

Subject: FW: Notice of Motion-Ernie Crist-Special meet of Council by no later than Dec. 15-2001 with provision for public input re Rec. Comm. Joint Bylaw review.

Date: Mon, 12 Nov 2001 10:37:08 -0800

From: Ernie Crist <CristE@district.north-van.bc.ca>

To: Ernie Crist <CristE@district.north-van.bc.ca>

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

> -----Original Message-----

> **From:** Ernie Crist

> **Sent:** Monday, November 12, 2001 10:35 AM

> **To:** Nathalie Valdes

> **Subject:** Notice of Motion-Ernie Crist-Special meet of Council by no
> later than Dec. 15-2001 with provision for public input re Rec. Comm.

> Joint Bylaw review.

>

>

> **Motion: Report Councillor Crist**

>

> That following the North Vancouver Recreation Commission Joint Bylaw
> Review meeting held by the City and the District Councils on Nov 6,
> 2001, District Council facilitate a special meeting in the District
> Council chambers with provisions for public input to

>

> 1) discuss the implications of the "Joint Bylaw Review" including
> discussion of a possible reorganization of the North Vancouver Rec.
> Commission administration

>

> 2) provide an opportunity for the public to provide input and respond to
> this report

>

> 3) provide strategic directions pertaining to the future role of the North
> Vancouver Recreation Commission to more effectively meet its role in
> the provision of public preventive health care and recreation, while at
> the same time providing District Council, the public and the neighborhoods
> in which these facilities are located with a greater degree of control
> over the management and programming and

>

> 4) clarify the all important question of the present annual subsidy of
> close to 5 million dollars by the District to the Rec. Commission

>

> 6) to discuss the subsidies extended by the District to the City in the
> form of meeting playing field demands by the City, as well as

>

> 5) to address the all important question of adequate funding for the
> maintenance and the financing of new capital projects and that

>

> 6) this meeting take place by no later than Dec. 15, 2001

>

> **Rationale:**

>

> The North Vancouver Recreation Commission is a joint service facility
> operator established by the City and the District to provide recreational
> services to residents of both the City and the District of North
> Vancouver. Despite its success in the provision of such services and
> programming, the Rec. Commission has come under mounting criticism for a
> whole number of reasons.

>

> It is alleged that the Rec. Commission, notwithstanding the volume and
> quality of its programs, is effectively out of control, that it is top
> heavy in administration personnel, that it is inefficient in its use of
> funding provided by both Councils, that it has become an unwieldy empire
> expanding its role into areas which have little or nothing to do with

> recreation per se, that it has become a major political entity bringing
> into question its conduct during the last municipal election, that its
> financial acumen, as demonstrated during budget times, is severely
> lacking, that it is fiscally inconsistent and unbusinesslike, that it is
> more and more distancing itself from its mandate of providing health and
> recreation programs to achieve maximum benefits for the maximum number of
> people at minimum cost, that, at the expense of its regular clientele, it
> is accommodating, on a growing scale, private clubs and private programs
> up to and including evicting bona fide and long established non-profit
> community sports groups and that its performance measurements and
> benchmarks are suspect.

>
> As a result of these criticisms, on one hand, and demonstrated new forms
> of governance based on the Parkgate example, which might more effectively
> meet the challenges of providing preventive health care to the maximum
> number of people at a minimum cost, on the other hand, and also because of
> charges that through the existing present arrangement between the two
> joint Service Partners, the City and the District, District taxpayers are
> subsidizing the City, a report on the matter commissioned by the City,
> the District and the Rec. Commission " the David A. Hughes Report" has now
> been presented.

>
> The report by David A Hughes & Associates Ltd. on the North Vancouver
> Recreation Commission Joint Bylaw Review was presented to both the City
> and District Council at a joint meeting on Nov. 6, 2001.

>
> The report has wide ranging implications for all residents of North
> Vancouver since the Recreation Commission plays a crucial role in the life
> of North Van residents in general, including in preventive health care.
> This is especially so in light of the present and growing crisis in health
> care which presents additional challenges for local government.

>
> Although the report states that the review of the mandate issue focused on
> how governance policy and practices and Board structure could assist the
> NVRC to meet the needs of the City and District, this study and bylaw
> review, according to the authors of the report, was not an
> organizational, operational or efficiency review of the NVRC, nor did it
> address whether the Recreation Commission is successful in meeting its
> current mandate. That is, the study was not a review of the performance
> of the organization, but rather a review of its governance structure and
> procedures and how its accountability can be measured.

>
> It might have been better to define the role of the Rec. Commission
> before dealing with administration scenarios. After all it is a well
> established law that in any business scenario form follows function not
> function form. Before defining possible administration scenarios it is
> the function of the Rec. Commission itself, in a fast changing
> environment, that should have been addressed first. This is apart from the
> crucial question of the District subsidizing the City as a result of the
> Joint Services agreement between the two partners..

>
> Notwithstanding, the report provides an important opportunity for
> discussion by the community and to move forward. The key is public
> participation and debate. Ideally, following public input, District
> Council will make proposals best suited to the interests of its residents.
> Subsequently, District Staff should prepare and Council should present a
> new policy for the delivery of recreation services to its residents,
> including playing field services, based on the following principles

>
> a) All expenditures for recreation facilities in the District including
> operational, capital, maintenance, personnel etc. will be financed
> through user fees except that the District Council commits to provide
> subsidies or grants in such areas as may be decided by Council annually

- > *through the Budget process and in consultation with the stakeholders.*
- > *Decentralization and giving local neighborhoods ;a greater say is clearly*
- > *better suited to meet the challenges. Also a two tier system between the*
- > *City and the District is already in effect primarily as a result of the*
- > *City providing greater per capita capital maintenance funding for its*
- > *facilities and also because of the two tier fee structure for seniors, for*
- > *example, which is already in place not to speak of District's policy of*
- > *subsidizing the City including in the provision of paying fields.*
- >
- > *b) The delivery, administration, financing, control, accounting and*
- > *dispensation of recreational programs is accomplished by the Director of*
- > *Recreation in consultation with Local Recreation Facility Boards or*
- > *Facility Councils elected from the ranks of relevant neighborhood,*
- > *community, youth, seniors, sports and other user representatives in all*
- > *areas based on the Parkgate model, more or less.*
- >
- > *c) All subsidies by the District are to facilities and programs of*
- > *benefit to District residents only*
- >
- > *d) notwithstanding the above, the City be invited to enter into an*
- > *agreement with the District for contractual provision of services provided*
- > *this is done in consultation with local facility Councils affected by such*
- > *a contract and provided it is done without direct or indirect cost to*
- > *District taxpayers as in capital facility compensation and provided it*
- > *applies to all facilities including playing fields.*
- >
- > *e) The Commission undertakes to hire a full time business manager*
- > *responsible for putting the Commission on a sound business footing in*
- > *which genuine performance criteria based on providing programs geared to*
- > *achieve maximum health benefits for the maximum number of people at*
- > *minimum cost are the basis of the operations.*

> Ernie Crist.

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>

>


>

>

>

>

>

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