

Subject: [Fwd: Notice of Motion - Councillor Crist.]

Date: Sat, 27 Apr 2002 17:51:51 -0700

From: Brian Platts <brian_platts@telus.net>

To: Corrie Kost <kost@triumf.ca>

Subject: Re: Notice of Motion - Councillor Crist.

Date: Fri, 12 Apr 2002 11:24:09 -0400

From: "Wayne Hunter" <noblepacific@telus.net>

To: "Ernie Crist" <CristE@dnv.org>, "Nathalie Valdes" <ValdesN@dnv.org>

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

Dear Councillor

As a District taxpayer, you seem to make a compelling argument about the scope of the apparent direct and indirect subsidization of recreational services enjoyed by City residents, but paid for by District taxpayers.

I have followed the amalgamation "campaign" for almost 20 years, and it would seem readily apparent to even a casual observer that the City, for at least the foreseeable future, will never be motivated or induced to proceed to any process or negotiation that would lead to a formal integration of both municipal service administrations to offset the apparent unreasonable usage of District funded services and facilities.

You make a broad set of generalizations about the apparent impact and the current state of affairs.

District taxpayers should be able to reference more up to date and specific calculations about the current arrangements. I seem to recall a series of audits or studies previously sponsored by the District and perhaps the City about the impact of amalgamation. What were the results and recommendations, (if any) of the most recent "Amalgamation Study"? I would think that what is required is an independent third party analysis of the current direct and indirect subsidies paid by District taxpayers. Such an analysis should be able to (1) identify all District taxpayer funded recreational services, (2) identify and project these costs for the the next 10 years, at least, both in terms of (a) administration and maintenance of existing recreational services and programs and (b) a projection of all capital items for the same period.

If such an analysis confirms in any substantive way the direct and indirect subsidies made available to City residents by the taxpayers of the District, then our future is clear. As a District taxpayer I don't need to be "polled" about my "willingness to continue to subsidize the City" as you wish to do through your current motion. At a time when we are all struggling with the offloading of the delivery of services from more senior governments, it is clear to me that no fellow District resident would be inclined to perpetuate any further "gift" to the City. It seems clear to me that going forward we should adopt a "User Pay Principle", (UPP). If a current analysis determines any substantive subsidy to the city our actions are clear.

A further up to date study should identify ALL major services enjoyed by the District and jointly paid for between both municipalities, with a view to estimating the financial impact to the District if any and all such services were separately or independently delivered and paid for by District taxpayers for those services which only applied to them. The purpose here is to try and estimate our "exposure" to any "linkage" between our demands for the UPP as it relates to recreational services and other current shared municipal services.

Assuming that our "exposure" is manageable we should immediately give notice of our intent to "disengage" from the current North Van Rec Commission arrangements. District residents can manage their own facilities along the Parkgate model. I speak as a Parkgate Board member, where I believe my fellow Board members and I have done more than a reasonable job (1) administering and directing the delivery of programs and services and (2) managing the physical plant and equipment at the Parkgate facility.

Summary

The City must know that we are adopting a User Pay Principle (UPP) in ALL shared services. District taxpayers can expect nothing less in this period of fiscal restraint. If amalgamation is the solution then let the City propose it. I'm sick and tired of appearing to go "hat in hand" to the City to be properly reimbursed for services and programs which they enjoy but which we pay for.

I would recommend that your motion incorporate an immediate call for the studies which I have described above, and such studies should be completed within a maximum of 60 days. If it is determined that a substantive subsidy exists, and given the apparent attitudes of certain City councillors, a District referendum in the fall should call for the termination of such subsidized services.

Wayne Hunter
3658 Garibaldi Drive
North Vancouver, 604-929-0797

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

From: "Ernie Crist" <CristE@dnv.org>
To: "Nathalie Valdes" <ValdesN@dnv.org>
Cc: "FONVCA (E-mail)" <fonvca@fonvca.org>
Sent: Friday, April 12, 2002 1:43 AM
Subject: Notice of Motion - Councillor Crist.

> *Notice of Motion;*
>
> *Report Councillor Crist:*
>
> *Subject: 2002 public referendum on subsidizing the City of North Vancouver*

> *under the present "Shared Services Agreement" between the City and the District.*

>
> *Motion:*

>
> *That Staff be requested to prepare a public referendum question to be put to*

> *the taxpayers of the District of North Vancouver during the 2002 Municipal*

> *Election in Nov 2002 as to whether the District taxpayers are willing to continue to subsidize the City of North Vancouver through the existing "Shared Services Agreement" between the City and the District of North Vancouver for recreation facilities and playing fields currently administered by the North Vancouver Recreation Commission.*

>
> *Rationale:*

>
> *All Municipal Recreation Facilities in North Vancouver regardless as to whether they are located in the City or the District of North Vancouver are*

> *currently under the jurisdiction and are administered by the North Vancouver*

> *Recreation Commission. This also applies to the allocation of playing fields*

> *in both municipalities, which is also covered under this "Shared Services Agreement".*

>
> *On the surface, it appears that the Shared Services Agreement is eminently reasonable, forward looking, fiscally sound and advantageous for both jurisdictions. In reality the agreement is seriously weighted against District taxpayers and constitutes a serious drain on District resources. It constitutes a large subsidy to the City.*

>
> *When the "Joint Services Agreement" was implemented it was thought to be the*

> *first step towards the complete political amalgamation between the two jurisdictions. But every subsequent effort by the District to bring about amalgamation was rejected by the City.*

>
> *Councillor Crist, in an attempt to advance this matter, made a motion for*

> *a step by step program culminating in a political union of the two municipalities. But the District failed to accept these recommendations while the City turned down even any initial joint dialogue towards that end.*

> *The City's political spokespersons advanced several reasons why they were not interested in amalgamation with the District. The main points they voiced included the following.*

>
> *1) The City has maintained a fiscally frugal and responsible budget policy while the District has not.*

>

- > 2) *The City has built up its Heritage Fund while the District has used its own Heritage Fund to cover expenses for what, in broad terms, can termed "operating" expenses.*
- >
- > 3) *Municipal taxes are considerably lower in the City than they are in the District, i.e. taxes for a \$ 400,000 assessed home including waste disposal fees and water rates are several hundred dollars less in the City than for a similar assessed home in the District.*
- >
- > 4) *Reserves for crucial infrastructure renewal as indicated by provincial statistics are \$ 1.600 per capita in the City (\$ 1.700 in West Vancouver) while in the District they are a mere \$ 300 more or less. Even before recent "adjustments" in calculating these reserves by District staff, the per capita reserves in the District were a mere \$1.200 falling considerably short of the per capita reserve level in the City.*
- >
- > 5) *Annual tax increases in the District, despite accessing both the District Heritage Fund and District Reserve Funds have been consistently higher than they are in the City of North Vancouver.*
- >
- > *Notwithstanding the veracity of these statements, the District continues to subsidize the City via the current Shared Services Agreement. This is accomplished in the following manner. Though the District has far more recreation facilities than the City, and although the City has more than 50 % of the population of the District, the burden of capital maintenance for all facilities in the District rests with District residents. The City does not contribute a single penny towards the capital maintenance of District Recreation facilities.*
- >
- > *While the City allocates up to one million dollars annually towards capital maintenance of facilities within the City's jurisdiction, the District, with far more facilities, allocates a mere \$600.000 towards the capital maintenance of its facilities. As a result, District facilities and capital assets are deteriorating at an alarming rate and will, in all likelihood, soon end up in private hands.*
- >
- > *Councillor Crist, in an additional effort to effectively end subsidies to the City, recently made a motion that the Rec. Commission be re-organized along the lines of the "Parkgate" model which would at least have*

- > *partially addressed this matter but this too was refused by District Council*
- > *with the result that the subsidy to the City continues unabated.*
- >
- > *What is true of recreational facilities is also true for playing fields.*
- > *Indeed here the weighted arrangement against the*
- > *District is even more pronounced.*
- >
- > *While the City has more than half of the population of the District, it has*
- > *less than a third the number of playing fields. There is a drastic shortage*
- > *of playing fields in the City and, although there is no such shortage in the*
- > *District, playing fields in both the City and the District are treated as*
- > *one, thus resulting in a combined shortage in both jurisdictions. Thus the*
- > *District is not only paying the tab for this shortage in the City but the*
- > *District is also obliged to add to its own field inventory to accommodate*
- > *City residents. The shortage is exacerbated by a growing number of young*
- > *adults of both sexes joining the ranks of users in both jurisdictions.*
- >
- > *To sum up. At a time when District taxpayers are faced with yet more*
- > *above*
- > *average tax increases, when they are burdened with actual cuts in the*
- > *level*
- > *of services in such important areas as snow clearing, street sweeping, lack*
- > *of sidewalks, huge increases in recreation fees of up to 51 % in a*
- > *single*
- > *year, at a time when the District is short of money to adequately*
- > *maintain*
- > *its own capital assets and infrastructure, not to mention many other*
- > *important community services, it is subsidizing the City for reasons that*
- > *cannot be construed as anything other than politically motivated at the*
- > *expense of the District taxpayers.*
- >
- > *In light of this, it behooves District Council as elected custodians and*
- > *protectors of the public interests, to take this issue to the taxpayers*
- > *of*
- > *the District of North Vancouver to ask them directly whether, under these*
- > *circumstances, they are willing to continue to subsidize the City of North*
- > *Vancouver.*
- >
- > *Ernie Crist,*
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >

