

Subject: [Fwd: Re: NOTICE OF MOTION - ERNIE CRIST- There has to be a better way]

Date: Mon, 25 Oct 2004 15:29:23 -0700

From: Brian Platts <bplatts@shaw.ca>

To: Corrie Kost <kost@triumf.ca>

Subject: Re: NOTICE OF MOTION - ERNIE CRIST- There has to be a better way

Date: Mon, 25 Oct 2004 19:27:39 +0100 (BST)

From: Elizabeth James <cagebc@yahoo.com>

To: Brian Platts <bplatts@shaw.ca>, Ernie Crist <ernie_crist@dnv.org>

CC: Nathalie Valdes <Nathalie_Valdes@dnv.org>, "FONVCA (E-mail)" <fonvca@fonvca.org>, Mayor and Council - DNV <Council@dnv.org>, James Ridge CAO <james_ridge@dnv.org>

25 October 2004

Gentlemen:

Before I make my main point, I wish to emphasize that I do not support BC's current model of regionalization; this is particularly so with respect to GVRD and TransLink. That said.....

It does not make any sense to me to have BC communities as small as 725 with full councils and almost a full administration. Today's taxpayers cannot afford such bills.

On the North Shore, we have a vivid urban example. Here, we have two, geographically contiguous, municipalities with a combined population of only +/- 150,000. While they do cooperate on provision of some services, they irresponsibly spar on others - the Rec Commission being but one - very expensive - example.

At this stage of the game, to do as Clr. Crist suggests - essentially pick up our marbles and go play by ourselves - may well be the only feasible action to take right now, and there is little doubt it would be better than the *status quo*.

What would be far preferable, in my opinion, would be for the two municipalities to hire outside facilitators to examine the two operations with a view to answering the question: Would North Vancouver taxpayers be better or worse off if the two communities were to be amalgamated under one council and administration?

My own suggestion is that a single council, increased by two members for a total of nine, would be elected in 2008 and that, in the interim, the two staff contingents would be integrated - layoffs to be achieved over 1.5 to 2 council terms, as much as possible by attrition. To alleviate concerns on the part of each population, I envision a Mayor and four councillors being elected 'at large' with the addition of 2 councillors being elected in each of the current two North Vancouvers - i.e. a partial ward system.

In summary, I believe the problems being experienced with the Rec Commission are merely the most noticeable symptom of a much deeper and more expensive problem than has yet been realized. One only has to look at City voters who are balking at being overwhelmed by density [they obviously would prefer to be closer to the District model of growth] and the ongoing assertions by many District residents that they are subsidizing City recreation programs, to know that it is past time for the amalgamation discussion to take place in earnest.

However, my guess is that this discussion needs to be initiated and conducted by citizens themselves. Why? Because the interests of both councils and staffs will be threatened by such a move and because, left to those bodies, matters would have to get an awful lot worse before they would ever make the move themselves.

In the meantime, I support Clr. Crist's Motion.

Sincerely,
Liz James

Brian Platts <bplatts@shaw.ca> wrote:

Dear Councillor Crist,

I support your motion 100 percent.

Sincerely,
Brian Platts

Ernie Crist wrote:

>Notice of Motion - Ernie Crist

>

>

>Whereas the District of North Vancouver is subsidizing the North Vancouver Recreation Commission to the tune of close to 6 million dollars annually and

>

>Whereas in addition the North Van Rec Commission is subsidized by not paying taxes for either land or improvements thereon and

>

>Whereas the facilities are deteriorating at an accelerating pace for lack of funding and

>

>Whereas, under the existing agreement with the City of North Vancouver, the City is not contributing to the capital maintenance of District facilities and

>

>Whereas the District has 4 facilities more or less for every one facility in the City of North Vancouver and

>

>Whereas the population of the City is more than half of that in the District and

>

>Whereas the Parkgate model constitutes a superior form of administration of any given facility since it is controlled in part by a board of directors elected by the public and

>

>Whereas "Parkgate" is a registered non profit society which unlike the Recreation Commission itself enables "Parkgate" to raise a considerable amount of money each and every year from sources other than fees and funding from the District and

>

>Whereas the District would save a great deal of money by dissolving the Commission in its present form and running the Commission through a Director of Recreation directly responsible to Council and

>

>Whereas a change in administration would not prevent individual facilities and/or the District to still cooperate with the City of North Vancouver through a mutually satisfactory agreement for the use of facilities and

>

>Whereas the City of North Vancouver as an alternative to the present situation has refused to amalgamate with the District

>

>

>Therefore be it resolved that, the District dissolve the present administration of the Rec Commission and reorganize the Commission based on the Parkgate model and further

>

>that Public Recreation be administered by the District directly through a director of recreation directly responsible to the Council of the District and further be it resolved

>

>that the money saved form such a reorganization be spent on capital maintenance of the Recreation facilities in the District and further

>

>that the reorganization of the Rec Commission also extend to the administration and use of District playing fields.

>

>

>

>

>

>

>