

Subject: [Fwd: TransLink Board: December 7 2005 Meeting]
From: Brian Platts <bplatts@shaw.ca>
Date: Mon, 13 Feb 2006 19:07:32 -0800
To: Corrie Kost <kost@triumf.ca>

----- Original Message -----

Subject: TransLink Board: December 7 2005 Meeting
Date: Mon, 13 Feb 2006 07:56:40 +0000 (GMT)
From: Elizabeth James <cagebc@yahoo.com>
To: Mayor Walton and Council <council@dnv.org>
CC: Brian Platts <bplatts@shaw.ca>, FONVCA <fonvca@fonvca.org>

12 December 2006

RE: TransLink: December 7 2005 meeting of the outgoing Board

Dear Mayor Walton:

In your brief chat with me just prior to last Monday's meeting of Council, you mentioned that you had attended the first meeting of the new TransLink Board in January. At that time, you enquired as to the legality of decisions made by the outgoing Board at its meeting December 7 2005, which was attended by four members who were no longer elected officials.

Three of those former members had been defeated at the November 19th polls, and one had declined to run for re-election. Nevertheless, as I wrote in my challenge to the meeting, those four unelected citizens were able to vote to commit regional taxpayers to over \$3-billion dollars of TransLink projects.

You advised that you were informed that, "the system had been set up that way, so as to provide continuity in an election year, during the transition from one Board to the next." While that may well be the case, I find it unacceptable.

I agree that there needs to be continuity. Nevertheless, by your own February 6th admission, that was not achieved by the fact of the December meeting - "Liz, I would appreciate continuing to receive the TransLink material you circulate; I find it helpful in understanding some of the issues you cover. I still have not received the huge binder of briefing material that we are supposed to receive from TransLink."

Furthermore, the legislation - if that is what is meant by "the system" - should preclude inclusion of massive amounts of spending initiatives on the agendas of outgoing, lame-duck, Boards. Those agendas should include only minor housekeeping items. If continuity truly is the only motive for a meeting of the outgoing Board - after the swearing into office of the newly-elected councils - then the new Board appointees should be chosen in time to attend that meeting - if only for the purpose of receiving backgrounders on the most important initiatives which are currently underway.

In my opinion, there was absolutely no excuse for TransLink to delay a vote on that amount of spending to a pre-Christmas meeting of a defunct Board. So I repeat what I said in my previous correspondence: Those four unelected members had no more authority to sit at the Board table than any other citizen in the Region - certainly

they had no moral authority to do so --- whatever the system says.

In closing, I would very much appreciate it if you could refer me to the piece of legislation that covers this matter or, even better, tell me where I could obtain a copy of the opinion you were given at the January meeting.

Your comment would be appreciated.

Sincerely,

Liz James
[604] 988-2066

[Yahoo! Photos](#) – **NEW**, now offering a [quality print service](#) from just 8p a photo.