

Subject: FW: Property Taxes

Date: Sat, 1 May 2004 16:52:36 -0700

From: "Ernie Crist" <ernie_crist@dnv.org>

To: <dbrear@shaw.ca>

CC: "Mayor and Council - DNV" <Council@dnv.org>, "Senior Management Committee" <managecomm@dnv.org>, "FONVCA (E-mail)" <fonvca@fonvca.org>, <Cagebc@yahoo.com>

Dear Mr. Brear:

I did not support the District tax increase for reasons I have outlined in a letter to another concerned resident printed below. My letter to this person also clarifies some of the issues around the lack of interest by District residents in this matter.

As for your second question regarding an increase in Council indemnity? This issue is outside the jurisdiction of the elected representatives since the matter will be dealt with by a citizens committee. They will undoubtedly take all points into consideration including the one you have raised. Thank you for bringing your concerns to my attention.

Yours truly,

Ernie Crist.

To: Ernie Crist

Subject: RE: Property Taxes

Dear Mr. Crist,

Please accept my apologies for including you in my "group e-mail" to Council.

I must admit to reading about your efforts on behalf of the hapless homeowners in the press and should have made an appropriate distinction in my correspondence.

Please keep up the good work,

Yours truly,

Jim.....

To: Jim

Subject: RE: Property Taxes

Dear Mr.....

I did not support the 4.95% tax increase for the 2004 budget as you imply in your email. I did however, vote in favor of a uniform tax rate application. The two have nothing to do with each other since the tax rate is simply a statement that, notwithstanding any tax increase per se, the rate of increase will be the same for all categories of taxable properties regardless of their type such as industrial, commercial and/or residential for example. Voting in favor of the equal tax rate does not mean agreeing with the 4.95% tax increase.

In voting against the 4.95% budget increase I also stated my reasons. What is more, in the course of the open budget debates I made numerous proposals, brought forward initiatives and made many motions to make our operations more efficient and save millions of dollars without reducing the overall level of services. But there was no one to pay the slightest heed on Council including the Mayor and/or the 90,000 (excepting very few including Dr.Kost) or so people in the District of North Vancouver who all had an opportunity to provide input during the open debates.

My proposal to reorganize the North Vancouver Recreation Commission on the Parkgate model alone would save the District millions of dollars annually, while at the same time it would make the delivery of public recreation services far more efficient than is the case now. I also suggested that we stop subsidizing the City of North Vancouver as we are doing on a grand scale for absolutely no reason other than purely politically motivated reasons. These issues have been printed in the press repeatedly but there was simply no interest by the good people of the District and or the Council and the Mayor of the District.

Thank you for bringing your concerns to my attention - if you wish to discuss this matter further I would be more than happy to oblige. I will distribute my reply to you to Mayor and Council as well as to various community groups. It trust this will meet with your approval.

Yours truly,

Ernie Crist

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

From: Jim

Sent: April 28, 2004 12:34 PM

To: Mayor and Council - DNV

Subject: Property Taxes

Once again you have contrived to agree on a tax rate which bears no relationship to reality and the prevailing rate of inflation in the country which I understand is at an all-time low!!

The decision of Council to vote down the Mayor's proposed 1% reduction, notwithstanding the fact that it probably was self-serving, was obviously taken by the majority of Councillors on the basis of a "shafting" the Mayor rather than on a rational analysis of the minimum financial requirements of the District.

When viewed in relation to the Provincial Government's refusal to deal with the property assessment issue, which has resulted in the total loss of the Homeowner Grant and Senior's Discount for many seniors (including my wife and I), your selection of a 4.95% increase this year is unconscionable.

To make matters worse, your selection of 4.95% smacks of an arbitrary decision (keep it below 5% chaps!!) which is more in keeping with a Woodward's \$1.49 Day approach than sensitive and responsible government.

It is no wonder that people have become jaded and disinterested in all levels of government to the point that most of you have been returned time and time again on the basis of farcically low voter turnouts.

Yours in frustration,

Jim

