

MINUTES — Regular Meeting
CHUCKANUT COMMUNITY FOREST PARK DISTRICT
Wednesday, September 10, 2021, at 8 AM
 Online Meeting Through Zoom with Master Plan Steering Committee
 Mailing Address: PO Box 4283, Bellingham, WA 98227

Official email addresses for Commissioners, where public may send comments (subject to public disclosure):

John Hymas jhymas1331@gmail.com

Frank James fjames.ccfpd@gmail.com

John McLaughlin johnm.ccfpd@gmail.com

Hue Beattie hue.ccfpd@gmail.com

John G. Brown jbrown.ccfpd@gmail.com

Our Mission: The mission of the Chuckanut Community Forest Park District is to ensure the entirety of the property is protected in perpetuity in public ownership, with respect for its ecological, recreational, and educational functions and to serve as a fiscal mechanism through which the district, via a tax levy, will repay the City of Bellingham for the Greenways Endowment Fund loan.

Due to the Covid-19 outbreak and the Governor’s “Stay At Home” Order, this meeting of the Chuckanut Community Forest Park District will be conducted online on Zoom.

A visual and audio recording of this meeting will be posted on the CCFPD website. If your camera is on during the meeting, your voice, likeness, and surroundings, will be publicly available and viewable on the CCFPD website. If you choose to speak with your camera off, or by calling on a telephone, only your voice will be recorded.

Roll Call: Frank James, John Brown, and Hue Beattie are present. John McLaughlin is excused. John Hymas is absent.

NEW BUSINESS Master Plan Steering Committee

a. Programmatic use of Fairhaven Park Open Space

Continuation of discussion from last Steering Committee Meeting about what groups use the Chuckanut Community Forest and the Fairhaven Park Facilities. David Roberts said there’s a desire to better document what’s going on in the forest area as separate from the park itself. Maybe there are some planning aspects of that activity that needs to get figured into the overall plan process.

b. Urban Forestry Management Plan Presentation by Analiese Burns, the Habitat and Restoration Manager for the City of Bellingham with Public Works.

The urban forest can be managed in a way that optimizes environmental, economic, and social benefits, but we haven’t had an overarching plan for the city. The city has valued forests, but management has been department by department. It would be useful to have an urban forestry management plan. The purpose is to create that strategic plan and have a well-coordinated, consistent efficient effort so that we can have our urban forests sustainable and well managed, through time.

This has been envisioned from the beginning as an inner departmental effort so we have been working closely with public works (who has been leading it), planning, parks and the fire department. The scope is the city limits plus the UGA (Urban Growth Area). By forests we mean all types of trees, open spaces, developed parks, private land, public land, and street trees.

The intent is that it will inform existing plans and regulations and some examples such as the pro plan, but there are many other documents, the critical areas ordinance, park policy that deals with street trees. The management plan is a very long process, and it has been divided into three phases. Phase one is data collection.

Our consultant has been Diamond Head Consulting, out of Vancouver, British Columbia. They are very familiar with the ecology as they are in the same ecosystem, and they are world renowned. There is a graph showing the canopy cover throughout the city through 2018. There is a varying canopy coverage across the city that ranges from less than 15% in downtown to two areas that are greater than 45%. Each of the squares is a five-acre grid. We looked at canopy change over a 12-year time span, 2006-2018. We saw canopy gains in the green areas and canopy loss in the pinks and reds. The loss is primarily from development and forestry management, gains were from reforestation of forestry areas that development had to do, as well as restoration by private groups and Public Works in parks. We now have a data set that shows us what the forest looks like underneath the canopy. What is the complexity of the structure underneath the canopy and this graph showing the structure stage? Shrub would be in yellow, which is essentially little saplings. Then as it gets older it gets darker in color and you see the southern part of the city, including the Chuckanut Community Forest is some of our older more complex forest.

We also have a data set now for wildland urban interface. This is published by the Department of Natural Resources and shows you your proximity to a forest, a place that might be able to burn. We didn’t change

the state map, but we did provide more information about those forests. Diamond helped us create a map showing what the fuel loading is, so we know not just your proximity to the forest, but also the fuel loading. Most of the city is light or medium fuel loading with very few places with heavy fuel loading. There is a wildlife corridor analysis that was just completed to fill a data gap about terrestrial wildlife. We have quite a bit of information about aquatic habitat species like fish, but we didn't have as much information about terrestrial wildlife and the habitats that they need, and which are the most important through the city. That was one of the major data gaps we needed to fill with this effort and so I'm really happy to have a citywide map now that deals with terrestrial forest habitat that's important. The green areas are the most important habitat areas. A model was used that had three surrogate species that represented three types of species with types of movement that would be common within the City of Bellingham. Then they modeled the movement of those three species and where we found habitat that had multiple species that would use that same habitat, that was elevated to be an important wildlife habitat area. Then they mapped narrower and narrower habitat that would be accessible for movement for multiple species and those are important wildlife corridors, so they are connecting the important habitat hubs and then we documented significant movement barriers as well.

We updated our street tree inventory. We had just over 700 before and now we have close to 4000. Overall, the city, plus the UGA, has 42% canopy cover and city alone if you just take within the city limits is 40%. If you compare that across jurisdictions in Puget Sound, there are some as low as 19% and as high as 45% in Lake Forest Park. The lower part of the slide is percent of canopy cover in the green, in that land use (private, right-of-way, other public, all city owned) and next to it in blue is corresponding acreage. Private land would be 38% canopy cover at about 5000 acres. By contrast, rights of ways are only 26% canopy cover, but they're only 982 acres. Of interest is all the city owned property is 75% canopy cover and represents about 2200 acres.

Canopy change over time. This slide has three bar graphs representing three different time periods. The sage color is within city limits, light blue is just UGA, and the darker teal green is the city plus the UGA. Overall, the total canopy cover has been very stable. Earlier slides showed we have canopy gains and losses in different parts of the city, but overall, our gains are keeping pace with our losses. We were interested in checking out riparian areas. In 2018 we have an average cover in our riparian areas of 45% and that's very important to us because we don't meet state water quality standards for temperature in most of our city streams. Canopy cover is one of the major tools to achieve that, so it's nice to see we're at 45%. There's some water sets that need more improvement.

Now the city is going to embark on phase two so we're contracting with Diamond Head Consulting to do goals establishment. Now we know existing conditions in the city, we want to know as a community what our goals for urban forest are, what do we want to achieve, and how do those goals conflict with or synergize with existing goals and policies that we have in the city and how do we reconcile those. We will be completing that Phase in Winter 2021 through Spring 2022. There will be a significant community outreach component because we want to figure out what the community values.

Then we will move into phase three, which would be taking the results from phase one and two, looking at our current practices, policies, and regulations and the Chuckanut Community Forest Master Plan and saying are we going to achieve our goals with the current practices we have? The consultant can help us recommend changes and prioritize our actions and wrap that up into an actual action management plan. We have a website, so this is going to be going on for quite some time. The results from phase one are already on our website and you can go there for the latest information. There is also a sign-up to receive quarterly updates. <https://cob.org/services/planning/environmental/urban-forestry-management-plan>

Questions: Hilary Wilkinson: Bellingham is maintaining its canopy cover over time. Is that composition declining to younger versus more established forest?

Analiene Burns: We paid a lot of money for this, but it was worth it, and the analysis we had them do for change over time was just for canopy cover. However, we have a fantastic GIS group at the city, and we have a lot of rich data sets now. The forest structure data may have been compiled for the 2006, 2013, 2018 years. I can't remember if they just picked the 2008 or all three. If they did all three, we could look at structure over time. It's actually not a question that I have asked of Diamond Head. What we do know is that we don't have a map of recommended areas that could be improved. But there is a report on the website that suggest places where we can look forward to take an immature forest and make it more mature. Hilary Wilkinson: I think that would be a really helpful question to answer from my observations living on an edge where a huge amount of big established trees are being taken down and replaced with young saplings and they don't provide the same ecological benefits.

Wendy Scherrer: Wondered if DOT has been engaged as a stakeholder in wildlife corridors and I5, SR 11 and would love to see some mitigation when they do projects, or their management plan to connect with our management plan.

Analiene Burns: They have been involved as a stakeholder in the wildlife corridor analysis. There's some construction going on at Padden Creek and I5. One of the components is a fish passage barrier removal, but as a part of that they looked at wildlife corridors and decided to overbuild the culvert to make it a wildlife corridor as well. They have a robust wildlife arm that looks at wildlife issues and crossings. Our wildlife corridor breaks are consistent with their data as well and they're aware of our results.

Frank James: It seems like the functional components like stream temperatures are going to be what we're really trying to impact if we expect fish to come back. I'm just wondering to what extent you have the use of functional outcomes incorporated in your planning and active measurement.

Analiene Burns: We've decided to figure out what existing conditions are, then we're going to figure out what our goals are, such as is that corridor, heat island effect, air quality important to us. Is that what we want from our urban forests? How does that conflict with other policies we have like infill and reducing sprawl? In phase three we say, we know what we want as outcomes and what our values are. Are our current policies and procedures going to get us there?

Frank James: I would advocate for a system that looked at functional long-term outcomes, as the main driver in the process, because that's what really going to matter.

Analiene Burns: I wrote down stream temperatures as one of the functional goals you mentioned. If you have the time, we are going to have an outreach component in phase two and that would be a great place to mention specific functional goals you want us to focus on.

Frank James: The whole point of our conservation easement is to preserve those functions in our community and part of town. The continuity of habitat is a very important function, salmon restoration components would work well with the new culvert that will accommodate the terrestrial beings under I5. These are important additional things that are possible to do in other places. Sign put up to warn drivers to drive thoughtfully are helpful, but probably not the ultimate solution to these kinds of issues. We would be happy to work with other communities within our city to look at ways that individual citizens can begin to participate more actively in this.

Analiene Burns: General definition for canopy (from questions): it is the upper layer of the forest. If you were in an airplane looking down, that's what you see is the canopy. The canopy also refers to just trees. There was a height layer, I think we broke it off at about 20 feet.

Nicole Oliver: I wanted to recognize the fact that we're in this planning process and we're going to get a bit ahead of the rest of the urban management plan by focusing in and taking all this information, creating goals and actions. I really like your idea of long-term benchmarks for this particular area. We're going to dive in deeper to just this particular forest and we're going to be able to get into the details that I think will really be useful for us, but also at the end of the day be informed by the broader policies that are going to be set for the planning process. The other goals, policies, and objectives that are going to be created for the entire Community, are going to come later as this process continues.

Analiene Burns: Data layers for Chuckanut Community Forest. We have data layers that show canopy coverage from 2006, 2013 and 2018. We can see whether trees are deciduous, coniferous or non-tree. When you click on a specific polygon there's a lot of information related so they'll tell you, is it a conifer or deciduous, and the height mean. There's all kinds of information. The height information can only be gained from 2013. We don't have any plans for another overflight right now. Majority of trees in the Chuckanut Community Forest are in the 100-foot range. Most of it is a young forest tall. The definition in the report about what that means is a medium maturity forest.

We have another map that isn't included yet about available planting areas and some of the forest structure was that Chuckanut Community Forest has a lot of social trail use and a lot of the understory is going away and so there is a lot of opportunities to improve the Forest.

Frank James: There's a designation for wetlands on the map and there are significant wetlands in the area and that's a defining feature. I wondered if they are tracked differently or the wetlands not reflected?

Analiene Burns: Yes, it would be ones that are not forested, so your wetlands would qualify as a forest, so it was categorized as forest if it was forested. We probably should be changing that designation to non-forested wetlands. If you were to click on a polygon, you have all kinds of information on average height, number of conifers within that area, deciduous, fuel loading which is medium, all kinds of information related to structure. There was a field check, so there were some notes from the biologists that went out or the forester that went out about invasive plants and different things like that.

I will read you some notes for forest health in this polygon is Douglas Fir beetle and dead cedar in 25% of the understory. Which is a climate change question about dead cedars, there's invasive English Ivy choking out Douglas Fir, and an understory compaction due to social trails. Also, medium fuel loading.

Terrestrial Wildlife Habitat: Probably one of the most important findings for you is that Chuckanut

Community Forest has wetland habitat but doesn't have stream habitat and so a lot of times it's been missed how important this area is. The analysis that we did officially says yes, the Chuckanut Community Forest is a very important habitat for terrestrial wildlife. It verifies some gut instincts that we have, and it also bolsters the findings in the habitat restoration technical assessment that also says this is important habitat for preservation and restoration with the social trail expansion.

This was a modeling of three different surrogate species, and this was important habitat for them. We had an amphibian, a bird and a small animal.

Frank James: The Master Plan will have a larger area that is quite a bit more complex with associated ponds and streams.

Analiene Burns: We can switch to the larger map. We have lots of interactivity. Ask Nicole and we can get you the actual data, the GIS layers to look in deeper. There is a lesser wildlife corridor break down on the south end of the Forest that it would be nice to address in the future.

I am going to quick thumb these. All the data I just presented supplements existing layers we already have. We have a lot of rich data layers, lidars, park trails, open space, lidar bare earth topography. What's really important when talking about wildlife, is we have the 2015 habitat restoration technical assessment, which shows the Chuckanut Community Forest. It's also an important area that is identified in that plan for protection and if it was analyzed today, it probably would be put into restoration now as a lot of that understory is important for wildlife and is being impacted.

c. **Preliminary public survey results**

Laine Potter: This is the public survey that we went through on our July 30th meeting, we refined the questions and then published this, pushed it out with the press release and the flyers we sent out that we mailed to all the neighbors within 500 feet of the planning area boundary. It's been shared through the Park District Board's website. As of this morning we have had 537 people take the survey, so we've had really great engagement. This is a first glimpse at some of the results, but I think some of the general trends are going to remain consistent, even with another 50 to 100 responses. One thing to note is that the actual project page, so not just the survey, had had over 2500 people check it out.

The first question asked if they agree with the planning area boundary and 87% did. 9% had other comments. There was some confusion about why the conservation easement boundary is different (a lot of clarifying questions).

The next question was to capture who are the people taking the survey and 98.9% do visit the planning area.

Third question captures a little bit more about our users. Green was people who visit once a week, yellow once a month, purple once a year, pink other, and blue was every day.

Fourth question about the most common uses, almost 100% are out there walking. Second top use was dog walking or exercise, biking for recreation, birdwatch or wildlife viewing and then education. This will be an important section for us to dive into as we start working on our plan.

This question is about the planning area and name. 65% of respondents like Hundred Acre Woods, then Chuckanut Community Forest, Community Forest, Fairhaven Forest and then other suggestions.

When the survey is closed, we will be sending all of you the 200-page report, so you'll have a chance to read through any of the other responses to see what people are saying.

Next was a ranking question. Things that are ranked lower means more people ranked them as their number one top priority for this area. The standout is trails followed by quiet and solitude. That mirrors what this group talked about during our first meeting.

I know there was concern, early on, that this group really wanted to learn more from the Community and make sure that we're making decisions that reflect and represent the Community and I think this question was really reassuring that the Community seems to be pretty consistent and in alignment with a lot of the values that this group discussed early on, so it was nice to see the thoughts and initial feedback from this group has been mirrored by the community.

In this question I added the red line down the middle so we can see the 50% line here. This was a question about each of the uses and whether you agree or disagree that this is appropriate in the planning area boundary. The green are people who feel that this use is appropriate for the property and purple is saying no I don't think this should be on the property.

Over 50% said accessible paved trails wasn't an appropriate use and just over half of the respondents said that limestone trails would be an appropriate use. Boardwalks and bridges were another standout approved use of the property.

Additional parking had the highest not sure response, which is reflected in open ended comments at the end. What does additional parking mean? Is that a 50-car paved parking lot or adding six spaces. That is

an interesting one for this group to look at because it had such a high number of unsure? Benches was an interesting one in that only about half the people felt benches are an appropriate use of this site. I have an idea of what a bench means, and it might be very different than Nicole's idea of what a bench means. This will be a good one to go through as a group when we get the results.

Recognition or memorial plaques are another unsure and I think the unsure really goes to highlight that more clarification about what this means is needed. Overwhelming folks feel there is a need for way finding, so we need some directional signs out there. There are people who like the fact that you can get lost in there. There were quite a few comments that we should keep it unclear, and people should be able to be lost out there.

For educational/informational kiosks, are we talking about a giant paved stand with a kiosk or is it just a smaller informational kiosk at the start of a trailhead? So probably a little more clarity about them is needed.

The native plant garden was liked by 60 to 65% of the people. That is interesting to me because I feel as though that's one that's not super clear as to what that means, but people seem to really value the vegetation and plants that are here. I think that speaks to the community value more than anything. Another one that needs more clarity is the multipurpose outdoor seating area. The same is true with the kid friendly learning exhibits again, is it a small, cleared area for children to sit in a circle, or is it a big area with manufactured seats. The covered view pavilion is one that the community disagrees that is an appropriate use. The informal outdoor learning spaces and kid friendly exhibits numbers are almost identical. A good indication that people probably feel as though these may be appropriate uses is if they're managed responsibly and consistently with the goals and objectives of this plan.

Question 8 was about dogs: They are currently required to be on leash in this area. About 65% of respondents feel that dogs should continue to be on leash only and about 25% said no, they should not continue to be on leash. There were a large number of other comments (42) where the overwhelming theme were that there should be a designated on leash versus off leash areas in the forest.

Last, this is just a word cloud which is a weighted visual from the last question asking if people have any other thoughts, suggestions, or feedback. The bigger the word the more comments that included this phrase or this word. When you get the final report, you will have a chance to read through all the comments we have received. This is just a nice way to see what those hot topics for the respondents are.

Hue Beattie: I was curious why the notification is 500 feet from the Forest. Why couldn't it just be anybody that voted on the issue. Laine Potter: The survey link was also sent out to the mailing list for the Park District. The 500 ft was the notification that the group discussed and felt was appropriate. It was 500 ft from the planning area boundary, so it included Hoag's Pond as well. It was a really long list. It went to close to 600 residences. Hue Beattie: Eleven and a half precincts that voted on spending their money for 10 years on it. There's a lot more people that probably didn't even know this survey existed.

Nicole Oliver: A press release was sent out. There was a nice article in the Cascadia Weekly and the mayor directed everyone in a city council meeting to participate. Todd Elsworth: Signs were posted all over the south side with QR codes letting people know the survey is going on. Recreation Northwest included it in our last newsletter.

Frank James: I think it would be good to augment this with some observational data. I'm in the area very regularly and I don't see that many people biking relative to the people that I see walking. The number of people who ride bikes relative to those that walk, my sense is that it's probably at least 90% walking.

Nicole Oliver: I think that's because the boundary of the planning area includes the interurban which a lot of people use. David Roberts: The survey also doesn't ask how frequently you do those things, so you could ride once and walk 100 times and you would still get a hit for ride.

Wendy Scherrer: I wonder if you could do some observational data with groups of different ages, which would give you an idea of different age groups using it in different ways. Is it possible Laine for you to have your intern go there with some of the groups that are using this area regularly and actually seeing how they use it? Laine Potter: The comments section will reveal quite a bit of that. There are personal anecdotes in the comments about how people are using their property and they're really interesting to read through. There's another show us tool on the map on the Engage Bellingham site where people have put the pins in different places and talked about their experience in those places whether they are restoration opportunities or kind of trail connections that need improvement. I'd like to think about how we can capture the age group use and the spatial use as that would be helpful.

Vince Biciunas: We might consider doing a one-day survey to have volunteers at all the trail entrances for an informal count say on a Saturday in October. People might go to the Engage Bellingham site, about 1000 people did, but only half of those people got a password and got into the questionnaire, so there

might be a bit of resistance to technological stuff. Doing an observational survey with volunteers could give us an observational data set. Laine Potter: There is a question about how you access the property, and the standout is off the interurban. Nicole Oliver: I think that question was super interesting because when the Park District has held public hearings on trails and access, which has been an important topic. That is a topic that got a lot of passion, such as which way do you get in and which ways might we not need in the future, restoration, obliteration of trails and some access points that aren't necessary.

Suggested that the Park District take on the survey and this was agreed upon. Frank James made the point that it is important to differentiate in the count on the people traveling along the interurban but not going into the forest and those who go into the forest.

Todd Ellsworth: There is a group called the Walking Coalition for Environmental Educators and that would be a good channel to reach out and have them take the survey or answer the questions that Wendy has on how the forest is being used by those environmental education groups, at least for kids.

- d. Restoration and trail planning (20 min.). Karleena Burdick, an intern for the Master Planning process, graduated from Western last spring and had worked on a restoration project with John McLaughlin. She was then hired to continue to work on the project through the master planning process. Karleena did a presentation on the student projects for restoration for John McLaughlin. The goals of the project were to develop a trail impact restoration design for the forest that may be suitable for potential inclusion in the master plan. Details that students were given included the baseline report from 2017 and trail plans that Parks and other entities made a while back and they brought in a lot of wetland information. The first design components were an approach to restore compacted soils, to narrow or remove trails. Students mapped what trails they would choose as main trails, and which would be removed or narrowed. Second design component was restoring vegetation, including removal of invasive plants and replacement with native plants species, closing down of trails. There are many different types of plants that could be used for water retention and to block trails that are closed. Third and fourth are focused on structures or strategies to determine the use of trails and direct visitors to sanctioned trails and to keep to narrowed trail treads (to keep people from rewidening those trails that were narrowed). Fifth component focused on locations for trail wetland mitigation structures and description of structures to be installed to restore hydrologic connections between wetlands. The sixth design component looks at how to restore hydrologic connections where impeded by old roads or trails. The seventh component is about monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of numbers 1 through 6. The plans also include assessment at five and ten years after implementation and some are very detailed. The plans were very focused on restoration goals and necessarily all the logistics of other planning items that go into city work. I went through about six or seven different student projects and pulled a lot of good information. I created a restoration summary that I can send out if anybody's interested. Included two of the students' maps that I thought were interesting. Map on the left, they chose to do boardwalks and introduced ways to do that in a cost effect and environmentally way. There was a lot of description about how to connect the geologic connections and there is a lot of concurrence between them. There was a lot of alignment between everybody's plans and ideas. A lot of the goals for restoration were aligned with the goals the public has for the future of this area. Laine Potter's map of the Park District with the Park Dept's trail design options aligns well with the students designs. They are available on the Park District's web site. There is a lot of good information there.
- Frank James: I wanted to clarify that this was an iterative process over more than a year where several groups of students did it first at one level, and the second group edited it at a lot higher level where they developed criteria for the reasons they did things. As well we had public hearings on both of them and there is public input on all of that which is available on our website.
- Nicole Oliver: We are really interested in this work. It is good and helpful. The focused criteria that was used I do think should be in the master plan. What I wanted to demonstrate here is that this is the kind of thing that has come out of the Park District Board and the work that John McLaughlin has done over the years with students. I want to emphasize that this is good solid work that's happened over time and there is good content here and so we are planning on incorporating some of this into the actual planning document.
- Bob Carmichael: I want to encourage this committee to look at the restoration policies for Forest worked out by the Park District after considerable discussion. John McLaughlin had a big hand in those and if we're going to be considering incorporating things like that in the master plan, it would be worthy of also taking a look at those for incorporation into the master plan.
- Laine Potter: The list Nicole was talking about was the list here that we just shared. I think this is a really great place to start thinking about which goals will be incorporated into our master plan.

Bob Carmichael: There's a set of policies that were formally adopted by the Park District Board on restoration and those should be reviewed as well. Bob will send the list to Nicole Oliver so they can see it.

Wendy Scherrer: One of the things that we struggled with the Connelly Creek course plan that was adopted by the Parks Department was that we had to identify a lot of the invasive plants. Removing those invasives with volunteers and staff I think is really important with global climate change. There is ivy but also a lot of English Hawthorne in there. It's fun to plant trees and native plants, but I don't want to underestimate how much energy we need to put into restoration. We have efforts to remove the invasives more aggressively and I think if there is an effort with volunteers and staff in the management plan to identify and remove invasives, that will be much better to set the stage for planting native plants.

Frank James: We had the County person come and give a talk to the Board. They have a map of the invasives in the Park and it was very rewarding to hear from her that most of the Forest does not have an invasive problem. There are focused areas of bamboo, English ivy, some scotch broom and Herb Robert. It is detailed on a state level mapping system and though it's in good shape, there is definitely work to do. We would be happy to share with this planning process. Wendy Scherrer would like to include that in the plan. Frank James agreed that it is important to include this in the plan.

- e. Preparation and assignment for next meeting (20 min.) Laine Potter: I will be sending out materials and please go through them at your convenience and come prepared to discuss them at the meeting on 9/24. The city's draft wayfinding and trail map that we came up with about a year ago is kind of a guide for starting to dive into the creation of the trail plan, way finding plan, trail restoration plan for the master plan. We are going to split up this plan so that we have four clear maps of existing trails in the planning area, trails that are possibly identified as needing to be obliterated, decommission, restored. A look at trails that need more assessment for environmental impacts or topography and an analysis of whether they should be rerouted, improved, kept, removed. A fourth map will just be a look at access way finding, directional signage. Each of the maps will be clear maps that have topography and wetlands. My ask of this group is just to take on those maps and start to look through them, make your notes on the map and then when we come back on the 24th to spend a good part of the meeting starting to work through the trail plan that will be included as a component of the master plan.

Vince Biciunas: I am looking forward to going on another hike.

One of our guests here said that really the big picture on holly and ideas on getting people in the neighborhoods around the Park to control their populations of those things. It's obviously this is not just an elimination issue; this is a long-term maintenance issue.

Nicole Oliver: I want to thank the Park District Board Members for coming today. Analiese Burns has been doing the urban forestry presentation to multiple groups and I think it was really important for us all to hear the information at the same time. I will go back and look through and see what other work has been sent to the city from the Park District and talk to Robyn or Bob or Frank about making sure we have everything that has been done to make sure we have all the information and start to really lay out the pieces of the plan. I think the trail plan is kind of the next big piece we need to fine tune and dial in. I think doing more fine-tuned work with the environmental educators is a really good idea and getting a focus group with them. If the Park District Board is able to do some sort of one day in the Park to do interviews and get a little more feedback, that would also be useful. Also be good to get that information on the invasive species.

What we've heard from the public is really reinforcing what our direction is which is restoration, preservation, no hard scapes, no big amenities and I want you all to broadcast that to the Community, because I think there's a little bit of fear right now in the community about what this planning effort might result in. The whole save the trails petition has been a little complicated. I've had a couple of phone calls where people say I hope you're not going to go in and chop down trees and put in playgrounds. If you could just reinforce the direction of this planning effort in your community, that we're all on the same page working together and dispel some of the fear myth that is going on a bit, I would appreciate it.

Bob Carmichael: Because we are a special purpose district/government entity, we have more rules and requirements than the Steering Committee does and so we can't really make representations or decisions at this meeting, but one thing that would help with our collaboration, which I think it should be a collaboration between the Park District Board the Parks Dept, is put on the Park Districts agenda what can we do to help you with this process, what information can we provide to you and have some dialogue at the next meeting. I think that would be fruitful for you and for the Park District Board and go a long way towards cementing that collaborative relationship.

Hilary Wilkinson: I really love the idea of as many of us as possible being there on the day that we're going to go and chat with people because the other benefit in addition to collecting information is for people to have a face to the people that are making this decision and that's going to pay dividends down the line too.

John Blethen: I'm obsessed with the fact that there's no water in Fairhaven in Padden Creek. It is virtually bone dry and it's out of the planning area. It's vital to the wildlife and the area and it's unfortunate that I think that it's not included in the forest area because without surface water there's not going to be a lot of terrestrial life. I'm wondering how we could make a connector maybe on the east end of Fairhaven Parkway and I'm concerned about the lack of connection to Connelly Creek, which is basically connected to the Arboretum. These are going to be limiting factors to the effectiveness of this forest.

David Roberts: Maybe the plan has an element to it that discusses those opportunities that are out there that make sense John. John Blethen: Still no water in Padden Creek is very disturbing. Frank James: That's actually a phenomenon we see nationally this year. There's a disproportionate number of streams that are not flowing either intermittent stream draining or full-time streams that have dried up across the nation. I hope that our contribution here is a small contribution to mitigating those effects and I agree with the connectivity with adjacent areas.

We are now calling our official meeting of the Chuckanut Community Forest Park District to a close.

Next meeting: Wednesday October 27th, 2021.

Adjourned. Approximately 10 am.