

**Colville Forest Plan Revision  
Environmental / Conservation Community of Interest Meeting  
April 19, 2016  
5:30 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.  
Stevens County Ambulance Center, Colville, WA**

---

### **Meeting Purpose and Overview**

The U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution (U.S. Institute<sup>1</sup>), hosted an Environmental / Conservation Community of Interest meeting for the Colville National Forest Plan Revision process in Colville, Washington on April 19, 2016. The meeting provided a combination of formats including a presentation, full group discussion, and question and response. Invited representatives from environmental and conservation organizations active on the Colville National Forest attended the meeting, as well U.S. Forest Service (Forest Service) staff from the Colville National Forest (Attachment A). The meeting was facilitated by Susan Hayman and Tricia Tillmann, EnviroIssues, contracted to provide third-party neutral services on behalf of the U.S. Institute.

The primary purpose of the meeting was to provide participants an opportunity to learn about the U.S. Forest Service's (Forest Service) proposals for long-term management of the Colville National Forest, with a particular focus on how the proposals could affect the environmental and conservation interests on the Forest. Proposals were developed in cooperation with seven cooperating entities<sup>2</sup> and with input from the public and interest groups. The DEIS describes and analyzes six alternatives for long-term management of the Forest. **The draft plan reflects the Forest Service Preferred Alternative identified in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), which is Alternative P.** Participants also received information on how to comment on the proposals, how their comments will be used, and ongoing and future opportunities to be involved in the Forest Plan revision process.

### **Meeting Agenda**

Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues facilitator, welcomed everyone and explained the meeting objectives, agenda, and meeting conduct. She spoke briefly about the value of public participation in the Forest Plan revision process and encouraged participants to share what they learn with their organizations and communities. She explained Forest Service staff were present as subject matter experts on Forest Plan revision and were participants, not hosts, of the meeting. She also noted this Community of Interest meeting was the third of four such meetings; summaries of each meeting would be made available to the public.

### **Presentation**

Following introductions by everyone present at the meeting, the facilitator invited Amy Dillon, Forest Plan Revision Team Leader, to present the key concepts relevant to environmental and conservation

---

<sup>1</sup> The U.S. Institute, under federal law, helps federal agencies and other affected stakeholders address environmental disputes, conflicts, and challenges through programs and services that provide situation assessments; conflict resolution; facilitated collaboration; and capacity building. The U.S. Institute is a program within the Udall Foundation.

<sup>2</sup> The seven cooperating entities are the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, Kalispel Tribe, Spokane Tribe of Indians, the State of Washington, and Ferry, Pend Oreille and Stevens Counties in the State of Washington.

interests. Amy reviewed the purpose and scope of forest plans, including what forest plans can and cannot change. She also covered the need for change, key issues that informed the development of alternatives, the plan direction for threatened and endangered species, and key differences between the alternatives for key topics previously identified by environmental and conservation interests, including:

- Riparian and aquatic resource management strategy to be employed, and associated priority or key watersheds. The strategies are the Inland Native Fish Strategy (INFISH) and the Aquatic and Riparian Conservation Strategy (ARCS and ARCS-modified).
- Location and extent of motorized and mechanized recreation use
- Recommended wilderness, which varies from 1% (Alternative O) to 20% (Alternative B) of the Forest. Alternatives also vary by whether existing uses incompatible with designated wilderness can continue until Congress designates a recommended wilderness area as wilderness.
- Establishment of a recreation Special Interest Area, which retains the backcountry “feel” and includes motorized and non-motorized recreation use and mechanized trail maintenance

Amy concluded the presentation with a review of near-term public involvement opportunities, how to submit formal comments and comments received to-date.

Please see Attachment B (provided in a separate file) to view the presentation slides.

### **Questions & Answers (Q&A) | Full Group Discussion**

The following is a summary of questions (Q), comments (C), and corresponding responses (R) from the full group discussion. Participants provided questions before the meeting, and Susan facilitated a brief conversation to select the order of topic areas to discuss:

- Difference between Preferred Alternative and Proposed Action Alternative
- Recommended wilderness and Kettle Crest Special Interest Area
- Forest and vegetation management, timber outputs
- Wildlife habitat and connectivity
- Livestock grazing
- Recreation
- Backcountry motorized use and management areas
- Outcomes from prior public involvement, specifically the 2006-2008 collaborative process<sup>3</sup>

Representatives of the environmental and conservation organizations in attendance provided all questions and comments. Unless otherwise indicated, the Forest Service participants provided the responses.

---

<sup>3</sup>Facilitator’s note: The substance of questions submitted for this section were raised and discussed during the response to questions regarding wilderness and the proposed Kettle Creek Special Interest Area.

**Q: From a big picture perspective, how does the overall forest management and restoration approach differ across alternatives?**

R: Each alternative would move toward an overall set of desired conditions established for the Forest, but would do so in different ways. Alternative P and the Proposed Action Alternative would use a landscape approach to manage for old growth and early seral habitat across the landscape. The rest of the alternatives use a more classic management approach to establish old forest in one area, another forest type in another area, and so on. This is a finite approach.

Alternatives also vary by the plan direction on motorized access (roads). Alternatives P and R are more specific about access than other alternatives.

**Q: Is the presentation the same for every Community of Interest meeting?**

R: Each presentation is tailored to the interest of focus of the meeting, with the goal of touching on the key topics the audience will likely want to discuss.

**C: The organization I represent also has non-motorized recreation interests. We were not invited to participate in that community of interest meeting.**

R (Facilitator): EnviroIssues and the U.S. Institute identified invitees based on groups known to be active on the Colville National Forest and associated with particular interests. Summaries of each community of interest meeting, once finalized, will be publically available and serve as a way to learn about the topics discussed at any of the community of interest meetings.

**Q: Why did Alternative P replace the Proposed Action as the “preferred alternative”?**

R: In 2011, the Forest Service developed a proposal for Forest Plan revision based on prior public involvement and other input. The Forest Service called this proposal the “Proposed Action” in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) – that name must remain the same throughout the remainder of the current Forest Plan revision process. When the Forest Service releases a draft plan and DEIS for public comment, they are required under NEPA to identify a Preferred Alternative from the available alternatives and base the draft plan on it so the public and stakeholders can see what the new Forest Plan would look like were the Preferred Alternative selected.

The Regional Forester, Jim Peña, and Colville Forest Supervisor, Rodney Smoldon, identified Alternative P as the Preferred Alternative.

**Q: Are all alternatives considered equally?**

R: Yes, the alternatives are considered equally. Different aspects of the alternatives can also be added to an existing alternative or, if there are a lot of changes, combined to develop a new alternative. An example of combining different aspects might result from a comment that says “I like Alternative 1 but want to add the recommended wilderness from Alternative 3.” Another example is that the Regional Forester could change aspects of an alternative such as whether or not existing uses on recommended wilderness would continue until Congress designates the area as wilderness or cease once the alternative is selected. The Regional Forester could also change the riparian and aquatic resource management strategy, for example by selecting an alternative that originally included the Inland Native

Fish Strategy and choosing the Aquatic and Riparian Conservation Strategy (ARCS) as the strategy instead.

**Q: How much is the Regional Forester and Regional Office going to micro-manage the alternative selection process?**

R: The current Regional Forester is very interested and involved in the details of this plan. He may be more likely to make changes than the previous Regional Forester.

**Q: What did the Forest Service use as criteria to identify recommended wilderness?**

R: The Forest Service used two initial criteria: the area must cover more than 5,000 acres and have no open Forest Service system roads in the area (fundamental criteria for wilderness). It can also be adjacent to existing wilderness.

The next step was a series of wilderness evaluation collaboration meetings to identify Potential Wilderness Areas (PWAs). The Forest Service assessed the capability, availability and need for each PWA. Capability is defined as how natural or undeveloped the area is and opportunities to solitude. Availability is defined as the value and need for an area to be wilderness compared to other resources such as recreation, logging, mineral extraction and wildlife habitat. Need is defined as the degree to which the area contributes to the overall national wilderness preservation system.

The Forest Service's wilderness evaluation documents have been publically available online since 2009. The Colville Forest Supervisor and Regional Forester assessed the tradeoffs between capability, availability, and need to determine which PWAs would move forward as recommended wilderness.

That is the big picture of how recommended wilderness areas were identified by the Forest Service. The final step was to reflect a range of options for recommended wilderness areas in the alternatives, from no additional recommended wilderness in the No Action Alternative to including all the recommended wilderness in Alternative B.

**Q: To clarify, all the PWAs are qualified to be recommended wilderness, but in the weighing process, different amounts of wilderness were recommended in different alternatives?**

R: Yes, all PWAs meet the two basic criteria. They vary by how well they meet capability, availability and need – some are high on some and low on others. Those conducting the assessment looked at wildlife, fish, recreation, non-conforming uses and other factors to determine what to recommend. All the information is online and you are encouraged to view the documents.

**Q: There seems to be a lot of difference between alternatives, for example three or five recommended wilderness areas versus twenty recommended wilderness areas. Why that gap? There is a sliding scale of availability, need and capability, but 13-Mile, Profanity, Hoodoo and others south of the Salmo-Priest Wilderness did not make it in to all alternatives.**

R: Alternative O, for example, includes the one PWA as recommended wilderness that almost everyone agreed on in the collaborative public process. Alternative P is stepping up somewhat from Alternative O; Alternative B is based off the Northeast Washington Forestry Coalition Blueprint. Alternative R included

all potential wilderness areas (PWAs), except Lost Creek. It includes all Inventoried Roadless Areas (IRAs).

The reason recommended wilderness increases from 9% to 19% recommended wilderness is because of the motorized recreation activities currently underway in some of the recommended wilderness areas. In the Proposed Action Alternative, Huckleberry and Jackknife were not included as recommended wilderness; in Alternatives R and B, they were. That is responsible for the big jump. A comment regarding this would be useful.

**Q: Why is an area like Hoodoo not included?**

R: In Alternative P, the Forest Service wanted areas high in capability, availability and need with little to no non-conforming uses. Hoodoo and Quartzite potential wilderness areas (PWAs) were not ranked as highly as other PWAs. Specific comments about what was and wasn't recommended are encouraged.

**Q: Why are areas that received a two-thirds vote in favor of wilderness recommendation (as part of the 2007 Forest Summit collaborative public process) are not included in the Preferred Alternative? The Proposed Action Alternative says non-conforming uses like mountain bikes can continue until Congress acts so I don't understand the approach. If the non-conforming use can continue, why do PWAs like Profanity get taken out of some alternatives?**

R: The Forest Service released the Proposed Action for public comment in June 2011. In response, six significant issues were raised. These alternatives – No Action, Proposed Action, Alternatives P, R, B and O – were built to respond to those six issues. The Colville Forest Supervisor and Regional Forester discussed and identified PWAs included or not included in an alternative. The Forest Service also received input from many places – local, state, federal and tribal governments, for example – and is responding to all that input.

**Q: Regarding Alternative O, if it is supposed to reflect the views of the 2007 Forest Summit collaborative public process, why wouldn't those views of wilderness choices be included in the alternative? It seems like people worked through a lot of these issues to identify areas suitable for wilderness, but that outcome doesn't seem to be included in Alternative O.**

R: Alternative O reflects all those collaborative public process meetings between 2006 and 2007 and the agreements and principles established there. Consensus was not reached about wilderness in that process. The Forest Service carried forward those areas where there was the greatest degree of consensus – the Salmo-Priest Adjacent PWA. There was general agreement that the Lost Creek PWA should not be recommended wilderness.

**C (non-Forest Service participant): There may be different views on what came out of that process, or it may have changed over the past eight years. Hoodoo had 85% support for wilderness recommendation and was not included, but others with lower support were included. This inconsistency is happening across the board on the alternatives. Rick Brazell (former Colville Forest Supervisor) promised an alternative that represented the outcome of that process – the bunch of meetings between March 2006 and January 2007.**

**Q: What economic data does the Preferred Alternative use in determining that wilderness may result in lower revenue to local economies due to reduced recreation opportunities?**

R: In the DEIS, the context of the statement referenced is that the Forest Service is responding to public concerns that wilderness may result in lower revenue to local economies due to reduced recreation opportunities. That was a public concern, not a Forest Service view. The Forest Service encourages you to cite studies that support your view in your comment.

**Q: Is there any analysis of the actual economic effect of wilderness that would allow data to inform the public about how wilderness affects the economy? Is that information in the DEIS as well, or is it just the public concern that is included in the DEIS?**

R: The data in the draft plan focuses as much as possible on local data. It is in Chapter 3 of the DEIS under economic and social interests. A Forest Service economist conducted the analysis and will be asked to look into your questions and the level of detail used in the economic analysis.

**Q: What is the statutory or administrative authority to designate Special Interest Areas (SIAs)?**

R: It extends back to the Principal Acts from 1897, which are described now in 36CFR.294.1 This is interpreted in in Forest Service Manual 2370 under Recreation Special Designations. The Forest Service Manual talks specifically about SIAs.

**Q: What establishes the boundaries for what can and cannot be done in a SIA?**

R: Management Area direction sets the boundaries. An SIA management plan can be developed as part of a forest plan revision process, or can be completed afterward as an amendment to a forest plan. Once designated, a SIA would remain in place until an analysis is completed to rescind it which would require a forest plan amendment. If the use described in a designated SIA was proposed to change, or if a SIA was proposed to be rescinded, the proposal would need to be analyzed and any changes would require a forest plan amendment.

**Q: A group of people are working on other SIAs to propose as part of their formal comments. The group sees SIAs as an opportunity for economic support and to connect communities. There may be interest to establish a collaborative group to define these boundaries. Is that possible within the plan?**

R: A SIA has to have outstanding or unique recreation values – that is the basis. The management plan can be developed separately by the Forest Service or through a collaborative group. For example, the Pacific Northwest Trail needs a management plan, and the Pacific Northwest Trail Association is involved in developing that plan.

**Q: Why is Kettle Crest proposed as a SIA instead of recommended wilderness?**

R: Kettle Crest is proposed as an SIA in Alternatives P and O. It is proposed as recommended wilderness in the Proposed Action Alternative and Alternatives R and B.

**Q: Why was Kettle Crest pulled out of the Proposed Action as recommended wilderness and listed as a SIA in Alternative P?**

R: There seemed to be a lot of energy around the idea of a SIA in the Kettle Crest where a variety of motorized and non-motorized uses could be accommodated. Many stakeholders agreed the Kettle Crest was special to them for their specific recreational pursuits and because they loved the wilderness characteristics. They did not necessarily agree on what recreation should be allowed there. Since the Kettle Crest was already listed in the Proposed Action as recommended wilderness, to develop another alternative, the Forest Service looked at what the public said and for a way to continue the variety of existing uses that people want to do while retaining the wilderness characteristics everyone loved. There was no decision made, it is just another alternative.

**Q: So the decision is to allow motorized use in the Kettle Crest SIA?**

R: The proposed Kettle Crest SIA reflects all the motorized and non-motorized existing uses within the underlying management areas. It does not allow motorized use in non-motorized areas, such as the Backcountry Management Area. No decision has been made -- this is an alternative to manage the Kettle Crest.

**Q: How does the Forest Plan account for effective management for ecological resilience across the landscape?**

R: There was a lot of internal discussion about how to address the pattern/patch question, and it was a struggle to find good science about what the pattern/patch across the landscape should be. Desired conditions about patch patterns across the landscape intentionally were avoided. Instead, the draft plan and DEIS describe desired conditions for forest structure; patch pattern may be best addressed at the project level.

**Q: How will it be done? The process affects the product and it seems that ought to be part of the Forest Plan.**

R: The Forest Service struggles with the “how” question on every project. There are lots of ways to come up with an analysis for how to describe pattern patch in the plan, but the science changes frequently. If the draft plan describes a particular process based in current best available science, it could be obsolete next year. With both vegetation and wildlife, the draft plan points to the need to evaluate spatial pattern because it is important for a variety of reasons, for example how fire moves across a landscape. The “how” can be addressed in the implementation plan because the science changes so frequently. The science around patch sizes is hard to boil down to a desired condition state. It is very complicated, so it is identified as an important part that needs to be addressed in an implementation strategy.

**Q: Is the implementation strategy a published appendix?**

R: It is separate from the plan because it needs to be adaptable to the latest science. Once the Forest Plan is adopted, the Forest Service will develop white papers about how to move toward desired conditions and describes methods to achieve a certain patch size and pattern.

**Q: What are the implications for forestry given the planning rule’s requirement not to reduce timber outputs. It is unclear how the 1982 Planning Rule constrains or directs analysis of timber outputs.**

R: The 1982 Planning Rule requires the Forest Service to develop allowable sale quantity (ASQ) and long-term sustained yield (LTSY). To do so, desired conditions for structure type and vegetation type are developed and inform suitable timber production. From suitable timber production, models are used to identify suitable volume numbers and a harvest prescription. The ASQ comes from the suitable volume numbers, which reflects timber quantity that moves toward desired conditions. Once the desired conditions on the Forest have been reached, management moves toward a sustained yield approach.

**Q: [Collection of questions on how wildlife habitat connectivity, species viability, and large old trees are defined, measured, and if there are applicable standards and guidelines in the draft plan for these]**

For wildlife, Forest Service Region 6 developed the terrestrial species viability process for forest plan revision from 2008-2010. There were different planning rules, and one of the goals was to make the process fit multiple planning rules. The Forest Service worked with Pacific Northwest scientists with experience on a similar process. The Forest Service started the viability process with 700 species across eastern Washington and Oregon, then looked at the scientific literature for those species to narrow it down to 209 species of conservation concern.

The analysts then developed habitat relations and factors causing those species to have viability concern and grouped those species based on similar habitat requirements. Through the grouping exercise, the analysts identified surrogate species, which are the two or three species within each group that represent a broader range of species. From there, analysts narrowed it further to 30 species that represent the 209 species. This process was completed for all of northeast Washington, including both the Okanogan-Wenatchee and Colville National Forests.

The analysts evaluated current conditions and highlighted primary issues causing concern for viability such as old forest and connectivity, then developed a process to evaluate each issue and ensured this process was robust and peer-reviewed. This process was published in a peer-reviewed scientific journal and the analysts produced a General Technical Report (GTR). The GTR highlights, species by species, the viability work for northeast Washington and the Colville National Forest.

The Forest Service used the issues causing concern for viability (e.g., old forest, connectivity) to develop plan components and varied them by alternative. The Proposed Action Alternative and Alternative P are integrated with reference conditions and historic range of variability (HRV) – they identify structure types, wildlife habitats associated with those structure types, and the preferred conditions on the landscape. An important component is large trees and snags. Snags have really specific direction. Proposed management for large trees varies by alternative.

To assess habitat connectivity, the Forest Service selected a set of focal species, excluding species that can move a lot (such as birds) and those that do not move a lot. The Forest Service chose species to evaluate connectivity for each alternative. The evaluation looks at activities allowed in unroaded and roaded landscapes under each alternative. The Forest Service also looked at the patch pattern and made the assumption to aim for historical conditions. The tools developed for viability and connectivity helped the development and assessment of alternatives.

**Q: Are there guidelines for large trees? How is it incorporated? There is a strain between large trees for economics and ecological value and viability.**

R: Large trees are addressed in desired conditions for forest structure: desired conditions for older structure require older trees. There is also a desired condition around habitat that describes the amount of old forest structure, so larger trees are embedded in that as well. It does vary by alternative, but this is how large trees are addressed in the Proposed Action Alternative and Alternative P.

**Q: For threatened and endangered species such as grizzly bear, the presentation said there was no difference across alternatives, yet land management varies dramatically across alternatives. How do those things reconcile? It seems alternatives would have different impacts to those species.**

R: Regarding grizzly bear, there is little difference across alternatives because management direction for grizzly bear was addressed in the original 1988 plan. A big issue with grizzly bears is roads – road goals were set originally in the recovery plan and road density standards have largely been met since then. Meeting those road density standards and outfitting recreation sites with bear-resistant facilities has largely been done in the portion of the recovery zone that the Colville National Forest manages. Therefore, there is not a lot of need to vary management across alternatives.

For woodland caribou, there was a change between the No Action Alternative (the current Forest Plan) and now. Based on changes to woodland caribou status, the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service provided a new biological opinion than differs from the No Action Alternative. The biological opinion is based on winter recreation, so the Colville National Forest adopted a management strategy to address the issue. That is why there is little difference for caribou – we are already implementing the management strategy on the Forest.

For Canada lynx, many live at higher elevation. Most of the focus is in the Kettle Crest and secondarily in the Selkirk Mountains. Management of Canada lynx is based on 2013 updates to the Canada lynx strategy, which was added to all action alternatives. Under the No Action Alternative – the current Forest Plan – we are implementing the Canada lynx conservation strategy without a formal decision to do so. The reality is that the work is happening even though it is not in the No Action Alternative.

Because management plans have been in place for some time for these late-seral species, the prescribed management is consistent across alternatives.

**Q: What are the Forest Service’s proposed changes to livestock grazing?**

R: The simple response is that the draft Forest Plan does not make any changes to livestock grazing permits. Some desired conditions are clarified that do not exist in the current Forest Plan, and stubble heights have increased overall in riparian areas. If Alternative R were selected, recommended wilderness would be treated as wilderness upon signing. It does not change the allotment boundary or season of use, but it would change how livestock grazers could manage their allotment. Similarly, it does not change the number of allotments or cattle, but it could affect their operations. The plan clarifies requirements in Canada lynx habitat and for protection of salmon redds, but the need to protect this habitat isn’t new to this plan. The draft Forest Plan does not affect numbers of livestock or season of use. Those parts of the permit will be addressed as allotment management plans are updated.

**Q: Is the stubble height for riparian areas only or does it include upland areas as well?**

R: There are no upland stubble height standards except those associated with salting areas.

**Q: The draft Forest Plan formalizes existing policy, then?**

R: The current Forest Plan is pretty light on these factors, and Forest Plan revision is one way to clarify the factors.

**Q: Are the stubble heights statutory? Do you have decision space?**

R: ARCS provides the guidance about stubble heights and grazing around redds. INFISH has four-inch stubble heights, while ARCS has six-inch stubble heights. There is wording in the draft plan that allows site-specific analysis to adjust stubble height requirements if needed. Again, the draft Forest Plan could result in the need to change how livestock grazers conduct their operations.

**Q: Is protection higher with ARCS or INFISH?**

R: New science says six- to eight-inch stubble heights will help recover plant species. Anywhere on an allotment where recovery is needed, especially in bull trout habitat, the Forest Service can apply six to eight-inch stubble heights. Both ARCS and INFISH call for beneficial use for riparian values and not to retard attainment of these values. If cattle are retarding attainment of riparian values, this use will have to be adjusted.

---

The remaining submitted questions could not be addressed during the meeting. The Forest Service will follow up with these questions in its “frequently asked questions” (FAQ) document or by other means.

- Why is the Forest Service proposing to permit powerline construction Backcountry Motorized areas in the revised Plan (Preferred Alternative P) when this was not permitted in the 1988 Plan?
- The EIS states that 3% of trails are designed for mountain biking – why aren’t more trails designed for mountain bikes being proposed?
- Why are non-motorized trails that are not designed for mountain bike usage (81% across the Forest -- such as the Kettle Crest) being proposed for mountain bike use, and why are the conflicts that are likely to increase in the future not being assessed?

---

**Next steps**

At the facilitator’s request, Debbie Kelly, Forest Service, reviewed ongoing and upcoming public involvement opportunities, including the online open house, topical webinars, listening sessions and meeting with organizations and individuals when invited. Formal comments can now be submitted via an online comment form and viewed in a Comment Reading Room accessible from the Forest Plan revision website. The Maps section of the Forest Plan revision website includes an interactive mapping feature and GIS maps for downloading. The draft Forest Plan and DEIS are available online and via CD by request.

Once all comments are submitted, the Forest Service reviews the comments and determines if changes to the alternatives are needed, and/or if an entirely new alternative is needed. Then, the Forest Service has an internal review with the Forest Service Regional and Washington offices. The Forest Service anticipates the final revised Forest Plan documents in early spring 2017 if all goes well. There is an opportunity to file an objection between the release of the final documents (anticipated in mid- to late-winter 2017) and the record of decision. If someone has commented during a public comment period, they have standing to object at this time if they choose to do so.

Susan concluded the meeting by encouraging participants to share what they learned with their networks and to fill out the meeting feedback form at the meeting or electronically following the meeting. She noted the listening sessions are planned for early June 2016.

Susan thanked everyone for attending and adjourned the meeting.

**Attachment A. Participants**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Amy Dillon	U.S. Forest Service – Colville National Forest
Bill Gaines	U.S. Forest Service – Colville National Forest
Dave Werntz	Conservation Northwest
Dean Fischer	Kettle Range Conservation Group
Debbie Kelly	U.S. Forest Service – Colville National Forest
Eric McQuay	U.S. Forest Service – Colville National Forest
Gregory Gordon	Spokane Audubon
Jon Day	U.S. Forest Service – Colville National Forest
Karen Honeycutt	U.S. Forest Service – Colville National Forest
Mike Peterson	The Lands Council
Mitch Friedman	Conservation Northwest
Rodney Smoldon	U.S. Forest Service – Colville National Forest
Tim Coleman	Kettle Range Conservation Group