the motion could not be explained much less debated for the public's*

> *benefit - another CCA endorsed Councils democratic success story.*

>

> *Ernie Crist*

>
>
>

	Part 1.2	Type: application/ms-tnef Encoding: base64
---	--------------------------	---