

Friends of Cedar Hill Park Society Special Board Meeting Minutes – V1

Tuesday 05.07.2019 from 2:00pm to 3:30pm

Location: 3515 James Heights, Victoria BC, V8P3R6

Final Minutes: Peter Haddon - Secretary

Attending:

Barb Latham

Peter Haddon

Ken Campbell

Susan Haddon

Luis Netter

Jim Moores

Regrets:

Andy Ruszel

Hugh Fraser

Lana Burns

Don Scott

Dave Robertson

1. The agenda:

- a. The agenda subject per Luis Netter's email was to "initiate a discussion within the board on how to proceed" (with regard to engagement with Saanich Parks and Eva Riccius' letter to Luis).

2. Recap of events

- a. Ken asked for the background. Luis explained our participation in the CHP SWG and how we expressed FCHP's concern for the natural and green space in the Park as per FCHP's published mandate.
- b. Luis said that he had received Eva's letter subsequent to the circulation of the flyer. He had discussed with Peter (QCHCA's rep.) and had sent a response from himself to Saanich. This meeting was called to consider what actions by FCHP board would be appropriate.
- c. Peter said that we engaged with Saanich respectfully and responsibly and communicated clearly with the SWG members and Saanich as we were told that our input to the report was finished. As a result Saanich could not claim that Luis and Peter continued to be bound by the SWG terms of reference.
- d. In SWG meetings Peter and Luis clearly expressed their opposition to the construction of a new N to S bike path in writing and Saanich Parks staff were well aware the reasons for opposition.
- e. Jim noted that Eva's letter says that Luis and Peter, as representatives for FCHP and QCHCA, agreed to the new bike path being built. Jim said that based on their written objections, Eva's statement is incorrect.
- f. Ken said FCHP's objective is clearly to protect the green space and natural areas. Eva relies on a technical point to object to FCHP and QCHCA's circulation of the flyer.
- g. Luis asked that FCHP board considers our continued participation with Saanich Parks. He expressed a concern that FCHP might have minimal influence on the CHP management plan final draft. How to continue to engage?
- h. Susan asked what the FCHP board could do to influence Parks' staff, community and council in the future. What should FCHP's position be?

3. Consideration of how FCHP will move forward

- a. Luis said that he believed a further letter should be written by FCHP board to Saanich at some point.
- b. Peter said that QCHCA board will be asked to consider how to respond to Eva's letter.
- c. We agreed that a continuing, healthy relationship with Parks' staff was important to the work of FCHP including the physical work we do through people like Rich Hatch and Jill Tuson. These relationships also support our ability to advocate and engage.
- d. Ken asked if FCHP can serve as an independent advocate AND/OR work in collaboration with Saanich Parks. Do we need an outside path to Council? Peter said he believes that both should be possible. Susan said we should keep building our relationship and trust.
- e. Ken said that he doesn't think we should tender an apology. Through Luis' letter, he has offered an explanation for FCHP's action to circulate the flyer. Eva could use this explanation to reposition her reaction.
- f. Peter said that we should present the bigger picture issues/opportunities including means to improve cycling on parallel streets.
- g. Jim said that Saanich Parks' are in a conflict of interest with respect to building the new bike path. Susan observed that their position is confusing with different statements being made by Julie Lommerse, Eva and Garry Darrah for instance. Ken said that this makes it difficult to trust Saanich Parks.
- h. Susan said that community must be involved, must communicate and use the opportunity to influence, ready to jump in when something comes up.

4. Timing of response and other initiatives

- a. Peter said that he had broached the subject of an FOI to obtain more information from Saanich as to the background for their decisions and actions to date. Barb asked that we avoid making matters worse and that an FOI might be seen as an inflammatory action by FCHP. This should come back to the board. Peter said that he agrees to delay.
- b. Peter wondered if we might try to further communicate with the community through flyer, etc. to give our assessment of the potential impact of path construction and other initiatives. It was noted that Saanich had not asked any questions in the survey re conservation and restoration of green, natural areas. This is a significant oversight.
- c. It was generally agreed that we should be patient and wait for emotions to cool down. We should engage with FCHP board to gather suggestions.

5. Questions for the board

- a. Next board meeting has to move from June 4th. Luis and Susan suggest it could be around June 17th. Date TBD.
- b. The board is asked to consider the following:
- c. Concerning the new N to S bike path. Question: How should the FCHP respond to Eva's letter?
- d. Should we continue to emphasize to community and Saanich that we have contributed in a meaningful way to communicate and to support the well-being of the community.

- e. Does the board agree that we should wait before further initiatives like FOI and the need to communicate with the community through flyer or similar before the survey closes on Jun 6th 2019?
 - f. Should we wait for the final draft of the CHP management plan to be published before responding?
 - g. Barb said we have to find ways to encourage community to fill in the survey.... Fill it in!! Susan said she will ask Saanich to extend the survey to July 6th per the previous survey. Susan will also do an e-blast to members asking them to complete the survey.
 - h. Other questions?
- 6. Final comments**
- a. Luis is absent from May 13th. He returns June 16th for a short period. Susan or Don can chair a further meeting should this be required.
- 7. The meeting adjourned at about 4:15 pm.**