

**Subject: [Fwd: FW: Notice of Motion-Ernie Crist-Special meet of Council by no la ter then Dec. 15-2001 with provision for public input re Rec. Comm. Joint Bylaw review.]**

**Date:** Mon, 12 Nov 2001 13:56:21 -0800

**From:** Brian Platts <brian\_platts@telus.net>

**To:** Corrie Kost <kost@triumf.ca>

---

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

**Date:** Mon, 12 Nov 2001 11:05:07 -0800 (Pacific Standard Time)

**From:** "The Frasers" <weemalkies@telus.net>

**To:** <CristE@district.north-van.bc.ca>, <CristE@district.north-van.bc.ca>

**CC:** <fonvca@fonvca.org>

This has been an outstanding issue for far too long. There are many groups and individuals in this community who have a serious interest in seeing this process through and hopefully resolved. Good luck!!! - Margaret.

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

**From:** [Ernie Crist](#)

**Date:** November 12, 2001 10:35:12 AM

**To:** [Ernie Crist](#)

**Cc:** [FONVCA \(E-mail\)](#)

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

> -----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 then 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 then 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.

- >
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >

>  
>  
>  
>  
>

---

 **IncrediMail** - Email has finally evolved - [Click Here](#)