**University Endowment Lands**

**Minutes from the**

**COMMUNITY ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING**

**Monday, July 18, 2016**

Minutes from the meeting of the University Endowment Lands (UEL) Community Advisory Council (CAC), held at **6 pm on Monday, July 18, 2016** in the Community Amenity Space at 300-5755 Dalhousie Road, Vancouver, BC.

**CAC Members Present:**

Jaymie Ho, Area B, Vice-President

Peter McConnell, Area C, Secretary-Treasurer

Lynne Pomfret, Area A

Justin LeBlanc, Area D

Hong Chen, Area D

**CAC Members Regret:**

Dave Forsyth, Area A, President

Mojan Nozari, Area D

**UEL Staff Present:**

Jonn Braman, Manager

**Delegates:**

David Eby, MLA Vancouver-Pt Grey

Marcin Pachcinski (Metro Vancouver - Division Manager, Electoral Area and Environment).

Mitch Sokalski, Director, Regional Parks

Jeff Fitzpatrick, Metro Vancouver Pacific Spirit Park Consultant

Sylvia Pendl, Park Planner, Metro Vancouver Regional Parks, West Area

Maria Harris, Electoral Area A Director, Metro Vancouver

1. **Call to Order at 6:10 pm**

1.1 Open Public Session

1. **Approval of Agenda**

Moved, Seconded and Carried.

That the agenda be approved with one change: David Eby has not yet arrived, and therefore agenda item 4.1 will be postponed.

**3.0 Approval of Minutes**

Moved, Seconded and Carried.

That the minutes of the Community Advisory Council regular meeting dated June 20, 2016 be approved with one change: the removal of [… one abstention] from a new CAC member who felt he needed more time to review the report” in 8.1.

1. **Delegations**

4.2 Jeffrey Fitzpatrick and Sylvia Pendl on Pacific Spirit Park Service Yard. Also in attendance were Mitch Sokalski (Metro Vancouver - Director, Regional Parks) and Marcin Pachcinski (Metro Vancouver - Division Manager, Electoral Area and Environment).

* In response to concern from the UEL community regarding the lack of awareness surrounding the public information session on June 22nd, Metro Vancouver (MV) Parks has updated the project website to reflect that the response deadline for the online questionnaire has been extended to Friday, July 22nd, and materials presented at the information session have been brought to this meeting.
* In response to the strong response from the community, MV Parks has also added another public information session in Fall/Winter 2016.
* The concerns and community values of Area C residents regarding the Little Australia Park have been recognized by MV Parks.
* The MV Parks presentation file is attached to these minutes as “Appendix A”. A summary of the presentation is as follows:
  + Service yards for Pacific Spirit Regional Park serve as a space to support basic park operations, such as park maintenance, stewardship and protection of ecological resources, and the facilitation of interpretation programs to allow the public to connect with nature. See the primary operation details on page 8 of Appendix A.
  + The existing service yard facility, which is provincially owned, is at the end of its operational lifespan. The trailers used for work and receiving visitors on-site, which were constructed in the 1990s, are currently in poor condition and unsuitable for their purpose.
  + There is no tenure on the site; the provincial government has denied requests of tenure from MV Parks, and has issued a notice that the site should be evacuated. Tenure is critical for maximizing the capital investment and minimizing rental costs.
  + The service yard is a one acre space that must accommodate a small administration area, work areas, change rooms for staff, first aid and other safety facilities, outdoor equipment and material storage, a staff parking area, and an adjacent storm-water enhancement facility. The new site must be ecologically sound and have a minimal footprint.
* Three locations have been shortlisted for further study and review: Little Australia Park, the area at the intersection of Imperial & 29th Ave, and the Sedgwick fill site.
* The project milestones are shown on page 11 of Appendix A. Currently it’s still in information-gathering and analysis stage; no decision has been made yet. The project implementation time is 2018.

**Comments (C) and Questions (Q) from the Community Advisory Council and EAA Director; Answers (A) by MV Parks Delegations:**

* + **Q**: (Jaymie Ho) Why was Little Australia Park selected as a candidate site?
  + **A**: Seven sites were initially considered. Evaluation criteria for the shortlist included the degree to which the site is disturbed, availability of tenure, impacts to residents and park partners, impacts on overall park operations and ecology, and practicality as the site of a functional facility. Public consultation will provide more insight into the candidate sites beyond this basic preliminary evaluation.
  + **Q**: (Lynne Pomfret) Has the provincial government informed MV Parks of other plans for the existing site? How long was the negotiation with the provincial government?
* **A**: MV Parks was informed that tenure is not available for the site, but no rationale was provided. The standard application process was followed in its entirety by MV Parks. Considering that the facility is at the end of its lifetime and tenure is an obstruction to renewing the facility, it is necessary for MV Parks to explore alternative sites at this time.
  + **C**: (Jaymie Ho) Jaymie Ho remarked that she was not aware that the project had been underway for several years prior to recent discussions with the UEL.  
    From the notice that was distributed for the open house event on June 22nd, it was not evident to the Council that the community would be substantially impacted by this project. Hence, the UEL is considerably shocked by the shortlisting of the Little Australia Park, which entails not only the destruction of a park but also the destruction of a community. Due to the lack of information regarding this project, the community still has many questions regarding the history, development, and current status of this project. Therefore, the community needs and deserves substantially more transparency going forward.
  + **Q**: (Pete McConnell) Pete McConnell shared that he was unaware of the open house until he incidentally came across it. Among the CAC members and delegates present, he was only aware of one other individual who had attended the event. He raised a question regarding how the UEL, the CAC, the ADP, the residents of Little Australia, and other park users were entirely unaware of the event, and what means were employed to disseminate pertinent information.
  + **A**: The MV Parks staff regrets the low awareness regarding the event. Appropriate notices were posted in local newspapers (e.g. the Campus Resident), online, and through park notice boards. In the future, notices will be delivered directly to the CAC such that they may be distributed through an email blast.
  + **C**: (Jaymie Ho) Jaymie Ho commented that there was not enough emphasis on the importance of the meeting in the notification, which gave the false impression that the meeting was not exceptionally urgent.
  + **C**: (Maria Harris) Maria Harris likewise was unaware that Little Australia was a candidate site, and emphasized the problem of communication. She recommended that MV Parks consider the interests of the parties that would be affected by the information, as opposed to simply considering the means by which to distribute this information. The UEL’s unique two-tier consultation process (namely, through the CAC and the UEL administration) should also be considered; the CAC is the main means of communication with the community. Finally, the second information session, which appears to have substantial significance with regards to the future of the project, should be coordinated to tie in with the September CAC meeting.
  + **Q**: (Justin LeBlanc) What are the areas of the disturbed land on the three sites?
    - **A**: The Sedgewick fill site was logged in the past, and functioned as a dump for excess soil from the construction of the Sedgewick Library; the size of the disturbed land is significantly larger than one acre. The Imperial & 29th site is problematic in that it has no significant ecological value, but it also has the highest number of park users; while the edges of the locality are significantly disturbed, MV Parks was unable to exact figures for the acreage of disturbed land. The Little Australia Park was constructed on a fill site and therefore is also disturbed; the disturbed area is about 0.61 hectares. The ecological maps on the MV Parks website can provide additional information regarding the disturbance of these sites.
    - **Q**: (Jaymie Ho) Has MV Parks suggested a land swap agreement with respect to tenure such that the current service yard site could be granted tenure and Little Australia could be retained as a park? In any case, there should have been further discussion with the provincial government before the MV Parks prior to simply moving on to plans for a new site.
    - **A**: MV Parks has thus only far only applied for tenure, and has not explored land exchange agreements; they are currently unaware of any other disposable land in Pacific Spirit Regional Park that could be utilized for this purpose.
    - **Q**: (Maria Harris) How will the service yard fit into open space in Little Australia, with respect to the size of the locality and the orientation of service routes?  
      Furthermore, considering that the majority of Pacific Spirit Regional Park serves as an ecological park, it is important to protect the only two open spaces (which historically have been rare, valuable spaces) in the Point Grey Peninsula, namely the Little Australia Park and the field beside NW Marine Drive overlooking Howe Sound.
* **A**: How the service yard fits into the space is influenced by factors such as the distribution of disturbed land, road access, and ecological disturbance. The one-acre square as demonstrated on the illustrated diagrams is not intended as a representation of the final shape of the service yard.
* **Q**: (Jaymie Ho) There will be MV Parks committee meetings on September 14th and October 14th; is it possible for the CAC to apply to speak directly to the MV Parks committee?
* **A**: It is certainly possible; it is best to appear as a representative for the community with regards to a particular issue when that issue is the subject of the agenda. To apply, an application to appear as a delegation should be sent to the Board and Information Services, as listed on the website.
* **C:** (Maria Harris) Maria Harris responded that she will support the CAC by notifying CAC when this issue is raised on the agenda so that an email blast can be sent out when appropriate. It is important to keep in mind that the committee does not make the final decision; it is rather the Board of Directors as a whole. However, their decisions will be influenced by the conclusions of the committees. The extent to which the staff has responded to the recommendations made are usually delineated as part of staff reports, which provides residents with an opportunity to contact the Board of Directors to offer additional information or perspectives.
  + - **Q**: (Jaymie Ho) Is UEL Manager Braman aware of why tenure could not be granted?
* **A**: (Answered by UEL Manager Braman) The decision regarding tenure is made by the Ministry of Forests, Lands, and Natural Resources. The UEL Administration does not possess any additional information.
  + **Q**: (Jaymie Ho’s question to UEL Manager) Can Manager Braman write to Minister Fassbender regrading the community’s strong desire to preserve the park and whether or not there is an opportunity to grant tenure to the existing site?
  + **A**: (Answered by UEL Manager Braman) While Manager Braman provides updates to Minister Fassbender, and he will convey the sentiments of the community as heard during the meeting, he does not have a role in the final decision.

4.1 David Eby, MLA Vancouver-Pt Grey

* + - David Eby thanked the CAC and Maria Harris for their contributions to the community, and appreciated the work of the MV Parks staff.
    - He proposed two hypotheses regarding why tenure is unavailable: 1) there is an unstated plan for the existing site, or 2) there is policy in place such that the site will not be granted tenure at any time.
    - David Eby wrote to Minister Fassbender to delineate the consequences of the project to the community, and to verify if the government has another plan for the site. He also wrote to Steve Thompson, Minister of Forests, Lands and Natural Resources, and will speak to him in person during the Legislative session in two weeks. He will also have an opportunity to speak to Minister Fassbender on July 25th.
    - David Eby emphasized that, the further this project progresses, the more difficult it will be to intervene, with additional potential plans being created in the future. Thus, early intervention is important. He is confident that this will be a successful campaign, considering the upcoming election and the government’s resulting attention to community voices.
    - The staff in David Eby’s office has prepared postcards for residents to deliver messages to Ministers Fassbender and Thompson. The postcards will be hand-delivered by David Eby, and those who leave their email addresses on the cards will receive updates from him.
    - During the public question session, David Eby also stated that he was pleased with the momentum of the community voices in the meeting, and that the residents should use this momentum to fulfill the potential of the Little Australia Park by naming it and providing it with appropriate amenities.

4.3 Maria Harris, EAA Director

* The Electoral Area A report is attached to these minutes as “Appendix B”.
* In the interests of time, Maria Harris suggested that those interested can review her full report as attached to the CAC meeting notification email, or alternatively visit her website or the CAC’s website.
* Maria Harris reached out to Metro Vancouver staff to inquire regarding why the service yard cannot stay at the existing site, but received no response. According to her understanding, there has never been tenure on the property, and the work yard has existed for several decades sans tenure.
* She is also interested in the identities of the contacts and decision-makers for this project at the provincial level, in order to discover why tenure cannot be granted. She also would like to know what actions MV Parks would be willing to take in order to avoid this scenario, what alternative agreements could be reached between the provincial government and MV Parks, and whether or not some form of land-based agreement could be reached. She will share the information that she obtains with UEL residents.

**Motion Raised by Community Advisory Council:**

***Moved, Seconded and Carried  
that the UEL Community Advisory Council does not support the usage of the Little Australia Park in Area C as a potential site for the Pacific Spirit Park Work Service Yard.***

**Comments (C) or Questions (Q) from the Public; Answers (A) by MV Parks Delegations:**

* + **Q**: In the event that the service yard is relocated to Little Australia Park, what tenure will MV Parks receive?
  + **A**: Little Australia Park is owned by MV Parks. The existing site, however, is provincially owned.
  + **Q**: Referring to the project process timeline (page 11 of Appendix A), when will the site selection result be determined?
  + **A**: The decision will be finalized by spring 2017 in preparation for further feasibility analyses. During the next public session scheduled Fall/Winter 2016, the results of detailed analyses, along with the public input received, will be presented.
  + **Q**: When was MV Parks told to leave the site and when? How was that communicated to MV Parks?
  + **A**: MV Parks were asked to prepare to leave by mail, but no fixed date has been given.
  + **C**: The letter should be publicized.
  + **Q**: Was UEL informed prior to the June 22nd meeting?
  + **A**: (Answered by UEL Manager Braman) Yes, Manager Braman received a notice regarding the public meeting with an event poster attached (see “Appendix C”), and forwarded the notice to the Chair and Secretary of the CAC who posted the event poster on the CAC website. He also attended the CAC meeting on June 20th and advised the CAC of the time of the open house. However, like the CAC, he was also unaware of the potential impact of the open house.
    - **C**: A fixed-time lease of 25 to 50 years may be a reasonable alternative to full tenure.
  + **Q**: Why is Little Australia a “disturbed site”? It does not appear to be disturbed.
  + **A**: Disturbed sites are defined as sites that have been cleared for development or filled in the past; they can minimize ecological impact and will be considered as a priority during the site selection process.
  + **C**: (Dave Whightman, Area C Resident) A formal name should be given to this community space to create stronger recognition and greater potential for preservation. The name “Little Australia Community Park” is proposed.
  + **C**: (Hilary Reid, Area C Resident) The park is safe for children or pet-owners due to the lack of traffic. The service yard will cause severe negative impact on local housing value due to traffic from trucks and other large equipment.   
    It is also necessary to consider the future, in that large developments will be constructed at Block F, Jericho Lands, the University Golf Club, and elsewhere, making it crucial that Little Australia be preserved as a rare green space.
  + **C**: (John O’Donnell, Area C Resident) The concept of creating a children’s park in Little Australia for the UEL community has been raised multiple times in the past, and it was approved by Metro Vancouver on the condition that it be maintained by the community. Overall, the UEL has been continuously maintaining the Little Australia Park for a number of years.   
    The idea of a boundary adjustment to preserve both the service yard and the park is very viable, especially considering the ongoing incorporation study and the aforementioned significance of preserving a community park for the future. Furthermore, changing the use of the Little Australia green space to an industrial service yard necessitates the tedious process of OCP changes and re-zoning applications.
* **C**: (Margaret and Bill Walker, Area C Resident) A map that predates the formation of Pacific Spirit Park shows that Little Australia in fact belongs to the UEL; unless further rezoning has occurred, it should still belong to the UEL. A second map made shortly after the formation of the park shows that, although it has been considered in recent years without question as a part of Pacific Spirit Regional Park, the boundaries of Pacific Spirit Regional Park in fact excluded Little Australia Park.
* **A**: Block E was originally property of the GVRD; it was formally transferred to Pacific Spirit Regional Park during its formation in 1987. Several erroneous maps showing the zoning configuration as described by the residents persisted.
* **C**: (Cheryl Cooper, Resident on W 6th Ave) Since 6th Ave ends at Little Australia Park; the park attracts users both from the UEL and the City of Vancouver.   
  If the space becomes a service yard, with staff working at night, the lighting in the facility will be on throughout the entire day, creating an invasive presence in the small community.
* **Q**: (Svend Anderson, Area C Resident) Little Australia Park is important as a play area and family leisure space, and therefore thus the service yard will generate strong negative impact on families.   
  Would the future service yard also host community events such as Night Watch, in which case the community would be overwhelmed by parked cars?
* **A**: No, the service yard only has basic functionality and will not host events.
* **C**: (Harry King, Area C Resident) The values of the community are underestimated in the site selection process. Little Australia would have been removed from the shortlist if community values were addressed properly, given its strong ties with local residents.
* **Q**: (Greg Nelson to Maria Harris) This meeting provides good momentum to move toward dedicating the community park; how can this be done?
* **A:** (Answered by Maria Harris) A regional park differs from a community park in that it is created to preserve ecologically sensitive regions; although it is considered as a part of Pacific Spirit Regional Park, Little Australia Park has effectively acted as a community park, which does not reflect the overall function of the greater regional park. It is important for Metro Vancouver to identify pockets of green space that might not match the overall plan for parks, but should be preserved nonetheless because of their particular value; Little Australia is an example of such a locality. However, at the regional administrative level, this is a complicated issue to handle.
* **A:** (Answered by Mitch Sokalski, Director, Regional Parks)
* **Q:** (Fabio Rossi, Area C Resident) UEL is an incorporated area in the Province, and Maria Harris stands for the Province in this case?
* **A**: (Answered by Maria Harris) The UEL governance structure is very particular. Metro Vancouver is not the government; the UEL Administration is the local government of the UEL, and Minister Fassbender is the de facto “mayor” of the UEL.
* **C**: (Fabio Rossi, Area C Resident) Area C is a main route for bicycles commuting through the UEL to UBC; service trucks will pose a safety hazard.   
  The construction of the service will also damage the unique experience of picking blackberries around the park.
* **Q**: (Greg Nelson) Has any geotechnical study has been conducted?
* **C**: (Pete McConnell) A geotechnical study is particularly important considering the Fraser Delta is sinking as a consequence of its formation from glacial activity and is therefore unstable. This is demonstrated by the 1935 Great Campus Washout landslide (see “Appendix D”), in which 70,000 cubic metres of material flowed into the Spanish Banks area. The east slope of Spanish Banks Creek was the site of a landslide on January 30, 1935 (see “Appendix D”).
* **A**: No geological study has been conducted yet, but it will be an aspect of further analysis.
* **Q**: (Kim Smith, Area A Resident, *Connections* Editor) Will the UEL Manager, as the provincial representative, advocate for the residents at Victoria when appropriate?
* **A**: (Answered by UEL Manager Braman) The responsibility for advocacy rests with the CAC, but in the capacity of UEL Manager he will keep the Minister informed.
* **Q**: (Kim Smith to David Eby) A major party in this decision, the provincial government, is entirely absent from this meeting. As a consequence, the question regarding tenure remains unsolvable, especially since Metro Vancouver does not have the answer either. This demonstrates the lack of local accountable representation of the provincial government. Given that it is not the UEL Manager’s role to advocate for the community, Kim Smith requested that David Eby bring the voices of the community to the Ministry.
* **A**: (Answered by David Eby) Numerous requests have been made to the government with respect to governance issues over the past years, and very minimal response has been received. It is worth noting that consultation has routinely been conducted with all involved parties (UBC, Musqueam, Metro Vancouver, etc.) except the CAC. This is certainly an important and timely issue considering the upcoming elections.
* **C**: (Greg Nelson) The resident commented that the UEL Administration also never consulted with residents, such as the issue of collapsing sewer pump stations. Manager Braman elaborated on the cause of the problem and the efforts that the UEL staff are making to resolve it. In addition, the resident stated that the UEL Administration should always put up a sign to inform residents of the work taking place.
* **Q**: (John O’Donnell to Maria Harris) The resident asked if Maria Harris can help to find out whether the CAC can appear as an advocating delegation at the MV Parks committee to state that the UEL would like Little Australia Park to be removed from consideration immediately, as it will be very difficult to do so at a later stage in the project. He also shared his personal experience regarding advocating to the school board regarding Queen Mary School, in that intervention out of the regular flow of administration can be an effective tactic.
* **C**: (Bob Meyer, Area A Resident, Chair of Pacific Spirit Park Society) It would be preferable to wait for pressure from the community regarding the park and the service yard before taking such an action.
* **A**: (Answered by Maria Harris) Regardless of the alignment reached in the community, the community cannot directly control the decisions made by the board. The community should think strategically about how and when to appear as a delegation, such as when MV Parks releases a report regarding this issue, or right after the second information session at which point MV Parks will have an updated plan.
* **A**: (Answered by Jaymie Ho) Jaymie Ho noted that the existence of an established process, as well as the fact that the MV Parks committee does not directly make decisions, should be considered. She suggested that the CAC pass a motion to form a Park Committee. Pete McConnell stated he can be on the committee, and he will consolidate the thoughts of the Area C residents engaged in the discussion in order to provide recommendations for the CAC to act upon.

**Motion Raised by Community Advisory Council:**

***Moved, Seconded and Carried  
that a Park Committee to be formed with the intent to save UEL’s Little Australia Park.***

**Public Show of Hands for Those Who Do Not Support Little Australia Park Becoming a Service Yard for Pacific Spirit Regional Park:**

***Unanimously in favor.***

* **Q**: (Harry King) Will a report for today’s meeting be available, along with feedback/updates from MV Parks?
* **A**: The MV Parks delegations have taken note of public input at this meeting, which will inform the next public session scheduled for Fall/Winter 2016. The presentation file will be provided to the CAC. The CAC will prepare and publish approved meeting minutes on its website for public reference.

1. **CAC Correspondence**
   1. CAC Bank Statement for the period ending June 7, 2016.

That the bank statements for the period ending June 7, 2016 be received for information. Closing balance was $68,122.35. The July Bank Statement has not yet been received, and will be reported in the September CAC meeting.

* 1. Minister Fassbender's Letter

Minister Fassbender responded to the CAC inquiry regarding the incorporation study. In brief, the Minister currently cannot allocate the funding for an exclusive UEL incorporation study. There are broader constituencies in the greater Metro Vancouver area to be taken into account for incorporation studies at present. The CAC will have a follow-up discussion regarding this topic in the September CAC meeting.

5.3 Letter regarding Chancellor and N.W. Marine Dr.

A letter sent by Thomas Beyer expressed the resident’s concerns about the traffic along Chancellor Blvd and NW Marine Drive. UEL Manager Braman responded that both roads are owned by MOTI.

5.4 Letters regarding Little Australia Park

The CAC has received a number of letters regarding the park. The voices of the community have been heard, and the CAC is diligently working on this issue. The CAC offers special thanks to Svend Anderson, whose letter was published on the Connections Newspaper.

5.5 Email from Menno Mulholland regarding 4769 West 7th

The resident expressed concerns about inconsistencies between the actual development and the approved plan. UEL Manager Braman responded that, while reviewing the development permit, approved plans, and building permit, he discovered that the contractor provided incorrect plans at one stage, but later corrected it to the approved plan, which caused the aforementioned inconsistency. UEL Administration will enforce compliance to the approved plans.

**6.0. Next Meeting**

The meeting will be held Monday, September 19 at 6pm in the Community Amenity Space at #300 - 5755 Dalhousie Road.

1. **UEL Manager Report to the CAC**

7.1 Block F Project Update

There is no new update.

Jaymie Ho asked Manager Braman if he can comment on the ADP recommendations for Block F during the last ADP meeting. Manager Braman replied that his recommendations should be in the meeting minutes and he will confirm the availability of the meeting minutes on the UEL website, but his recollection is that there were concerns regarding height and density from community representatives.

7.2 Development Permit Update

No new development permit was approved this week.

7.3 MOTI has stated that temporary repairs for University Blvd sidewalks are underway.

**8.0 Old Business**

8.1 Community Works Fund Update

Jaymie Ho and Lynne Pomfret met with Marcin Pachcinski, Division Manager, Electoral Area and Environment, to discuss potential project options. They also met with Manager Braman to review evaluation criteria. A further discussion with Marcin Pachcinski is scheduled for July 25. The total fund allocated is $575,000. One of the key projects under consideration is a bike route from W 16th Ave to Chancellor Blvd, and it will be conducted in conjunction with UBC.

8.2 Water Quality Report

Pete McConnell has received the 2015 water quality report from Jonn Braman to check for the recurrence of the inconsistencies regarding the reporting of turbidity data in the 2014Drinking Water Quality Report. The UEL Manager had told the UEL CAC previously that the 2015 report would provide feedback to the CAC that would address the inconsistencies found in the 2014 water quality report. An initial evaluation of the 2015 report suggests that these inconsistencies in the 2014 report have not been addressed.

(Note: Upon detailed review of the 2015 Drinking Water Quality Report, it was found that the serious inconsistencies found in the 2014 Drinking Water Quality Report were not addressed as promised.

8.3 CAC Administrative Assistant Job Position

The job opening is posted on the *Connections* newspaper. For those interested, please contact the CAC President (Dave Forsyth) or Vice-President (Jaymie Ho) for details.

8.4 Society Act Changes

Pete McConnell and Dave Forsyth are working with a lawyer to make the required changes; the estimated cost is between $4,500 and $5,000.

8.5 Bicycle Storage Sub-Committee

It was noted during the previous meeting that bicycles tied to posts as a consequence of insufficient space in the UEL for bicycle storage have been repeatedly impounded by the UEL Administration. Following the suggestions of Manager Braman, the CAC has created a bicycle storage sub-committee with Justin LeBlanc as a chairperson.

**9.0 New Business** – No new business is reported.

**10.0 Questions (for questions related to Little Australia, please see section 4) from the Public to the CAC**

10.1 Patricia Vertinsky, Area B Resident

The resident raised three questions, followed here by Manager Braman’s response.

1. Unfixed lamps at the corner of Acadia and Chancellor – The problem has persisted for more than a year, and the resident has repeatedly written to the CAC and Minister Fassbender but has received no reply.

Manager Braman responded that the repair is on the work list. The UEL is also in the process of switching lamps to LED lighting. It would be helpful if residents could report the number imprinted on the post when reporting a problem that necessitates repairs.

1. A total of 73 trees were removed on Wesbrook Mall due to UBC’s expansion. Is the UEL involved, and will tree removal take place in the UEL?

Manager Braman responded that UBC did distribute a notice regarding tree removal and ongoing reconstruction at Chancellor and NW Marine as well as the entirety of Wesbrook Mall, on account of road repair and improvements; the jurisdiction of Wesbrook Mall north of University Boulevard falls entirely to the UBC, not the UEL, and tree removal will not encroach into UEL itself.

A question was raised by the public regarding the impact of the road work on residential hedges; Manager Braman replied that the details of this aspect have not been worked out yet. Jaymie Ho inquired if it is possible to invite UBC to join a CAC meeting to provide more information. Manager Braman responded that the redesign of Wesbrook is a very substantial project and UBC is not yet at a stage in their planning where they are able to move forward and share specific details.

1. Recently, Telus attempted to install fibre-optic cables in the UEL, but was not able to access easements located on private property. What communication exists between Telus and the UEL regarding this issue?

Manager Braman responded he does not think that access should be a problem, but he is aware of an incident where a contractor was asked to move their vehicles, which were parked on a private path. If any issues arise with utility vehicles, it should be referred to the UEL office.

**11.0 Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 8:35 pm.

