

**MINUTES — Regular Meeting**  
**CHUCKANUT COMMUNITY FOREST PARK DISTRICT**  
**Wednesday, May 25, 2022, at 6 PM**  
 Online Meeting Through Zoom  
 Mailing Address: PO Box 4283, Bellingham, WA 98227

Official email addresses for Commissioners, where public may send comments (subject to public disclosure): Frank James [fjames.ccfpd@gmail.com](mailto:fjames.ccfpd@gmail.com) John Hymas [jhymas1331@gmail.com](mailto:jhymas1331@gmail.com)  
 John McLaughlin [johnm.ccfpd@gmail.com](mailto:johnm.ccfpd@gmail.com) Hue Beattie [hue.ccfpd@gmail.com](mailto:hue.ccfpd@gmail.com)  
 John G. Brown [jbrown.ccfpd@gmail.com](mailto: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 Dist. has been 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.

**Call to order:** Frank James. Welcome Commissioners and Citizens. Per Chapter 42.30 RCW (Open Public Meetings Act), CCFPD Board meetings are open to the public.

**Roll Call:** Frank James, John Brown, and Hue Beattie present. John McLaughlin is excused. John Hymas arrived later.

**Motion** by John Brown to approve Agenda for today's meeting. Second by Hue Beattie. Approved 3/0.

John Hymas arrived.

**Introductions:** Bob Carmichael, legal counsel, and Robyn Albro, secretary. Other attendees: Vince Biciunas.

**General Public Comments:** No public comments.

**Motion:** by John Brown to approve April 27, 2022, minutes. Hue Beattie seconded. Corrections from Bob Carmichael. Minutes approved with corrections, 3/0. John Hymas abstained as he was absent at the last meeting.

**Park Advisory Board Meeting:** No report. Frank James mentioned there is going to be an important Park Advisory Board Meeting where the City's Draft Master Plan will be presented. He asked John Hymas to find out when the meeting is and let us know so that someone can attend. John Hymas said it was the second Wednesday morning of the month, June 8th at 7:30 am on Zoom.

### **Stewardship Plan Comments, Trail Changes, Budget, and Next Steps**

Frank James noted that comments were received from Ann Eissinger, John McLaughlin, Hue Beattie, John Hymas and Bob Carmichael. He feels it is important to consider the invasive species and it should be addressed in our process. We have a fair amount of information from the report that was given at one of our meetings. He had a screenshot that he added in what he sent in. Our consultants asked the City for that, and it wasn't given to them. Many of the corrections were technical in nature, a few were of focus and emphasis, and a few were about content.

Frank James also sent out a document from Herrera on a scientific review of the impacts of dogs in parks and he encouraged everyone to read it. He also sent out, just now, the consolidated comments for the Stewardship Plan.

Frank James reported on a meeting with the City Parks Dept and Herrera regarding trail changes.

Frank James: the draft Master Plan had some trail alignments that did not seem consistent with what had been recommended by our consultants and I think the consultants had some very good reasons for not doing it that way and so I encouraged them to get together, which they did. It turns out that there was a long and complex discussion about different possibilities. The key issues being that in the City's plan there are segments of the main trail and other trails that were preserved within the wetlands themselves, in the setbacks that are usually allowed for wetlands and there was a full, but not a complete discussion and no resolution at that meeting. The City seemed very willing to leave some of the proposed trails where they were. It was not resolved at the meeting, so I think there's still some significant amount of work to do. I'd be happy to review that in as much detail as people would like. Suffice to say that the City was anxious to move forward as the top priority in the City's part is not on revising things. There was a great deal of discussion though about the technical merits in the southwest corner of the property that is most problematic in that some of the main entrance areas to the parcel are in that area. To put a trail through there is possible, but at \$1000 a foot it's hard to see how there would ever be enough money to

actually build the trail where the City wanted to, which is through the wetlands. To go through a category 1 wetland would be a major undertaking and require substantial thought. The second area is actually the main trail, the old road, and they were very interested in using that for access. Understandably, it does go through some sensitive wetlands that go through a substantial portion of the buffers from the wetlands and they go through that both on the property we're responsible for, but also on the adjacent property. Again, there was no resolution of that. My interpretation is they felt comfortable moving forward as planned. There was some discussion at the very end about a very interesting approach of building a trail through the southwest corner. There was no real resolution of the cost issues or the real impact issues if it wasn't built according to standards.

Frank James: John McLaughlin had extensive comments that could be built into a modestly redrafted proposal. More difficult is Ann Eissinger's comments. Chris and the other members of the Herrera team have looked at them carefully and are very respectful of them. Those comments are more difficult, and they really look at a different scope of what's there rather than simply correcting or modifying the existing core document. To incorporate Ann's ideas, and Ann is the single person that probably has the most experience with this parcel, will take more work.

I think there are a number of things in the Master Plan the City has put forward that are directly from the Stewardship plan as well that are fairly expensive things. I would hope that as we work through this political process that we try to ensure that there are adequate funds possible to do the things in the plan. To have a plan that's inherently not fundable is not a plan. I think we need to begin to estimate what some of these costs are. It's one thing where our entire focus is this parcel and we do whatever it takes to make it happen, right? What happens when we go away though is that this is going to be competing with many, many other projects in the City for funding, and restoration is not something that the Parks Department does. Probably Public Works does some. I think the restoration parts may or may not compete favorably in the budget process in the future. I'd like to have a better understanding of what this process might be and some effort at planning how those costs could be met if they are essential to the parcel. I'm hopeful that we can move this forward relatively quickly. It is going to take more work and we could have something ready still in June that we could review with our constituents and have a public meeting sometime in the month of June.

Vince Biciunas: What I heard is the draft Master Plan will be taken to Greenways Committee in June, to the Park Advisory Board in July, and to the City Council in August or September. The Steering Committee work is done, so the rest of it is between Herrera, you guys, and the City. Nicole Oliver was anxious to move things along. I think Herrera needs to step in now and represent the Commission.

Frank James: I did talk with Tina and Chris about that, and they have expended all the budget and they've worked a fair number of hours for free since then as well, but our process is not done. What I would like to see us do is to allocate not more than \$10,000 for this project to get it finished and will allow Herrera to continue this and to finish it and that would include basically working with us in the city to resolve the trail location issues consistent with environmental principles. Also, to work on including special expert information about dogs and bikes in this space so we have expert opinions about that and that we will put on some estimates about what budget would be required to actually implement some of this stuff and work with the City about a realistic plan for implementing this plan fiscally. Chris said that they could do it probably for less than \$10,000 and he again assured me that if they went over a little bit, they would absorb that amount. That's what I'd recommend right now. We've got a good draft going and I think we could have a great final document, and then I think it's going to be very important as we move this document forward through the political process to have the science behind it solidly.

John Brown: I realized when I heard from Tina before she sent me the links to the dog and bike information, that they pretty much spent all of the money and they had billed us over \$29,000 and that money has mostly been paid. When the issue of spending more money on this came up, I felt very reluctant to do it. I would want to be very clear about the scope of Herrera's additional work, incorporating into the draft as it now stands the comments from Hue, John Hymas and me, should not take very long. John McLaughlin's and Ann Eissinger's are more extensive. I can see spending a little bit of money to get those incorporated into the plan. The dog information Tina sent to us can be included as an addendum to our plan and perhaps to the Master Plan. I was thinking estimates for work would be perhaps another \$1,000 or \$2,000, but spending \$10,000 is to my mind beyond anything I can conceive. It's public money. We've spent \$30,000. We spent \$15,000. I see you're pushing this thing in the direction of \$50,000. It's a hell of a lot of public money and I'm not in favor of spending any more here than we have to.

Frank James: They actually don't think they can do it for \$2,000. I had that conversation. You're welcome to talk to Tina and Chris too. We can get an estimate of what time and specific activities they would do. I'm not against any of that for sure.

Hue Beattie: Well, I for one would just like to have time to read through all this stuff that just came in on the e-mail this afternoon and tonight and discuss it. Maybe have another meeting in June in a couple of weeks.

Discussion about having a special meeting in two weeks (at least 24 hours' notice would have to be given).

Frank James: I had already incorporated my comments directly into the document and I wanted to take all of our comments directly into the document and that was pretty easy for Hue's, John Hymas' and my comments. It became a much bigger effort when I got to John McLaughlin and Ann Eissinger's was a significantly bigger effort that I didn't feel I could just do. John Brown: Do you feel confident turning that work over to Herrera to include John McLaughlin's and Ann Eissinger's comments?

Frank James: I think, that in addition to that, we need to talk about dogs and bikes and have science behind whatever our opinions are. Those are major issues and I think having a well written paper at the end without really incorporating the body of our work would not be what I would prefer. I really think we need somebody to thoughtfully apply it to this parcel of land.

John Brown: The dog issue document that Tina sent us, she's given us a list of links and articles and although it takes four or five pages to elaborate on it, the summation of the point of view on dogs is very short on the first and last page. Those conclusions could be included in their comments and the the footnote directing people to the scientific link.

Frank James: That was a paper written by one of the staff in Herrera in the Seattle area for a Metropolitan Park.

John Brown: I very much like the conscientiousness and vision that you have shown on this. It gives me a lot of confidence in siding with you on this \$10,000. It just seems an enormous amount of money to finally put a ribbon on this thing out of Herrera, even if it's going to be half that.

Frank James: The other things are the trail alignments. Those are not simple things. We need to work it out with the City or they're going to do things that I think will permanently harm this parcel.

Vince Biciunas: Isn't the trail alignment something that the experts are supposed to figure out, not lay people. I mean, maybe the trail alignments don't have to be in the Master Plan. We're talking about the Master Plan, which is the policy, not the detail.

Frank James: My fear is the City has shown that they're willing to just go down and do what they want. What they've proposed is not in alignment, even with state and local law, and they're willing to put that in their final version of the Master Plan. I'm extremely uncomfortable with that. This is not a park. This is not something where you just put roads wherever you want. You know there are actually impacts on wildlife and on the viability of these wetlands.

John Brown: I can't sum it up for you and for John McLaughlin, but I am going to follow your lead on this Frank and hope that Herrera does not charge \$10,000 for the extra work. I think that your vision ought to prevail with the board. What you've said so far, I'm comfortable with that. I'm not comfortable with the money, but I'll go along with it if the rest of the board does.

Frank James: Thank you John. I think in my view it's not to exceed, so we want it as cheap as we can get it right, but we also don't want to come back to this later on. John Hymas: I agree with Frank. I think that trail finalization should be in the Master Plan. I don't think we can leave it up to the City to do what they want with the trails after the Master Plan is in order.

John Brown: Let me be clear about something, is Herrera recommending a trail change or is the City recommending? Frank James: Yes, their trails do not align with the City's. That's what was discussed in the meeting we had a couple of weeks ago. John Brown: Is there any sense in which there's going to be movement in our direction? Frank James: There was not resolution at the end of the meeting. John Brown: I don't know how to unstick this bottleneck, Frank.

Bob Carmichael: I know \$10,000 is a lot of money and that it's taxpayer money. I'm very sensitive to that. The legal fees have been expensive over the years for this for the public, but in the end, I think it's been worth it. I think that Herrera's time and effort in the end is going to be worth it. Perpetuity is a long time, and we are only going to get one shot to have it done right. I also think it's not just going to be about putting Herrera's final work together. We are probably going to want them to defend their work because it's probably going to be attacked by people who want to use the park for different purposes and we want to secure the park for wildlife habitat, small critters, and that sort of thing. I think we're going to need Herrera beyond just completing the report and maybe we can talk to Chris about what he's willing to do in terms of defending his work in a public forum. A lot of times consultants charge premium rates to do that. It's one thing to charge for the work and then if they have to testify and things like that, a lot of them will charge not just the regular rate but a premium rate. In the world I live in with consultants, \$10,000 goes awfully fast. I know it's a lot of money, but I also know it takes a lot to put together the kind of quality report that we want for this Forest, and I think that's what Herrera is trying to do. I just want us to keep that in mind when making this decision that it's expensive, but I'd hate to have us be penny wise and pound foolish.

Frank James: It's still a lot less than what the estimate was to do a proper Master Plan. That number had been about \$100,000. So even if you add up what the City is spending and what we're paying, we still haven't spent the amount of money that was estimated to be the actual cost of such a plan.

Frank James: I move that we extend a contract to our current contractor, Herrera, of up to \$10,000 for reviewing additional issues, trail alignment and negotiation with the City, expert testimony about the impact of dogs on a preserve, impact of biking in a preserve, the additional issue of some planning for the financing of trails in estimated way so we had a realistic expectation that the plan could actually be executed, and incorporation of information that we have about invasive species, and also include the work of Ann Eissinger and John McLaughlin. John Brown seconded it. Hue Beattie: The City spent \$10,000 just to put some meetings together. Motion passed 4/0.

John Blethen joined the meeting.

### **Update on Steering Committee Meeting and Master Plan Process**

John Brown: We aren't going to have another Steering Committee meeting. Nicole laid out the timeline which we've already talked about. Frank James: John Blethen do you have anything to add?

John Blethen: Nicole feels the Master Plan organization is done and that it will go for comments next, then Parks and Greenways. We've gotten some comments that are inconsistent with what the Steering Committee recommended and I don't know how that will play out. We're entering the political stage of this Master Plan. I think Nicole buckled to the bike community and added a little qualifier to the Master Plan statement that opens the door for more bikes in the Community Forest. I think it's inevitable that we will see another linkage that connects Chuckanut Drive, but what I would not like to see is bike jumps and that level of deterioration because I think it'll affect the health of the Forest. There was a huge response from the bike community that was choreographed. They got like 600 or 800 responses, a huge number of people that were concerned about excluding bikes from the Forest. When you go up against WHIMPS, we go up against a really powerful community of bike advocates, so that's to be expected and that's basically what happened. The chair of WHIMPS rallied the troops. How that will play out it'll be interesting to see. It sounds like you are orchestrating some pushback against that. The dog component is also out there and strong, so these master plans tend to be diluted in their final form. The question is, how workable will it be, how much will it protect the Forest.

Vince Biciunas: I'm really hopeful that the Herrera report, especially after they beef it up with Eissinger's comments and McLaughlin's comments, along with dog and bike info. The dog report evidence that dogs negatively impact wildlife is overwhelming. The Herrera report has to really use that word overwhelming, and the Steering Committee really didn't hear that as the Herrera report was not ready yet. Nicole was supposedly meeting with them, but I don't know that anything stuck with her. What Bob said about spending 10K and then defending that report is going to be crucial and we're going to really have to do some PR with people. What do you want? Do you want wildlife, or do you want bikes or dogs? You know you can't have both.

Frank James: There will be competing priorities for sure.

There was a discussion about whether Park Advisory Board or Greenways are meeting in person or via zoom. Right now, they are both meeting via zoom. Frank James feels it is too early to meet in person right now as there are some of the highest rates of infection we've ever had.

Hue Beattie: My son told me about a lot for sale near Hoag's Pond in the Forest. It's covered with trees. It's in an area where the streets have not been cut through, on the northwest corner of 28<sup>th</sup> and Willis and it's \$35,000, 10,019 square feet. I was thinking Greenways could buy it, and it would fit in right there pretty good into the Forest plan area, property listing MLS 1921374, acquire it for 20% down and \$156 month.

John Blethen: You'll be happy to hear we're already on it.

Hue Beattie: Yesterday they bought a property in our Happy Valley Neighborhood, which I was pleased to see, and it's going to add to our playground park area off of Donovan.

### **Potential Hearings by CCFPD Board on Stewardship Plan and Master Plan**

Frank James: Are we in a place where we can set a hearing date on the Stewardship plan and the Master Plan? We talked about the end of June. Herrera felt they could have it done by the end of June, not sooner.

John Brown: So, the City would not get the plan until the end of June from us. They're not going to be happy.

John Hymas: Let's have a meeting on June 8<sup>th</sup> and then our regular scheduled meeting in the 4<sup>th</sup> week in June.

Frank James: My thinking is that was going to be a working group meeting for us to review and move forward, kind of a committee of the whole if you will. A time to review things and to give final input and direction to Herrera and then we're going to have later in June, but I thought we talked about having an actual public hearing on the

Stewardship and Master Plan. We could still have significant impact on the processing, or with the City, if we got it before that meeting of the Parks Department in July, so we could have the hearing at the beginning of July.

Vince Biciunas: Before having a public hearing, you'd want the public to see the Herrera report, right? So, I think the public hearing should wait until Herrera's report is out publicly.

Frank James: The Park Advisory Board meeting will be the second Wednesday in July, July 13<sup>th</sup>. We could have a special meeting before that on July 6<sup>th</sup>, which would be a public hearing reviewing both the City's Master Plan and our finalized Stewardship plan. Hopefully then people would have it for a week or so to look at it. Then we'll have that hearing and collect input and then we'd be able to participate in the Parks and Recreation process relative to the Master Planning process.

John Brown: Is there any reason to have a special meeting before that time? Our next meeting is on June 22<sup>nd</sup>.

Vince Biciunas: You'd also have to check with Herrera to make sure that they could have it done by then.

Frank James: They said they could get it done in the month of June.

John Brown: I make a motion that we have a tentative special meeting to review our draft of the Herrera plan and the City's Master Plan on July 6<sup>th</sup>. John Hymas seconded. Passed unanimously 4/0.

The potential special meeting on June 8<sup>th</sup> to discuss changes in the Stewardship Plan was discussed again but it was decided that a special meeting early in June was not needed.

### **Updates regarding Whatcom Land Trust and Conservation Easement**

Bob Carmichael: I talked with Rand Jack after he reviewed a copy of the Conservation Easement with the red-line revisions that eliminated the things that we didn't want to see in the Forest. We had a phone conference of some length after his review. What he told me was that for the Land Trust to accept the Conservation Easement, they will need more certainty and clarity as to what the rights and obligations are in the Forest. There's a number of things in the Conservation Easement that say trails shall be determined in the Master Plan. That's something we did as a shorthand back in 2013 to try and move this along and it was a way of getting a conservation easement in place. We weren't ready to establish the trail locations, obviously, at that point. Rand used that as an example of something that would be intolerable to the Land Trust. He said we can't have legal rights determined by master planning. Even if we were to say that it could be determined by the Master Plan and we knew what was going to be in the Master Plan, his point was they could come up with a new Master Plan 10 years from now and do whatever they wanted and then we wouldn't have that protection. He was adamant that provisions like that would result in his recommending against the Land Trust accepting the Conservation Easement. He wants to see us make an effort to make it clearer. He was also not willing to say that he was taking up the fight for ecosystem preservation. He said this is your fight, not mine. We need clarity on which uses need priority. In addition to the example I just mentioned, another example of required clarity would be what happens when there's a conflict between the uses. The way our mission statement reads, the way the ballot title reads, we don't have a hierarchy of priority. I think we've over time developed a hierarchy of natural preservation as being the principal purpose of this land, but even our mission statement doesn't say that it refers to the ecology and the recreational opportunities. So, what happens when there is a conflict? We're seeing some of that play out right now between what one group of recreational users who want to ride their bikes in the Forest and what their rights are going to be versus the rights of people who want to see wildlife, preserve wildlife, habitat and ecosystems. What happens when those conflict with one another? In Rand's view, we have to make it clear that one is going to have priority over the other, which is going to make for some interesting discussions with the City obviously and it's not something that we have previously insisted upon as a Park District Board. This is going to be somewhat of a new position but I think that based on what I'm hearing, we are going to have to try to become clearer on what the real purpose of the Forest is so that the Land Trust feels comfortable that they have a document they can enforce. What they're saying is they want more clarity. He was not taking a position on whether we should allow bikes or not allow bikes, he just wants clarity as to if they're allowed, where are they allowed, what happens if there's a use that will impair the ecosystem, which one's going to have priority? Those are two examples of the comments he made. We talked for quite a while. He gave me other examples. The way we left it at the end was that I would try to conceptualize what he was saying into a new draft of the Conservation Easement, which we would do basically with another red-line iteration of what we have that would attempt to address issues. That's something that we're going to have to talk with the Land Trust about and make sure that they're comfortable with the document and once we come to a point where the Land Trust is comfortable with the document and we're comfortable with it. I think then we really have to take it to the City and say this is what we're looking for and what the Land Trust insists upon. I think John Blethen is right this is really political at this point, but we have to have the clarity. I think the Land Trust is the organization, despite John McLaughlin misgivings about them, that as a practical matter, they're the best equipped organization in existence right now to take this over. The other possibility is citizens could form their own nonprofit Land Trust just for the purpose of protecting this property. That's something that people could do that's not within the purview of this board, but if there was a groundswell movement of people who wanted to do that, that would be another option. But such an

organization does not exist right now. The only organization really that is qualified to take this on is the Whatcom Land Trust, in my opinion. So, I think we need to work with them to try to address the comments that Rand Jack has made and work through it with them.

John Brown: Are you comfortable with drafting up a new revised red-line Conservation Easement and putting together conceptually everything that he wants and everything that you imagine we want?

Bob Carmichael: That's what I believe I need to do. I'm not saying it's going to be easy. I think it's going to be challenging actually and it will require more than one iteration of the document before it's acceptable to the Land Trust and to us and then to the City. You know that's a whole another level of review with a lot of different interest involved and whether we ultimately get there on an agreement of how this Conservation Easement should be changed, I don't know the answer to that question, but I do feel comfortable to go ahead and do my best to incorporate Rand's comments and I would expect I'm going to fall short, frankly, of having it in a form that they'll accept, but I'll make my best effort and then he can get me his comments back and we can go back and forth and hopefully come up with something that everybody is happy with, at least between us and the Land Trust.

John Brown: I think that's what we have to do Frank. Frank James: I agree John. Thank you for doing that Bob. I appreciate your report and Rand's candor and encouragement. I take this to be a really positive thing. What Rand is telling us is this is how you win, and this is how you succeed. We look forward to that document coming back to us as soon as it is finished.

**City's Response to Urban Forestry Plan Letter.** Postponed until John McLaughlin is in attendance.

## **New Business**

### **Public Education and Communication Strategy**

Frank James: Regarding the public education and communication strategy, I have been starting to reach out to our partners to alert them that the Master Plan is going to completion and that our Stewardship plan will be available soon. I personally am going to be reaching out to the Audubon Society, the Sierra Club, to former leaders in the City Council, particularly Terry and Gene, and other interested parties to make sure they're aware that this process is going forward, but I think we need to make it a plan for all of us. Each of us needs to be reaching out to those people that have spent, sometimes years, working on these efforts. So, I just wanted this to be on here to say that we're going to need to go up our game. I'd be happy with anybody's ideas or suggestions or volunteer efforts of any of you that want to begin to reach out and organize and coordinate again. This next year is all there is and we're going to be wrapping things up here. I believe it's my belief that we need a public education communication effort of substance. We're going to have to organize and so I look forward to doing that. What do other people think?

John Brown: I've spoken with some of my neighbors.

Hue Beattie: Well, you know we need to get the issues solidified first.

Frank James: Getting those issues concretely and succinctly expressed are really important, I agree. Having an elevator speech is very important.

Vince Biciunas: I agree you need to do something, an elevator as a minimum about bikes, dogs, and preservation. As Bob said, we need to have a definition of the priorities for that area and maybe that's where there's a mistake in the Master Plan encompassing more than just our 82 acres. I am kind of worried about that because in our 82 acres, we don't want bikes, but for the other extended acreage, there's the Interurban Trail and so maybe we need to, I don't know, define the Master Plan one way, but the Conservation Easement another way and maybe that's going to become complicated for people to understand. I'm just a little worried about that, but we need to talk about that.

Frank James: One of the key things I think on that vein is very simple and that is that the naming of the place. The City has decided that the 100 acre wood is the name. Vince Biciunas: That's what everybody agreed. Frank James: I would love to put a colon after that and say Chuckanut Community Forest Preserve. I think a word like that has a lot of power and I think that should go around the land that we're responsible for within the planning process. I don't mind adding some planning for those other places, but I really think we need to have an aggressive naming process, that it needs to be called a preserve and it needs to be part of what we leave when we walk away. If you call it a preserve, it's different than a park.

Vince Biciunas: I would say skip the Chuckanut Community Forest, we all know that's what it is and have 100 acre wood preserve, 100 acre wood: Preserve. John Brown: Or 100 Acre Preserve. Vince Biciunas: Because CFE is just too many letters. Frank James: That's okay, the only word I'm stuck on is preserve. Vince Biciunas: I agree with that. John Brown: I do too.

Frank James: John Blethen do you have something to add to that? John Blethen: I agree that you need to do some PR. I think there are good people, good biking people that are missing the point here and I think it's going to be very hard to keep bikes off of the two major corridors, the one that connects to Chuckanut and the one that goes to the 18<sup>th</sup> St. Trail. I think that's a fight that it's going to be hard to win. But keeping bikes off secondary trails, really defining the outcome that we want, preservation, with education, I think we can do that. I think we really need to be talking about bike jumps and secondary trails and the importance of the ecology of the forest. It's going to be a tough sell to the larger community to exclude bikes from the major corridors. That's my take. I'm not optimistic in that regard, but if we can define that in such a way that it doesn't damage the Forest, then that's ok with me. The 100 Acre Woods is somewhat of a separate entity from the larger forest and quite frankly, I'm working on extending the 28<sup>th</sup> St trails so you can get all the way from the Sehome neighborhood all the way to Larrabee Park. So, there will be a major bike corridor close to Hoag's Pond, in that area, and that's probably a given and a connector up to Lake Padden, so there are concerns that in the general area that are larger than the 100 Acre Woods.

Frank James: Thanks John. I was going to reach out to Eric Brown. It's been told to me he's a very reasonable person and he might in fact have the bandwidth to help moderate the impacts. Also, some of the business owners that own some of the big bike companies, I'm going to reach out to them too. They may be receptive, they may not be, but I think we need to find some leadership people in the biking community that are prominent to move to our side. If we can get them there.

John Hymas: Isn't there a bike shop owner on the Park and Rec Advisory Board?

John Blethen: She gave up her position. For a while we had two bike WHIMPS people. One led the bike protest and the women you're talking about resigned her position.

Hue Beattie: We could change our name to the Chuckanut Community Forest Preservation District, just to get rid of the park, we're all together there.

Frank James: I wanted to raise the issue and make sure we all were thinking about it and developing those ideas.

John Brown: I've been talking with people as I expect we all should, just our neighbors on my email list (not necessarily people on the CCFPD list), but alerting neighbors to the possibility that we would be having a public meeting and we would appreciate, without coercing them to say one thing or another, to speak up about bikes and dogs and they have said that they are agreeable to that.

**Filing with State Auditor's Office** Robyn Albro mentioned she is doing the annual filing with the Washington State Auditor's office regarding our finances for 2021 and is two-thirds of the way through it. She will finish it up and send the completed reports out when she does.

### **Monthly expenses and cash flow sheets.**

**Petty Cash:** WECU Bank account balance as of 04/30/2022 was \$2,967.

**Treasurer's Report:** As of April 30, 2022, Whatcom Co. Treasurer's Monthly Report, beginning unencumbered cash balance (04/01) \$246,093, ending unencumbered cash balance (04/30) \$269,063. We received tax revenues of \$50,849. Paid out \$19,828 in operating expenses, and \$8,051 was paid on our loan to the City of Bellingham. Current debt outstanding as of 04/30/2022: \$12,248. The debt was paid off on May 20<sup>th</sup>.

**Motion:** To approve District Payroll Input Form by Hue Beattie, seconded by John Brown, wages for Robyn Albro, 25 hours in April 2022, total gross of \$625. Approved 4/0.

**Consent Agenda: Motion to approve following payments** by John Brown, seconded by Hue Beattie, approved 4/0.

- Payment for April 15, 2022, Invoice #97877 from Carmichael Clark PS for \$2,052.50 for regular professional services.
- Payment on May 23, 2022, Invoice #51079 from Herrera Environmental Consultants, Inc. for \$9,787.06 for Tasks 3, 4, 5, and 6. (Total billed to date \$29,575.75 of \$29,960 Budget, balance of \$384.25.)

**Reminder:** Robyn Albro will send an email to three board members right after the meeting, Frank James, John Brown, and Hue Beattie. Please respond confirming that you approve the paying of bills as listed in the consent agenda and payroll.

**Next meeting:** Wednesday, June 22, 2022, at 6 PM. Special Meeting on Wednesday, July 8<sup>th</sup>, at 6 PM.

**Adjourn.** Time: 7:30 PM.