

**Subject: [Fwd: Re: Notice of Motion]**

**Date:** Mon, 25 Oct 2004 15:05:02 -0700

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

**To:** Corrie Kost <kost@triumf.ca>

---

**Subject: Re: Notice of Motion**

**Date:** Mon, 25 Oct 2004 18:24:43 +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>, Cagebc@yahoo.com, Senior Management Committee <managemcomm@dnv.org>, Mayor and Council - DNV <Council@dnv.org>

25 October 2004

Dear Clr. Crist and Brian:

I echo the comments you both have made. My first reaction was that such a step flies in the face of stated goals - viz. to encourage everyone, young to the old, the poor and the not so poor, to maximize their fitness potential for the sake of their health.

The "experts" tell us that the nutrition of those who are struggling with finances is not as good as it is on the tables of those who can afford to make different choices. While I don't totally accept that, it still doesn't seem to make much sense to put exercise programmes provided at publicly-owned facilities beyond the reach of even more of our citizens.

Before being willing to provide any further funds to the North Vancouver Recreation Commission, District citizens should demand a full process and fiscal audit of all NV recreation facilities - including the Centennial Theatre operation.

Going back to my earlier comment - the healthiest items which can be placed on the table are fruit and vegetables, milk and coldwater fish such as salmon and mackerel. With the possible exception of the last two items, these are actually the cheapest of all grocery items to buy. Certainly, these items are a sight cheaper than hamburger meat, let alone steak, cheese, pop, beer and potato chips! So I've never quite bought into 'the poor must eat unhealthy' argument; in fact, with some ingenuity, they could be the healthiest of all of us. I believe we need to be more proactive in this area - even providing "Diet on a Dollar" cooking classes ..... at the rec centres.

Cheers,  
Liz

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

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.

>

>

---

[ALL-NEW Yahoo! Messenger](#) - all new features - even more fun!