

October 1, 2025

Steering Committee Mtg. Summary

Wenatchee Valley Fire Stn. 11, Wenatchee, WA

1:00 pm - 4:00 pm



Formal Approvals

Item	Action-Decision
Proposed Oct. 1, 2025 SC agenda	Approved. The final will be posted online at: https://www.ncwfhc.org/meetings/
Proposed Sept. 3, 2025 SC meeting summary	Approved. The final will be posted online at: https://www.ncwfhc.org/meetings/
Operating Protocols	Approved subsections and adjusted language Section V: Structure & Roles, detailed below.

Next Steps

Item	Follow-up
Compile changes into Current Operating Protocols	Karen Berg
Summarize sections for final voting and determine mechanism (email or upcoming meeting)	Chairs and Facilitator

Welcome and Introductions

Facilitator Karen Berg opened the meeting at 1:00 PM and welcomed all participants to this in-person only meeting.

Agenda and Summary

Karen presented the Oct. 1, 2025 agenda and asked if there were any further edits or adjustments. To allow for attendance to reach a quorum, the Member Rec commitments and Co-Chair Election items were swapped and the agenda was approved as revised.

Karen asked if there were any edits or adjustments to the September 3, 2025 Quarterly meeting summary; none were noted.

The October 1, 2025 SC agenda and September 3, 2025 SC meeting summary were approved as presented.

Member Rec commitments

- Karen reviewed member recommitment status and past procedure, summarized from past documents found.
- Some procedural elements from our working documents are in contrast with others regarding timing or responsible persons.
 - **Current Operating Protocols (p.1) Living Document:** "The NCWFHC reviews these protocols annually to assess if updates are needed. NCWFHC members recommit to these protocols after the review and any amendments."
 - **Proposed Operating Protocols (p.9) section in Structure and Roles:** "All NCWFHC members will recommit to the NCWFHC ~~biannually~~ biennially." – there is a typo in the text, and it is meant to be every other year.

- **Annual Recommitment Procedure (p.1) Process:** “Current members receive this form annually, in January or after the Annual Evaluation process. The Executive Committee leads this process and can delegate tasks to the Coordinator or others as needed.”

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/1QHcEdKm2SA7KDETCrwHJIsCJkjXxiFaHQ17HEhWGT3g/edit?tab=t.0>

- To resolve these discrepancies and get through the Operating Protocols decisions/ review for 2025, the group agreed the member recommitment process will occur each odd-numbered year at the May quarterly meeting and be initiated by the coordinator.
- A Recommitment Procedure will be included in the Operating Protocols as an Appendix to unify all guiding documents.
- This decision will go to vote by the membership at the next SC meeting.

Preliminary Decision: The member recommitment process will occur each odd-numbered year at the May quarterly meeting and be initiated by the coordinator.

Co-Chair Election

- Karen reviewed election protocols and terms with the group from the current operating protocols.
- Anjolene Ngari was the only nominee for the Co-Chair position. She has been Co-Chair since January, filling in the remainder of the Sept. 2023- Sept. 2025 term vacated by Chris Branch when he retired. Discussion opportunity was provided prior to the vote. No further discussion.
- Voting took place and Anjolene Ngari was voted in as Co-Chair of the collaborative and Steering Committee for the Sept. 2025 – 2027 term.

Anjolene Ngari was elected Co-Chair of NCWFHC and Steering Committee for the Sept. 2025 – 2027 term.

Operating Protocols

This meeting was designed as in-person only for final discussion and voting on the [Proposed Operating Protocols](#) Section V: Structure and Roles. Karen noted that minor changes (typos and clarifications) are to be made in the document linked here as well as changes made below. The online version will keep up with these changes, as well as a final “tracked changes” version will be made available in the drive.

Karen provided a summary of the Current and Proposed Operating Protocols as presented ahead of this meeting, plus a review of the documents made to assist decision making presented at Quarterly and Steering Committee over the last several months. Because a quorum was present, only in-person discussion and votes were heard. This had been announced in several meetings ahead of time and a reaffirmation voted to approve only in-person votes. She recognized that the group could vote on Section V Proposed Protocols as a whole, or parse them out, section by section.

Brandon noted that the subcommittee had done a lot to develop the protocols as one and thought we should vote on them as all or nothing. The group considered the matrix “Structure and Roles Comparison” Tiana had prepared for the September meeting and saw there is a lot to digest still on each subsection. Also, if the vote were to go on the section as a whole, and single “red” vote would end the decision process, then the decision is already made as there was one or more red vote in the room. Tiana noted that we may be better served to vote on parts of the Structure & Roles section. A vote was put out and all were green except two yellow votes (Yakama Nation and The Nature Conservancy).

Decision: The members decided to vote on the Proposed Operating Protocols Structure & Roles Section in individual subsections.

Karen then brought up each of the 10 subsections as separate documents to review together for discussion and possible vote. Members selected subsections for voting in order of readiness, not in the order of the document. The following four subsections were voted on and approved:

1. Alternates and Proxies
2. Ad Hoc Committees
 - a. Lorah Super noted that this does not change the standing committees section
3. Facilitation Team
 - a. Only difference in the Proposed is in the facilitator role which is not spelled out in the Current version.
 - b. Anjolene: is 0.25 FTE accurate for Facilitator/Coordinator? Karen answered that she does not believe this is an appropriate amount for the work, at least at certain times in the overall progress of the collaborative. There may be times when it adequately covers the need and other times when it does not. She suggested that the amount of time shouldn't be defined. The group agreed to remove the time from the document.
4. Co-Chair Leadership
5. Forest Service Partners
 - a. The section defines the partnership with OWNF.
 - b. Lorah: There is a clarity in the Proposed that protects both NCWFHC and USFS against litigation. It helps define the nature of the relationship.
 - c. Eli: Remove the word “early” – implies the process happens outside the public process – could be misinterpreted by the public. Lloyd: We still need information in a timely manner. Tiana: change to “promptly.” All members agreed.
 - d. Tom expressed frustration with FS – we aren't getting what we need from them to move projects forward. He doesn't know where the right place is to express that concern. This will be brought up in more detail in future meetings (SC, PWG, or as deemed appropriate).

Decision: The members approved four (4) individual subsections of the Proposed Operating Protocols: Alternates and Proxies; Ad Hoc Committees, Facilitation Team; Co-Chair Leadership; Forest Service Partners.

The following subsections were discussed without any vote to approve as written, as they were each intertwined with elements not yet voted upon. These sections will be brought back to membership for a vote at a later meeting with additional discussion.

1. Standing Committees

- a. Tiana: includes executive committee?
 - b. Anjolene: Difference between executive and standing committees is exec has 4-10 voting members and goals are outlined in the matrix; full collab is decision-making body
2. NCWFHC Membership
- a. Anjolene: Remember the intent is to give more voice to the collaborative through equal voices, more participation.
 - b. Karen: the primary expressed concern is about voting rights, so perhaps it would be useful to identify the issues that would be voted on in each group. The Executive Committee would “make administrative decisions” in the Proposed Standing Committee section. The Current says the Steering Committee provides “day-to-day decision-making consistent with the intent and direction of the Collaborative.” Would it be useful to further define this?
 - i. Tom: using the example of a comment letter, what are the steps? Who approves what?
 - ii. Tiana: as written – on the example of a comment letter: full collab will vote; actual – Steering Committee votes.
 - c. Tiana: The big difference in the proposed Protocols is that there would be 14 voting members only, based on predetermined categories; KKR’s perspective is that the voting and non-voting members are fairly self-selected by attendance and participation
 - d. Anjolene: voting members represent the collab and non-voting members can weigh in
 - e. Lorah: the concern is with issues out of my reach
 - f. Tom: this sounds like we don’t want non-voting members no to participate anymore
 - g. Anjolene: that’s where caucus comes in
 - h. Lloyd: yellow vote vs. preference – TNC will step back and trust to be informed and heard; preference – executive committee would be admin and full collab will have a vote
 - i. Anjolene: Like other non-profit structures – the executive committee has admin power but makes no project decisions
 - j. Matt: the collaborative is different than a non-profit – set up for efficiency’s sake – This collaborative has evolved – Consider: what are we here for now? FS is stalled right now – what are we being efficient for?
 - k. Lloyd and Matt: Pace and scale decisions should be made at full collab level – all voters – 2 tiers of voting – why be in collaborative if I can’t vote?
 - l. Tiana: agree with 2 tiers – co-chairs have been doing executive committee duties – hierarchy in collaborative devalues collaboration
 - m. Brandon: stuck where we come up with a letter and it’s time-sensitive – solve with email voting even with a 24 hr deadline
 - n. Anjolene: KKR – change quorum/consensus for nimble voting – proxy/email/alternate if gone
 - o. Lorah: KKR is very complex – original dispute was everyone votes but has little understanding on process – can we start over and trust each other now? – stick with current voting membership

- p. Tom: one iteration is one red card stops everything – 75% instead of 100%
- q. Anjolene: red card = alternate ideas – need efficiency with moving on with votes
- r. Karen: capacity issues – those with no capacity be partners not members
- s. Tiana: last recommitment – responsibility to participate or get kicked out
- t. Anjolene: proposed – 22 member voting membership – what’s the group temperature on keeping 22 members as voting members
- u. Brandon: can you decide to be non-voting as a member?
- v. Anjolene: yes, but recommitment – different from KKR because of predetermined list
- w. Tiana: predetermined cuts out openness and inclusivity
- x. Karen: people can come and go with recommitment – strong code of conduct – participation – acceptable for inclusiveness
- y. Yesenia: what about an annual basis of committing to be a voting or non-voting member – change to open membership and they will self-select and every year a recommitment allows for new self-selection based on code of conduct and experience
- z. Anjolene: start with existing membership
- aa. Yesenia: include a one-yr probationary period to check it out and decide if they want to be a serious member

The following subsections were discussed and approved as written or with minor modifications:

- a. Alternates and Proxies
- b. Caucuses
- c. Co-Chair Leadership
- d. Ad Hoc Committees
- e. Forest Service Partners
- f. Facilitation Team

The NCWFHC Membership subsection was discussed and approved as agreed below:

Agreements:

- All current members are currently voting members. Members self-select as voting or non-voting.
- They can reevaluate at the May recommitment.
- Membership will follow all expectations of their status of voting or non-voting, described in the Membership Expectations section.
- New members are allowed to join according to Member Recruitment Policy.

Decision: The members approved 1) there will be open membership, 2) voting membership starts now with the current 22 members, 3) new members must have aligned interests to NCWFHC, 4) the facilitator/coordinator tracks participation, 5) each member self-selects at the May recommitment.

Quorum:

- There has been a challenge to have enough members present for decision-making and the proposed section would increase the quorum to 75%. The quorum was voted to remain at 50%.
Decision: The members approved keeping the quorum at 50% of voting members.

The following subsections remain for voting:

1. *Upcoming Meeting*
 - a. *Membership Processes*
 - b. *Standing Committees*
 - c. *Types of participation*
2. *To vote via email*
 - a. *Types of participation*
 - b. *Member recruitment*
 - c. *Standing committees*
 - d. *Member expectations*

Meeting Schedule 2026

The 2026 meeting schedule below was revised to include “hybrid” where applicable. The Dec. 2025 SC meeting is changed to 12/10 and will be fully remote.

Below is the revised 2026 schedule based on the discussion and group approval:

Month	SC/Quarterly (1 st Weds)	PWG (1 st Thurs)	OWG (1 st Tues)
January	Virtual	Virtual	Virtual
February	Virtual	Virtual	Virtual
March (Held 2/25/26)	Wenatchee/ Virtual	Wenatchee/ Virtual	Virtual
April	Wenatchee/ Virtual	Wenatchee/ Virtual	Virtual
May	Wenatchee/ Virtual	Wenatchee/ Virtual	Virtual
June	Okanogan County/ Virtual	Okanogan County/ Virtual	Virtual
July	Leavenworth/ Virtual	Leavenworth/ Virtual	Virtual
August	Wenatchee/ Virtual	Wenatchee/ Virtual	Virtual
September	Chelan/ Virtual	Chelan/ Virtual	Virtual
October	Okanogan County/ Virtual	Okanogan County/ Virtual	Virtual
November	Wenatchee/ Virtual	Wenatchee/ Virtual	Virtual
December	Virtual	Virtual	Virtual

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 PM.



Attendance

NCWFHC Member	Representative	Participation	SC	10/1 SC
American Forest Resource Council	Tom Partin	NCWFHC	Y	TP
	Matt Comisky	Alternate		
Cascadia Conservation District	Patrick Haggarty	NCWFHC	Y	
	Joe Hill	Alternate		
	Ryan Williams	Alternate		
Chelan County	Mike Kaputa	NCWFHC	Y	
Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation	Rebecca Hunt	NCWFHC	Y	SR
	Sam Rushing	Alternate		
Conservation Northwest	Matt Danielson	NCWFHC	Y	MD
	Dave Werntz	Alternate		
Hampton Lumber	Anjolene Ngari	NCWFHC	Y	AN
Okanogan Conservation District	Lorah Super	NCWFHC	Y	EL
	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 CW
	Catherine Waterston	Alternate		
The Wilderness Society	Tiana Luke	NCWFHC	Y	TL
	Megan Birzell	Alternate		
Trout Unlimited	Crystal Elliot-Perez	NCWFHC	Y	
	Theo Burgoon	Alternate		
WA Department of Natural Resources	Chuck Hersey	NCWFHC	Y	
	Amy Ramsey	Alternate		
Yakama Nation	Brandon Rogers	NCWFHC	Y	BR
Boise Cascade	Kevin Arneson	NCWFHC		
Cascade Fisheries	Jason Lundgren	NCWFHC		
Chelan-Douglas Land Trust	Mickey Fleming	NCWFHC		
Chumstick Wildfire Stewardship Coalition	Cristy Bishop	NCWFHC		
	Mandy Maxwell	Alternate email		
	John Callahan	Alternate		
	Jim Passage	NCWFHC		JP

Lake Wenatchee Fire Adapted Community	David Walker (Chief, LWFR)	Alternate		
	Kris King	Alternate		
Methow Valley Citizen's Council	Lorah Super (interim)	NCWFHC		LS
Vaagen Bros. Lumber Co	Josh Anderson	NCWFHC		
	Kurtis Vaagen	Alternate		
WA Department of Fish & Wildlife	Lisa Dowling	NCWFHC		
	* empty at the moment	Alternate		
Wenatchee Cafe	Yesenia Perez	NCWFHC		YP
	Marco Granados	Alternate		
	Alma Chacon	Alternate		