



Formal Approvals

Item	Action-Decision
Proposed Sept. 3, 2025 SC agenda	Approved. The final will be posted online at: https://www.ncwfhc.org/meetings/
Proposed August 6, 2025 Quarterly meeting summary	Approved. The final will be posted online at: https://www.ncwfhc.org/meetings/

Next Steps

Item	Follow-up
Anjolene Ngari requested that AFRC reviews the Timber Capacity & Utilization Analysis directly.	Kerry Kemp, Karen Berg will reach out to Tom Partin directly.
Ask Sam Scott, U. Montana’s Timber Capacity Analyst: how much more wood do our mills need and if its less than 3BBF, then why are the mills running out of wood?	Karen Berg will follow-up with Ben Irely and Sam Scott on this.
Forward comment to Ben Irely & Sam Scott, U. Montana’s Timber Capacity Analysts: this analysis should accompany a harvest feasibility study	Kerry Kemp email and Karen Berg follow up.
Lloyd will draft his idea for a study showing the overlap of our priority landscapes with actual fires, proving our capacity to predict the problem, and then taking it to NCWFHC to look at what tools we recommend to speed up the process.	Lloyd McGee bring outline or draft to NCWFHC.
Patrick Haggerty work with Holly Krake on a trip to see the lines cut around Entiat or Chiwawa side – set a couple of proposed dates in end of Sept/ early Oct.	Patrick Haggerty, Tiana Luke

Welcome and Introductions

Facilitator Karen Berg opened the meeting at 1:02 PM and welcomed all participants.

Agenda and Summary

Karen noted minor changes to the September 3, 2025 SC meeting agenda that was emailed out: add FS Fire Activity Update, FS Project Updates, 2026 Meeting Schedule . She asked if there were any further edits or adjustments. There were none and the agenda was approved as written.

Karen asked if there were any edits or adjustments to the August 6, 2025 Quarterly meeting summary; none were noted.

The September 3, 2025 SC agenda and August 6,2025 Quarterly meeting summary were approved as presented.

Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest (OWNF) Updates

Supervisor's Office Updates

The collaborative welcomed John Kerkering as the new Central WA Initiative Program Lead, replacing Kari Grover-Wier. He is new to OWNF from the Washington Office where he spent the last 15 years working with International Programs and Trade Office.

US Secretary of Agriculture Rollins said the comment period on the proposed USFS reorganization has been extended to 9/30/2025. See details here: <https://www.usda.gov/about-usda/news/press-releases/2025/08/01/usda-opens-public-comment-period-department-reorganization-plan>

OWNF 5- and 10-Year Plan

Tara Umphries, OWNF Forest Supervisor gave a review of the 5- and 10-year planning. With fire activity impacting all districts except Methow Valley RD, the team has been engaged in fire. There are many residual and upcoming uncertainties related to agency direction, so the planning is not firm, but she gave an overview as best possible. Five-year strategy is predicated on where we are as a region, and Region 6 has drafted a plan that has been sent to the WDC office and is awaiting review. Likely to see slight increase in timber volume, slight decrease in fuels volume, and new NEPA target that will strive towards reforestation work. No real details to share until the plan is returned.

John Kerkering will be critical in helping both draft and shepherd the plan. He is currently building relationships, learning the situation to best build solutions.

Uncertainty in budget is not new to those working in government, but we are coming off a period of having relatively good sources of funding to very restricted funds. We need to figure out how to get this work done. Working with this group will be crucial to find mechanisms to do the work when the plan finally gets in place.

Still having dialogue with fuels targets for FY26. Currently thinking 30mmbf. Streamlining program of work to focus on the Midnight Project and getting NEPA done. FY26 projects: Midnight [Methow], Upper Swauk [Cle Elum], South Fork Tieton [Naches], and Chumstick to LP [Wenatchee River]. There is a bit of other work, some mining and some range. The main focus is to meet the targets that they have been assigned.

The strategy continues to evolve and we need to be flexible and resilient as new uncertainties come about. Tara noted the opportunity to comment on the possible reorganization of the agency.

Barriers are budget and capacity. OWNF is trying to reorganize within to minimize capacity issues. They may engage partners differently, use neighboring capacity to really focus on the active management work we're leaning into. This is a unified direction from the top.

Ranger District Updates

[Written updates read by Seth Kammer]

Projects

UWPP – Nata-Wen Timber Sale is out for bid, bids are due Sept 23

- FRB non-commercial mastication and thinning is ongoing (Chelan Co)
- Several aquatic projects in planning/design

- Raging DXP is operating right now; Meadow will be active in the winter

Chumstick-LP

- Second review of Draft EA from contractors is occurring
- Consultation timeline was updated following our FWS meeting according to new leaders' intent but will still likely not conclude until February
- Current emergency (Lower Sugarloaf fire) could affect NEPA existing condition and consultation

Fires

Pomas – rapidly downsizing due to other fire priorities and suppression repair work being wrapped up or requiring fall moisture to complete.

- secondary fireline work on the Chiwawa completed during the period of highest fire activity resulted in commercial logs that will be sold as 2 separate deck sales with a 14-day advertisement this Fiscal Year (Erica has conflicting information about volume and will get it later)
- Holly and Erica were planning to share with the group more information about the Chiwawa work today, but Lower Sugarloaf fire needs our attention. We also would like to offer an opportunity for a tour later in the fall if folks are interested.

Lower Sugarloaf

- Estimated to have grown from around 800 to over 2500 overnight. Extreme fire behavior, torching and long-range spotting is making it difficult and it has already crossed into the Entiat District roughly between Medicine Creek/Tillicum Creek.
- Primary values at risk are public safety, private lands/residences, Sugarloaf lookout, BPA powerline, recreation assets, and of course natural resources including timber and ESA listed species habitat
- Large FS closure, level 1 and 2 evacuations are being recommended based on high spread potential of this fire
- Complex Incident Management Team in-briefs tonight

Cougar, Allen Creek, and Mission Ridge are fairly well contained at this point, holding so far.

Questions

Jim Passage: Sugarloaf Fire is growing rapidly – 860 ac yesterday, to 3600 ac a few hours ago – with not enough resources available to fight it. We are losing ground and the fire is increasing exponentially. He showed this photo, taken from his deck last night.



Tiana Luke: A tour to Chiwawa area would be of interest, and she would like to have PWG coordinate with Erica Taecker and Holly Krake on this. Holly invites us all to see the fuel break work/ secondary line on Chiwawa. Patrick Haggerty would be happy to spearhead this field tour. Holly expects to be busy with Sugarloaf Fire for the next while and would appreciate getting a couple of proposed dates

set for a trip to see the lines cut around Entiat or Chiwawa side. She suggested a couple of afternoons at the end of September/ early October.


Lloyd: We are again witnessing a landscape getting hit by fire before we get to implementation. He would like to do a study in which we look at all the prioritized landscapes we've looked at since at least South Summit in which at least 70% burned and had to be re-analyzed (2014). Hearing that Chumstick to LP may get burned and need to be reanalyzed brings up the question: how close are we to implementation ahead of fire? We know we have prioritized the right landscapes because they keep catching fire, but are we a year too slow/late, or more? If we know, we could perhaps use this information to leverage what it takes to speed up the implementation. Lloyd asked the group if there is interest in the group to do a study on this. He said it would be good PR for us to show that we have accurately predicted the wildfire-prone landscape and ask for what is needed to work faster. Would the PWG want to take that on? Would the SC want to recommend the PWG take it on, or should Lloyd just work on it independently? He'd like to have some maps, show where the fires are and the fire-prone landscapes are laid out, expecting to see overlap. It seems there is only 1 year delay between implementation and loss to wildfire.

- Mike Kaputa asked what this will tell us or what this will help us with, would it help move work along faster? Lloyd said it's about PR, showing we do know where the fires are going, that we do have good assessment tools. This would help us build rationale.
- Tiana noted that this is the piece of interest: what do we need to do to speed it up? Do we have the resources to do so? What we need to know is "are we where we need to be, just not quite fast enough" or what else is needed to work ahead of the fires? To come up with recommendations would be valuable, and to bring in experts who help us answer those questions. This would not be a direct response to a specific thing like Fix Our Forests Act, but to come up with what the collective expertise in this group may recommend for our Forest. We could look to hiring someone for help on this rather than doing it all in house.
- Karen summarized that Lloyd will draft his idea as a study showing the overlap of our priority landscapes with actual fires, proving our capacity to predict the problem, and then taking it to NCWFHC to look at what tools we recommend to speed up the process.
- Anjolene highlighted the decision-making process as one in which Lloyd will draft the ask as a proposal to be sent out ahead of the meeting requesting the vote. The idea is great and she looks forward to a proposal.
- Lloyd was taking a temperature check on this study idea. He will possibly draft something for review but recognizes some skepticism in the room. Jim noted that it is always great to think outside the box and encouraged the proposal.

Timber Processing Capacity and Utilization

Ben Irej, University of Montana Forestry Industry Research Program presented the analysis done as part of the CFLRP, designed to measure if the Program is making a difference. The data has been sent out to the collaborative for feedback and he came to explain its significance and preliminary results ahead of the final report to be completed 10/1. If you were not in attendance and want to watch the presentation in full, contact Karen.Berg@ucsr.org for the recording. **Any further feedback should be sent to Karen by 9/17.** Questions can be directed to Ben Irej or Sam Scott at U. Montana:


The analysis is designed to compare timber processing capacity and actual utilization for CFLRP purposes. In other words, it will set the local baseline for timber processing to measure over time. For context: 2020 WA census identified 97 timber-processing facilities. The 2020 timber harvest was 2.96 BBF. These are located largely on the west side of the state, and the northeast, as seen in this map:



The study area divides harvest by log type, species, ownership, and whether it is live or dead. The origin of the timber processed is recognized. They evaluate annual timber-processing capacity and capability along with most recent timber consumption and unused capability. Ben asked members to use their on the ground experience to provide greater context for the analysis and provide feedback on the values provided.

The timber harvest in the study area (see map below) was 45.5 MMBF in 2018 and 56.6 MMBF in 2020.

North-Central Washington CFLRP



In 2020, 73% of the total harvest was on private and tribal timberland, 25% on national forest, 2% on other public. 7% of the total harvest was dead. 75% of the logs harvested were saw logs.

59 facilities = 32 sawmills + 4 plywood/veneer + 4 roundwood pulp-chip conversion + 4 pellet/presto log, briquette + 4 post/pole/piling + 2 particleboard/MDF/hardboard + 2 pulp/paper + 2 biomass/energy + 2 cedar products + 1 concentration/export yard + 1 furniture + 1 other

In 2020: There was 1.92 BBF of timber processing capacity. 1.51 BBF or 78% of the timber processing capacity was used.

Analysis highlights – Flow of timber from the Study Area

	Processed within the county of harvest	Processed elsewhere within the Timber Processing Area	Processed outside the Timber Processing Area
Study Area harvest			
Chelan County	0%	99%	1%
Okanogan County	12%	88%	0%
Study Area harvest total	10%	90%	0%

Analysis highlights – Flow of timber to the TPA

Origin of timber	Volume (MBF)	Volume (CCF)	Proportion of the total timber received
From Study Area	56,571	129,638	4%
From TPA outside Study Area	707,993	1,701,814	49%
From other Washington counties	541,732	1,307,517	38%
From other states	135,959	310,738	9%
From British Columbia, CA	12,089	27,919	1%
Total	1,454,343	3,477,626	100%

Analysis highlights

	Capacity to process timber		Actual timber consumption		
	Thousand board feet, Scribner (MBF)	Hundred cubic feet (CCF)	Thousand board feet, Scribner (MBF)	Hundred cubic feet (CCF)	Most recent utilization
Timber Processing Area Lewis, Pierce, and Yakima counties, WA	758,010	1,807,886	660,397	1,568,735	87%
Kootenai County, ID and Stevens County, WA	510,399	1,267,419	419,056	997,484	79%
Skagit and Snohomish counties, WA	515,747	1,229,049	318,404	763,393	62%
Umatilla and Union counties, OR	138,271	315,615	115,625	263,895	84%
North-Central Washington total	1,922,426	4,619,968	1,513,482	3,593,507	78%

Analysis highlights

Timber use

Tree dbh	Thousand board feet, Scribner (MBF)	Hundred cubic feet (CCF)
<7 in.	11,908	50,911
7 - 9.9 in.	159,318	447,029
≥10 in.	1,342,257	3,095,567
Total use	1,513,482	3,593,507

Unused capacity

Tree dbh	Thousand board feet, Scribner (MBF)	Hundred cubic feet (CCF)
<7 in.	106,066	275,216
7 - 9.9 in.	488,444	1,159,880
≥10 in.	(185,564)	(408,635)
Total unused	408,946	1,026,460

Questions

Karen Berg: when the request for feedback on the results earlier this summer went out, some members asked about the purpose of the study and how their information as industry would be used. Ben explained that the primary purpose is for the CFLRP and the Wildfire Crisis Landscape analyses, but will serve as a general understanding of industry in the region. Specific size class and processing capacity information can be very helpful to inform FS timber sale planning and administration.

Anjolene Ngari:

- Requested that AFRC reviews this directly. It was sent out to members generally, but Karen Berg will reach out to Tom Partin directly.
- The size class distinctions could use adjustment. Typically, in commercial sizing, we refer to trees as <5" rather than <7" for most facilities. And >10" is not specific enough; 10-14" tends to be the sweet spot for restoration wood, where most of the recovery wood is. Then 14-21" and <21" as noted size classes is much more useful for discussions of both the CWI and WCS landscapes. Ben said those size classes are from earlier study setup and he is not sure if the data can be pulled out at this point. Anjolene: These numbers are important because this matters to our forest stakeholders in these class sizes. It would be good to try to tease out what can be known.

Lloyd McGee:

- we are getting mixed up between DBH and top log size. 5" diameter and larger top log would go to the mill or generally 7 or 8" DBH would be mandatory removal. Size classes perhaps serve better if we look at top end diameter (5-7") or below 5" to hew saw wood. 10-14" top diameter is industry acceptable. Note that >21" DBH is generally not allowed to be cut. Top diameter is what the mills really go by. Ben noted that the question to the mills was in fact asking for "small end inside bark diameter."
- Clarify: these annual volumes presented are removal volumes, not sold volumes, correct? In other words, these are the volumes annually harvested from the landowner, not those sold by the mills? Ben: all the volumes are collected by the mills themselves, so these are volumes that make it to the timber processing facility. Lloyd: the National Forest sold more than the amounts received in this chart, and it's important to clarify that more wood was removed from the forest than these charts show, and this study does not show all that comes off a CFLR project, but only that wood that gets to a facility. What is sold does not necessarily get removed the same year.

At the discretion of the purchaser, they can hold it or sell it quickly. This point should be made in the analysis: the CFLR volume is based on first sales volumes and then on actual annual removal to really determine what is the productivity of the CFLR Program. Ben: do you track harvest on the CFLRP annually? Ben will circle back to Kerry on this.

Dwight Filer: the last table showed negative capacity. To clarify: the >10" size class, the mills don't have capacity to process anything larger than this. Ben: the total capacity of a mill is 100%, and each can do a certain amount of specific size classes and will do so based on market demand. Generally speaking, the larger trees are more economical so they will take those if they can. The table shows that if the mill had the material, they processed more than they were expected to have processing capability to do in a certain size class. So there may be processing capacity that went unused overall with an abundance in a specific size class. Anjolene put this all in very simple terms: we see in these data that the mills in this area have quite a bit more capacity to process wood than they are getting, and they have a lot of need for wood coming off our public lands, whether state or federal. Where we get the most economic return is in the 10-14" DBH range in our mills specifically as they have been retooled. Hampton Lumber specifically can take up to 5" top and 32" butt. Best forest recovery + best economic value is in the 10-14" DBH. This varies by mill but can provide context for people.

Lloyd: the Forest Products Roundtable was pulled together by WA Dept. of Commerce. This group of experts was not able to answer the very simple question: What is the removal annually? This analysis shows 2.96 BBF. What is the capacity in WA and what is the difference between what is removed and the capacity of the mills? We should be able to answer: how much more wood do these mills need and if its less than 3BBF, then why are the mills running out of wood? It doesn't make sense that a group of experts still cannot answer this question. It would be great if this study could help us and the public understand why the mills are shutting down by knowing how much more wood they need. This would help the FS know what they can do to support mills in using ecological restoration wood. Ben: we are the only ones showing statewide harvest figures of what the mills are taking in. He will pass this question on to Sam Scott, the Washington Analyst also. The 2025 data is just being collected now, and when it's cleaned up, they may be better able to answer this for a forthcoming report.

Matt Danielson: [chat] I think this analysis should accompany a harvest feasibility study. Folks in north-central WA are consistently presented with differences between what was harvested and what mills can process, but harvest feasibility is at the heart of what makes timber predictability nearly impossible in north-central WA. This is the toughest wood basket in the state: wildfire-prone environment, cold winters, steep mountains = really, really slow growing trees and inaccessible acres for machinery. [question forwarded to Ben Irely and Sam Scott]

Project Work Group Updates

Co-chair Luke noted that the final Monitoring Thursday is happening tomorrow, 9/4. If you would like to join, please meet at 8:30 at Lake Wenatchee Fire and Rescue Station 91. They will aim to be wrapped up and back at Station 91 by 4:00 PM.

The more the better. There has been a lot of success so far and we are close to the goal of pre-treatment plots.

The PWG meeting is moved to 9/11 from 9-11am to accommodate the monitoring.

Outreach Workgroup

Outreach Workgroup Chair Catherine Waterston gave written updates, read at the meeting.

- Chelan County Legislative Tour –
 - Planning is well underway with the core team of TNC, SNW, Chelan County, and Cascadia CD. We are hosting state legislators and local electeds for a tour on Friday, October 10th from 9:30am-1pm. We will start and end at Mountain Springs Lodge with two stops in the field to showcase 1168 funded forest health, wildfire risk reduction and community protection efforts and to advocate for sustained state investment. We will end our tour over lunch at Mountain Springs Lodge with Jen Watkins (DNR) as a speaker.
- Okanogan Outreach
 - When the Collaborative toured the Mission project this summer there was discussion of hosting a federal legislative tour this Fall followed by a public engagement opportunity next summer. Catherine will schedule a follow up meeting for those interested in planning a public event in Okanogan. Please let me know if you would like to be added to that group.
 - UCSRB legislative tour will be held 10/2 and 10/30 during Newhouse's in district days in October and will be coordinated with the Collaborative and other member tours.

Wildfire and Insurance

Mike Kaputa is doing some exploration into Colorado's House Bill which allows community level mitigation actions to affect property insurance premiums. <https://leg.colorado.gov/bills/hb25-1182>

[Risk Model Use in Property Insurance Policies](#)

The act requires a property insurer that uses a wildfire risk model, a catastrophe model, or a scoring method to assign risk to: For the purposes of underwriting homeowners and other property insurance policies, adhere to specific requirements to share information with the commissioner of insurance (commissioner) and the public, include specific activities in the models, and provide notices to ...

leg.colorado.gov

This bill got his attention to see if and how it may be working to link forest treatments with insurance costs for increased forest health. He recently discovered WA HB1539 creating an insurance work group

and asked if anyone had more information. Eli Loftis said that this bill was passed in the last legislative session and it sets up a Washington Wildfire Insurance Working Group that has been meeting since early July. <https://www.insurance.wa.gov/laws-rules/legislation-and-rulemaking/legislative-committees-and-work-groups/wildfire-mitigation-and-resiliency-standards-work-group>

Conservation Districts are now represented ex-officio, not as an official member. Meetings are posted on the internet if you'd like to follow.

Mike will look deeper into this effort and see how it dovetails with the Colorado effort and will talk with Eli and Anjolene to then circle back to see how it might work with NCWFHC.

Positive Media Strategies

Tiana noted that there has been some recent positive media on collaboration.

- the recent UCSRB newsletter had a blurb on the collaborative today (<https://mailchi.mp/ucsr/the-stream-newsletter-spring-9167094>).
- Jerry Franklin put out an Op-Ed in a Bend, OR paper that is fair and balanced (<https://bendbulletin.com/2025/08/26/guest-column-saving-both-fire-frequent-forests-and-the-spotted-owl/>).
- Tiana was quoted on CFLRP in another article published in the beginning of August that was relatively positive on collaboration.

Anjolene added that Hampton Lumber wrote a letter to the editor of High Country News that was not published so far, but they may send out to other channels.

Jim noted that there is positive energy in the room today.

~~ End of open session ~~

Co-Chair Election

Anjolene Ngari is currently Co-Chair for the term left by Chris Branch's retirement in January. The next term is from September 2025-2027. Anjolene announced she would run last month; no other member announced running for Co-Chair. An opportunity for member discussion of the candidate was provided. A quorum was not present and the vote will be delayed until the October SC meeting.

No Decision: quorum not present.

Member Recommitments

Karen Berg is gathering information regarding Recommitment process and status, as there is no formal statement in the Operating Protocols. She will be sending out letters to those who are due for the biennial recommitment letter, although all members recommitted in 2024. She will work with the Co-Chairs to draft a protocol for this process.

Member Roundtable

Tiana Luke: The Wilderness Society led a tour in the Naches to demonstrate “How to Fix Our Forests” for legislators, along with Bill Gaines, Brandon Rogers, and others.

Lloyd McGee: he is retiring effective Feb. 27, 2026. There were accolades and best wishes around the room, and many thanks for his service and giving time for people to get his perspective and history on the wide variety of issues he has worked on. He is recognized as a true collaborator, mentor and big-picture thinker. Also, we need collaboration more now than ever!

Lisa Dowling: there is still no office space in Wenatchee. She’s gotten to do a lot in the field, including Monitoring Thursdays. Hiring is getting squared away.

Karen Berg: Funding – we have requested funds from Thriving Together and will have an interview with them 9/8 as part of the application. We hope to have an interview with Community Foundation as well.

Eli Loftis: He is now the primary representative from Okanogan CD on NCWFHC. He is working on the 10/3 field tour for State Senate Resource Committee. They will see beaver project sites in Mazama/Winthrop and then go to near Malott. They expect 2-6 members of the committee and equal number of staff. They’ve been putting in for funding on other kinds of projects like biochar.

Matt Danielson (CNW):

Our Colville Nat'l Forest team member just left for her doctorates, so are looking to fill her position and may reorganize our team's geography to accommodate potential hires. I've been helping WDFW conduct surveys for western gray squirrels. The surveys are taking place in the Methow in areas that have recently been treated in the Mission Project, so I am getting a good look at all of the implementation up to date. I have also been helping folks monitor CFLRP plots each Thursday in the UWPP. Sorry I can't make it tomorrow!

Anjolene Ngari: has some updates on the Twisp litigation that she will share with the team when she has the specifics. They may be able to start treatments earlier than expected.

Lorah Super: updating for Methow Valley Citizens Council. She will stay Eli's alternate for the collaborative. The MVCC Executive Director has decided to resign the position, leaving end of Sept. The Coalition will be reevaluating the Forest Program, where they stand with interests and capacity and how they will interact with the collaborative. It's timely that this is when the recommitment process is happening so they can determine who the representative will be and if they will recommit.

Patrick Haggerty: monitoring email went out.

Meeting Schedule 2026

Reminder: next meeting is IN-PERSON ONLY for Operating Protocols vote. 10/1, 1-4pm at Wenatchee Fire Station #11. There will be a vote on the current versus proposed Operating Protocols.

November 5 Quarterly meeting is the week before the Science Symposium and Resilient Roots (collaboratives across OWNF), so will be held if there is pressing business, though it may be shortened or held virtually.

Tiana drafted the below 2026 meeting schedule. In general, meeting at least once in Leavenworth, Chelan, and the Methow each year is the goal. We can add a full day or half day field trip if it makes sense. Note that PWG location is adjusted to the same as the SC/Quarterly meetings. That means adjusting Dec 2025 PWG on our calendar to remote.

Month	SC/Quarterly	PWG
January	Remote	Remote
February	Remote	Remote
March	Wenatchee	Wenatchee
April	Wenatchee	Wenatchee
May	Methow	Methow
June	Wenatchee	Wenatchee
July	Leavenworth Opt 1/Wenatchee	Leavenworth Opt 1/Wenatchee
August	Wenatchee	Wenatchee
September	Wenatchee or Opt Chelan	Wenatchee or Opt Chelan
October	Leavenworth Opt 2/Wenatchee	Leavenworth Opt 2/Wenatchee
November	Wenatchee	Wenatchee
December	Remote	Remote

To the extent possible it would be great to get these on the calendar. These are draft suggestions, so **all comments and changes are welcome.**

The meeting adjourned at 3:57 PM.



Attendance

Additional Parties:

Karen Berg (NCWFHC), Leslie Selgestad (UCSRB), Tara Umphries, Seth Kammer, Kerry Kemp, Holly Kraker (OWNF), Jim Passage (Lake Wenatchee Fire Adapted Communities), Yesenia Perez (Wenatchee Café), Lisa Dowling (WDFW), Dwight Filer (Methow Valley Citizens Council), Cathy Baker (The Nature Conservancy), Ben Irely (U. Montana)

NCWFHC Member	Representative	Participation	SC	9/3 SC	in-person/ online
American Forest Resource Council	Tom Partin	NCWFHC	Y		
	Matt Comisky	Alternate			
Cascadia Conservation District	Patrick Haggarty	NCWFHC	Y	PH	in-person
	Joe Hill	Alternate			
	Ryan Williams	Alternate			
Chelan County	Mike Kaputa	NCWFHC	Y	MK	in-person
Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation	Rebecca Hunt	NCWFHC	Y		
	Sam Rushing	Alternate			
Conservation Northwest	Matt Danielson	NCWFHC	Y	MD	online
	Dave Werntz	Alternate			
Hampton Lumber	Anjolene Ngari	NCWFHC	Y	AN	online
Okanogan Conservation District	Lorah Super	NCWFHC	Y	LS EL	online online
	Eli Loftus	Alternate			
	Craig Nelson	Alternate			
Okanogan County	Commissioner Andy Hover	NCWFHC	Y		
	Commissioner Nick Timm	Alternate			
The Nature Conservancy	Lloyd McGee	NCWFHC	Y	LM	in-person
	Catherine Waterston	Alternate			
The Wilderness Society	Tiana Luke	NCWFHC	Y	TL	in-person
	Megan Birzell	Alternate			

Trout Unlimited	Crystal Elliot-Perez	NCWFHC	Y	CE	online
	Theo Burgoon	Alternate			
WA Department of Natural Resources	Chuck Hersey	NCWFHC	Y		
	Amy Ramsey	Alternate			
Yakama Nation	Brandon Rogers	NCWFHC	Y	BR	online