

Siskiyou County Forest Service Resource Advisory Committee and Title III Case Study

Juliet Christian-Smith and Jonathan Kusel¹
Sierra Institute for Community and Environment



¹ Juliet Christian-Smith and Nick Menzies conducted the field research for this case study.

Background

Siskiyou County is located in inland northern California, adjacent to the Oregon border. It is the fifth largest county in California by area, but has a 2005 population of only 47,500.² More than 60% of the land within the county is federally managed—most of it in the Klamath and the Shasta-Trinity National Forests, but the county also encompasses portions of the Modoc, Rogue River, and Six Rivers National Forests. Siskiyou County was once one of the most productive timber counties in California and therefore receives the highest annual payments in the state under P.L. 106-393, averaging \$9.1 million per year. Fifteen percent of this total is being allocated to Title II and Title III. For three of the four years that the Resource Advisory Committee (RAC) has been in existence, the county has chosen to divide the 15% evenly between the two titles.

Throughout most of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, Siskiyou County's economy was based on natural resource extraction (primarily mining, fishing, and logging) along with agricultural production. The most recent down-turn in the county's economy began in the mid to late 1980s as the decreased availability of large-diameter timber, lawsuits brought by local and national environmental groups, implementation of the Northwest Forest Plan, and reduced budgets all forced the Forest Service to reduce timber offered for sale. The Klamath National Forest annual sale volume fell from a 1990-1994 yearly average of 66 million board feet (mmbf) to five mmbf in 2000.³ In recent years many of the timber mills in Siskiyou county have decreased hours or shut down completely. The remaining mill operations in the county include Roseburg Forest Products and Timber Products, both of which operate veneer mills.

In addition to timber, agricultural production is important to the county's economy. Within the last

10 years, agricultural water usage has come under increasing scrutiny. Much of Siskiyou County lies within the Klamath River watershed, which encompasses 15,600 square miles of northern California and southern Oregon. The Klamath River has several endangered fish, triggering federal protection under the Endangered Species Act (ESA). In 2001, federal agencies cut off the flow of irrigation water to 1,400 farms in the upper Klamath basin to protect habitat for these fish. In the aftermath of this decision, thousands of affected farmers and their neighbors rallied in protest. While the decision only directly affected farmers in the town of Tulelake in Siskiyou County, it raised the stakes in a decade-long controversy between farmers, fishers, and Indian tribes over the management of the watershed. It also led to increased state and federal oversight of the area's river systems.

Much of present-day Siskiyou County incorporates the major portions of the historic territories of the Karuk, Shasta, and Winnemem Wintu Tribes. The American Indian population today makes up almost 4% of the county population, double the statewide average,⁴ with some rural areas containing much higher percentages. The tribes are not only an important part of the social and economic fabric of the region, but they also each have unique relationships and claims to natural resources. Salmon were a staple of the diet of many of the Indian tribes in the region.

The Karuk were federally recognized in 1979 and today have over 3,300 enrolled members. The tribal headquarters are located in the town of Happy Camp, where the Karuk maintain an important local presence that extends beyond the tribe. Since the early 1990s, the Karuk tribal government has grown from three employees and an annual operating budget of approximately \$250,000 to more than

² Center for Economic Development, California State University, Chico. 2005. Annual County Economic & Demographic Profile Series, Siskiyou County.

³ Forest Community Research. 2002. Northwest Economic Adjustment Initiative Assessment. Available online at: sierrainstitute.us

⁴ Lopez, Alejandro. 2002. The Largest American Indian Population in California: Household and Family Data from the Census 2000.

75 permanent employees, 25 seasonal employees, and an annual budget of approximately \$12 million. They are now one of the largest employers in the mid-Klamath River region.

Another federally recognized tribe and locally important Indian community is the Quartz Valley

Indian Reservation, located in Scott Valley. The reservation was established for Shasta, Karuk, and Upper Klamath Indians,⁵ and is one of the major employers in rural Quartz Valley with an annual operating budget of roughly \$1 million.

County Elections for Titles II and III

Though Siskiyou County has evenly divided 15% of the total P.L. 106-393 payment between Titles II and III the last three years. The county allocated only 25% of the first payment to the RAC and Title II projects, reserving 75% for Title III because the board of supervisors were unsure of the role and effectiveness of the newly-created RAC. Even with a 50/50 split, title III funds total nearly 10% of the

county budget. The County Administrator indicated that this division of funds may be changed again in the next fiscal year with the Title III total increasing to offset the increase in county expenses. He is suggesting allocating 43% to Title II and 57% to Title III to cover the increase. This was approved by the board of supervisors in August of 2005.

Title III Projects

There is no formal call for proposals and project selection process for Title III projects in Siskiyou County. Instead of a Title III project proposal solicitation and review process, the county administrator rolls Title III funds into the county budgeting process and reports expenditures under the six categories listed in the legislation: (1) search and rescue/emergency services, (2) community service work camps, (3) easement purchases, (4) forest related educational opportunities, (5) fire prevention and county planning, and (6) community forestry. The county holds a public meeting to approve the proposed allocations, but currently there is no means for organizations and individuals to access Title III monies.

The highest percentage of Title III expenditures each year have been made in the category of emergency services (as high as 74% in FY 2004). These funds have been dedicated to the Office of Emergency Services, water safety, the county fire department, and the sheriff's office. The sheriff's

office receives funds specifically for search and rescue and air support, along with general operating support. The second largest category of expenditures is fire prevention and county planning. These expenditures are for activities and services associated with planning on federal lands, the county fire department, the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO), predatory animal control, and clerk and board members' salaries. Each year, planning efforts on federal lands and/or the county fire department receive the highest allocation. During the first year of P.L. 106-393 the county used Title III funds to pay for portions of supervisor and clerk salaries (totaling \$40,460). These are listed below in a category called "other" because they do not comport with the designated categories of expenditures. In addition, the Title III funds used to offset Payment-in-Lieu-of Taxes (PILT) funds that were lost as a result of Title III funding (totaling \$80,048) and funds used for predatory animal

⁵ United States Department of the Interior, Office of Indian Affairs. 1939. Constitution and By-laws of the Quartz Valley Indian Community, California. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office (June 15).

Table 1. Title III Expenditures since FY 2002.

Title III Expenditures	FY 2002	% of total	FY 2003	% of total	FY 2004	% of total	FY 2005	% of total
Emergency Services								
Office of Emergency Services	\$72,712		\$33,155		\$54,878		\$38,332	
Water Safety	\$7,238		\$25,275		\$13,489		\$10,915	
Co. Fire	\$168,690		\$75,369		\$195,182		\$163,544	
Sheriff	\$199,008		\$244,593		\$212,910		\$206,296	
Search & Rescue	\$16,557		\$16,639		\$7,213		\$7,862	
Air Support	\$12,000		\$6,461		\$7,603		\$18,467	
subtotal	\$476,205	47.8%	\$401,492	58.8%	\$491,275	71.6%	\$445,416	65.2%
Community Service Work Camp	\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0	
Easement Purchases	\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0	
Education	\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0	
Museum	\$3,000		\$3,000		\$0		\$0	
subtotal	\$3,000	0.3%	\$3,000	0.4%	\$0	0.0%	\$0	0.0%
County Planning & Fire Control								
Planning (on federal lands)	\$197,475		\$98,169		\$0		\$15,290	
Co. Fire	\$168,690		\$75,369		\$195,182		\$163,544	
LAFCO	\$15,372		\$17,547		\$0		\$0	
subtotal	\$381,537	43.9%	\$191,085	40.8%	\$195,182	27.9%	\$178,834	34.8%
Other								
Supervisor Salary	\$5,916		\$0		\$0		\$0	
Clerk Salary	\$34,543		\$0		\$0		\$0	
Predatory Animal	\$15,107		\$87,265		\$0		\$58,707	
Offset of PILT losses	\$80,048		\$0		\$0		\$0	
subtotal	\$135,614	4.1%	\$87,265	0.0%	\$0	0.0%	\$58,707	0.0%
Community Forestry	\$0		\$0		\$0		\$0	
TOTAL	\$996,356		\$682,842		\$686,457		\$682,957	

control (totaling \$161,077) are also categorized as “other” because it is unclear as to which category these expenditures might “fit.”

Siskiyou County’s Title III expenditures are all accomplished through administrative allocations. The county has dedicated the majority of its Title III funds to categories in the legislation, but for some projects there is little to no data available regarding the connection between an expenditure and its category and a discrete project outcome. Hence,

expenditures on salaries for county officials, raise questions about whether they fit legislated categories.

As administrative allocations, county distribution of Title III funds does not include a call for proposals, nor does it solicit projects from entities beyond its own administrative offices. Allocations are made internally as part of the county budget process. The legislation does not expressly prohibit Title III administrative allocations, but it does call for Title

III *projects*, taken here to mean what it does in Title II: involving a solicitation or call for proposals that include a stated purpose, objectives, and discrete actions associated with a budget. Anyone may apply, and funding decisions are based on a competitive review process. Siskiyou County has published lists of proposed Title III expenditures for a 45-day comment period, which comports with the requirements of the legislation. There is clear distinction, however, between project notification and solicitation of pro-

posals. More importantly, the use of Title III funds to close critical gaps in the county budget, as reported by some officials, comes at the expense of a more open process that excludes parties outside of county administration. Given the many groups and diversity of proposals that are part of Title II, a more open Title III grants program would likely be utilized by numerous groups and better fit with the spirit and intent of the legislation.

Title II Projects

As of August 2005, the Siskiyou County RAC had recommended 78 projects, allocating a total of \$1,979,346. The RAC receives roughly \$600,000-\$700,000 per year in Title II funds. Fuels management and fire prevention projects are the most numerous and account for 26% of the total funds allocated. Yet, there is a wide variety of project types. These are discussed in more detail below.

Project Solicitation

The RAC actively solicited projects at the time of its formation. At that time, the RAC coordinator sent press releases to local papers and held several workshops explaining how to apply for project funding. Bill Turner, current co-chair of the RAC, along with other RAC members, conducted these workshops with the public to explain Public Law 106-393 and the process of applying for RAC funds. A website was created to allow online project proposal submissions, which are compiled by the RAC coordinator. The success of this and subsequent work is reflected in the fact that only one in four or five proposals are funded. Though perhaps frustrating to applicants, the low proportion funded suggests that the RAC may recommend higher quality projects for funding.

In addition to its success in receiving a high number of proposals, the Siskiyou RAC has wrestled with how to create local employment through funded projects. This issue was raised at the very first RAC meeting and continues to receive atten-

tion. While acknowledging the important work being done on all projects, RAC members have expressed concern about supporting large numbers of small, sometimes unrelated projects that may not generate long-term employment and economic activity in the county. Members of one community described projects as “stopgap measures”—activities that enhance the quality of life without substantially addressing the growth of the community and diversification or expansion of the local economy.

Over the last year, the RAC has held special meetings to solicit large, multi-year projects, marking a departure from past projects that normally involve \$100,000 or less and are limited to a period of one year. One proposal that has generated interest among RAC members is the Happy Camp Roundwood Utilization Center, at a proposed cost of \$600,000. This project involves a collaboration of several groups, including the Happy Camp Ranger District, the Forest Service’s National Forest Products Laboratory, the Karuk Tribe, and the Klamath Knot Arts Council (KKAC). The KKAC was established in 2003 as a non-profit organization of local artists. The project would expand an existing gallery into a 4,200 square foot, two-story Regional Arts Center. The building would utilize roundwood, a wood chip and clay mixture, and other materials that will come from fuel reduction projects planned in the Happy Camp Ranger District. Local people could be trained in new building techniques. The Center will serve as

a demonstration project, as well as a spring board to establishing an industry processing prefabricated components for similar roundwood structures and building supplies from forest products.

The RAC's interest in larger projects, however, is not without its critics. There is concern for example, that other community-based groups would lose support if RAC funds were tied up in one large project. One member of the Klamath Fire Safe Council discouraged such a shift in focus, emphasizing how important even small RAC grants have been to community members. A focus on a large project like the Roundwood Utilization Center requires RAC members not only to think about the many trade-offs, but, according to some, requires members to understand technical details, and to analyze questions such as the availability of supplies of raw materials. The Siskiyou County RAC, in late 2005, continues to explore the trade-offs in the service of workers and communities.

Project Review, Prioritization, and Selection

The RAC accepts project proposals quarterly. Prior to proposal review meetings, the RAC coordinator sends each RAC member a packet of project proposals. RAC members are expected to review and evaluate project proposals thoroughly before they meet and come with explanations of why they will or will not support particular proposals. At the meetings, the three RAC sub-groups break up to discuss and prioritize the projects. Their top-ranked projects are placed on the board. If all three sub-groups rank a project highly, it is automatically recommended for funding. This is followed by a RAC-wide discussion of projects that receive support from one or two sub-groups. The RAC chair asks each sub-group to choose one person to explain why the group supported a project. Several RAC members remarked that this process encourages the discussion to remain positive. RAC members also noted that sub-groups will often horse-trade, agreeing to support certain projects in order to obtain approval for their own preferred projects.

RAC sub-groups have different priorities, but members share an interest in project sponsors

providing matching funds or in-kind services. The RAC is also very interested in stimulating sustainable jobs that do not rely on continued grants. After the RAC agrees on projects to recommend and the forest supervisor approves them, the agency's RAC coordinator writes the necessary contracts or partnership agreements to enable project funding.

Approved Projects

Appendix 1 lists all approved projects by category. There are three notable characteristics of these projects: (1) the project approval rate is comparatively low—only 20 - 25% of projects are approved on their first submission to the RAC, (2) the majority of projects come from community groups rather than the Forest Service, and (3) many of the approved projects are on private lands. These issues are discussed in more detail in the section on RAC Formation and Operation.

RAC projects have a high level of cost-sharing. Title II funds amount to only 51% of the total cost of approved projects. The Forest Service has contributed 19% and the private sector or local government contributions total 30%. Recipients of Title II funds are asked to keep records of project specifics like the number of acres treated and the number of jobs created, and the RAC coordinator compiles this information. Based on these data, RAC funded project accomplishments total 3,242.8 acres of forest health maintenance, involving weed eradication, thinning, and brush clearing; 652 acres of rangeland health maintenance; 48.5 river miles of fishery habitat restoration; 1,130 acres of wildlife habitat restoration; 1,239 acres of soil productivity maintenance; 163.4 acres of native vegetation restoration; 16 improved recreation sites; 77 structures maintained; 142.1 miles of road maintenance (project proponents included weed eradication along roads in this category); 186.5 miles of trail maintenance; and over 3,500 acres of fuel reduction activities. Overall, grant recipients report a total of 208 local jobs created by RAC funded projects. These totals represent impressive accomplishments for the Siskiyou RAC. Given the inconsistencies in self report

measures of project accomplishments, however, further review is important. For example, while any increase in local work is valuable, it is not clear from the reports the duration of employment for many of these jobs.

Roads, Trails, and Infrastructure Maintenance or Replacement

There are seven projects in this category that cost a total of \$102,352. The RAC has, thus far, supported only a few projects that involve roads. These projects have focused primarily on reducing fire risk along roads and improving emergency egress, and, secondarily, on general road improvements. Because of the connection of these and other roads and trails projects to recreation activities, we refer to this as recreational infrastructure in the Appendix. Siskiyou County is a rural county with a large percentage of public land and recreational opportunities. The Pacific Crest Trail is a National Scenic Trail that serves backpackers, hunters and fishermen, stock users, and other non-motorized traffic such as fire crews and public land agency personnel. The RAC has funded yearly proposals from the Back Country Horsemen of California to conduct maintenance on the Pacific Crest Trail. Several RAC members mentioned that it was regularly one of their favorite projects, getting important work done, employing local people, and building a partnership between the Horsemen's Association and the Forest Service. Each year, blow-down, rocks, or debris block the trail, and erosion may occur due to damaged water drainage systems. The work includes removing debris, cleaning the drainage systems, brushing, and trail tread repair. Work crews identify and report locations of noxious weeds to agency personnel and inventory trail signage. The Scott-Salmon River Districts of the Klamath National Forest act as advisors and provide trail maintenance training. They also monitor the project from the Saloon Creek to Shelly Meadows. The Weaverville Ranger District of the Shasta-Trinity National Forest monitors the project from Scott Mountain to the Saloon Creek saddle.

Invasive Weed Control

Eleven noxious weed control projects have been implemented at a cost of \$273,461. The Salmon River area has received \$86,099 of that total for a cooperative noxious weed program and community demonstration projects. This amounts to almost one-third of the total invasive weed control support. With these funds they have developed the "Salmon River approach," which involves manually removing target noxious weeds in sensitive areas rather than using herbicides. Priority species include white top, Italian thistle, Scotch and Spanish broom, yellow and Malta star thistle, marlahan and hedge mustard, tree of heaven, and teasel. The community-based program was designed to expand cooperation and increase awareness between multiple stakeholders in the Salmon River weed management area, and to strategically protect and restore forest and aquatic ecosystems. It involves a high level of community involvement and volunteer labor.

With RAC funding, the Salmon River Cooperative Noxious Weed Management Program has been able to provide integral watershed restoration stewardship jobs to an experienced and organized local labor force in the economically depressed Salmon River area. The program uses maps, aerial photographs, and Geographic Information System technology to identify areas infested by noxious weeds, develop systematic plans for removal, and monitor results. Detailed records are kept regarding the species and biomass removed from sites, followed by intensive monitoring. The program goals are to improve up to 100 acres of wildlife habitat and protect thousands of acres from the deleterious effects of non-native species.

Fuels Management

There are 19 fuels management and fire prevention projects, totaling \$473,748, the highest RAC categorical expenditure. The highest percentage of dollars granted in this category goes to fire safe councils and involves fuels reduction and thinning work. Initially, the RAC was only interested in providing seed money, as many grants for fire safety were available through federal initiatives that could be used to fund the continued work of these groups.

However, much of that funding has dried up. In response, the RAC has chosen to continue to support many of these efforts. The Klamath River Fire Safe Council is a good example. It has proposed several successful projects, including the Klamath River Community Corridor, Phase I and II. These projects have treated a total of 8.5 acres along Highway 96. Highway-caused wildfire is a serious issue in the area. Treatment involves cutting, piling, and burning extra fuels along the roadsides to reduce the risk of fire starts. The work was done primarily by California Conservation Corps crews and local Forest Service crews, thus providing important local jobs.

The project proponent explained that the Klamath River Community Corridor projects are part of a larger, comprehensive plan to reduce fire risk in the area. This includes a RAC-funded fuel break on the ridge just above the Community Corridor project area, and a non-RAC funded fuels reduction project on the nearby Beaver Creek, implemented by the Klamath River Fire Safe Council with outside funding. The work also has a multiplier effect within the community that is not captured by quantitative measures, such as acres treated or volume of biomass removed. Private landowners along Highway 96, for example, have now voluntarily cleared brush and thinned areas after seeing the results of the Klamath Community Corridor work. The combined educational effects of the projects manifest in landscape change also helped stimulate interest in forming a fire safe committee.

Watershed Restoration and Enhancement

A total of \$274,732 has been allocated to nine watershed restoration and enhancement projects. Two of these are riparian restoration and exclusionary fencing projects, which amount to 30% of the total expenditures. The Shasta Valley Resource Conservation District (RCD) proposed the Nicoletti Ranch Riparian Fencing project, located on private lands between the Klamath and Shasta-Trinity National Forests and near the town of Mt. Shasta. The project represents an interesting example of this RAC's approach to working with private

landowners and community-based organizations. The objective of the project is to construct 4,900 feet of new livestock exclusion fencing along the Shasta River on the Nicoletti Ranch. The fencing was intended to protect and restore critical riparian habitat by restricting cattle access to the river. These riparian areas are important for spawning as well as providing habitat for juvenile Coho and Chinook salmon, and native steelhead.

The project proponents explain that planning and implementing the project will allow for collaborative work between private landowners and the RCD that could lead to further work on neighboring properties. They justify its importance and connection to public land by noting that much of the lower six miles of the Shasta River are located on BLM-managed ground, and the Shasta is a tributary to the Klamath River, which flows through the Klamath National Forest. By protecting and restoring spawning and rearing habitat in the Shasta River, they argue that greater numbers of these endangered fish will migrate into federally managed areas. The RAC recommended and the Klamath National Forest supervisor approved this project. Both feel that it is one of many that is working to repair not only damaged habitat, but damaged relationships between interest groups and agencies in Siskiyou County.

Wildlife and Fish Habitat

The nine projects funded in this category total \$300,433. Six of these projects include fish passage or fish screening, which amounts to 52% of category funding. The environmental group Cal Trout received \$79,066 to improve fish passage in Swamp Creek, one of the few creeks in the world believed to contain genetically pure populations of the imperiled McCloud redband trout. Approximately three miles of Swamp Creek provide suitable habitat for the McCloud redband, but this habitat is divided by two road crossing culverts. Due to the excessive jump heights and poor jump angles, conditions at both culvert sites are not suitable for McCloud redband to pass upstream. Additionally, water tanker trucks regu-

larly fill their tanks from Swamp Creek for fire suppression and road dust abatement. Fish biologists have shown that low water levels can threaten the survival of McCloud redband, as well as other aquatic organisms. Cal Trout will place a series of cross vane boulder structures in the stream bed to mimic the reference reach channel dimensions and restore the fish passage at each crossing. The project will also include a riparian revegetation component, planting native willow cuttings in disturbed areas. Finally, it will install a water intake system for filling water tanker trucks.

Other

Half of the 14 projects in this category are related to conservation education, accounting for 66% of the total funding of \$378,686. In 2005, the RAC supported a proposal funding the Mt. Shasta Youth Conservation Corps (YCC) program, first established in 1978. Due to Forest Service budget reductions, the YCC program lost its support. The approved project funded three YCC crews for projects designed to provide conservation

education and training in resource management during summer 2005 on the Shasta-McCloud Management Unit. Each crew had six members and a crew leader (Figure 1). Projects were overseen by a resource professional who provided expertise in his/her specialty and promoted individualized learning experiences. Projects that the YCC accomplished during the 2005 field season included: recreation area improvements, reforestation of the wild-urban interface, trail maintenance, fuels reduction, native revegetation, and stream restoration. The project proponents explained that the YCC program provides much needed employment opportunities for their rural community, especially for the high school-aged population. A local Forest Service employee comments, “We employ 24 people—but when there are only 400 kids in the high school, that’s significant.” YCC proponents also noted that the program has a long history in their community, and that it was a way to introduce teenagers to resource management jobs. Several former YCC crew members now work for the Forest Service.

Figure 1. Youth Conservation Corps members



RAC Formation, Operation and Process

This section focuses on the institutional dynamics of the RAC. It begins with a review of the RAC's initial formation and operation, and then discusses some of the ways the RAC has fostered the development of relationships between and among interest groups, and between the broader community and the agency. Finally, it addresses the RAC's approach to decision-making, the relationship between the county and the RAC, and the relationship between the Forest Service and the RAC.

RAC Formation

Amidst a context of divisiveness in the county, the RAC was launched. The establishment of the RAC followed on the heels of a failed consensus-based process that attempted to bring together area industry, forestry, tribal, and environmental interests. There remains today bad feelings about the experience, which exacerbated rather than diffused conflict between parties. A number of individuals were concerned that this would cloud establishment of the RAC and that the RAC would be unable to escape from such divisiveness. With this in mind, the county board of supervisors and the Klamath National Forest supervisor screened potential RAC members. In interviews, interested individuals were asked specifically about prior experience working with groups of diverse interests. The ability of members to work cooperatively was considered extremely important for the success of the RAC.

The county supervisors and county administrator were both involved in the process of recommending individuals to be considered for appointment to the RAC. Final decision authority, however, resided with the Klamath National Forest supervisor. The Forest Service followed the federally mandated Civil Rights Impact Analysis (CRIA) guidelines in the selection process, which attempt to foster diversity. Despite a county with strong tribal presence, and with areas near national forest land where Native American density exceeds considerably the county-

wide average, not a single tribal member applied to be part of the RAC. This was the first and unfortunately not the last time the RAC and the Forest Service would be challenged to secure native representation. A Forest Service official remarked that many tribes are already stretched thin in regard to resources and capacity, and participating on the RAC may not be a top priority.

The nominee to fill the RAC tribal position was not a tribal member and was rejected by the Karuk Tribe in favor of their cultural resource specialist (who is a tribal member). However, this individual left the RAC, disturbed by what he perceived as a lack of representation of, and indifference to, tribal issues. Many on the RAC were both surprised and frustrated that such feelings existed and disagreed with the perspective. After leaving, this individual has since been replaced by a Quartz Valley Indian Community representative.

Both tribal and RAC members have pointed out, and it is clear from the record of projects, that Title II funds have supported a significant number of projects with the tribes as partners or proposed directly by the tribes themselves. Projects include, among others, the Quartz Valley Bat Education and Habitat Enhancement Project, the Panther Meadows Restoration Project, the Quartz Valley Aquarium Project, the Karuk Cultural Youth Training Program, and others that have provided training, employment, or both to tribal members. This support is important not only for its inclusion of the tribes in RAC supported work generally, but as a way to encourage more tribal involvement in the RAC in the future.

RAC Operation

The RAC meets on the third Monday of every month, occasionally skipping one month in the summer and December, depending on the work load. From the start, the RAC has been well supported. The present Klamath National Forest supervisor has made the RAC a top priority. Chris Nota, the

Regional Forester's Representative, directly supported training early in the process. The RAC has also benefited from dynamic coordinators who have devoted considerable time to the RAC. Many RAC members noted the importance of the current RAC coordinator, who not only performs typical administrative and support functions, but also takes an active role in helping community groups develop and revise project proposals.

The Klamath National Forest takes a 10% administrative fee out of the total Title II allocation for drafting the agreements, processing invoices, and tracking payments.

Public, Agency, and Interest Group Relationship Building

Siskiyou County still bears the scars of the "timber wars" of the 1980s and 1990s, with a bitter legacy of deep divisions and brittle community relations. That and the more recent failed consensus process created a challenge that was as deep and conflicted as any RAC faced. Bill Turner, currently the RAC co-chair, testified to Congress, "I have to tell you that at the first meeting there was some apprehension over whether such a diverse set of people (leaders of environmental groups, a union representative, tribal representative, timber and ranching interests, elected officials, and other) would ever agree on anything, let alone projects that may benefit our communities." Yet, Turner goes on to say that the RAC has broken down barriers between participants, created jobs, and leveraged funds for the community. This sentiment was echoed by many other RAC members in individual interviews. Turner concludes that if the legislation is not reauthorized, "it will be taking a giant step backwards away from the recovery environmentally, socially, and economically that we are just now beginning to feel is possible."

Indeed, the opportunities for funding through the RAC have generated a high proportion of community-driven proposals. As previously mentioned, the RAC has a relatively low project approval rate, estimated by RAC members to be around 20 to 25%, as a result of the large number

of proposals submitted by local organizations. Recipients of Title II funds include community fire safe councils, watershed groups, tribes, schools, horseman's associations and resource conservation districts. The RAC offers the opportunity for community groups to leverage funds by providing them with seed money for projects. One county supervisor noted that the strength of the RAC was its ability to bring people together and to create organizational infrastructure in the community.

RAC Decision-Making Processes

The RAC has avoided much of the contentiousness that has plagued other multi-stakeholder processes in Siskiyou County. It is impressive not only that the RAC has moved beyond a milieu of intense discord, but that it has developed a RAC in which interests are working together effectively and funding a broad array of projects. Some RAC members attribute this to the individuals on the RAC, remarking that they are not "extremists," and are willing to work together cooperatively. There remain, however, concerns among a few that some interests may not be represented as well as others. Whether this is part of the legacy of conflict in the county, is something that will continue to abate, or remain a concern is unclear. One concern involves the Native American voice in decisions. This concern does not reflect at all on the current tribal representative, but is more general and addresses perhaps subtle attitudes, as well as a fundamental institutional challenge associated with the legislation.

The issue of attitudes involves community and RAC response to Native American involvement on the RAC. Like the more recent resource conflicts between interest groups, Anglo-European and Native American relationships have long been strained. Some suggested these attitudes have subtly played out in treatment of Native Americans and Native American projects. Perhaps contrasting this perspective and suggesting, at minimum, a RAC effort at inclusion and support for tribal projects, are the five funded tribal projects along with several other funded projects in which tribes

have benefited.

Representation and participation in decision-making also involves the more fundamental issue of who speaks for tribes and the institutional limitation of one tribal “representative” on the RAC. Given the number of tribes and tribal groups in Siskiyou County, tribal representation is difficult for any individual given the unique and individual relationships that tribes have with the federal government, and the fact that one individual may not speak for other tribes. Siskiyou County’s American Indian presence raises significant questions for the legislation that allocates but a single slot for a tribal representative, and severely challenges both the RAC and the Forest Service to respond to multiple and diverse tribal issues.

County-RAC Relations

The RAC coordinator presents a summary of the RAC’s accomplishments to the county board of supervisors two times a year. The county has thus far played an interested, yet not adversarial or controlling role, regarding the RAC. Both the county department of agriculture and the city of Yreka have received Title II funds through the RAC. Yet the county administrative officer (CAO) admits that Title II and Title III are in competition with one another. More of one means less of another. Due to increasing county fire department costs this fiscal year he hopes to secure a slightly higher percentage of Title III funds. Nonetheless, despite the budget challenges facing the county, the continued high level of support for Title II confirms county board of supervisor’s support for the work of the RAC.

Forest Service-RAC Relations

Relations between the Forest Service and the community have long been contentious. Many Siskiyou County residents blamed the Forest Service for the decline in timber sales, and the overall decline in the timber industry. Initially, this resentment affected the RAC. Several members reportedly held negative feelings toward the Forest Service, but participation on the RAC has offered them an opportunity to learn about what the Forest Service does, especially regarding the requirements of the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA). Relations between the Forest Service and Siskiyou residents by almost all accounts are on the upswing. The RAC coordinator seems particularly committed to securing community trust.

The Klamath National Forest supervisor notes that gaining public support has been extremely important to the success of the RAC, and it would not have happened if projects were only approved on national forest land. She explains that because the Klamath National Forest covers a checkerboard of public and private lands, a good case is made for work on private land. This, in turn, has led to increased buy-in to the RAC process and improved Forest Service Relations. The forest supervisor credits the RAC with not only fostering cooperation between the Forest Service and private landowners, but also contributing to the improvement of relations between local environmentalists and the timber industry: “As late as five years ago there was little cooperation between farmers, ranchers, and environmentalists.” In an area with long-standing, deep hostility, the fact that different interest groups and the Forest Service are working together productively represents a significant, if not dramatic, accomplishment.

Conclusion

The Siskiyou County RAC has created a positive dialogue between interest groups, and between interest groups and the Forest Service. This is particularly notable given the mistrust and hostility that characterized their relationships between groups prior to the launch of P.L. 106-393. The RAC has seeded and supported a number of projects that would otherwise not have been completed. The Siskiyou County RAC functions smoothly and effectively. Some of its success can be attributed to the strong leadership at the time the RAC was established, the current leadership structure, and the continued support it receives from the forest supervisor and RAC coordinator.

While there have been numerous successes in regard to Title II and Title III projects, challenges remain. These include the capacity of the RAC, the county, and the Forest Service to address: (1) improved tribal involvement—beyond the one representative—and general tribal engagement, (2) creating sustainable jobs, and (3) creating a more open Title III process, including favoring discrete projects over administrative allocations.

Given their contemporary relationship to the forest and watersheds, their historic role and knowledge, and their importance in the county, tribal participation in the RAC is important for future RAC success. While challenges exist in terms of soliciting participation, it remains important for the RAC to continue its work with tribes, funding projects with tribal involvement or leadership and soliciting more tribal involvement in the RAC. The legislation has only one formal position for a tribal representative, but Native American participation in the RAC can nonetheless be expanded by having a tribal member serve as a representative for the education, dispersed recreation, timber industry, or any other interest group category.

The creation of sustainable jobs continues to be an area of concern for the Siskiyou RAC. Project recipients reported that over 200 local jobs were produced, but many of these are short-term or seasonal jobs and do not represent stable employment opportunities. The RAC's current discussion of larger, multi-year project proposals is one response

to this concern. The RAC has debated whether to support smaller community projects or to spearhead larger, potentially more transformative projects. It is important to recognize that the creation of sustainable jobs in rural areas is a formidable challenge. What is important is for RAC members to keep the debate open and to be engaged in addressing the challenge. There is no “silver bullet.” Rather, it is this productive engagement that will contribute to successful actions on the part of the RAC to confront unemployment and to make a contribution to sustainable local economic development.

The success of P.L. 106-393 in Siskiyou County is also tied to the county's allocation of Title III funds, including the willingness of the county to support Title II. The biggest challenge for the county now and in the future will be shifting the use of Title III dollars away from “filling gaps in the county budget,” as one put it, to developing a process for funding Title III projects through a competitive program with discrete proposals, and open to groups beyond county administrative units.

The current process blurs the distinction between an administrative allocation and a project. An internal allocation of funds was not envisioned in the legislation. This process encourages the view that county fiscal crises will result in a reduction of Title II funds.

Moving away from an internal budget “gap-filling” Title III program in Siskiyou County will not only have the effect of encouraging high level support for the successful Title II program, but it will likely stimulate a successful and dynamic Title III program. If the relatively low level of funded projects and the high amount of leveraged funds are any indication, offering a competitive Title III program will lead to the development of proposals and projects that seed needed work. The Title II program, which depends on Siskiyou County funding it, offers a powerful example of how Title III funds might be used to involve more groups, overcome historic animosities, and leverage more money to do valuable and needed work in the county.

Appendix 1

Siskiyou County, California RAC: Title II Projects, FY02-FY05

Category	Project Name	Title II \$	Project Form Primary Purpose	FY
Recreational Infrastructure				
	Pacific Crest Trail Maintenance	\$10,000	Trail Maintenance	05
	Bridge Creek Trail Opening	\$24,500	Trail Maintenance	04
	Pacific Crest Trail Maintenance	\$13,000	Trail Maintenance	04
	Hatchery Trail Extension and Education Project	\$28,000	Trail Maintenance	03
	Pacific Crest Trail Maintenance	\$2,600	Trail Maintenance	03
	Butler Mtn Trail Maintenance	\$16,700	Trail Maintenance	02
	Pacific Crest Trail Maintenance	\$7,552	Trail Maintenance	02
	subtotal recreational infrastructure	\$102,352		
Soils				
	Mt. Dome Feral Horse Recapture	\$36,500	Reduce Soil Erosion	05
Forest Health				
	Canyon/Kelsey	\$49,100	Forest Health Improvement	02
Watershed				
	Elk Creek Sewer Extension	\$32,000	Watershed Restoration & Maint.	04
	Nicoletti Ranch Riparian Fencing	\$34,375	Watershed Restoration & Maint.	04
	Yreka Greenway Planning	\$16,461	Watershed Restoration & Maint.	03
	Shasta Watershed Restoration GIS Database	\$24,409	Watershed Restoration & Maint.	03
	Lake Siskiyou North Shore Restoration	\$53,240	Watershed Restoration & Maint.	03
	Klamath/Salmon River Dispersed Recreation River Sanitation	\$17,500	Watershed Restoration & Maint.	03
	Butte Cr. Ranch Riparian Restoration	\$38,904	Watershed Restoration & Maint.	03
	River Park Habitat Restoration and Environmental Education	\$14,750	Watershed Restoration & Maint.	02
	Cade Mtn. Septage Closure/Happy Camp Sanitary Sewer Septage Disposal Facility	\$43,093	Watershed Restoration & Maint.	02
	subtotal watershed	\$274,732		
Habitat				
	Swamp Creek Fish Passage	\$79,066	Fish Habitat Restoration	05
	Quartz Valley Bat Education and Habitat Enhancement Project	\$7,560	Bat Habitat Improvement/ Conservation Education	05
	Panther Meadows Restoration	\$68,205	Alpine Meadow Habitat Improvement & Visitor Trails	05
	Riparian Restoration Greenhouse and Wildlife Gardens Project	\$20,000	Conservation Education	05
	Little Shasta River Riparian Project: Phase I	\$28,000	Fish Habitat Restoration	04
	Shasta Valley RCD Tube Screens	\$32,122	Fish Habitat Restoration	03

Siskiyou County Forest Service Resource Advisory Committee and Title III Case Study

	Riparian Restoration Greenhouse and Wildlife Gardens	\$18,700	Conservation Education	03
	Parks Creek Fish Passage at I-5	\$16,556	Fish Habitat Restoration	02
	Headwaters of Shasta River	\$8,810	Fish Habitat Restoration	02
	Eric Peters Fish Screen	\$21,414	Fish Habitat Restoration	02
	subtotal habitat	\$300,433		
Weeds				
	Happy Camp -Oak Knoll Noxious Weed Abatement	\$19,515	Control of Noxious Weeds	05
	The Salmon River Approach for Effectively Controlling Prioritized Noxious Weed Species- Cooperative Noxious Weed Program	\$29,900	Control of Noxious Weeds	05
	Siskiyou County Noxious Weed Eradication Program	\$74,000	Control of Noxious Weeds	05
	Emergency Manual Treatment of Priority Noxious Weeds	\$11,500	Control of Noxious Weeds	04
	Happy Camp Noxious Weed Abatement	\$10,185	Control of Noxious Weeds	04
	Salmon River Approach for Controlling Noxious Weeds - Community Demonstration Project	\$25,412	Control of Noxious Weeds	03
	Noxious Weed Inventory, Mapping, and Treatment by Hand Pulling on Eastside Recreation Sites	\$10,450	Control of Noxious Weeds	03
	Lower Mid Klamath Community Invasive Species Abatement Program	\$12,102	Control of Noxious Weeds	03
	Noxious Weed Control - California Lands	\$0	Control of Noxious Weeds	03
	Musk Thistle Control and Eradication Project	\$49,610	Control of Noxious Weeds	03
	Salmon River Approach for Controlling Noxious Weeds - Community Demonstration Project	\$30,787	Control of Noxious Weeds	02
	subtotal weeds	\$273,461		
Native Vegetation				
	McCloud River Native Vegetation Restoration	\$46,200	Reestablish Native Species	03
	Improving Fish and Wildlife Habitat	\$10,384	Reestablish Native Species	02
	subtotal native vegetation	\$56,584		
Fuels				
	Somes Bar Sustainable Fuelbreaks	\$63,844	Fuels Mngt/Fire Prevention	05
	Seiad Fire Protection Water Resource Project-Phase II	\$13,869	Fuels Mngt/Fire Prevention	05
	Siskiyou County Community Wildfire Protection Plan, County-wide Fire Safe Coordination and Outreach Project	\$53,150	Fire Safe Council Funding	05
	Dutch Creek Fuel Reduction and Road Improvement Phase II	\$50,800	Fuels Mngt/Fire Prevention	05
	Callahan Fire Protection District	\$43,000	Fire Prevention Infrastructure Maintenance	04
	Klamath River Tanker Fillsite Restoration	\$8,500	Fire Prevention Infrastructure Maintenance	04
	Willow Reservoir	\$14,500	Fire Prevention Infrastructure Maintenance	04

Siskiyou County Forest Service Resource Advisory Committee and Title III Case Study

	Klamath River Community Corridor Phase 2	\$13,558	Fuels Mngt/Fire Prevention	04
	Dutch Creek Fuel Reduction and Road Improvement Phase I	\$11,096	Fuels Mngt/Fire Prevention	04
	Seiad Fire Protection Water Resource Project	\$17,050	Fuels Mngt/Fire Prevention	03
	Sawyers Bar Planning & Fuel Reduction	\$30,360	Fuels Mngt/Fire Prevention	03
	Sand Dollar Plantation Thinning	\$23,000	Fuels Mngt/Fire Prevention	03
	Indian Creek Road Fire Reduction Project	\$31,280	Fuels Mngt/Fire Prevention	03
	Deer Mtn. Plantation Thinning	\$16,500	Fuels Mngt/Fire Prevention	03
	Forks Fire Hydrant Project	\$22,000	Other Project Type	03
	Ukonom Hazard Fuels Reduction	\$27,372	Fuels Mngt/Fire Prevention	02
	Salmon River Fuel Reduction	\$11,164	Fuels Mngt/Fire Prevention	02
	Merrill Fuel Reduction	\$18,000	Fuels Mngt/Fire Prevention	02
	Klamath River Community Corridor	\$4,705	Fuels Mngt/Fire Prevention	02
	subtotal fuels	\$473,748		
Recreation				
	Juanita Lake Campground Vegetation Management	\$33,750	Campground Improvement/ Forest Health	05
History				
	none			
Other				
	Watershed Science Education	\$10,883	Conservation Education	05
	Quartz Valley Aquarium Project	\$5,610	Conservation Education	05
	Youth Conservation Corps	\$77,487	Community Economic Benefit/ Conservation Education	05
	Happy Camp Visitor Information Center	\$38,500	Conservation Education	04
	Siskiyou RAC Member Travel	\$2,500	Other Project Type	04
	RAC Internet Tracking Database	\$18,150	Other Project Type	04
	Orr Lake SSTs	\$50,000	Other Project Type	04
	Klamath/Salmon River Dispersed Recreation River Sanitation	\$17,500	Other Project Type	04
	Greenhorn Reclamation and Public Use Plan	\$40,150	Other Project Type	04
	Happy Camp Scat Machine & RV Dumpsite	\$59,620	Community Economic Benefit	03
	Watershed Science Education	\$11,971	Conservation Education	03
	Salmon River Watershed Education	\$6,715	Conservation Education	03
	Karuk Cultural Youth Training Program	\$19,800	Conservation Education	03
	Karuk Cultural Youth Training Program	\$19,800	Conservation Education	02
	subtotal other	\$378,686		
	TOTAL	\$1,979,346		

Interviewees

Larry Alexander, RAC member
Peg Boland, Forest Service
Petey Brucker, RAC member
Julie Cassidy, Forest Service
Sherry Crawford, RAC member
Max Creasy, Forest Service
Eddie Davenport, RAC member
Debbie Derby, Forest Service
Steve Fisher, Klamath River Fire Safe Council
Don Hall, Forest Service (RAC Coordinator)
Jeanette Hook, RAC member
Bob Lindsay, RAC member
Valerie Linfoot, Forest Service
George Livingston, Klamath Fire Safe Council
Kerry Mauro, RAC member
Rick Meredith, RAC member
Howard Moody, County Administrator
Sandra Tripp, Karuk Tribe
Harold Tripp, RAC member
Bill Turner, RAC member
Rebekah Sluss, RAC member

The name of one individual is not listed by request.

