

Subject: FW: Notice of Motion - Report Councillor Crist

Date: Thu, 17 Jul 2003 08:59:29 -0700

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

To: "FONVCA (E-mail)" <fonvca@fonvca.org>, <cagebc@yahoo.com>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Ernie Crist

> Sent: Thursday, July 17, 2003 8:56 AM

> To: Nathalie Valdes

> Subject: Notice of Motion - Report Councillor Crist

>

> Motion:

>

> That staff be requested to provide a follow up report on the implementation and status of the Joint Use Of Public Facilities Agreement for the joint use of North Van City, North Van. District and School District 44 owned public facilities including District owned recreation facilities in partnership between the District of North Vancouver, the City of North Vancouver, the North Vancouver Recreation Commission and School District 44.

>

> Rationale:

>

> In the summary of a staff report to Council dated January 31, 2003 on the Joint Use Of Public Facilities signed between the District of North Vancouver, the City of North Vancouver, the North Vancouver Recreation Commission and School Districts 44 for the joint use of Public Community Facilities including District and City owned Recreation Facilities and School District 44 owned facilities, it stated, among other things, that the reason for the report is to improve and clarify reporting relationships between the "Partners, Joint Planning Committee, and the Standing Committee " as defined in the Master Agreement of Joint Use of Public Facilities. Council was requested to receive the information and adopt the recommendations which included the 2002/2003 work plan an amendment of the Master Agreement.

>

> The general purpose of this agreement was to permit, albeit not exclusively, access of City and District Recreation Facilities by Schools under the jurisdiction of School District 44 during specified periods in return for the use of school space for community use after school hours.

>

> Regular visits to our Recreation facilities have confirmed that the agreement is being adhered to by the District via the Recreation Commission. Not only are public Recreation Facilities being used by the Schools on a regular basis but they are being used by excluding the general public altogether during certain periods. This is not within the terms of reference of the agreement signed between the partners. Thus it would appear that the Recreation Commission is not only carrying out the terms of the agreement, while the School District has not, but has gone one step further and, in violation of the all round healthy community concept, has done so by excluding, at certain times, the general public altogether from using such facilities.

>

> However, when Councillor Crist enquired of the School District 44 whether the agreement for the use of School facilities had been implemented, the spokesperson not only stated that it had not, but even denied any knowledge of such an agreement, stating further that to the best of her knowledge no policy to this effect existed and that, in any case, she had not been given any instruction by the Chief administrator to this effect. When Councillor Crist requested clarification from District staff, the answer was vague and inconclusive.

>

> In summary, it would appear that while the District has upheld its side of the bargain, School District 44 has not. However, the Recreation Commission is not only adhering to the terms of the agreement on a unilateral basis but is doing so at the expense of the general public by excluding or sharply infringing on the public's ability to use such facilities, thus jeopardizing the very foundation of public recreation as an important arm of the preventive health care and the healthy community concept.

>

> While the general thrust of the agreement may have been to make better use of facilities, it was never its intention to accomplish this at the expense of the general public who subsidize the District owned recreation facilities to the tune of nearly \$ 6 million annually. The situation is especially sensitive since the Commission is increasingly using facility space not only to accommodate individual client instruction at the expense of the general users, including seniors, but is also increasingly using facility space, including pool space, for the benefit of private clubs, albeit non profit, at the expense of the general public. By way of example, in one instance, the Ron Andrews facility was closed to the general public for 2 days to accommodate a private club.

>
> To allow schools to use public recreation facilities is one thing. To do so by excluding the general public altogether, as has been the case, is something totally different and flies in the face not only of common sense but also flies in the face of the agreement whose status appears to be uncertain. What is more it appears to have taken place under an umbrella of large increases in staff contingents

>
> In light of this, an explanation and an update report is needed to clarify the situation.

>
>
>
>
>
>

 winmail.dat	Name: winmail.dat Type: application/ms-tnef Encoding: base64
---	---