

Subject: [Fwd: Formal Complaint - Value Analysis Task Force File: 0360-20/65]

Date: Wed, 03 Apr 2002 16:40:13 -0800

From: Brian Platts <brian_platts@telus.net>

To: Corrie Kost <kost@triumf.ca>

Subject: Formal Complaint - Value Analysis Task Force File: 0360-20/65

Date: Wed, 3 Apr 2002 14:05:18 -0800

From: "Dave Sadler" <davesadler@telus.net>

To: <dbell@dnv.org>

CC: "Mayor and Council - DNV" <Council@district.north-van.bc.ca>, <bdenault@dnv.org>, <ecrist@dnv.org>, <hdunsford@dnv.org>, <jharris@dnv.org>, <lmuri@dnv.org>, "Councillor Doug MacKay-Dunn" <macdunn@dnv.org>, "Agnes Hilsen" <ahilsen@district.north-van.bc.ca>, "FONVCA" <fonvca@fonvca.org>

Dear Mayor Bell:

April 3, 2002

File: 0360-20/65 Formal Complaint – Value Analysis Task Force

Thank you for responding to my complaint on the above issue.

It would seem by your explanation, that the Value Analysis Task Force did not violate the Local Government Act because after concluding their last interview on February 27, 2001 they did not hold another 'formal' meeting.

Therefore the VATF never reconvened to discuss, consider or debate the input received from District Management, Council & the Mayor. Nor did they formally meet to discuss the format, content, summary or recommendations presented to Council in the form of a report.

I believe that any rationale person would conclude that either this explanation is not credible or the quality of the VATF's report has suffered as a result. What kind of task force doesn't meet again after the interviews were concluded to discuss what has been heard? The notion is preposterous especially considering the seriousness & importance of their mandate.

Considering the repeated concerns, which I addressed to the Municipal Clerk (21 emails) & District Council while the VATF was meeting, I find the lack of vigilance of this District task force inexcusable. In my opinion the District failed in its responsibility to monitor the workings of an appointed public committee to ensure a legal or meaningful result.

In regards to the interview with the Mayor which was changed and moved to February 6th, 2001 without proper notification, when examined singly the explanation is acceptable. However when placed in context with the above, this rationalization becomes suspect.

It would appear that the Municipal Clerk was aware of the change, but needed to "confirm" the meeting. A rational person would consider that to "confirm" the meeting with the Mayor's secretary would have sufficed. I previously asked the Clerk if the meeting had been recorded in the Mayor's diary. This as well as other questions to the Clerk were ignored and to this day remain unanswered.

Lastly, I feel it was questionable of the District to consider & approve an application from the Chairperson of the VATF to participate in another District Committee (Library Board), before first investigating my serious concerns regarding their role in the above matter. I know for a fact that the District had at least one other qualified applicant for the vacant position.

I continue to be sickened by the ongoing state of affairs at District Hall and I will continue to press for fair, open & accountable government.

Yours truly, Dave Sadler