

**Subject: Re: Notice of Motion**

**Date:** Sun, 24 Oct 2004 20:35:58 -0700

**From:** Brian Platts <bplatts@shaw.ca>

**To:** Ernie Crist <ernie\_crist@dnv.org>

**CC:** Nathalie Valdes <Nathalie\_Valdes@dnv.org>, "FONVCA (E-mail)" <fonvca@fonvca.org>, Cagebc@yahoo.com, Senior Management Committee <managemcomm@dnv.org>, Mayor and Council - DNV <Council@dnv.org>

Dear Councillor Crist,

Thank you very much for this motion. I had intended to write to Council on this matter. Last week my Mom renewed her pass and was charged the \$15 administration fee. I will have to pay the same fee tomorrow when I renew my own annual pass. Who made the decision to charge this outrageous "fee"? The Rec. Commission? I don't recall Council being involved. How is it that if you lose your pass, the charge to obtain a new one is just \$5, yet an annual renewal now costs an additional \$15? There is something not right here. How is it that at the Griffin Rec. Centre, for example, there can be approximately 650,000 paying customers going through the doors every year, yet the facility requires even more operational funding from taxpayers? Griffin should easily be entirely self-sufficient -- after all, the District owns the land and the building. The Rec. Com. doesn't even have enough funding to have a staff member in the Griffin gym for all hours of operation. Your repeated contention that the Rec. Com requires a complete re-organization along the Parkgate model is bang-on.

Sincerely,  
-Brian Platts

Ernie Crist wrote:

>NOTICE OF MOTION - ERNIE CRIST - RECREATION FEE SURCHARGE

>

>Whereas the North Vancouver Recreation Commission has recently implemented a surcharge of \$ 15 for persons unable to pay recreation fees in advance and

>

>Whereas most persons who pay for recreation fees in installments do so for economic reasons and

>

>Whereas the very idea of enabling person to pay fees in installments is to make it easier for them to exercise and

>

>Whereas the Recreation Commission is charging a \$ 15 surcharge because some of the clients fail to pay such installments on time or because the Recreation Commission has difficulties collecting from such persons and

>

>Whereas this is discriminatory against the people who do pay on time and

>

>Whereas in this electronic age the Commission can surely find a different method of collecting money form clients in default of paying without punishing those who are not in default and

>

>Whereas the District of North Vancouver subsidizes the Recreation Commission to the tune of close to \$ 6 million annually and charges no taxes on land used by the Commission

>

>

>Therefore be it resolved that the North Vancouver Recreation Commission be requested to abandon such an across the board surcharge and either charge only persons failing to pay installments on time and/or deny such persons the use of the facilities.

>

>