

FONVCA's 10 QUESTIONS	Don Bell	Ernie Crist	Janice Harris	Maureen McKeon-Holmes	Lisa Muri	Alan Nixon	Richard Walton
1. What role should community associations play with respect to local neighbourhood and district-wide issues?	Community Associations should be respectful, objective and, hence, respected and valued advisors to Council, providing truly representative local area perspectives on both local neighbourhood and district-wide issues.	Community associations need to raise their profile within their own communities. One way of doing this is to chair the information meetings now chaired by the developers.	They should actively represent their local neighbourhoods on issues of concern.	Community Associations, if working effectively, should be a true reflection of the community. In addition, council and staff should be able to integrate those ideas into planning and decision-making.	Community Associations should maintain their role with council and increase their visibility with the community. It is imperative that council work closely with c.a. to understand better the pulse of the community and to help council guide their decision making. The municipality should help and encourage more people to get involved with their local community association.	As a former chair of the Pemberton Heights Community Association I am convinced of the importance of such groups to serve as: <b>facilitators</b> of community input on issues of neighbourhood significance and District-wide import; <b>conduits</b> through which residents can <u>effectively</u> approach and lobby Municipal Staff and elected officials with concerns of personal, local or district-wide nature. <b>Barometers</b> of localized opinion by which Council can gauge public reaction to existing or impending initiatives. <b>Initiators</b> of targeted, local physical infrastructure or program deliverables. <b>Mediators</b> of neighbour vs. neighbour conflict issues.  The relevance and importance of Community Association input cannot be over-emphasized. However, Council must not evade its ultimate decision-making responsibility to <b>all</b> District residents and taxpayers.	Individual Community Associations' roles are key to developing both neighbourhood and district policy. Their views, however, must be considered by Council against views of other associations, and the impact of their comments and recommendations on the community as a whole. Councillors should listen well to the Community Associations and in the event they don't follow their recommendations, should be prepared to explain and debate their reasons.
2. Do you advocate any further significant growth in specific areas of the District?	Future growth must reinforce the desirable characteristics of our community. Growth rates should be slow, allowing for consideration of public input and compatibility with our District OCP and Local Area Plans.	I believe in neighborhood driven development. The question of how much development is therefore irrelevant since it is the neighborhoods who will decide how much development based on their needs. This is at the heart of the "sustainable community"	Only as envisaged in the various community plans.	I do not advocate significant growth.	No, but be prepared for an acceleration of the OCP'S in regards to development if some of the more development friendly councillors or candidates are elected.	"Significant" growth is a relative term. The Local Area Plans, adopted, or otherwise, must be the considered by Council as the definitive, considered response of the residents of <u>specific</u> areas of the District. I am <b>not</b> in favour of growth without the <u>concurrent</u> development of traffic and transit solutions to the inevitable strain new development brings.	I advocate smarter growth. Wholesale subdivision growth requires considerable infrastructure expense; infill and renovation makes sense...population can grow significantly if transportation issues are dealt with first: not as an afterthought as happened in the Dorothy Lynas catchment area when I was on School Board.
3. What sort of changes would you like to see with the current public input process for council decisions?	Greater utilization of input through e-mail and internet. Use of professional public-opinion polling on major issues.  Public input at the beginning of Council Meetings should be related to listed agenda items. General comments on other issues can follow when the Council agenda business is completed.	On District wide issues FONVCA should take a position. For that purpose it is necessary for FONVCA to deal with such issues and make collective statements.	There are generous public input opportunities at this time, and I feel no need to curtail or expand them	I would like to ensure that those presented truly reflected the interests of the community.	I would favour a separate night once a month to allow the community to come and comment on larger and more controversial issues.	In my personal experience, there is sufficient opportunity for public input at Council meetings; there is lots of opportunity to provide Council with written submissions through the District Website e-mail system as well as traditional correspondence. I have also had good experiences contacting Council members by telephone. I <u>would support</u> a change that would allow one speaker to address Council more than once during the Public Input phase if speaking on separate issues or agenda items.	Public input biweekly for slightly longer period of time...councillors on line for at least one hour a week, when citizens can communicate with them on issues in an interactive manner.
4. Under what circumstances should major capital projects go to referendum?	Where funding commitments required would exceed the authorizations allowed in the Local Government Act or Community Charter.	Referendums should be held on all major capital projects.	Where there is a perceived groundswell of support or opposition, i.e.: the Winter Olympic bid.	Major capital projects should go to referendum with a price tag attached.	1 million dollars and over	I personally feel there is undue emphasis on the "capital" side of the District budget. Many "operational" expenses have far larger "lifetime" budgetary impact than many "capital" projects without ever being subjected to the focussed scrutiny of the electorate.  During the regular election cycle, referenda should be utilized to seek the public's guidance on, or endorsement of medium to long-term strategies for infrastructure and amenity maintenance and development. These could take the form of referenda-approved percentages of annual budgets to be spent in the achievement of the broadly-stated objectives.  Over time, circumstances can change that render specific project-based, "dollar-based" referendum mandates out-of-date. Given the existing, lengthy planning cycle, we must constantly guard against spending money on projects that may no longer be necessary or responsive to the community's needs.	While I am not a fan of referenda (they have decimated public services in California where my wife is from), I believe they have a place for decisions having long-term economic and quality of life effects on citizens... I would suggest that any Council (3 year term) have a limit of what capital decisions they can commit to without going to referendum...a quota system that ensures no "fast ferries" are left as legacies to future citizens.

FONVCA's 10 QUESTIONS	Don Bell	Ernie Crist	Janice Harris	Maureen McKeon- Holmes	Lisa Muri	Alan Nixon	Richard Walton
5. Do you favour changes to the fee/subsidy structure of recreational and sports programs?	Recreational and sports fees/subsidy structure must be affordable to users and competitive with other municipalities and encourage a healthy lifestyle.	I believe in low fees. I also believe that the current subsidy to the City via the Rec Commission should end. I also believe that the Rec Commission should be abolished in its present form and reorganized along the Parkgate model. I believe that once that is done any and all co-operation with the city should be on a businesslike and mutually beneficial and good neighborhood basis rather than on the present basis whereby the District is subsidizing the City for no reason ;than political opportunism at the expense of the District taxpayers.	The Recreation Commission, in my opinion, is serving the community reasonably well in setting fees.	I would like to look again at the District residents subsidizing recreational facilities for non-residents.	I would not want to discourage residents from using our rec facilities because they can't afford them, however we need to be fair. Certainly the current system works well, but one can always look at improvement with any structure or funding situation.	Without knowing all the facts surrounding the issue of "sports subsidies" I am not going to offer my opinion on this topic at this time. I would appreciate the opportunity to submit my response to this question within the next 5 days.	Costs need to be matched so that heavy users pay more than infrequent users. I believe that public subsidy allowing general affordable access is a foundation of a healthy society. I have been a recreation commissioner and have travelled extensively, using facilities in other communities...our system is outstanding and I support the fee/subsidy system in place...keep fine tuning it to ensure it is equitable.
6. Are you committed to the repayment of principal and interest of monies borrowed from the Heritage Fund?	Yes, as agreed to by Council.	Yes I am.	In principle, yes.	Yes.	Yes, however I am not in favour of selling anymore land to build up the fund.	I do believe that the principal and interest accruing against an advance from the Heritage Fund should be repaid on a pre-determined on a case-specific basis for each project so funded. The schedule and formula for to calculate re-payment should be determined at the outset prior to Council voting on the withdrawal from the Fund. Obviously, if estimates of the ability to repay prove faulty, then the issue must be re-visited and a case-specific adjustment made.	I am not committed to repaying the principal and interest from the Heritage Fund...don't handcuff the ability of the next Council to get the finances in order. There should be clear policies in place to ensure what goes in and what comes out of the Heritage Fund, and the fund should not be only land based...it should involve donations of cash, equities etc.
7. How would you minimize future tax increases?	Continue to find efficiencies and innovative methods to reduce costs while maintaining desired service levels. Implement "Zero-Based" budget approach by department on a multi-year cycle. Pursue new opportunities (Community Charter) for alternate revenue sources and cost sharing such as Public Private Partnerships and Inter-Municipal Agreements.	a) end subsidizing the City, b) reorganize the Rec Commission via the Parkgate model, c) establish meaningful efficiency criteria and benchmarks as laid out in "Reinventing Government. d) give management an absolute order to do so within a certain deadline as was promised and carry it out.	A better, more inclusive public consultative process during budget debate.	I think we have to look closer at our utilization and the services we provide. We must have better accountability on the part of the administration and management to provide the best quality service while cutting costs. The Inventory of Municipal Services report shows what appear to be examples of redundancy and a lack of centralization in services. If a service could be provided better and cheaper by the private sector then we should be looking at outsourcing that service.	Prioritize our wants over our needs, this is where council struggles the most.	We can minimize future tax increases through: Aggressive lobbying of the provincial and federal governments to return proportionate tax revenues for social development, infrastructure construction, maintenance and replacement. This would help to offset rising expenses in these areas.  Taking concerted, aggressive legal action to recover "avoidance" of Tax revenue as practised through the Vancouver Wharves/ BCR merger.  Ensuring there is appropriate value received for all operating and capital expenditures by: instituting "zero-based" budgeting; cost benefit analyses of all programs and initiatives; rigorous monitoring of accounts; management and line-staff bonuses for target achievement; encouraging the location to the District of commercial and industrial enterprise to broaden the tax base under the auspices of the yet-to-be-enacted Community Charter provisions.  Ensure the retention of existing commercial and industrial enterprise by constantly and pro-actively monitoring the "satisfaction" levels of District business owners and reacting to adverse response through process and procedure improvements.  Ensuring that the municipality, through its staff, is only involved in the delivery of "core" services once identified and adopted after a thorough, constituent-led review process.  Ensure the recovery of expenses through the fair and judicious application "secondary suite" fees and surcharges.	North Vancouver is an expensive management proposition: there is a price to pay for living with all of this green space and recreational space all around us. Government must be smaller and have more ability to contract out services, expanding and contracting with more flexibility than it does now. The Long-term plan should define 20 year objectives and councils make decisions based on longer term implications.

FONVCA's 10 QUESTIONS	Don Bell	Ernie Crist	Janice Harris	Maureen McKeon-Holmes	Lisa Muri	Alan Nixon	Richard Walton
8. Do you support the Draft Seymour Local Area Plan?	Generally support, subject to upcoming public review and Bylaw process.	In principle.	From what I've read so far, I support it in large measure. I would look for changes in a few areas. I am also wanting to hear what the public has to say about the plan.	I would like to hear the final public input before making an opinion.	Yes, although I will always look at each individual development application based on community support as I have done with every district plan.	I do support the many practical and philosophical objectives of the Draft Seymour Local Plan, as it is the result of significant and substantial consultation with the residents of the Local Area over an extended period of time.  I have been, and remain, concerned that there needs to be a mechanism to ensure professional facilitation and mediation of individual, or collective conflicts that will inevitably arise during such crucial and far-reaching deliberations.  In the future, we must ensure we take steps to synchronize the development and updating of Local Area Plans with the overall development, review and updating of the Official Community Plan.	Draft Seymour Plan is well thought out and I support it. Decisions made in one section of the community, however, cannot cause higher taxes in another without Council's careful analysis...the effect of the Plan on the entire District must be reviewed by Council prior to complete endorsement.
9. Are you in favour of residential water metering? Please explain.	I generally support the user-pay concept of water metering, but a detailed cost/benefit analysis is needed before proceeding.	In principle - look into establishing incentives for home owners who do so at their own cost and or pay for it and charge it to homeowners similar to local improvement etc.,	Not yet.	Not yet. I would be interested in the research supporting this kind of initiative.	Yes, it is the only fair way to charge for consumption.	I am in favour of the concept of Residential Water metering as it has been shown to be very effective in conserving the resource as well as confirming a "user-pay" philosophy that should drive the delivery of all District services.  I am concerned at the inherent capital costs of supplying and installing such metering technology but understand there are schemes by which such costs can be mitigated. A good "first-step" would be a requirement to install water meters on all new construction and new water-service installations. (In my view, the rule of equity would prevent charges until universal metering is achieved.)	Yes. I am in favour of water metering. The waste in our community is shocking. It is a mainstay in many communities in North America and affects design and consumption patterns in a positive way. Water metering means those who consume more pay more...why should it be any different from electricity? A flat rate on power would be inconceivable.
10. Do you support increased maintenance of our parks and public areas? If so, how?	Need for increased maintenance of our parks and public areas must be included in a bigger picture review leading to a new maintenance and replacement policy for District infrastructure and facilities.	Yes - free up fiscal resources now wasted throughout virtually all areas of the District's operations. Elect a Council who knows the difference between accessing the principle of the Heritage Fund to cover operating expenses and using the interests generated by the Heritage Fund.	I think maintenance levels are adequate at the moment, given budgetary constraints.	I would like to have a better sense that the staff we now employ are being used effectively to maintain parks.	Yes, we have continually cut back in our parks department while increasing their responsibilities. These areas are critical for our overall quality of life and must be maintained, for the environment and public.	I subscribe to a policy that ensures our parks and public spaces are kept clean and tidy and maintained to an "average" standard while allowing their intended use. Public safety and hazard elimination must always be a priority in the design, operation and maintenance of public amenities and facilities.  I favour the involvement of Community Associations in the development of maintenance specifications for their "neighbourhood" parks and public areas. Their "first-hand" knowledge of the specific needs of their neighbours can result in more "site-specific" targeted expenditure of maintenance funds.  I favour the public tendering of park and public area maintenance and upkeep. I would encourage District department groups to participate in the tendering process.	If it is consistent with the ability of the community to pay and the priorities for spending developed. We have many wonderful parks that we love and make us want to live here. I would be interested to see if adopt-a park programmes can be developed here, as in the U.S. that allow communities to look after their own facilities when local government can not afford to.
<b>OUTLOOK 10 Q.</b>	<b>Don Bell</b>	<b>Ernie Crist</b>	<b>Janice Harris</b>	<b>Maureen McKeon-Holmes</b>	<b>Lisa Muri</b>	<b>Alan Nixon</b>	<b>Richard Walton</b>
1. Marital status, children (w/ages) and municipality you reside?	Married, 3 adult children. Live in NVD	Married, 1 adult child. Live in NVD	Married, 2 children ages 12,16. Live in NVD	Has children. Live in NVD	Engaged. 1 child, age 8 months, Live in NVD	Married, 3 children, ages 12-28. Live in NVD	Married, 4 children ages 15-25. Live in NVD
2. Should municipal staffing levels be: a)decreased, b)increased, c)remain the same	c) Remain the same	a) Decrease or c) remain the same	c) Remain the same	An internal evaluation must be done first.	c) Remain the same	a) Decreased	a) Decreased over time
3. Make, model and year of the vehicle you drive?	2002 Dodge Caravan	1997 Suzuki X90	1983 Volvo station wagon	1992 Volvo	1993 VW Jetta	1999 Ford Taurus	1986 Volvo: 2002 Toyota Highlander
4. Do you support the Vancouver/Whistler 2010 Winter Olympic bid?	Yes	Yes, but only if it is privately financed	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
5. Are you in favour of paid parking for business areas?	No, but would consider to resolve local issues	No	No	No	No	No	No

6. In terms of residential growth, would you like to see: a) zero growth; b) growth of less than 1% a year; c) growth of more than 1% a year?	b) growth of less than 1%	Can't answer as I believe in the 'neighbourhood need' model.	c) Growth of more than 1% (less and 1.5%)	b) Growth of less than 1% a year	b) Growth of less than 1% a year.	I favour housing stock growth of more than 1%	b) Growth of less than 1%
7. Are you receiving monetary or volunteer campaign support from CUPE 389 members?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
8. Do you support tax cuts for waterfront industries	I support a review of the policy	Yes	No	If in our budget, we should help support industry.	No	No	No
9. Should the City/District pull out of the North Vancouver Recreation Commission?	No	Yes, unless City pays its fair share	No	An option if we continue to subsidize people from other municipalities.	No	No	No
10. In 30 words or less, sum up your desire to be an elected municipal official.	I have a proven track record of providing common-sense leadership to council based on vision and experience. I can build a team approach with District staff and the new Council to meet the challenges ahead.	I have been on District council for 22 years. I want the District to be a model showcase of a culturally advanced, environmental, livable, and efficiently run municipality.	I have deep feelings for my community and the quality of life, both social and environmental, that we enjoy here. I feel capable of protecting and enhancing the livability of the District of North Vancouver.	I bring a commitment to this community. I have a proven record of responsible decision-making, managing large budgets and team building. I will fight to ensure that the right questions are asked in council.	I am honest and straightforward. I want to protect our natural green space, our quality of life, and maintain our infrastructure. We must encourage small business, and we need to look at the big picture when planning our communities.	After several years on the Advisory Planning Commission and Transportation Advisory Committee, I am aware of serious flaws in District process. I will affect change.	I care deeply about community, having raised family here and planning on living here in retirement. I have the financial and business management experience badly needed on district council.
<b>Lower Capilano 7 Questions</b>	<b>Don Bell</b>	<b>Ernie Crist</b>	<b>Janice Harris</b>	<b>Maureen McKeon-Holmes</b>	<b>Lisa Muri</b>	<b>Alan Nixon</b>	<b>Richard Walton</b>
1. Are you committed to the timely development of the Lower Capilano Community Centre, as provided for in the 1996 referendum?	Yes, once remaining local issues are resolved	Yes		Yes, the Lower Capilano area has been ignored over the years and it is time for the Capilano area to get what they rightly need and deserve. Given the Districts lack of money, I would like to look for partnerships to assist with the cost of improvements.	Yes, I would like to see a better location, but I realize the land constraints in that area. Let's encourage the community to be involved in the project as was the case in our Parkgate Centre. Various local groups commented on different aspects of the centre to really design it based on community needs.	Yes! We are way beyond "timely" right now! This is a project that has been studied to death ad nauseum and if Council had acted in a decisive manner in response to various task force recommendations over the past 6 years we might be enjoying the facility right now.	I am one of only three of 17 candidates west of Lonsdale and am committed to the development of the Lower Capilano Community Centre.
2. Currently, a committee of Lower Capilano residents and District staff are reviewing the Marine Drive corridor, to make recommendations for improvements to this commercial area. Will you be committed to work towards implementation of a new vision for the area?	Yes, but it must include significant input from the affected business sector.	Yes		Absolutely	Yes, we have not given this area the priority it deserves, fortunately the committee is working again and hopefully we will be able to begin discussions with them soon to look at their vision. With some auto sales moving to the auto mall, we may have an opportunity to look at more diverse business' and uses in keeping with the residential area.	One doesn't implement a vision. We need to develop a short, medium and long term plan and then implement the plan through to completion. As one of the original members of the Marine Drive Implementation Task Force I am definitely committed to work towards the development of the plan.	I am interested and committed to developing a for the Marine Drive corridor...it is the gateway community and not one to be proud of in its current state.

3. Do you feel auto sales and service businesses should be encouraged to locate in the auto mall or off of Marine Drive?	Generally yes for large auto sales and service businesses, with the need to recognize that some businesses have recently invested in new, attractive facilities on Marine Drive.	Highly prestigious new car malls such as Audi Mercedes Benz should remain for the time being as they bring in a lot of customers for other business in the area		The auto mall has appeal in that it is one stop shopping for those looking for a vehicle. I would like to hear the community view on this issue.	One could ask why we would want to flood the market with any one use, zoning will play a key role in this decision and hopefully local business would see the benefit in creating a diverse Marine Drive.	Yes.	I would like to see all car dealerships off Marine Drive.
4. What is your involvement in the community? How has this prepared you for a position on District council?	28 years total as Alderman, Mayor, School Board Member and Chair, Councillor and Mayor.	Councillor for 22 years		I have a long history of community service in the District of North Vancouver. Most recently, I was a member of the North Shore Regional Health Board, responsible for health services of all north shore residents and for a \$180,000.00 budget. In addition, as President of the Norgate House Society, I worked tirelessly and without compensation to take Zajac Norgate House from plans on paper through completion. This is an innovative independent senior's apartment building designed so residents can age in place. I was instrumental in securing \$412,000. in donations. This PPP was built without capital grant money from federal, provincial or municipal governments. I am prepared for a seat on council because I have the ability and background to make positive change in our community. I will listen to the community and work with other council to be an effective representative.	I have been a Councillor with the District for 6 years, elected in 1996. Was spokesperson for GUARD and member of the Deep Cove Community Association, Vice President and Director.	Please refer to my website at <a href="http://www.alannixon.com">www.alannixon.com</a> for a comprehensive CV. My several years experience on the Advisory Planning Commission (2 years as chair), the Transportation Planning Advisory Committee, the Marine Drive Implementation Task Force, the Pemberton Heights Community Assn (3 years as chair) have all given me considerable insight into the intricacies of the District from an operational and political standpoint.	Public Service 1986-1993 North Vancouver School Trustee 1989-1993 North Vancouver Recreation Commissioner 1991-1992 North Vancouver District Parks Commission 1999-2002 North Vancouver Advisory Planning Commission Leadership Positions 1992 Chair North Vancouver School District 1998-1999 Chair 1999 BC Games for Athletes Disability 2000-2001 Chair North Shore Bid Committee for 2006 BC Summer Games 2001-2002 Chair North Vancouver District Advisory Planning Commission I have attended parts of about 20 council meetings the past year.
5. Over the past few years, there have been several proposals for redevelopment of the CapWest Athletic Club, known as the Larco site. Are you supportive of the Lions Gate residents' desire to only permit a redevelopment of the site which does not result in having a negative impact on the residential character of the neighbourhood?	Generally yes. Must be resolved within the context of the overall neighbourhood plan, with due consideration of the concerns of local area residents.	Yes.		I would only support neighborhood improvement projects that are aesthetically pleasing. The Superstore should be used as a model of what not to do. Other examples such as Edgemont and Dunderave areas have more attractive appeal for shoppers and residents.	I am not interested in any high density residential development for the Larco site. I will oppose any negative impact of the local community on this site.	While supportive of the neighbourhood's desire, I do believe there is a requirement for thoughtful and meaningful compromise on the ultimate redevelopment otherwise the blight as we now know it will continue forever.	The Larco site should be developed into residential and I would like to see a developer provide a community facility as part of the site...I reviewed the last proposal as chair of APC and thought the density too great for the land space...

<p>6. Do you have suggestions for how District council meetings can accomplish more District business in the time available?</p>	<p>Yes. Encourage more focussed discussion by Councillors. Reduce from 4 to 3 Council Meetings per month and use the fourth Monday for regular, in-depth policy discussion of important issues.</p>	<p>I have plenty of suggestions</p>		<p>I think that more business can be accomplished by council sticking to topics on the agenda and not using the time to berate each other. Unnecessary and redundant issues should not be placed at the top of the agenda.</p>	<p>Councillors should do less talking and more homework.</p>	<p>Very simply! District "business" should be delegated to the greatest extent to an empowered, competent Municipal staff. This would permit Council to focus its attention on the development of policies and strategies to ensure our District becomes one of the best in the GVRD.</p>	<p>Four public meetings a month keeps the wheels rolling but provides too limited a time for long-term policy analysis...I voted against televised meetings as a school trustee, but believe the public should view targeted policy meetings once a month, when larger issues are dealt with rather than variances and presentations. The APC now has virtually nothing to do and is one step above a make work project.</p>
<p>7. Are you in favour of the way bylaws are currently enforced? Please comment on the present compliance of the following bylaws: zoning, noise, parking, signage.</p>	<p>Generally yes, on a complaint response basis with noted exceptions.  Zoning Bylaw – usually good compliance  Noise Bylaw – difficult to enforce, but usually effective  Parking Bylaw – generally acceptable, Rec Vehicle parking regulations need review  Sign Bylaw – too restrictive and unfriendly to the needs of businesses</p>	<p>I am not satisfied.</p>		<p>These issues were raised at the last election and here they are again. Clearly, the community representatives are not finding that bylaws are being enforced adequately. These problems are not isolated to the Capilano area. In my neighborhood, we regularly phone police for noise, parking and loitering in the park. Several neighbors have approached district staff and written letters but have not found adequate solutions to date.</p>	<p>The zoning process works well, it is the only control we have over development, our sign bylaw will always be debatable because "one sign does not fit all", we have to find a middle ground that works. We need to encourage a walking environment and not pave paradise, limiting parking lots is one way, while maintaining the minimum amount of space needed for our local traffic. We also have to keep in mind who we are attracting, local or regional traffic. Noise is controllable, only if we are aware of the offence.</p>	<p>If bylaws exist that dictate zoning, noise, parking and signage then they must, quite simply, be enforced using the full power of the Municipality. If they are not going to be enforced the bylaws should be abolished or modified.</p>	<p>I cannot comment on the way bylaws are currently enforced because I have limited personal history involving bylaw compliance issues...apart from basement suite issues.</p>