

DRAFT. Do not cite. To be circulated for comments and suggestions only.

Socioeconomic Characteristics of the Natural Resources Restoration System
in Humboldt County

Mark Baker
Forest Community Research
October 2003

Summary

It is common knowledge to many people on the North Coast that natural resources restoration generates significant amounts of investment and employment. Others would be surprised to know how rich is the local history of restoration and how quickly it has grown to become a multi-million dollar endeavor in Humboldt County. Previous efforts have been made to help communicate information concerning the size of the restoration sector to both audiences. These include a study of Humboldt County's environmental restoration industry by the Redwood Community Action Agency (2002) as well as a report by the North Coast Restoration Jobs Initiative on heavy equipment work in restoration in Humboldt County (2003). This study builds on and expands these prior attempts to understand the socioeconomic character of the restoration sector in Humboldt County. Its purpose is simple: to describe the restoration system that has evolved in Humboldt County and to provide credible estimates of its size, both in terms of total annual investments in restoration and numbers of restoration-related jobs.

This project originated from discussions about the potential usefulness of conducting a comprehensive socioeconomic assessment of natural resources restoration that were begun in late 2001 in various community-based forums such as working sessions of the Collaborative Learning Circle and with members of the North Coast Restoration Jobs Initiative. In spring 2002, with support from the Pacific West Community Forestry Center, an initial proposal to conduct an assessment in Humboldt and Trinity County was developed. During the summer and autumn more discussions were held with members of the restoration community about the assessment, the proposal was further refined, and the search for funding began.¹ In January 2003 Forest Community Research received partial funding from the Ford Foundation for the project. Work on the Humboldt County portion of the project commenced soon thereafter. The Trinity County portion of the project was subsequently partially funded by the Watershed Training and Research Center in Hayfork (with support from the U.S. Forest Service Pacific Southwest Research Station). This report concerns only the Humboldt County portion of the original proposal; research on the Trinity County component is still under way.

This project purposively utilizes a relatively narrow definition of natural resources restoration, one with widespread currency that would be accepted by diverse audiences. Our focus is on the evolution and current scale of natural resources restoration as an independent, autonomous field of activity within the local economy. Therefore, our definition of restoration encompasses only those activities whose primary purpose is to reinvest resources back into the environment in order to enhance ecosystem health, resilience, and productivity. Thus for the purposes of this study, restoration includes 1) upslope watershed restoration activities such as road decommissioning and upgrades/storm proofing, removal/stabilization of landings, landslide stabilization, and other upslope erosion control projects, 2) riparian and instream fisheries habitat improvement projects, 3) invasive exotic species control and removal activities, and revegetation efforts in forest, meadow, dune and estuary ecosystems, 4) restoration of hydrologic flow regimes in stream and estuary ecosystems, and 5) fuels reduction efforts. It also includes the watershed assessments, planning processes, inventories, and monitoring efforts that precede and accompany these efforts. And it includes activities such as training workshops, organizational

¹ Andrea Davis of the North Coast Restoration Jobs Initiative took the lead on most of this outreach.

and business management workshops, and educational outreach and school programs whose goal is to enhance restoration capacity and support.

While the definition of restoration this study employs may appear to be expansive, it becomes less so when we consider what this definition excludes. For the purposes of this study, we are not considering restoration activities that are embedded within more traditional resource management and extraction regimes. Thus the road upgrades, stormproofing and decommissioning associated with the operation of timber harvest plans on industrial timberland ownerships are not included in this study. Also excluded are the considerable investments and efforts currently being made to improve dairy waste management on farms in the Eel River delta. The arena of restoration forestry, which integrates forest ecology and silviculture in the restoration and sustainable management of forest ecosystems, is excluded. Also excluded are the twenty years of studies and related efforts to understand and build the knowledge base necessary to restore the Trinity River and Klamath Rivers. Similarly, the \$35 million to \$40 million science and research driven “environmental restoration, assessment, and protection” industry, part of the “Education and Research Industry” cluster of the County’s Prosperity economic development strategy, is only included to the extent that it contributes directly to restoration implementation work in Humboldt County.² These various activities, many of which do have immediate positive effects on rates of sediment delivery to fish-bearing streams as well as forest ecosystem health, are excluded from this assessment because 1) for some, e.g. restoration forestry, it is nearly impossible to separate out the restoration component from the non-restoration component, or 2) some of these activities may be carried out to mitigate for the negative effects of other management actions and hence do not constitute a reinvestment designed to improve ecological conditions, or 3) some activities, such as the scientific investigations of the Klamath and Trinity Rivers and other research-driven efforts, are not yet linked with on-the-ground restoration programs, although the hope is that some day they will. The focus here is on restoration in Humboldt County and the system that has evolved to implement and accomplish restoration goals on the North Coast.

As this report demonstrates, even within these relatively narrow sideboards, there exists a vigorous and growing natural resources restoration sector in Humboldt County. This sector is not a random assemblage of parts engaged in different aspects of restoration in an uncoordinated fashion. Rather, since the late 1970s, and especially during the last 10 years, an internally coherent restoration system has evolved in Humboldt County. In powerful ways the restoration system belies the discredited “jobs verses the environment” rhetoric. Instead, it demonstrates the extent to which socioeconomic well-being is not only consistent with enhanced ecological conditions, but also that the process of restoring ecological processes and functions itself contributes towards socioeconomic well-being.

The restoration system in Humboldt County is comprised of 1) diverse entities linked together within a restoration network, united in their shared commitment to the goals of restoration, 2) explicit and formalized linkages between science and restoration practice, 3) the codification of standardized restoration methodologies, 4) a complex institutional infrastructure

² See www.northcoastprosperity.com for a copy of the recent Institute of the North Coast (a Humboldt Area Foundation Program) report on the “Environmental Restoration, Assessment, and Protection Industry,” part of the Education and Research Industry cluster

that facilitates collective learning and constitutes an effective vehicle for advancing restoration efforts. The entities within the restoration system include federal, state, and local government agencies, tribes, public and private land owners and managers, restoration nonprofits and watershed groups, private contractors, consulting firms and businesses. A complex web of relationships has evolved that links these entities together in a coherent fashion to enable restoration work to take place. Standardized restoration methodologies have been developed out of the rich experience with restoration over the last three decades. These methodologies, although periodically refined through adaptive management, have been codified in manuals and have begun to be used to guide restoration work elsewhere. The continuing evolution of restoration knowledge reflects the productive engagement between scientific inquiry and restoration practice that characterizes the restoration system. The restoration system includes institutional infrastructure for transferring lessons learned from one part of the network to others. Training workshops and other forums provide opportunity to disseminate information and mobilize resources concerning a wide range of topics, from recent insights concerning specific restoration approaches, to strategies for meeting the challenges associated with permitting requirements, to state and national efforts to garner political and policy support for restoration work.

The restoration system in Humboldt County contributes significantly to the local economy. Between 1995 and 2002 the restoration system generated more than \$65 million dollars for restoration work in Humboldt County. Almost all of this amount came into the county in the form of restoration contracts and grants from state and federal agencies; virtually none of this amount was used to support the many state and federal government agency restoration jobs and related expenses. In the last three years alone, more than \$38 million dollars came into the county for restoration project implementation or for activities directly related to project implementation. In 2002 approximately \$14.5 million was generated; this is about twice the value of the commercial fishery landings in Humboldt County and it is greater than the value of some of the county's agricultural products. While restoration work is related to these other resource-based sectors in a synergistic manner, it clearly is an economic engine in its own right. Given the extent of the need, natural resources restoration work only promises to grow. For example, it is estimated that \$150 million dollars of restoration funding are needed to address water quality and salmonid habitat issues related just to the county roads in the five county north state region (Trinity County Planning Department 2002). The recently released National Academy of Science report concerning the health of the Klamath River ecosystem calls for \$25 million to \$30 million for restoring coho salmon in the river and upstream endangered suckers. And the Department of Fish and Game's draft coho salmon recovery plan (released 11/7/03) estimates that it will cost \$5 billion to restore California's coho salmon population, and that the recovery will stimulate the coastal economy by more than this amount. Apart from the ever-increasing integration of restoration activities into traditional resource management sectors, simply accomplishing the restoration work related to addressing the challenges of these legacy issues suggests the need for the continued growth of the restoration system.

The restoration system also generates significant employment in Humboldt County. Based on information from phone call interviews with almost every public and private entity involved in restoration, we developed a conservative estimate of restoration jobs in the county in

2002.³ Most restoration jobs are in the private sector. In 2002 there were approximately 120 Full Time Equivalents (FTE's) in private sector restoration jobs. These 120 FTE's translate into a larger number of actual jobs, the specific number depending on how one defines a restoration job. If one defines a restoration job as being 75% restoration oriented, then in the private sector there are 143 restoration jobs, at 50% the number increases to 188 jobs, and at 35% the number of jobs increases to 205.⁴ There are approximately 37 FTE's in public sector restoration jobs in the county. These 37 FTE's are distributed across approximately 45 public sector jobs. There are about 11 FTE's (11 jobs) in restoration within tribal government. Assuming that to be called a "restoration job" a job must be comprised of at least 50% restoration-related work, we can conclude that there are approximately 244 restoration jobs in Humboldt County. Both the levels of investment in restoration and the employment restoration generates have significant multiplier effects as they ripple through the regional economy. These effects are estimated in the report.

This report is a credible assessment of some of the primary socioeconomic characteristics of the natural resources restoration sector in Humboldt County. It focuses on restoration's current benefits - the socioeconomic benefits of restoration as process - as compared with the valuation of restored watersheds, ecosystems, and fisheries. It also provides the information necessary to establish that restoration in Humboldt County comprises a coherent system. This information includes brief descriptions of some of the standardized restoration methodologies that have been developed, the role of science in restoration, its community-based aspects, and its institutional infrastructure. However, these descriptions are by no-means comprehensive, rather they are drawn from a wide array of possible examples to help make the arguments contained herein.

Acknowledgements

This effort would not have been possible without the generous financial assistance provided by the Ford Foundation and the Pacific West Community Forestry Center. I would like to express my gratitude and appreciation to those individuals who were directly involved in the research on which this report is based. Don Son, Megan Taylor, Jayme Seehafer, and Donnie Bidlack participated in the data collection process as interns through Professor Steve Hackett's Economics of a Sustainable Society course in the Spring semester, 2003. Don and Megan continued to work on this project throughout the summer and autumn months. Andrea Davis of the North Coast Restoration Jobs Initiative of the Alliance for Sustainable Jobs and the Environment contributed many hours to this project. In addition her on-going interest in and general support for this project, Ms. Davis' participation began with an initial series of conversations with members of the North Coast restoration community to explore local support for and interest in this kind of study. Subsequently, Ms. Davis took the lead on making the

³ This estimate of restoration employment does not include the 30 full time employees and the 300 residents at the California Conservation Corps' Fortuna Center. The contribution of the CCC's to restoration on the North Coast, especially through the Salmon Restoration Program, is hard to overestimate. However, how to calculate the employment contributions of the CCC Fortuna Center is a challenging issue, partly because the program has a job training and employment provision component – so the jobs, while focused on restoration work, are qualitatively different from other private or public sector restoration jobs. This issue requires further investigation.

⁴ There are significantly more jobs than FTE's because 1) some restoration workers, especially contractors, have a short work season and therefore do not work "full-time" when defined as a 40 hours of work per week year round, 2) some restoration work, especially that done by resource professionals, comprises only part of what they do.

numerous phone calls to all restoration-oriented businesses in the region to gather the raw data necessary to determine the current employment levels with the restoration sector. Conversations with members of the steering committee of the Restoration Jobs Initiative during spring 2002 helped to define the scope and scale of this project in its early stages.

Most importantly, I would like to extend my utmost gratitude to the many members of the North Coast restoration community without whose willing participation this study would have been impossible. Even during the height of the busy field season, restoration nonprofit staff, private contractors, and other restoration professionals were invariably willing to set aside time to discuss with us their perceptions and insights about the restoration sector. Whether in offices, at a restaurant or coffee shop, around the campfire, or bouncing along dirt roads to a remote job site, we almost always managed to find a time and place to meet to talk restoration. Their willingness to meet and talk frankly about the structure and challenges of restoration reflects the passion and dedication that members of the restoration community bring to their work.

State, federal, and local agency staff were also invariably supportive of this project and contributed towards it in many ways. Without exception, federal, state, and local government personnel were more than willing to provide us with information on restoration-related projects and expenditures in Humboldt County. Along with the data received from other sources, their efforts enabled us to develop a conservative and credible estimate of the total annual flow of funding for restoration in Humboldt County from 1995 through 2002. Many of these individuals also generously consented to meet to discuss in more detail the organization, structure, and operation of the restoration system, with a particular focus on the role(s) they play in restoration. Please refer to Appendix II for a full listing of those individuals who generously contributed their time and expertise towards this project.

Table of Contents

Summary	2
Acknowledgements	5
Introduction	8
Evolution of Restoration in Humboldt County – An Overview	10
Diverse Sociocultural and Tribal Roots	11
The Northwest Forest Plan – the Federal Government Connection	13
State Involvement in Restoration	15
Combining Socioeconomic and Ecological Goals - Local Government Involvement in Restoration	18
Current Restoration Models in Humboldt County	19
Private Lands Models of Restoration	20
Public Lands Models of Restoration	22
Tribal Models of Restoration	24
The Five County Salmonid Conservation Program	25
Restoration and Community	27
Restoration Science (and Art)	31
Restoration - a Coherent System	35
How Much Money Does Restoration Bring Into Humboldt County?	37
Comparing the Value of the Restoration Sector With Other Resource and Agricultural Products	40
Private, Public, and Tribal Employment in Restoration	42
Restoration Constraints	44
Conclusion	48
References	50
Appendix 1: Survey Form Used for Phone Interviews of Private Sector Restoration Organizations	52
Appendix II People Interviewed	54

Tables

Table 1. Public Funding by Source for Restoration, Humboldt County, 1995-2002.....	38
Table 2. Gross Value of Selected Agricultural Production, Humboldt County, 2001.....	43

Introduction

The objectives of natural resources restoration, to simultaneously improve ecosystem health and enhance community and worker well-being, enjoy wide support throughout the North Coast and Pacific Northwest region. In many respects, the region is at the nation's forefront in terms of the amount of restoration work that has been completed to date and the wealth of experience that that work has generated. Despite the impressive track record and local knowledge concerning restoration that exists, we lack a comprehensive understanding of the size and scope of the restoration sector, its institutional and bureaucratic infrastructure, and the numbers and kinds of workers involved in restoration. The lack of information regarding these parameters hampers efforts to advance restoration as a viable economic sector, hinders our understanding of the current economic and community benefits of restoration, dilutes our appreciation of the scientific and methodological accomplishments in restoration, and tends to render invisible the complex institutional infrastructure that has evolved within the restoration system.

This report seeks to shed some light on these aspects of the restoration system through a comprehensive and empirical analysis of the current structure and size of the natural resources restoration sector in Humboldt County.⁵ This report does not attempt to estimate what would be the value of restored watersheds, fisheries, estuaries and coastal environments on the North Coast. Rather, we focus on the current value of restoration as process. By this we mean the contributions that current restoration efforts are making to our regional economy, both in terms of dollars brought into the county for restoration and the jobs those dollars support. Clearly, restoration has significant value both in terms of end product – restored and resilient ecosystems – and as process, in terms of the contributions to the regional economy, community building, institutional development and learning that accrue through the process of restoration itself. The focus on the process benefits of restoration draws attention to the complex and dynamic institutional infrastructure that has evolved to accomplish restoration goals and objectives. For restoration does just “happen,” but rather it takes place only because of the concerted activities of a large number of diversely positioned individuals and organizations that are committed to the values of ecosystem restoration and local community well-being. Consequently, an important

⁵ Some of the limitations of this study should be noted from the outset. First, as with any bean counting exercise, some beans invariably get away. Thus, it is inevitable that some of the funds spent on some of the restoration projects in Humboldt County will not be included in our estimate of overall restoration investments. We have made every effort to uncover as many stones as we could to accurately estimate both restoration investments and employment levels in restoration. I would estimate that, within the parameters of restoration used in this study, our estimates are accurate to within 5%; they most likely underestimate restoration investments. With respect to restoration funding, this report does not delve into the specific histories of the different ballot propositions that have been (and still are) used to fund restoration, nor does it attempt to assess the probability of future propositions and legislation that could provide continued support for restoration. While this report discusses issues such as permitting and contracting them, it does not provide a detailed analysis of these issues. Our descriptions of the socioeconomic characteristics restoration in Humboldt County are necessarily partial. We have not attempted to write a comprehensive analysis of the evolution and current structure of the complex and highly diverse restoration sector. Our view of restoration is conditioned by a variety of factors, including the time and resource constraints on this study and the particular array individuals and organizations whom we were able to interact with as part of this study (see appendix 1 for a list). Our descriptions of particular organizations and restoration programs are intended to illustrate specific points or themes, they are not intended to constitute a comprehensive overview of all the organizations and programs that work on natural resources restoration in the county.

aspect of this report is to convey a sense of how restoration “works” in Humboldt County. This provides the basis for arguing that a restoration “system” has evolved from the ground up to achieve restoration goals and objectives, and that sustaining this system is central to enabling restoration efforts to continue.

What sorts of activities are considered natural resources restoration for the purposes of this study? Restoration is an inherently nebulous term. It can refer to a way of structuring the productive and material forces of a capitalist economy in a manner that minimizes waste during the production process (Cunningham 2002). This perspective focuses generally on the importance of “closed production loops” in which incentives that encourage investment in environmentally and socially sustainable production strategies and labor relations are incorporated within the policy framework that governs a particular activity, production process, or industrial sector. This report, however, focuses more narrowly on natural resources restoration. Even that remains a broad category and it remains necessary to define the range of activities that are considered restoration for the purposes of this study.

Because one of the underlying purposes of this study is to examine the extent to which a cohesive “restoration sector” actually exists independently of the more traditional resource management sectors, e.g. forestry or fisheries management, agriculture, ranching, or dairying, the analysis focused primarily on restoration as an independent field of activity. This analytical perspective provided a lens through which to concentrate attention on the unique set of activities, people, and organizations that are focused primarily or to a large extent on natural resources restoration work, as distinct from resource management or extraction. There are several ways to characterize this work. Some focus on location of the work (upslope, in-stream or near stream), others on how the work gets done (heavy equipment intensive or labor intensive), and others, such as the 23-fold classification system used by the California Department of Fish and Game’s fisheries restoration grant program, describe a broad range of restoration activities ranging from assessment and planning, project implementation, monitoring, and other efforts such as public school educational programs and watershed organizations assistance.

Restoration activities included in this study fall under the general rubric of fisheries, watershed, and ecological restoration projects. This includes the assessments and planning that precede implementation and the monitoring that follows it, occurring anywhere from the dune and estuarine ecosystems up through the riparian corridors to the roaded and forested ranges and on up to the ridgetops of the watersheds of Humboldt County. Also included in the category of “restoration” are investments and activities such as support for watershed organizations including capacity building work and school educational programs related to restoration (especially anadromous fisheries restoration) that relate directly to the organizational infrastructure of restoration and its community-based aspects. This definition encompasses upslope work related to transportation networks such as road, crossing, and landing decommissioning, near stream work such as riparian habitat restoration, instream work such as bank stabilization, habitat restoration and barrier modification, and species and hydrological manipulation such as exotic and native species management and tide gate, dyke, and channel modifications. It includes both labor and heavy equipment intensive forms of work as well as the more technical engineering and scientific studies necessary for project planning, prioritization, and monitoring.

This definition of restoration captures the great majority of work being done in Humboldt County whose primary focus is to improve ecosystem condition and health. It could be described as the core of what constitutes watershed and fisheries restoration. The investigation that follows explores the size, structure, and extent of this core. The approach taken in this study is to focus on restoration as a distinct entity. There are, however, several types of restoration that are not included in this study. In general, natural resource restoration-related work that falls outside the purview of this study tends to be combined with one or more of the pre-existing natural resource management regimes in the county. This includes, for example, 1) the relatively recent work concerning the creation of dairy waste management systems designed to improve water quality in the lower Eel River watershed, 2) road system work such as stormproofing, crossing removal, and bridge installation done in conjunction with timber harvesting and/or as mitigation required for the approval of Timber Harvest Plans on industrial forestland ownerships, 3) forest harvesting techniques and silvicultural practices that come under the rubric of “restoration forestry,” and 4) municipal water supply and storm water drainage system infrastructure development and upgrades. While these examples are all related, either directly or indirectly, to restoration, there are several reasons why they are not included in this assessment. In some instances, e.g. dairy waste management, THP mitigation work, and restoration forestry, the restoration-related work is so tightly integrated into the broader set of resource management practices that to try to separate it out from them is methodologically challenging and to lump them together with other more restoration-focused activities that may comprise a restoration sector is conceptually arbitrary. Furthermore, as in the case of restoration done as part of THP mitigation to fulfill the “zero net erosion” rule, sediment transport related to the actual timber harvest may make up for the sediment saving effects of road rehabilitation, thus at least partially obviating the “net gain” derived from the restoration activity. Another issue, especially related to restoration forestry, concerns the lack of consensus on what it is and is not; one person’s restoration-oriented rehabilitation cut may not be another’s; when is a thinning operation restoration as opposed to a standard precommercial thin? This study skirts these Gordian knots by focusing on those activities, described above, that are not tightly integrated with other resource management sectors.

This approach to defining the field has several implications. First, it tends to underestimate the amount of work, investment, and expertise going into practices that have outcomes consistent with restoration. Secondly, it draws attention away from relatively recent changes in traditional resource management, such as forestry and dairy management, that have the effect of integrating restoration goals and objectives into management planning and practice. These changes are encouraging. Their institutionalization will help improve the sustainability of present and future resource management and extraction activities, thereby minimizing the likelihood of creating future restoration challenges. This is good because institutionalizing restoration promotes the establishment of a restoration economy on the North Coast. Meanwhile, addressing the legacies that past management and extraction practices have created will occupy the restoration system for decades to come. The following sections provide an overview of the current efforts to address these restoration challenges.

Evolution of Restoration in Humboldt County – An Overview

This study did not include a comprehensive analysis of the historical evolution of restoration in Humboldt County. A detailed study of this topic, which is closely related to the social history of the area, is warranted but has yet to be undertaken. This study also does not provide comprehensive information on the evolution and accomplishments of the various nonprofit and other organizations that are involved in restoration on the North Coast. Where specific organizations or programs are mentioned, the purpose in doing so is illustrative only. However, I would like to discuss a few key points about the history of restoration as they help inform our understanding of the current restoration sector. These points concern the various social and tribal roots of restoration and the nature of the engagement of federal, state, and local governments in restoration.

Diverse Sociocultural and Tribal Roots

The first point concerns the diverse roots of restoration in Humboldt County. As the fieldwork for this assessment progressed, I was struck by the diverse origins of the different groups of people involved in restoration. Despite the very different backgrounds of these groups, they all share a strong, and in many cases passionate, commitment, often rooted in a well developed sense of place, to help restore the natural environment and in particular, to bring back the salmon and steelhead runs.

Ex-commercial fishermen and fisherwoman and individuals who come from a commercial fishing background comprise one of these key groups. In the early 1980s, some of the men and women who were unable to continue fishing due to declining catches resulting from catch size limits and reduced fish abundance turned to restoration. Gradually, their efforts to restore the anadromous fisheries of the North Coast developed into a professional activity that paid the bills. Today, ex-commercial fishermen and women work in the restoration sector in a variety of roles, including leading some of the area's restoration nonprofits, managing their own restoration businesses, working within agencies such as the California Department of Fish and Game, and doing independent restoration-related consulting.

A second group that became involved in restoration were people whose families have lived in the area for more than one generation, and who were often involved in land management and resource extraction, primarily logging and ranching. Some were and still are landowners. Over the last 20 years or so, a number of factors including declining employment in forestry, ranching and agriculture, a strong attachment to the area and outdoor lifestyle, and an environmental stewardship ethic have lead people from this background to become involved in restoration in a variety of ways. These include contracting and heavy equipment operation, school and community education and outreach work, involvement in restoration nonprofit organizations, and in some instances, implementing restoration projects on their property.

First generation residents of the area comprise a third important group of people involved in restoration. These are the people who moved here mostly during the 1960s and 70s, motivated by the ideals and ideas of the environmental movement, bioregionalism, and back-to-the-land self-sufficiency. Combining the skills and knowledge of higher education with a strong work ethic, some of these men and women started the early forest cooperatives that did a large

part of the tree planting and other labor-intensive work related to forest and watershed restoration work in the 1970s and early 80s. These individuals were also some of the earliest advocates of restoration as well innovators in the development of the methods and practices associated with it. Many of these individuals remain involved in the restoration sector as leaders (locally and at state and national levels), contractors, policy analysts and planners, practitioners, and watershed association organizers.

A fourth group of people involved in restoration consists of professionals – geologists, fisheries biologists, hydrologists, foresters, ecologists, engineers, and others – who apply their skills and expertise to the problems and challenges associated with the planning, implementing, and monitoring of restoration efforts. Scientists and other resource professionals generally work in the private sector, alone or with a small group of other consulting professionals, or with state or federal resource management agencies. Some work in the nonprofit sector and others are part of large engineering firms. The involvement of this group of people dates back approximately 15 years, although some individuals have worked in restoration much longer. These individuals play important roles in activities such as the development, articulation, and application of the scientific and engineering principles that underlie restoration practice. Furthermore, through their interaction with other colleagues in professional forums and associations, they facilitate the horizontal transfer of knowledge and insight about restoration to other regions and bring back lessons learned from restoration experiences elsewhere.

This overview of the diverse roots and origins of restoration in Humboldt County would be entirely incomplete without mention of the area's tribes and their involvement in restoration. In particular, the Hoopa Valley Tribe and the Yurok Tribe have been extensively involved in restoration work, both in the watersheds of their ancestral territories as well as in the mainstem Klamath and Trinity Rivers. The Hoopa Valley Tribe's watershed restoration program, managed by the tribe's forestry division, gained tremendous momentum following the assumption of full management authority over tribal forest resources by the tribe, which took place soon after passage of the 1988 Hoopa-Yurok Settlement Act. Upon completion and approval of the forest management plan by the tribal council, the tribe, with partial support from the Bureau of Indian Affairs using Northwest Forest Plan funds, embarked on an ambitious trajectory that involved watershed assessment and restoration project implementation. In an analogous manner, the Yurok Tribe, whose ancestral territory lies primarily under the ownership of Simpson Resource Company, has been extensively involved in watershed restoration efforts since the early 1990s. Because Simpson Resource Company owns most of the Yurok territory, the watershed restoration efforts of the tribe's Watershed Department take place on Simpson property under the authority of various cooperative agreements between the tribe and the corporation. These efforts are primarily funded by grants from federal and state agencies.

The Hoopa and Yurok Tribes have also been involved in a variety of efforts, focused on the mainstem Klamath and Trinity Rivers, related to restoring the salmon and steelhead fisheries of the Klamath-Trinity basin. These efforts have centered primarily on 1) science-based efforts to understand the ecology, status, and trends of the basin's fishery, and 2) developing science-based models to secure the flows necessary to guide the eventual restoration of the basin's salmon and steelhead. To date, these efforts have not resulted in large amounts of restoration

work along the mainstem of these two rivers.⁶ Rather, these two tribes have played central roles in producing the knowledge and models that are necessary to guide restoration efforts – once the flows are secured for doing so. For example, with respect to the Trinity River, the Hoopa Valley Tribe was a central player in the Trinity River Flow Evaluation Study, completed in 1999. This study, formally embraced by the 2000 Record of Decision, outlines a restoration plan that combines flow management, fine and coarse sediment management, and channel and watershed management to restore the natural production of salmon and steelhead on the Trinity River. Although plan implementation has been delayed due to court challenges from downstream purveyors of Trinity River water, notably Westlands Water District in the San Joaquin Valley, no one doubts the political and scientific momentum that the work of the Hoopa Valley and Yurok Tribes has generated for restoring the salmon and steelhead populations of the Trinity (and Klamath) Rivers. Indeed, a recent Times Standard editorial acknowledged the efforts of the Hoopa Valley Tribe to restore the river in the following manner: “In reality, the Hoopa Tribe has intervened for all of the North Coast. Without the tribe, we would have hardly a chance to bring back the [Trinity] river” (10.10.03).

Other Native American groups have also been actively involved in restoration efforts in the area. For example, although their lands lie outside of Humboldt County (and therefore fall outside the geographic scope of this study), the Karuk Tribe has also been involved in large restoration projects, primarily associated with various forms of road decommissioning on public lands under Forest Service management. To the south, in Mendocino County, the Sinkyone Intertribal Wilderness is a well known example of Native American environmental management with a large restoration component based on traditional ecological knowledge. In Humboldt County another example of American Indian involvement in restoration is the efforts of the Wiyot Tribe to purchase and restore the northern portion of Indian Island in Humboldt Bay. The restoration efforts of the Yurok, Hoopa, and Karuk Tribes all include or have included a job training component.

The Northwest Forest Plan – the Federal Government Connection

The links between employment and restoration have been prominent throughout the evolution of restoration on the North Coast. Indeed, the employment generating capacity of restoration, especially within the context of declining timber industry jobs, partly accounts for the willingness of the federal government to support restoration programs. One of the first periods when this relationship was highlighted was immediately following the 1978 expansion of Redwood National Park. The legislation authorized the acquisition of 48,000 acres to expand the park boundaries and more effectively protect the old growth redwood groves, particularly the Tall Trees Grove, included in the original 28,000 acre Redwood National Park established in

⁶ The various studies of the mainstem Trinity and Klamath Rivers conducted by the Hoopa Valley Tribe, Yurok Tribe, and agencies such as the Fish and Wildlife Service that culminated in the Trinity River Flow Evaluation Study are not included as part of the assessment of the amount of funding coming into Humboldt County for restoration purposes. Although this is admittedly a fuzzy issue, it was decided to exclude these efforts because of our focus on restoration project implementation and those evaluations such as road inventories and watershed assessments that prioritize and precede project implementation. This decision is consistent with our relatively narrow focus on on-the-ground restoration-related work that is, for the most part, not associated with mitigation efforts required by law as compensation for the environmental effects of other management activities such as timber harvesting or dam construction.

1968. The legislation also included \$33 million for watershed restoration work on the cutover acquired lands, as well as funding for working retraining and assistance programs to offset the job losses resulting from the harvest level reductions the acquisition caused (DeForest 1999). The acquisition of these cutover lands in combination with the availability of funding for restoring them provided an unprecedented opportunity for experimenting with and developing effective methodologies for watershed restoration. The years following the RNP expansion were a time of rapid innovation in restoration techniques on the heavily roaded, steep, and unstable slopes characteristic of the Redwood Creek watershed and much of Humboldt County. Much of this early restoration work consisted of labor-intensive check dam construction and tree planting. Monitoring studies conducted by park scientists during the early 1980s revealed that heavy-equipment intensive restoration techniques were more ecologically beneficial and cost-effective than labor intensive manual techniques (Spreiter 1992). This realization, in combination with other structural and implementation problems associated with the training and worker compensation programs established by the 1978 legislation (DeForest 1999), meant that restoration in Redwood National Park would not be able to provide long term employment for large numbers of out-of-work timber workers. It did however, and still does today, provide jobs for both park employees as well as heavy equipment operators and other restoration practitioners in the region.

Two subsequent federal government programs were also based on the presumed relationship between employment and watershed restoration. The first was the Northwest Emergency Assistance Program, begun following President Clinton's declaration that the Pacific Northwest salmon industry was in a state of disaster. The Northwest Emergency Assistance Program, which lasted from 1994 through 1997 and was administered in Humboldt County through the county Resource Conservation District, provided funds to displaced salmon fisherfolk for training in watershed restoration and habitat assessment (Yoon 1998). In Humboldt County approximately 15 displaced salmon fishermen and women were trained in restoration and habitat assessment techniques; 130 fisherfolk were trained throughout northern California (Yoon 1998). Several individuals in Humboldt County continue to work in watershed restoration nonprofit and for profit organizations (Mitch Farro, pers. comm.). The relationships that were forged amongst those enrolled in the program and between them and landowners and resource management agencies, as well as the skills that the enrollees acquired during the Northwest Emergency Assistance Program, were crucial in enabling them to continue to work in watershed restoration.

The Northwest Forest Plan and the accompanying Northwest Economic Adjustment Initiative were the other federal policy initiatives, launched in 1994, that included programs to buffer the effects on displaced timber workers and rural communities of declining timber harvests. The Northwest Forest Plan made available more than \$1.2 billion to mitigate the socioeconomic effects associated with the changes in federal forest policy contained in the Northwest Forest Plan. This money, to be allocated through the Northwest Economic Adjustment Initiative using a novel approach that sought to coordinate the actions and programs of a large number of state and federal agencies, was focused on the following assistance categories: ecosystem investment, communities and infrastructure, workers and families, business and industry. Part of this assistance included funds for federal agencies such as the Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the Fish and Wildlife Service, to support watershed

restoration and implement training programs known as Jobs-in-the-Woods for displaced timber workers. Resource professionals working at Redwood National Park as well as a group of talented innovators working throughout the region had developed and to some extent formalized the art and science of watershed restoration during the late 70s and early 80s. The Northwest Forest Plan and Economic Adjustment Initiative provided key opportunities to expand the application of that knowledge and to begin to institutionalize watershed restoration as an independent sector of economic activity.

Although the Northwest Economic Adjustment Initiative did not provide the jobs and relief promised for displaced timber workers and their families (Kusel et al. 2003) and the Northwest Forest Plan has not been implemented as envisioned (Blackwell et al. 2003), it is nevertheless hard to overestimate the importance of the plan and the initiative for the development of the North Coast restoration sector in the 1990s. Two key elements were the provision of financial support for ecosystem management and watershed restoration through Jobs-in-the-Woods and other programs, and the prioritization of inter-agency coordination and collaboration that was a hallmark of the Economic Adjustment Initiative. For some federal land management agencies such as the Bureau of Land Management, funding for watershed restoration had previously come from timber harvest revenues. The Northwest Forest Plan altered this balance by reducing timber harvest levels and providing an independent source of funding for restoration work. On the North Coast, Bureau managers responded to these changed circumstances by strengthening already emerging partnerships with local restoration nonprofit organizations, such as the Mattole Restoration Council and the Redwood Community Action Agency, to achieve their watershed restoration goals and objectives. These continuing partnerships constitute an important element of the current restoration system, discussed further in the next section, as it exists in Humboldt County.

The Northwest Forest Plan also provided other agencies key opportunities to increase their involvement in watershed restoration. For example, the Bureau of Indian Affairs provided significant support, through Jobs-in-the-Woods funding, to the Hoopa and Yurok Tribes for watershed assessment and restoration work. This funding provided these two tribes opportunities to increase their internal capacity for watershed analysis and restoration planning and implementation, as well as train tribal contractors in restoration techniques. Some of these trainees have continued to work in restoration. Similarly, the Northwest Forest Plan Jobs-in-the-Woods program provided the Fish and Wildlife Service with resources to partner with the Yurok Tribe, other federal agencies such as the Bureau of Land Management and Redwood National Park, and private landowners (a relationship generally brokered by one of several restoration nonprofits including the Eel River Watershed Restoration Group, Mattole Restoration Council, and Redwood Community Action Agency), to conduct watershed assessments and implement restoration projects. The collaborative partnerships that evolved through this process are an important part of the existing restoration system.

State Involvement in Restoration

It is well beyond the scope of this study to provide a thorough review of the history of California's extensive engagement with fisheries and watershed restoration, which began soon after statehood. It is appropriate, however, to highlight some of the key aspects of the last

quarter century of this history as it relates to the North Coast. While generalizations are inevitably proven by the exception, it is perhaps safe to say that the primary mode of state involvement in restoration has been through the Resources Agency, particularly the Department of Fish and Game. The Department of Fish and Game is one of the primary state agencies involved in efforts to halt declines in salmon and steelhead runs and to restore these fisheries and their habitat. The collective efforts of the Department of Fish and Game and other state agencies, with the committed engagement of entities such as the California Advisory Committee on Salmon and Steelhead Trout, the California Salmon Restoration Federation, representatives of commercial and sportfishing associations, conservation groups, concerned individuals, and state political representatives, have produced an impressive array of legislation, propositions, and programs oriented towards salmon and steelhead habitat and watershed restoration. A dominant theme throughout these efforts is the goal of restoring naturally reproducing native fisheries in order that viable commercial and sport fishing industries may be restored and sustained, while maintaining the viability of other resource extraction industries and allowing for sustainable economic growth.

In the 1970s documentation of declining salmon and steelhead runs was instrumental in generating the momentum to establish and fund fisheries restoration and related activities. Reports published in 1971, 1972, 1975, 1986, and 1988 by the Citizen's Advisory Committee on Salmon and Steelhead Trout (established in 1970 and re-authorized by the state legislature in 1983 as the California Committee on Salmon and Steelhead Trout) and the Department of Fish and Game Staff Working Committee, chronicled the declines in runs and suggested strategies for restoring and protecting fisheries resources. The later reports in particular, emphasized the economic contributions associated with healthy salmon and steelhead trout runs, stressed the need for both amelioration of degraded habitat and the prevention of further declines in habitat quality, and documented restoration opportunities.

These reports, along with the concerted efforts of conservation groups such as Cal Trout, advocacy and research groups such as the Pacific Coast Federation of Fisherman's Associations, the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission, and the Humboldt Fisherman's Marketing Association, responsive political leadership at the state level, diverse stakeholder groups such as the Fish, Farms, and Forest Communities Forum, and many other groups and organizations too numerous to list here, have generated several pieces of key legislation promoting fisheries and watershed restoration. These include 1) the 1981 Boscoe-Keene Assembly Bill 951, which allocated \$1 million in cooperative fish restoration projects, 2) Senate Bill 2261 (introduced by Senator Barry Keene in 1988), which established and funded the Salmon, Steelhead Trout, and Anadromous Fisheries Program whose purpose was to increase the natural production of these species of fish through protection, conservation, and restoration measures, including those that engaged the public's participation, and 3) Senate Bill 271 (introduced by Senator Mike Thompson in 1997) that created the Salmon and Steelhead Restoration Account and provided \$43 million for six years to be administered by the Department of Fish and Game for funding the implementation of restoration projects. In addition to these legislatively-authorized programs and funds, other state support for restoration (and fish hatcheries) has come from the Resources Agency's Renewable Resources Investment Fund; the Resources Agency has also prepared and published long-term plans for achieving restoration goals, the most recent of which is the agency's "California Coastal Salmon and Watersheds Program." Other important state-level sources of funding for restoration include Senate Bill 400, Assembly Bill 1705, Propositions 19,

70, and 99, the commercial salmon stamp program, and the Steelhead Report Card. More recent propositions that provide significant funding for restoration include 13, 204, 40, and 50.

State legislative and programmatic support has been central to the evolution of the restoration sector in Humboldt County. The Department of Fish and Game's Fisheries Restoration Grant Program has helped support the development of the institutional capacity and infrastructure necessary for achieving restoration goals and objectives. Collaborative partnerships between the Department of Fish and Game and watershed groups, non-profit organizations, landowners, and contractors are a dominant feature of the North Coast restoration network. More than one-third of the cumulative financial support for restoration that came into Humboldt County between 1995 and 2002 was administered by the Department of Fish and Game through its restoration grant program (see Table 1 below). Apart from administering the restoration grant program, the Department of Fish and Game also plays a variety of other roles with respect to restoration. For example, the department has taken a lead role in the development and systematization of fisheries habitat restoration science and technique, as represented in the California Salmonid Stream Habitat Restoration Manual (1991, rev. 1994, rev. 1998) developed by department staff, many of whom are based on the North Coast. The department is also currently developing systematic protocols to guide effectiveness and validation monitoring of restoration projects. The Department of Fish and Game's Wildlife Conservation Board, established in 1947 to support wildlife conservation and public recreation, plays key roles in land and conservation easement acquisition, public access enhancement, and habitat restoration. It has pursued all three of these objectives in Humboldt County.

One of the Department of Fish and Game's key partner organizations is the California Conservation Corps. It is hard to overestimate the contribution of the California Conservation Corps (CCC) to restoration in Humboldt County as well as state-wide. Since 1980 the Corps has collaborated with the Department of Fish and Game, other agencies, and public and private landowners to restore salmon and steelhead habitat through the Salmon Restoration Program. With its roots in the social mission of the Civilian Conservation Corps of the New Deal era, the Corps combines employment and educational opportunities related to natural resource conservation and public service for young adults. In the north state, the Corp's Salmon Restoration Program has been nationally recognized as a leader in stream and watershed restoration. In Humboldt County 300 Corps members reside at the Fortuna residential center.⁷ The great majority of the work of these members and the approximately 30 center staff relates directly to restoration projects in Humboldt County. The Fortuna Center has an annual budget of between \$6 million and \$7 million dollars (Michelle Rose, pers. comm.). As with other restoration-related investments, these investments ripple throughout the Fortuna and greater Humboldt County economy. Another nearby California Conservation Corp center that specializes in restoration work is the Requa Center in Del Norte County. The recent outpouring of community and political support from those knowledgeable about the Corps' work and mission, in opposition to the Requa Center's tentative closure due to budget cuts, illustrates the high esteem in which the Corps, its mission, and work are held.

⁷ In addition to minimum wage (with graded salary increases) and benefits, Corps members receive subsidized room and board and, after one year of service, an educational award of \$4,725 to be used to pay for further education or to repay student loans.

Other state agencies also play key roles in supporting restoration efforts on the North Coast. The relative importance of their efforts has increased in the last few years. It is quite likely that as appreciation of the importance of restoration increases, this trend will only continue over time. The California Department of Parks and Recreation has a well developed restoration program in the county that focuses primarily on planning and implementing watershed restoration within Humboldt Redwoods State Park. The Parks Department annually lets contracts for restoration work worth several hundred thousand dollars within Humboldt County. The State Water Resources Control Board funds watershed restoration work, as authorized by the Clean Water Act (sections 319(h) and 205(j)). The involvement of the Water Board in funding restoration work on the North Coast will likely increase as a result of the passage of Proposition 50 and the Board's central role in administering Prop. 50 restoration funding. In recent years the California Coastal Conservancy has enlarged its range of activities to include making significant contributions for restoration efforts on the North Coast. The Department of Water Resources' Urban Streams Program is another state-level vehicle for funding restoration work. And lastly, the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection supports restoration work through the various cost-share stewardship programs that it administers. The Department of Forestry and Fire Protection has also provided support for the Five Counties Salmonid Conservation Program, which is the preeminent example of local government involvement in restoration activities.

Combining Socioeconomic and Ecological Goals - Local Government Involvement in Restoration

One of the most substantive engagements with restoration at the county level has been Humboldt County's participation in the Five Counties Salmonid Conservation Program. The program was initiated in 1997 when the Boards of Supervisors of the five northern California counties (Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino, Trinity and Siskiyou) adopted resolutions in which they agreed to collaborate in developing a positive, proactive manner to the federal listings of salmon as Threatened species by identifying opportunities whereby the counties can contribute to the long-term recovery of these species. The primary goal of the program is:

“To strive to protect the economic and social resources of Northwestern California by providing for the conservation and restoration of salmonid populations to healthy and sustainable levels and to base decisions on watershed rather than County boundaries.”

The program, which is administered by the Trinity County Planning Department – Natural Resources Division, focuses on those elements over which county governments have jurisdiction that affect salmonid species and their habitat. These elements include the region's extensive network of county roads and county-managed levees and spoils, and the planning and zoning authorities related to land use. Not surprisingly, decisions regarding these elements have vast implications for salmonid species and habitat. The goal of the Five County Program is to enable these elements to become vehicles for achieving restoration goals and objectives and, in the process, preserve and enhance the social and economic resources of the region. To date, the Five County Program has generated and is administering more than \$8.5 million dollars, most of which is comprised of state and federal funds, to achieve its goal. The specifics of the program, its accomplishments, and its linkages with the Humboldt County Public Works Department, are

discussed in a subsequent section. However, it is worth noting here that one of the primary underlying assumptions of the Five County Program is that restoration can be an important mechanism for conserving and enhancing the socioeconomic resources of northwestern California.

Although the initial county resolutions in support of the Five County Plan are six years old, and despite subsequent changes in the composition of the Boards of Supervisors, support for the program, and restoration in general, remains strong (Mark Lancaster, pers. comm.). For example, on October 21, 2003 the Humboldt County Board of Supervisors passed a resolution declaring that the third full week of October 2003 would be a week to honor “Watersheds and Fisheries Restoration Workers” and declaring furthermore that the Board is committed to supporting an “economy based on Conservation and Recovery of Watersheds and Fisheries” in which watershed and fisheries restoration workers receive living wages and benefits. The actual resolution is preceded by a series of statements describing the decline of salmonid and steelhead populations. It then briefly reviews the unstinting efforts of restoration workers and practitioners to restore the once-abundant runs of salmon and steelhead “that have and could still maintain life on California’s North Coast.” It notes that the “Restoration Industry” contributes significantly to the North Coast economy in a “just, equitable and sustainable fashion” and that the restoration effort should be based on “love of the resources, dedication to its recovery and living wages and benefits.” It is hard to imagine a stronger embrace and expression of support for the continued growth of a socially and economically sustainable restoration sector.

Almost every city in Humboldt County has some degree of involvement in restoration-related activities; some cities have well-developed restoration programs. Eureka and Arcata are both engaged in restoration projects related to the creeks, sloughs, and marshes that feed into and ring Humboldt Bay. The City of Ferndale has been involved in flood control and restoration efforts within the city limits. Fortuna, McKinleyville and others also have varying levels of involvement in restoration work. The majority of these efforts are funded by the same array of state and federal funding sources that support restoration elsewhere in the county. Some cities have unique opportunities to fund restoration work. For example, the City of Arcata Environmental Services Division reinvests a portion of the revenue derived from its management of the Arcata Community Forest into restoration projects. The sums generated and invested in restoration are significant. For example, not including Community Forest revenues, the City of Arcata has acquired and administered approximately \$4.1 million dollars for restoration work within the past nine years. Many of the restoration projects cities implement are multi-purpose projects that satisfy other purposes, such as flood control, in addition to achieving restoration goals and objectives. Many of these programs are also linked with community groups, neighborhood associations, and the public schools. Volunteer days are opportunities for city dwellers to participate in restoration work; in the process of restoring a marsh or creek, they develop community and a sense of place. School science classes have been intimately involved in the planning, implementation, and monitoring of some city restoration efforts – thereby providing students valuable opportunities to learn about the myriad connections between society and the environment and no doubt helping some to find their place in the world.

Current Restoration Models in Humboldt County

Restoration in Humboldt County is organized in complex ways that reflect the historical evolution of restoration work, the existing patterns of land ownership and settlement, the diverse array of federal and state public lands management agencies as well as regulatory agencies in the region with their respective agendas, interests, and capacities, and the robust civic culture of the North Coast that has given rise to a variety of nonprofit organizations, citizens' groups, and private enterprises involved in restoration. The web of connections and relationships that binds the people and organizations involved in restoration together is not arbitrary, on the contrary, its structure is identifiable and provides cohesiveness as well as flexibility to the restoration sector.

The key components of the restoration sector include: funding agencies and organizations, public and private landowners and managers, tribes, regulatory agencies, nonprofit organizations, for profit businesses, and community-based organizations. These different components of the restoration sector are bound together in numerous and complex ways. In many cases the networks that link these components together are based on personal relationships between people who have been a part of the evolving restoration sector for several years. While the mandates of many of the agencies involved in restoration are obviously much broader than restoration, in many there are individuals for whom restoration-related activities constitutes the primary component, if not the entirety, of their workload. These restoration "nodes" are linked together through dense networks of relationships to similar nodes in other agencies, e.g. US Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the CA Dept. of Fish and Game, and the CA Dept. of Parks and Recreation, and to the other nodes within the restoration network that are comprised of nonprofits, tribes, public and private landowners, businesses, and other community-based organizations. The strength and content of the relationship amongst these nodes varies across time and space. Financial resources, technical capacity, scientific expertise, heavy equipment, labor, regulatory oversight, coordination, and local environmental knowledge are some of the elements that flow through the restoration network.

Private Lands Models of Restoration

Among other factors, land ownership patterns strongly condition the specific configuration the restoration network assumes in a particular place. Almost half of the county's 2,272,000 acre land base (48% or 1,100,000 acres) is comprised of industrial and nonindustrial forest timberland.⁸ Federal, state and tribal lands account for approximately 29% or 650,246 acres within the county (Reichard 1998). Key to the success of restoration efforts on private industrial and nonindustrial lands is developing enough rapport and trust between the landowner and the involved government agencies to enable the access necessary for project design and implementation to take place. Within the general climate of distrust of government and concerns about regulation, this is not a trivial matter. Another key challenge for restoration work on private lands (and on public lands too, but to a lesser degree) concerns the permitting requirements for restoration projects. Almost invariably, an array of permits or consultations from a variety of different agencies must be obtained before a restoration project can be implemented. These can include, 1) permits from the Army Corps of Engineers required under

⁸ There are approximately 608,000 acres of industrial forest timberland and 492,000 acres of nonindustrial timberland in the county (Reichard 1998).

Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, 2) permits from the US Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service required under the Federal Endangered Species Act and the Marine Mammal Protection Act, respectively, 3) permits from the State Water Board required under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act, 4) permits from the CA Dept. of Fish and Game required by Section 1601 of the Fish and Game Code concerning stream alterations, and 5) permits from the California Coastal Commission required under the California Coastal Act and the Coastal Zone Management Act. Other county and state permits are also sometimes required.

The time and effort required to prepare the necessary documentation the permitting process requires, not to mention the costs involved, constitutes a significant disincentive for private landowners to engage in restoration activities. The gravity of this issue is illustrated by the fact that a full day workshop, sponsored by the Collaborative Learning Circle, was held July, 2003 that focused on understanding the permitting process and developing strategies for overcoming the hurdles that the permitting process represents. Attending the workshop were key members of the restoration sector, including people from almost all of the different nodes of the restoration network. Subsequent restoration-related workshops and training sessions have continued to include sessions on permitting.

How are the issues of trust, access to private property for restoration project design and implementation, and the challenges associated with permitting and regulatory compliance addressed on private property? In a minority of cases, often involving the Natural Resources Conservation Service and the County's Resource Conservation District, both of which have a long tradition of landowner outreach and extension, agency personnel themselves work directly with landowners to develop, plan, and implement a restoration project. However, in the great majority of cases involving restoration on private property using public funds, one of the area's restoration-oriented nonprofit organizations will play a key role in addressing these issues. These nonprofit organizations are a key component of the institutional infrastructure that has developed within the restoration sector. They often play crucial roles in addressing restoration issues on private lands. The trust they have cultivated with many landowners in the region enables them to function as bridging structures between the landowner and the regulatory and funding agencies. Area nonprofits also have developed the expertise required to navigate the regulatory shoals of the permitting process for landowners. They also have extensive knowledge concerning how to develop and submit proposals to funding agencies for restoration projects. Furthermore, many have the in-house expertise necessary for conducting the assessments and inventories that enable prioritization of restoration projects. Most also have the capacity to subcontract for restoration work and to work with contractors in a supervisory capacity throughout a restoration project's implementation. In short, they constitute extremely important nodes within the restoration network.

To a certain extent, the major nonprofits involved in restoration project design and implementation seem to have evolved a rough territorially-based division of restoration activities on private lands. The Mattole Restoration Council and the Mattole Salmon Group, not surprisingly, concentrate their activities in the watershed and tributaries of the Mattole River in southern Humboldt County. The Eel River Watershed Restoration Group and the Eel River Salmon Restoration Project work mainly on restoration projects within the Eel River basin, including the Van Duzen riverbasin, and their tributaries. The Pacific Coast Fish, Wetland, and

Wildlife Restoration Association works primarily on Simpson Resource Company in the northern part of the county (and to a lesser extent, on Pacific Lumber lands in the Humboldt Bay watershed). The Redwood Community Action Agency works on privatelands scattered throughout the county including in the Humboldt Bay watershed and elsewhere.⁹

The types of collaboration that almost invariably emerge on private lands restoration projects illustrate the complexity of the restoration sector, and the density of the restoration network. Restoration projects on private lands are often designed and proposed by one of the primary nonprofits (and based on a prior watershed assessment and/or inventory and sometimes on consultations with a regional expert) that has longstanding relations with the landowner, funded by a combination of state and federal funding sources (each with their own reporting requirements, billing and payment procedures, timelines, and grant lifespans), implemented by a local contractor under the guidance of the nonprofit during the very short restoration work season, often with in-kind and cash contributions from the landowner. It is not at all uncommon for more than two years to elapse between initial project proposal development and project completion.

While this is probably the most common scenario for the organization of restoration work on private lands, the restoration network does occasionally assume slightly different configurations. In some instances a private restoration business such as Coastal Stream Restoration Group, Restoration Forestry, or Monschke Watershed Management may perform many of the same functions as the nonprofit organization, and implement or subcontract the project themselves. There are, however, relatively few private businesses engaged in the lengthy and time consuming process of writing the grant proposals upon which most restoration work continues to depend. A further difference is that some nonprofit organizations, such as Redwood Community Action Agency, have an explicit commitment to community development and view restoration as a vehicle for achieving community development goals. Thus, Redwood Community Action Agency restoration proposals and projects often contain a training component that is designed to help prepare individuals for on-going work in restoration. Similarly, the Pacific Coast Fish, Wildlife and Wetland Restoration Association has trained (using NEAP funding) displaced fishermen and fisherwoman in watershed assessment methodologies, and continues to employ some of their prior trainees.

Other variations in the structure of restoration on private lands concern the extent to which consulting engineers, geologists, biologists and other professionals are contracted with to aid in the preparation of the documentation required for the permits, or for other aspects of the project such as the watershed assessments, road inventories, hydrologic analysis, or specifications for culverts or bridge installation.

Two points emerge from this discussion of restoration on private lands. First, although the nonprofit-landowner-agency collaboration is at the heart of this model of restoration, there are significant permutations and variations in the configurations the restoration network assumes on private lands. Secondly, regardless of the specific configuration, it is clear that a successful

⁹ In addition to these relatively large nonprofit organizations, there are many other smaller organizations and watershed associations, some with 501(c)3 status others without, whose activities are focused on various aspects of watershed and fisheries restoration.

restoration project involves the correct alignment of a large number of different factors and the application of a diverse set of skills, expertise, and capacities. These skills, expertise, and capacities are distributed across multiple nodes within the restoration network. It is a significant coordination challenge and achievement to align these resources and the nodes where they are located, and to bring them to bear in an effective fashion on a particular patch of land or stream reach to accomplish a restoration objective, especially given the extremely narrow operating window of four months for most forms of restoration work.

Public Lands Models of Restoration

On public lands restoration work is organized slightly differently than on private lands, although in many cases restoration nonprofits are still involved. The two most common models of conducting restoration work on public lands are 1) for the public land management agency to be responsible for all of the tasks related to a restoration project except for project implementation, which may be contracted out to a private contractor, 2) for the public agency to enter into a multi-year cooperative agreement with a nonprofit organization under which separate task orders are drawn up for each individual project. Although there are exceptions, restoration work in Redwood National Park, the Six Rivers National Forest, Fish and Wildlife Service units in Humboldt County, and Humboldt Redwoods State Park is generally carried out in the former manner. On these jurisdictions agency personnel are responsible for conducting the various assessments, surveys, and inventories used to prioritize restoration sites, conducting the environmental analyses and preparing the environmental documentation required in order to obtain the necessary permits, obtaining permits, preparing and letting the contracts for implementing the project, supervising the restoration contractor during the implementation phase, documenting the project implementation and doing post-implementation monitoring. Clearly, this approach is extremely staff-intensive. This method of organizing restoration generally does not involve extensive collaboration with other nodes on the restoration network, except for the private contractors who are hired to implement the project. Two modifications of this model are the extensive engagement of the community-based Friends of the Dunes organization with restoration efforts at Lanphere Dunes Wildlife Refuge, a unit of the Fish and Wildlife Service's Humboldt Bay National Wildlife Refuge, and collaborative restoration efforts at Redwood National Park involving the Yurok Tribe.¹⁰ Both of these examples are discussed further below.

The Bureau of Land Management has embraced the other primary model for organizing restoration work on public lands – that of the cooperative agreement. Since the mid-1990s the Bureau of Land Management has entered into multi-year cooperative agreements, under the authority of the Cooperative Assistance Agreement of 1977, with the Mattole Restoration Council and the Redwood Community Action Agency. These cooperative agreements have constituted the foundation for building lasting community partnerships with these two area nonprofits. A core principle of the cooperative agreement, which requires matching funds from the agency partner as well as demonstrated community participation and involvement, is that local community partners should not only participate in the decision making process concerning

¹⁰ Humboldt Redwood State Parks has also entered into an innovative agreement with Native American groups regarding the management of the Sinkyone Intertribal Wilderness. However, this is located in Mendocino County and is therefore outside of the geographical scope of this study.

public lands management, but that they should also participate in the actual planning process. This involves sharing in the process of developing land management plans, watershed analyses, and alternatives as required by the National Environmental Policy Act. Under the cooperative agreements, community-based partner organizations share the burden and the responsibility for performing some of these management functions. Project implementation is carried out as specified in individual task orders. Restoration project implementation (as distinct from the planning components of a restoration project) that often requires heavy equipment is contracted out through an open bid process. More recently, the Bureau of Land Management has begun partnering with the Pacific Coast Fish, Wildlife, and Wetlands Restoration Association (PCFWWRA) for restoration work in the Headwaters Forest acquired from Pacific Lumber as part of the 1999 Headwaters agreement brokered by the State of California. As Bureau of Land Management Assistant Field Manager Dan Averill described, working with PCFWWRA was an opportunity to partner with a nonprofit that had matching dollars and access to restoration talent and good contractors to begin work on the highest priority restoration sites in the Headwaters Forest. The partnerships that have been built through the use of the cooperative agreement approach have helped to develop the institutional capacity of these area nonprofits as well as the strength of the overall restoration network.

Tribal Models of Restoration

In Humboldt County the Yurok Tribe and the Hoopa Valley Tribe have both been extensively involved in watershed restoration efforts.¹¹ Beginning in 1994, watershed assessments and restoration work on the Hoopa Valley Indian Reservation were funded to a large extent by the Jobs-in-the-Woods program associated with the Northwest Economic Adjustment Initiative and the Northwest Forest Plan. These funds were allocated through the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Other current funding sources include the Bureau of Reclamation, the National Marine Fisheries Service, and tribal timber harvest revenues. The initial watershed assessments and restoration projects that were funded through the Jobs-in-the-Woods program played an important role in building restoration capacity. During the 1980s and early 1990s most of the watershed assessments and some of the restoration project implementation work were contracted out to outside professional geologists, hydrologists, and equipment contractors. However by the mid-1990s, this work had begun to be shifted in-house using the growing skills and expertise of the tribe's own employees. For example, beginning during the period after the adoption of the Northwest Forest Plan, most watershed assessment work was being done by staff within the Hoopa Tribal Forestry Division. The road decommissioning projects, which followed the watershed assessments and were funded through the Jobs-in-the-Woods program, included training workshops for independent tribal heavy equipment operators who then implemented the decommissioning project. A few of these individuals have gone on to develop successful businesses specializing in restoration contracting work. Currently, as with the watershed assessments, much of the roads-related restoration work is now done in-house by the Tribal Roads Department. As internal capacity and expertise have increased, the need to contract out

¹¹ Just next door to Humboldt County, the Karuk Tribe has been and continues to be engaged with watershed restoration work on their ancestral territory located on Forest Service lands. This work, which tends to focus on road decommissioning with a strong job training component, is organized through cooperative agreements with the Forest Service and through partnerships with the Redwood Community Action Agency and other organizations.

assessment and restoration work has declined; these functions have been internalized within the Hoopa Valley Tribe and have created jobs for employees of the tribe.

Most of the Yurok Tribe's restoration efforts are organized through the Yurok Watershed Restoration Department. The department's planning, assessment, and project implementation work occurs primarily on land owned by the Simpson Resource Company, which controls the majority of the Yurok ancestral territory. Beginning in the early 1990s a remarkable collaborative effort, facilitated by the California Coastal Conservancy, developed between the tribe and Simpson that focuses on watershed restoration in the Lower Klamath basin. In 1996 this collaboration was formalized through the creation of the Lower Klamath Restoration Partnership. The partnership has three goals: improving the health of the Lower Klamath basin and its tributaries, restoring the basin's anadromous fishery, and training tribal members to be skilled workers in the field of watershed restoration (Gustaitis 1998). As with the Hoopa Valley Tribe, the early years of this partnership involved working with private sector restoration firms such as Pacific Watershed Associates and Terra Wave, Systems, Inc., in part to provide training in restoration science and heavy equipment operation for road decommissioning work to tribal members. Now that sufficient in-house capacity has been developed, the Watershed Restoration Department can implement its own training program. Using grant funds from a variety of sources, the Yurok Watershed Restoration Department continues to integrate restoration training with project planning and implementation, primarily on Simpson Resource Company lands. Monitoring efforts, especially concerning the anadromous fishery, are coordinated with the tribe's fisheries program (Bob Rohde, pers. comm.).

It should also be noted that the Yurok Tribe and Redwood National and State Parks have signed a Memorandum of Understanding for Government to Government Relations and the Yurok Tribe and the U.S. Department of Interior, National Park Service have signed Self-Governance Annual Funding Agreements. Both the MOU and the Annual Funding Agreements are designed to foster collaborative management of cultural and natural resources within Redwood National and State Parks. While the MOU and Annual Funding Agreement cover a wide variety of different issues ranging from the application of traditional ecological knowledge to the provision of employment opportunities, they also provide the basis for collaboration between these entities for the purposes of watershed restoration. In recent years this has resulted in significant amounts of watershed restoration work contracted with the Yurok Watershed Restoration Department by Redwood National Park. It is a truism that watershed and anadromous fisheries restoration are of particular importance to these Native American communities. In addition to being critical for the maintenance of safe and clean domestic water supply, arresting sedimentation, and maintaining adequate water flows, ensuring the viability and return to health of the basin's salmonid populations are of central importance to the continued integrity of the cultural lifeways and identity of these communities. Not incidentally, these goals are also central to the federal-tribal trust relationship.

The Five County Salmonid Conservation Program

As noted briefly above, the Five County Salmonid Conservation Program was initiated in 1997 through resolutions passed by the Board of Supervisors for Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino, Siskiyou and Trinity Counties that sought to protect the region's social and

economic resources through proactive efforts to restore salmonid populations and habitat. The focus of the Five Counties Program is on those areas over which the region's counties have jurisdiction. This includes county roads and facilities, and the planning and zoning processes concerning land use over which county governments have authority. Since its inception, the Five Counties Program has pursued its overarching goal through a wide variety of strategies. One of the early initiatives was to commission the University of California Cooperative Extension to conduct a study of the effects of County land use regulations and management on salmonid species and their habitat. Completed in 1998, the report focuses on 1) county facilities management and practices and 2) land use regulations and environmental review. The former refers to county roads, levees, spoils disposal, etc., while the latter relates to land subdivisions, use permits, rezoning, and California Environmental Quality Act review (Five Counties Salmonid Conservation Program 2003). The Cooperative Extension study included a series of recommendations, to which the Five Counties Program has begun to respond. These recommendations include issues such as 1) county road and bridge maintenance, 2) an inventory of county roads with a focus on sediment delivery to streams, 3) further development of County policies and standards for protecting riparian and in-stream habitat, 4) institutionalizing mechanisms for consultation with hydrologists and biologists on projects that affect salmonids and their habitat, and 5) increasing opportunities for information and technology exchange throughout the five counties region and with state and federal entities (Five Counties Salmonid Conservation Program 2003).

To date, the program has conducted systematic inventories of barriers to fish passage and potential erosion sources on county roads throughout the five county region. These efforts have advanced restoration science and knowledge. The methodology developed and refined for the fish passage barrier inventory (by Ross Taylor and Associates and Michael Love and Associates, both based in Humboldt County) is currently being incorporated into the Department of Fish and Game's California Salmonid Stream Habitat Restoration Manual. The county road erosion inventory adopted the roads inventory model developed by Pacific Watershed Associates for forest and ranch roads and then adapted it to reflect the specific differences between county roads and private roads. Pacific Watershed Associates conducted training sessions for field crews and was responsible for quality assurance and control throughout the inventory work. Information from both inventories has been shared with the Department of Fish and Game and other agencies to assist in restoration planning efforts.

In Humboldt County these inventories have led to the implementation of 13 fish barrier removal projects between 1999 and 2003. Most of these projects involved replacing culverts that blocked migrating fish with fish-friendly bridges. Humboldt County Department of Public Works, Roads Division was responsible for the design and implementation of these projects; most of the construction work was contracted out to local contractors. More than \$2.7 million, more than half of which was provided by the Department of Fish and Game, has been spent on these efforts in Humboldt County. Other funding sources for these projects include the California Coastal Conservancy, Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission, Proposition 319, and contributions from Humboldt County.

In addition to these migration barrier removal projects in Humboldt County, the Five County Program has achieved other environmental and economic objectives throughout the five county region. From the project implementation standpoint, program accomplishments include the implementation of 22 fish passage barrier removal projects in Del Norte, Trinity, and Siskiyou Counties and eight sediment reduction projects (7 in Trinity County, 1 in Mendocino County). All of these projects were identified and prioritized through the erosion and fish barrier inventories of county roads. The Five County Program has also worked to increase information and technology exchange throughout the region by sponsoring annual workshops and fieldtrips for County Public Works staff, policy makers, and county planners who are involved in the planning and implementation of restoration projects. These workshops have helped increase support for restoration among county staff and have facilitated the process of strengthening county policies and programs related to road maintenance as they relate to salmonid species and habitat.

Another significant accomplishment of the program is the preparation of a draft county roads manual, *A Water Quality and Stream Habitat Protection Manual for County Road Maintenance in Northwestern California Watersheds*. The manual was developed through a collaborative effort involving County Public Works Staff, watershed consultants, the National Marine Fisheries Service, the Department of Fish and Game, and State Water Board representatives. This manual encapsulates many of the insights and approaches that the program has developed, and distills them into a set of improved Best Management Practices (BMPs) for road maintenance that minimize negative effects on local streams. Part of the development and codification of practice-based restoration science and knowledge, this manual, once it is adopted by counties, will institutionalize county practices that contribute to the recovery of salmonids and salmonid habitat. The guarantees regarding management actions and practices the manual will provide once it is adopted will facilitate the permitting process for county restoration projects.

Clearly, the Five County Program contributes to the development of the region's restoration sector in many important ways. It has advanced restoration science and knowledge through the fish barrier and erosion inventories of county roads. Between 1998 and 2002 it generated more than \$8.5 million dollars for all aspects of the program, e.g. the inventories, barrier removals, sediment reduction projects, county roads manual, training workshops and policy work. This constitutes a significant infusion of investment into the five county region. The Program has also played a key role in fostering local (county) participation in state and federal meetings, forums, and conferences concerning restoration-related topics. Through its efforts to build relationships within the region and between the five county region and state and federal entities, the Program helps build the mutual understanding among different nodes of the restoration network that is necessary to address some of the barriers and hurdles that restoration practitioners face. Perhaps most importantly, the Program has illustrated the central role that local governments can play in helping to achieve the goals and objectives of restoration. In particular, it demonstrates that conserving and restoring salmonid populations and habitat is not only consistent with, but actually helps, achieve the goal of sustaining the social and economic resources of the region.

Restoration and Community

Many restoration network nodes and linkages have a vibrant community element woven into them. This is because for many people involved in restoration, their commitment to it springs from a passionately held vision of healthy watersheds, reinvigorated salmon runs, and resource management practices grounded in stewardship principles. This vision, while hard to articulate, often springs from a deeply rooted sense of place, of relationship to the natural environment that gives meaning, and of connections with other like-minded restoration practitioners and conservationists. This vision inspired those who pioneered many of the restoration practices and techniques that are commonplace today. Often working on shoe-string budgets or sometimes on a volunteer basis, these individuals were the early innovators of community-based fishbox hatcheries, in-stream restoration techniques, and monitoring methods and technologies. For many, the idea of actually earning a living from restoration work came only as an afterthought. And, as described by one long-time restorationist, their approach to restoration was tinged with a slight “guerilla” element that stemmed from a combination of their commitment to helping the salmon runs return and their critique of the “system” that had led to the salmon declines in the first place.

While restoration in Humboldt County has become institutionalized in the last twenty years, there remain strong undercurrents of these early visions of communities and people, rooted in place, working towards a more harmonious integration of people, watersheds, and working landscapes. The community-based aspects of restoration show up in both rural and urban forms of restoration. In both cases community engagement with the restoration process serves to build community as well as to build connections between people and the natural environment, while simultaneously achieving the ecological goals and objectives of restoration. In some contexts, restoration is as much a social process as it is a set of practices and methods designed to restore ecosystem health. In these situations there are strong linkages between restoration and civic engagement, community identity, and the development of a sense of place. Freeman House, writing about community, place and restoration in the Mattole River watershed in southern Humboldt, conveys this notion in the following manner, “Engaging the lives of wild salmon in a single watershed has created a situation wherein the peoples of our place have begun to experience themselves as functional parts of the place itself. Engaging the lives of any part of the wild in any self-defined natural area will lead to the same experience” (1999:198).

In Humboldt County some of the many examples of contemporary community-based restoration are the work and activities of the Mattole Restoration Council, the public school education outreach programs funded by the Dept. of Fish and Game, the involvement of public school students in the planning, implementation, and monitoring of restoration projects, the community-based restoration efforts of the Friends of the Dunes, and the community-based fire planning efforts of the Lower Mattole Fire Safe Council. Additionally, there are a large number of other community-based watershed groups, some of which are actively engaged in different aspects of watershed restoration. A selective description of some of the activities of some of these organizations serves to highlight various facets of the relationship between restoration and community.

The Friends of the Dunes, a nonprofit organization based in Arcata, typifies the positive ecological and social outcomes that can result from community-based approaches to restoration. For twenty years Friends of the Dunes has been focused on community involvement in coastal dune conservation and restoration. The great majority of the members and supporters of the Friends of the Dunes live in the urban communities that ring Humboldt Bay. For most of the last twenty years Friends of the Dunes has focused its education, community outreach, and volunteer-based restoration efforts on the 500 acre Lanphere Dunes on the north spit of Humboldt Bay. Lanphere Dunes became a unit of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Humboldt Bay National Wildlife Refuge in 1998; previously it was owned and managed by the The Nature Conservancy. The Friends of the Dunes, which became an independent 501(c)3 nonprofit in 1995 and had been working in a collaborative manner with the The Nature Conservancy, developed new collaborative relationships with the Fish and Wildlife Service following the transfer. In recent years the nonprofit has gradually broadened its geographical range of activities to include the adjacent bay and dune environments. Fish and Wildlife Service staff at the Lanphere Dunes unit have helped Friends of the Dunes develop their community-based restoration program, acquire funding, and generally develop their current organizational capacity. As a community-based partner of the Fish and Wildlife Service, Friends of the Dunes plays several important roles. These include 1) contracting with the Fish and Wildlife Service to provide community outreach and interpretation at Lanphere Dunes and other units of the Humboldt Bay National Wildlife Refuge, 2) a volunteer program to help staff the newly opened Humboldt Bay National Wildlife Refuge Visitor Center, and 3) providing important in-kind contributions of labor and other resources through its community-based volunteer programs that constitute the matching contributions required by the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation and other organizations that fund restoration work at the refuge.

Some of the hallmark programs of the Friends of the Dunes are its community-based education and restoration program and its coastal areas land trust. While the latter was begun in 2000, the other two have been in existence since the mid-1990s. The Bay to Dunes educational program, supported by local foundations such as the Humboldt Area Foundation and the McLean Foundation, consists of in-class and fieldtrip activities in area public grade schools.

Restoration work on the dunes consists primarily of labor-intensive removal of exotic plants – the type of work conducive to extensive community involvement.¹² This is accompanied by a rigorous regime of basic research and intensive ecological monitoring conducted by Fish and Wildlife Service staff. The Friends of the Dunes' community-based restoration program, known as the Dune Ecosystem Restoration Team (DERT), organizes volunteer restoration work days the first three Saturdays of every month at the Manila, Eureka, and Lanphere Dunes. It also organizes the annual spring "Lupine Bash," an alternative spring break in which college students spend a week doing manual restoration work and enjoying the local environs, a Humboldt State University orientation, and various other activities.

The community volunteer restoration work days demonstrate the integration of community involvement and restoration. The activities of the Ecosystem Restoration Team

¹² Although it should be noted that other groups besides community volunteers, e.g. the Civilian Conservation Corps, prison crews, and California Department of Forestry crews, also do a significant amount of labor-intensive restoration work, and that occasionally some work is contracted out to heavy equipment operators.

illustrate the ways in which building community and ecological restoration go hand in hand, by linking people to each other and developing relationships between people and the environment where they live. The organization of the volunteer work “parties” reflects an explicit effort to foster these relationships. Three different coffee shops in Arcata and Eureka sponsor one of each of the three dune areas. On restoration work days community volunteers gather at the designated coffee shop to socialize and enjoy discounted or free beverages before heading out to work; social gatherings, sometimes including an evening meal and bonfire burning of the exotic plants, often follow the conclusion of the work day. Both the volunteer work days and the Bay to Dunes educational school programs serve to create connections between program participants and the bay and dune ecosystem; they foster a sense among participants that they are a part of the natural environment and related to it in meaningful ways. This approach is rooted in the understanding that environmental stewardship entails active engagement with ecosystems and landscapes. As Carol Vander Meer, Executive Director of Friends of the Dunes has written, “By participating in restoration I find a way to actually be a positive part of the ecology of the dunes...joining together with other community members who care about this place completes my sense of connection and belonging” (2001).

The ability of restoration to establish relationships between people and the natural environment and to serve as a vehicle for the development of a resource stewardship and conservation ethic is also apparent in the many public school restoration education programs in the county. Examples of this include the Bay to Dunes program of the Friends of the Dunes mentioned above and other programs, funded by the Department of Fish and Game, area nonprofits, and other restoration organizations, that involve taking fertilized salmon eggs into classrooms where children care for them and watch them develop into salmon fry and fingerlings. Such a program has existed in the Mattole watershed for almost twenty years (House 1999:215). A more recent one is the education program, supported by the Department of Fish and Game, Humboldt Area Foundation, and the Trees Foundation, that Jan Vaughn in southern Humboldt County has been leading for the last five years. Drawing on the earlier work on developing small-scale community-based fish hatcheries and community outreach by the Humboldt Fish Action Council and other restoration groups, Ms. Vaughn began in 1998 to develop a school program that entails placing tanks in school classrooms and teaching the students (and teachers) how to care for salmon eggs and rear salmon fry. This exercise provides an effective vehicle for teaching about the life cycles of anadromous fisheries, their ecological requirements, and the need for watershed restoration. The project is integrated within the school system’s science curriculum, and continuing efforts are being made to fit into the state standards for science teaching. Each year the effort culminates with the release of the fry into a local stream. In the beginning tanks were placed in 33 classrooms; since then the number of classrooms with tanks has increased to 75, which means that approximately 4,000 children and parents are involved in the project. While the short and long term effects of this kind of project are hard to assess, it is clear that the project awakens a new awareness in many children (and in their parents) of our collective stewardship and land ethic obligations and, like the volunteer restoration work “parties,” helps to build connections and relationships between people and the place where they live.

The Mattole Restoration Council, in its efforts to address the problem of sediment delivery to streams within sub-basins of the Mattole River, has developed and is implementing a community organizing approach to working with landowners throughout the Mattole watershed.

Although quite different from the approach the Friends of the Dunes Ecosystem Restoration Team has developed, this model too, fosters community and is aimed at creating the conditions necessary for a sustainable community stewardship ethic to take root, thrive, and be institutionalized within the region's natural resource management regimes. Drawing on lessons and approaches from grassroots organizing in other contexts, Mattole Restoration Council staff have developed a set of outreach and organizing tools, initiated a program that employs those tools, and deployed a network of paid, part-time "landowner liaisons" throughout the riverbasin to implement the program. The goals of the program, called "Good Roads, Clear Creeks," are to arrest sedimentation coming from roads at the points of delivery – many of which are on private property, which thus raises the difficult challenge of gaining landowner trust, confidence, and access permission. Arresting sediment delivery requires conducting road inventories and implementing heavy equipment-intensive restoration work. Gaining landowner confidence and access to the road networks on private lands is difficult and challenging under the best of circumstances. Mattole Restoration Council staff are attempting to do this through their network of community-based landowner liaisons – the centerpiece of the organization's community outreach strategy. The methods the liaisons employ are the tried and true approaches of convening small gatherings of adjacent landowners and neighbors, phone calls, and house visits. The idea is to gradually be able to convince landowners to participate in a sub-basin level road inventory and then support the development and implementation of treatments to address sedimentation sources. Eventually the range of activities under consideration will hopefully expand to include fuels reduction efforts. As landowner confidence in the integrity of the Mattole Restoration Council's role as a service provider grows, the need for continued outreach is expected to diminish. This will occur as the relations of trust between the Mattole Restoration Council and landowners in the riverbasin expand and the manifestations of those social relations on the landscape in the form of "good roads, clear creeks" become increasingly evident. As we saw with the Friends of the Dunes, restoration in the Mattole is as much a social process as it is an ecological one.

Restoration Science (and Art)

There has always been a lively interaction between natural resources restoration and science in Humboldt County. Adaptive management, the process through which learning mechanisms and opportunities for experimentation are integrated into management plans and actions, has been a hallmark of the restoration field – in many cases because in the early days restorationists were navigating uncharted waters and therefore had to rely almost entirely on their own "home grown" knowledge base. Because restoration is itself a multidisciplinary phenomena, scientists and engineers from a wide variety of disciplines, including geology, hydrology, fisheries biology, various sub-fields of ecology, soil science, and civil engineering, have contributed their expertise to the restoration endeavor. Furthermore, the site-specific nature of restoration efforts, combined with the challenges of designing restoration projects that must contribute to restoration goals and withstand stochastic and extreme environmental perturbations, requires that a good deal of "art" be mixed with the science. Thus restoration practice is not only informed by science, but also by the practical wisdom gained through years of experience by restoration practitioners, whether they be community-based streamside salmon hatchbox operators or heavy equipment operators skilled in road decommissioning. Restoration knowledge

is therefore an interdisciplinary amalgam that combines the insights of science with the art of experienced practitioners.

The dynamic interplay between art and science integrated within an adaptive management framework is apparent in the evolution, development, and formalization of restoration knowledge in the county. This evolution includes several sea changes. One of the earliest and perhaps most significant sea change related to upslope watershed restoration was the realization, based on study and experimentation, that labor-intensive restoration techniques borrowed from agriculture such as willow plantings and check dams were not effective ways to control sediment input to streams from logging and road construction. These insights were initially derived from experiences with watershed restoration at Redwood National Park soon after the 1978 park expansion. They quickly spread throughout the region and beyond as restorationists realized that stabilizing heavily roaded slopes required the same types of equipment, especially large excavators and bulldozers, that had been used to construct the road and logging networks in the first place. The realization that watershed restoration would be primarily a heavy equipment-intensive rather than labor-intensive endeavor changed the expectations regarding the labor-absorbing potential of watershed restoration. It also firmly established that restoration would be an art as well as a science because of the challenges associated with removing road crossing or landings and discovering and uncovering the original, natural contours of the stream and slope before the road was pushed across it. This understanding of restoration as a process that combines technical skills with experience-based understanding and expertise resonated with the experiences of restoration practitioners who focus on in-stream and near-stream restoration projects.

Over the last fifteen years there has been a trend towards the standardization of restoration approaches and practices. This has occurred both with regard to upslope watershed restoration as well as in-stream fisheries habitat improvement work. In both cases standard reference texts and restoration manuals have been developed and written, based almost entirely on restoration experiences on the North Coast. Two central texts are the Department of Fish and Game's *California Salmonid Stream Habitat Restoration Manual* (Flosi et al. 1998) and the *Handbook for Forest and Ranch Roads* (Pacific Watershed Associates 1994). These and other documents, which now guide restoration work in many regions beyond the North Coast, speak to the wealth of expertise that has evolved in the region, and to the productive integration of scientific knowledge and method with experience-based expertise that characterizes watershed restoration. Replicable and sophisticated models of restoration methodology have been developed in this region.

The frameworks that guide both up-slope and in-stream restoration work are designed to provide restoration practitioners the information necessary to prioritize restoration work in a manner that maximizes ecological benefit (measured for example, in cubic yards of sediment saved from entering a stream or amount of fish habitat restored or opened up) and meets cost-effective criteria. The model of upslope watershed restoration developed by local watershed scientists and practitioners is based on the understanding that sediment deliveries from road systems constitute one of the largest sources of anthropogenic sediment production and that watershed restoration work can effectively minimize those types of sediment deliveries. Effective prioritization of restoration work requires detailed site-specific information regarding sediment delivery sources

and erosion potential within a watershed. Multi-stage watershed assessment methodologies have been developed to provide this information. These assessments include, 1) compiling and mapping the road construction history of the watershed, often using historical aerial photo analysis, 2) conducting a field inventory and analysis of sites that have the potential to deliver sediment into fish-bearing stream systems, and 3) developing detailed prescriptions for treating each sediment delivery site. This watershed assessment approach for prioritizing and guiding upslope restoration work is commonly used by many organizations within the restoration sector.¹³

Restoration practitioners working downslope on in-stream and near-stream fish habitat restoration programs generally rely on the *California Salmonid Stream Habitat Restoration Manual*. This extensive manual, first prepared in 1991 (and revised in 1994 and 1998), defines and explains the department's approach to fisheries restoration; it is part of an effort to help provide restoration practitioners with proven standard procedures and techniques for in and near-stream restoration. The manual provides detailed guidance concerning watershed assessments, fisheries habitat inventory and distribution analysis, fish habitat restoration project planning and implementation, and monitoring. The manual also offers a standardized approach for downslope restoration work. Proposals submitted to the Department for funding under its Fisheries Restoration Grant Program must meet the design specifications contained in the manual.

The implementation phase of any restoration project, whether an upslope effort to hydrologically decommission a road network or an instream fish passage barrier removal project, always requires considerable expertise and ability to make mid-stream corrections and modifications to the original project blueprint, regardless of the blueprint's quality and sophistication. This is due to the unexpected vagaries and natural variations in circumstances that invariably arise in such complex situations. This also speaks to the importance of experience-based insight and knowledge of restoration practitioners, whether heavy equipment operators or workers installing stream habitat enhancement structures. In this field, experience matters a lot.

Monitoring also plays an important role in the restoration sector; it is key to the long-term success of restoration. Monitoring provides baseline information that establishes the need for restoration projects. For example, United States Geological Service studies of erosion and sedimentation rates in Redwood Creek were instrumental in helping to gain support for the 1978 park expansion and funding for restoration of park resources. Monitoring of restoration projects

¹³ The consulting firm Pacific Watershed Associates, based in McKinleyville, has played an important role in developing and formalizing this methodology. The level of detail involved in developing an assessment that can effectively guide implementation work is impressive. For example, PWA's 2001 watershed assessment and erosion prevention planning project of Jacoby Creek, Washington Gulch, and Rocky Gulch watersheds involved inventorying 69 miles of roads to assess future sediment sources. The assessment identified 454 potential sediment delivery sites, of which 304 were stream crossings, 89 were potential landslides, and 61 were ditch relief culverts and gullies. Detailed information regarding each site. This information is used to prioritize each site or group of sites according to erosion potential, the severity and urgency of treating the threat of sediment delivery, and cost-effectiveness (which should range from \$5 to \$15 per cubic yard sediment prevented from entering a fish bearing stream system). Based on this assessment, specific treatments and cost estimates for equipment and labor are prescribed for each site. Watershed assessments that provide this level of information are important tools that help in the acquisition of funding for restoration implementation and that function as a set of plans to guide the restoration work itself.

themselves is the hallmark of an adaptive management approach. It is only by monitoring the effects of restoration projects that lessons can be learned and incorporated into the subsequent restoration efforts. However many restoration practitioners readily acknowledge that developing effective monitoring protocols and securing the funding and other resources to implement them is an on-going challenge

There are several types of monitoring. These include trend, implementation, effectiveness, and validation monitoring. The monitoring program of the Mattole Restoration Council illustrates some of the varieties. The Council's monitoring program emphasizes trend monitoring; this includes monitoring of parameters such as water temperature at approximately 110 locations in the Mattole watershed, surveys of salmonids at different life cycle stages, cross-sectional stream channel surveys, and seedling survival and forest growth monitoring. Chris Larson, Executive Director of the Mattole Restoration Council, notes that much of the learning necessary for adaptive management can come from trend monitoring and observational monitoring.

Implementation, effectiveness, and validation monitoring become increasingly more challenging. Implementation monitoring entails an evaluation of the degree to which a project was implemented as planned. Implementation monitoring concerns evaluation of the immediate, short term effects of a restoration project. Implementation monitoring protocols have been used to monitor recent road decommissioning projects in sensitive areas of the Mattole River watershed. Effectiveness and validation monitoring quickly become fairly complex endeavors that challenge even the scientific "experts." The aim of the former is to relate restoration project implementation to changes in watershed function and species abundance and diversity – to basically answer the question "to what extent are restoration projects improving water quality and facilitating the return of once-abundant salmon and steelhead?" The aim of validation monitoring is no less challenging – to assess the validity of the presumed causal relationships between restoration activities and ecological structure and function. While a number of resource professionals and scientists, many of them supported by the Department of Fish and Game, are currently conducting research on some of the issues related to effectiveness and validation monitoring, the complexity of the modeling challenges and the limits of human understanding of these complex ecological systems challenge our ability to draw conclusive, causal linkages between fish populations, watershed health, and restoration.

As can be seen from this discussion, monitoring issues can quickly grade into science research questions. There are many examples of the productive synergy that has developed between research and restoration on the North Coast – several have already been noted. A brief review of one such example - the research-based restoration program at the Lanphere Dunes Unit of the Humboldt Bay National Wildlife Refuge - exemplifies the complementarity between research and restoration. At the Lanphere Dunes Unit monitoring for restoration is integrated with basic research concerning different aspects of the dune ecosystem, much of which is conducted through collaborative efforts involving faculty and graduate students at Humboldt State University as well as by Fish and Wildlife Service staff. Formal monitoring protocols have been developed and are followed to determine the effectiveness of diverse techniques for removing exotic invasive species such as iceplant, english ivy, and annual grasses. In addition to monitoring activities, basic research is conducted at the dunes. The research results guide and

inform the active restoration agenda of the unit's managers. Research projects have examined the effects of invasive plants on the distribution and structure of biotic soil crusts, developed baseline information on the common pollinators of dune species to aid in future trend and effectiveness monitoring, and determined the effects of invasive exotic plant species on native pollinators (Pickart 2001, 2003).

The productive integration of research and restoration at the dunes is yielding a model and techniques for restoring such ecosystems that restorationists in other regions are finding useful. Closer to home, the "tried and true" restoration techniques that have been developed at Lanphere Dunes through collaborative efforts between Friends of the Dunes and dunes managers are beginning to be applied to restoration of other dune ecosystem areas in Humboldt Bay and on the North Coast as well as to the adjacent estuarine systems of the bay. The recently formed Humboldt Bay Science Advisory Committee for Estuary Restoration (SACER), comprised of scientists and restorationists from both the private and public sector, is a key institutional forum through which Humboldt Bay ecosystem science and restoration efforts can be coordinated. SACER recently (October 28, 2003) sponsored a one day symposium, "Advancing the Science of Estuary Restoration in Humboldt Bay," that drew a large group of restoration practitioners and scientists to discuss current and future restoration efforts, the role of science in those efforts, and the challenges of developing a conceptual model of the estuary to guide future restoration efforts. At the symposium it was evident that estuary restoration efforts are gradually becoming linked with upstream watershed restoration programs and are beginning to evince the qualities of a regional ecosystem approach to ecological restoration – as Mitch Farro of the Pacific Coast Fish, Wildlife and Wetlands Restoration Association put it, "a headwaters to tidewaters" approach is emerging.

Restoration - a Coherent System

The various nodes and relationships that comprise the area's restoration network collectively create a pattern that exhibits enough cohesiveness and integrity to be thought of as a system. Webster's Dictionary defines system as "an assemblage or combination of things or parts forming a complex or unitary whole" and "a coordinated body of methods or a complex scheme or plan of procedure." The restoration sector in Humboldt County conforms to these definitions of system in many respects. It is comprised of a diverse assemblage of different "parts" (agencies, organizations, and people) bound together by the common enterprise of restoring ecosystem health. Taken together, these diverse entities comprise the restoration community and its well developed institutional infrastructure.

Let's consider some of the evidence for thinking of the restoration sector as a system and what benefits might derive from this perspective. While it is clear that a variety of "models" for organizing restoration work on different types of land ownerships have evolved, it is also apparent that rather than comprising disparate and unrelated actions and endeavors, these different models draw on common sets of relationships, skills, expertise, resources, and people that are all loosely linked together within the restoration network. Thus, a comprehensive understanding of any one component of restoration, say for example the flows of dollars into the restoration sector, or road decommissioning on Forest Service lands, is incomplete without also taking into consideration how it relates to the other components of the restoration network.

Attempts to address a bottleneck or barrier within restoration, say for example the increasing time, resources, and money required for the permitting process or securing on-going financial support for restoration, will only be effective if restoration is understood as a set of interdependent parts that together comprise a system. This perspective speaks to the importance of a perspective that acknowledges the implications of those networks of relations for the design of an effective strategy to address the permitting issue, or for engaging in the collective action and coalition building necessary for obtaining future streams of restoration funding.

Employing a “system” perspective highlights the importance of the existing institutional infrastructure that enables restoration to take place as well as the need to invest in and maintain that infrastructure. Part of the restoration infrastructure derives from the fact that a self-identified restoration community exists. This community is comprised of an extremely diverse assemblage of individuals who occupy very different positions within the restoration system. Diversely positioned members of the restoration community know each other and understand that only through their concerted actions and mutual cooperation will restoration work be sustained. The strength and importance of the personal relationships that bind members of the restoration community together are hard to overestimate. As Paula Golightly of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service noted, “It’s the trust, the ability to communicate, work one-on-one with people that trust and like you – these relationships are what make all of this (restoration work) go.” Similarly, Gary Flosi, of the California Department of Fish and Game and co-author of the *California Salmonid Stream Habitat Restoration Manual*, emphasizes the importance of stable personnel within the restoration system because of the importance of the social relationships and shared understanding of restoration within the restoration community. When new staff join his agency, Flosi noted that “the hardest part in training new staff is (helping them understand) the web of the restoration system.”

The restoration community has developed a standardized and codified body of methods and techniques for achieving the goals of restoration – these methods and techniques are encoded in the various restoration manuals and publications that have emerged from the restoration experience in northwestern California. Examples of these manuals (standardized texts) include the Department of Fish and Game’s *California Salmonid Stream Restoration Manual* (3rd edition), the *Handbook for Forest and Ranch Roads* developed by Pacific Watershed Associates, and the *Water Quality and Stream Habitat Protection Manual for County Road Maintenance in Northwestern California Watersheds* developed by the Five County Salmonid Conservation Program. Many other publications, too numerous to note here, also distill the lessons learned and promulgate standardized methods for different components of restoration. The wealth of knowledge, experience, and expertise that is embodied within the restoration system is an extremely valuable asset that could inform the many restoration initiatives and efforts of other regions of the country.

Employing a system perspective is an effective strategy for crystallizing and transferring, through practitioner to practitioner relationships and the dissemination of codified knowledge, some of the lessons learned from the area’s rich experience with restoration. The restoration system has institutionalized mechanisms for collective learning and lesson sharing. At the state level an important forum is the annual Salmon Restoration Federation Conference. More locally,

there are numerous workshops, training sessions, and field trips that are held each year to address different aspects of restoration. These forums include training programs for heavy equipment operators, planners, and policy makers, watershed restoration techniques, business management techniques, and ways of sorting out the permitting challenges restorationists face. The University of California Cooperative Extension, the Five Counties Salmonid Conservation Program, the Collaborative Learning Circle, the Redwood Community Action Agency, the Eel River Watershed Improvement Group, the Institute for Sustainable Forestry, and Humboldt County Resource Conservation District are just some of the regional entities that have sponsored workshops in the last year alone.

Humboldt County's restoration system also includes forums and arenas that integrate restoration research with restoration practice. This component of the restoration system involves the efforts of research scientists to understand ecological structure, function, and dynamics and to then relate that understanding to the design and implementation of restoration projects. A prime example of this integration is the activity and purpose of the Humboldt Bay Science Advisory Committee for Estuary Restoration.

Clearly, restoration on the North Coast is not comprised of a set of discrete, atomistic individuals working on their own on restoration projects, but rather it is a tightly articulated system, a community of people occupying extremely diverse positions within the restoration network, bound together by their common commitment to works towards improving ecological conditions in their neighborhood. Paula Golightly noted the role of fish in binding people together: "fish have connected a lot of people; everybody can relate to fish, everybody wants fish."

How Much Money Does Restoration Bring Into Humboldt County?

While restoration exists as a system - a coordinated network of people, agencies, and organizations - it does not lend itself to easy quantification in terms of its size. In this respect it differs significantly from other sectors of the North Coast economy, such as agriculture, forestry, commercial fishing, or tourism. The difficulty of describing the scope and scale of the restoration system in Humboldt County has challenged the ability of people within the restoration sector to convey to others outside the sector a clear picture of the sector's size. Indeed, coming up with some quantitative parameters of the size of the restoration sector was one of the primary reasons for initiating this study. This section reports on the flow of investment dollars into restoration.

Natural resources restoration work in Humboldt County is funded primarily by 13 different state and federal government agencies using a much larger number of programs, initiatives, ballot measures and legislation. The level of funding has increased dramatically in recent years. The great majority of funding for restoration that this study tracked comes in the form of grants to local nonprofit organizations, businesses, landowners, tribes, municipalities, and in some cases to public land management agencies. Table 1 shows the annual flows of investment into Humboldt County for restoration from 1995 through 2002.

For the last three years restoration has pumped more than eleven million dollars annually into the local economy; in 2002 it brought more than 14 million dollars into the county. The great majority of this amount is spent in Humboldt County; there is extremely little "leakage" of

this investment outside of the county. From any perspective, this represents a significant, and growing, contribution to the region’s economy. And this is not even counting the present net worth of the future value of restored watersheds, fisheries, estuaries and dune ecosystems, which increases with every incremental restoration investment. As Table 1 demonstrates, by any account, the restoration community in Humboldt County has been very successful at securing consistent, high, and increasing levels of funding.

Table 1 includes only those projects and activities that are directly related to ecological restoration. We purposively adopted a conservative definition of what to include as restoration investments for the purpose of this study. Thus Table 1 consists of grants and contracts for restoration project implementation and the watershed assessments and sediment inventories that are directly related to project prioritization and implementation. It also includes grants for the school aquatic education programs and public outreach efforts, and grants intended to support watershed organizations. It does not include the internal costs associated with the salaries, benefits, etc. of those public agencies that are part of the restoration system (see below for an estimate of public sector restoration-related FTE’s). Nor does it include the costs of on-going studies that are indirectly related to restoration project implementation such as salmon and steelhead and other monitoring efforts on the lower Klamath and Trinity Rivers.

Table 1. Public Funding for Restoration, by Source, Humboldt County, 1995-2002

	Bureau of Indian Affairs	Bureau of Land Management	National Fish and Wildlife Foundation	National Park Service	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	U.S. Forest Service	Department of Water Resources
1995	\$311,329	\$943,500	\$40,000	\$527,197	\$280,490	\$191,410	\$63,624
1996	\$275,666	\$539,924	\$0	\$167,870	\$158,820	\$323,700	\$0
1997	\$293,708	\$837,308	\$20,000	\$621,130	\$211,297	\$236,517	\$0
1998	\$510,934	\$366,000	\$380,876	\$1,120,057	\$109,849	\$318,155	\$0
1999	\$235,774	\$421,746	\$46,210	\$1,793,258	\$199,155	\$465,507	\$0
2000	\$248,149	\$1,435,762	\$128,992	\$2,443,216	\$370,214	\$189,951	\$158,826
2001	\$363,795	\$1,284,340	\$157,350	\$1,345,986	\$108,254	\$217,512	\$1,918,402
2002	\$346,010	\$1,976,183	\$20,000	\$1,383,050	\$262,533	\$51,020	\$502,209
Agency Total	\$2,585,365	\$7,804,763	\$793,428	\$9,401,763	\$1,700,612	\$1,993,772	\$2,643,061

	Coastal Conservancy	California Conservation Corps¹	State Water Resources Control Board	California Department of Parks and Recreation	Department of Fish and Game	Wildlife Conservation Board	Humboldt County Public Works²	Year Total All Sources
1995	\$450,000	\$1,000,000	\$0	\$68,000	\$472,170	\$288,197	NA	\$4,635,917

1996	\$0	\$1,000,000	\$0	\$146,849	\$570,628	\$234,581	NA	\$3,418,038
1997	\$0	\$1,000,000	\$402,504	\$540,806	\$2,320,444	\$93,650	NA	\$6,577,364
1998	\$0	\$1,000,000	\$419,315	\$99,990	\$1,039,850	\$0	NA	\$5,365,026
1999	\$75,000	\$1,305,646	\$248,751	\$705,186	\$1,980,911	\$159,388	NA	\$7,636,532
2000	\$185,000	\$1,301,120	\$158,826	\$848,856	\$4,818,131	\$99,700	NA	\$12,386,743
2001	\$680,000	\$2,115,109	\$330,534	\$317,148	\$2,295,063	\$24,090	\$464,833	\$11,622,416
2002	\$1,036,000	\$1,685,591	\$52,209	\$329,785	\$6,652,388	\$0	\$199,775	\$14,496,753
Agency Total	\$2,426,000	\$10,407,466	\$1,612,139	\$3,056,620	\$20,149,585	\$899,606	\$664,608	\$66,138,789

1. The figures for the Californian Conservation Corps refer only to the State Budget General Fund Allocation the Fortuna CCC Center received. Figures for 1995-1998 are simply place holder estimates; the final report will have the actual amount. The total annual budget of the Fortuna Center is approximately \$6.5 million to \$7 million. Much of this is comprised of grants and fee for service contracts paid for by other sources listed in this table and hence not included under the CCC column to avoid “double counting.”
2. These figures only represent the amount Humboldt County contributed for the implementation of fish barrier removal projects associated with the Five County Salmonid Conservation Program. Other county contributions for restoration have not been determined.

Table I provides a conservative estimate of restoration investments in Humboldt County. Other investments fit the criteria for inclusion but for various reasons are not included in the table. For example, the direct investments in restoration that industrial and nonindustrial timberland owners themselves make are not presented in this table. Some of these investments are made independently of other restoration grants, many constitute an in-kind or cash match required for a restoration grant. In-kind contributions include items such as materials and supplies, the use of heavy equipment, and in some instances, labor contributions. For this study we considered, but later rejected, the idea of collecting comprehensive information on in-kind restoration contributions due to the difficulty of tracking this information with any degree of certainty and comprehensiveness. Research assistants Don Son and Megan Taylor did track matching contributions for the Dept. of Fish and Game’s restoration grants program by reviewing the prior three years of funded proposals stored at the DF&G’s Fortuna office. This information is not entirely reliable because the matching contributions were anticipated, not retroactively determined, and we couldn’t tell what portion of the matching amounts were from other grant sources that we had already tracked; including them again as matching amounts for the DF&G grant program would have constituted a “double counting” of that amount.

We did however, acquire some information from Simpson Resource Company and Pacific Lumber Company regarding their restoration-related investments. For example, between 1995 and 2002 these two corporations together invested approximately \$630,000, primarily through collaborative partnerships with other restoration organizations, in restoration planning and implementation work. Most of this work focused on in-stream projects such as riparian corridor enhancement projects, bridge replacements or improvements, and fish habitat enhancement projects. While most road improvement work on industrial timberland ownerships is related to the implementation of Timber Harvest Plans, some is not. For example, Pacific Lumber Company spent the following amounts on non-THP related road improvements between 1995 and 2002: 1995-1999 – \$300,000; 2000 - \$1,800,000; 2001 - \$600,000; 2002 - \$400,000. Most of this work was contracted out. The large increase in expenditures after 1999 reflects Pacific

Lumber Company's efforts to comply with the Habitat Conservation Plan and the terms of the 1999 Headwaters Forest agreement. Clearly, private landowners are making significant investments in restoration that Table 1 does not capture. These investments constitute additional contributions to the restoration sector.

There are additional reasons why Table 1 constitutes a conservative estimate of restoration investments. Several types of activities that have a restoration component but that are integrated into other resource management and extraction regimes are not included in this table. Thus for example, the innovative cost-share programs of the Natural Resources Conservation Service that are fostering the development of dairy waste management systems on many of the dairy farms in the Eel River delta are not included in this database, even though such systems have direct and immediate positive effects on water quality and sediment delivery on the Eel River. Similarly, a large amount of the upslope restoration work related to road systems on industrial forestland ownerships is not included in this database. This work includes stormproofing road systems and decommissioning spurs and skid trails using the standard restoration techniques that restoration practitioners have developed in Humboldt County. Often using watershed assessments conducted for restoration purposes, timber corporations upgrade sub-basin road systems simultaneously with timber harvesting operations. These "restoration" investments are made for a variety of reasons, including as necessary mitigation to meet the zero net discharge sediment delivery condition of Timber Harvest Plans, to comply with a Habitat Conservation Plan, or to demonstrate commitment to land stewardship goals and objectives. Whatever the motivation, these activities also result in thousands of cubic yards of sediment saved from entering fish bearing streams. Yet they are excluded from Table 1 because of the near impossibility of separating out restoration-related investments from the larger resource management regime in which they are embedded.

A third example of restoration investments that are excluded from this database concerns restoration forestry. An important sub-discipline of forestry, restoration forestry focuses on the development and implementation of silvicultural treatments and forest management techniques that restore a degraded forest's species composition, structure, and function. Restoration forestry is often distinguished from "industrial forestry" in which short term profit generation objectives may override long term, natural capital-enhancing management prescriptions. In Humboldt County there is a strong restoration forestry movement and one of the leading proponents of it is the Institute of Sustainable Forestry. As with dairy waste management and timber corporation road improvement projects, investments and projects associated with restoration forestry are not included in this database – this is primarily due to the difficulty of distinguishing between restoration forestry and other models of forestry, both conceptually and in terms of investment levels. As a result of these exclusions, the flow of money, expertise, and other resources into natural resources restoration in the county is significantly larger than the amounts shown in Table 1.¹⁴

¹⁴ Table 1 also does not include the significant investments that some of the agencies and organizations in the Table have made for the acquisition of areas that are subsequently integrated within a restoration regime. For example, the Coastal Conservancy and the California State Wildlife Conservation Board have historically spent significantly more on land acquisition than they have on actual restoration efforts. These acquisition-related expenditures are not shown in this table.

Comparing the Value of the Restoration Sector With Other Resource and Agricultural Products

The restoration system constitutes a significant economic engine that has the capacity to attract more than ten million dollars from outside Humboldt County for investing in restoration in the county each year. How does the size of this sector measure up against other sectors within Humboldt County? Not surprisingly, it pales when examined in light of the value of the county's timber harvest; the 374,041 MBF (thousand board feet) harvested in 2002 was valued at \$130,554,325 (California State Board of Equalization 2003). While a tiny fraction of this value was reinvested in restoration-related activities, it should be noted that that reinvestment is NOT included in Table 1. However, the \$14.5 million that restoration brought into the county in 2002 does compare favorably with the value of some of the other resource-dependent sectors of our economy. Consider the gross value of some of Humboldt County's leading agricultural products that Table 2 shows for 2001. While the commodity value of several products is significantly larger than the amount of money restoration brings into the county, it is interesting to note that the differences are not huge and that in fact restoration generates more revenue than the value of several agricultural commodities. Lastly, it is of interest to compare restoration with commercial fishing. In 2001 the total value of the commercial landings (fish) in Humboldt County was \$6,302,270 (California Department of Fish and Game 2002). This is slightly more than half the amount of money that was brought into Humboldt County for restoration that same year. The point of these comparisons is to demonstrate that even when restoration investments are accounted for in a conservative manner, they are comparable to other resource extraction and agricultural sectors of the county's economy. Thus the fact that restoration brings into the county almost twice the revenue that commercial fishing does, indicates both the importance of the current restoration sector and the need to continue and expand restoration investments to enable the value of other sectors, such as commercial fishing, to also increase.

Product	Value
Milk Market	\$27,572,000
Cattle and Calves	\$18,547,000
Milk Manufacturing	\$15,290,000
Pasture Range	\$4,700,000
Livestock	\$3,450,000
Pasture Irrigated	\$2,828,000
Vegetable Crops	\$952,000
Silage	\$871,000
Hay, Other	\$600,000

Table 2. Gross Value of Selected Agricultural Production, Humboldt County, 2001
(Source: Summary of County Agricultural Commissioners' Reports, 2001)

How much value do the restoration investments in Table 1 generate? Using earnings multipliers from related industries, we can calculate the approximate value of the money brought into Humboldt County by restoration as it ripples through the economy. The Regional Input-Output Modeling System (RIMS II), developed and used by United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis, provides these multipliers for 38 industries in California. The earnings multiplier for “farm products and agricultural, forestry, and fishing services” is 2.05, and for “forestry and fishing products” it is 2.56. Using these two multipliers leads us to conclude that the \$14,496,753 brought into Humboldt County for restoration in 2002 generated between \$29,718,343 and \$37,111,687 in earnings for households employed in industries related to the restoration sector.

Clearly, restoration constitutes a significant component of our overall economic landscape. Furthermore, restoration interacts both directly and indirectly with other resource-based sectors of our economy in an entirely synergistic manner. Thus for example, fisheries habitat and upslope restoration efforts will result in increasing numbers of anadromous fish that successfully spawn and develop in Humboldt County’s fish bearing streams. Over the long run, this will increase the poundage and value of commercial and sport fishing landings on the North Coast. In the near term, restoration efforts contribute in a variety of ways to the sustainability of dairy farming, timber management, and other resource-based sectors. Furthermore, such efforts are an important part of restoring and conserving the environmental qualities of Humboldt County, whose amenity values are becoming increasingly recognized as one of the primary reasons why people want to live on the North Coast. But the focus of this report is on the current structure and value of the restoration sector, not the value of a restored ecosystem, so let’s return to our discussion of the size of the current restoration system.

Private, Public, and Tribal Employment in Restoration

(THIS SECTION SUBJECT TO MINOR MODIFICATIONS AS LAST BITS OF DATA COME IN)

How many people work in restoration? Because neither the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) code nor the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) that replaced the SIC system in 2000 include restoration as a category, determining employment levels in the restoration system is not straightforward. In this study restoration employment was calculated for a base year (2002) by drawing up a master list of all the private sector nonprofit organizations, businesses, firms, and contractors that have paid employees who do restoration work. All of these firms were contacted by phone (most were contacted by Andrea Davis of the Alliance for Sustainable Jobs and the Environment) and asked several short questions about their organization, including questions designed to enable us to calculate how many Full Time Equivalents (FTE's) were devoted to restoration-related work in 2002 (see appendix 1 for the survey form). Public sector agencies were also contacted and asked to estimate the FTE's within their organization devoted to restoration in Humboldt County in 2002.

The results of our phone surveys with more than 80 organizations and businesses show that approximately 120 FTE's were generated in restoration in the private sector in 2002. Of this total, 55 FTE's are distributed across restoration contractors, mostly heavy equipment; 42 FTE's are in consulting firms and businesses that do restoration work; 23 FTE's are within nonprofit organizations in the restoration system. These FTE's were distributed across a significantly larger number of people. The number of people with restoration jobs varies depending on how one organizes the data because many jobs in restoration also have non-restoration-related components; in some cases the restoration portion of a person's job is smaller than its non-restoration component. If we count only those people for whom restoration comprises at least 35% of their job, then our data indicates that the restoration employment profile includes 87 permanent full-time jobs, 46 permanent-part time jobs, 54 seasonal full-time jobs and 18 part-time seasonal jobs. This yields a total of 205 private sector restoration jobs in the county under these assumptions. If we tighten up the threshold for determining what constitutes a restoration job such that at least 50% of a person's job is comprised of restoration work, then the restoration employment profile shifts slightly in the following manner: 73 permanent full-time jobs, 46 permanent part-time jobs, 52 seasonal full-time jobs and 17 seasonal part-time jobs. Assuming a 75% threshold yields the following employment profile: 52 permanent full-time jobs, 35 permanent part-time jobs, 42 seasonal full-time jobs and 14 seasonal part-time jobs.¹⁵

Several factors account for the fact that there are significantly more jobs than FTE's in restoration. One primary factor is the seasonality of restoration work itself. Due to a variety of constraints, especially those designed to minimize the negative short term environmental effects of restoration project implementation, the great majority of restoration work, and almost all heavy equipment operation, is restricted to a four month window from July through October. The constraints that restrict operations to this time period are based on environmental

¹⁵ For comparative purposes, it is interesting to note that there are 571 employees in the logging industry (North American Industrial Classification System Code 1133) as reported in the 2001 "County Business Patterns for Humboldt, CA" (U.S. Census 2001).

considerations having to do with protecting federally listed endangered and threatened species and prohibitions against soil disturbing activities during the wet season. Because of the relatively narrow window of restoration work for heavy equipment operators, many find other jobs during the “off” season, even if they have specialized in restoration work. A second factor that accounts for the difference between the number of restoration-related jobs and the FTE’s in the restoration sector is the fact that many of the resource professionals involved in restoration, such as consulting engineers, geologists, hydrologists, biologists etc. who participate in restoration projects, also work on non-restoration-related jobs during the course of the year.

What are the secondary job creation effects of the restoration sector FTE’s? In order to assess the number of jobs created through the multiplier effect of the number of jobs in the restoration sector, we can again turn to the RIMS II model – this time to the employment multiplier. The employment multiplier indicates the number of jobs that are gained or lost within the economy for every job gained or lost in the sector of interest. For “farm products and agricultural, forestry, and fishing services” the employment multiplier is 1.69, and for “forestry and fishing products” it is 3.01. Using these two multipliers and taking the most conservative route of using only the number of private sector FTE’s in restoration, not the number of private sector jobs, we can conclude that restoration jobs in Humboldt County in 2002 created between 200 and 360 jobs in the industries related to restoration.¹⁶ While these are only rough and conservative estimates, they do convey a sense of the extent to which the level of investment generated for restoration purposes ripples through the local economy, both in terms of dollars and jobs generated in other, related sectors.

There are also a wide variety of public sector restoration jobs in Humboldt County. Public sector restoration jobs include jobs in state and federal government agencies, and local government. We asked each public sector organization with restoration jobs to estimate their restoration employment. We used this to develop an estimate of the total number of public sector restoration FTE’s and jobs. In Humboldt County there are approximately 37 FTE’s and 45 restoration jobs in the public sector. These restoration jobs are distributed across the following organizations: U.S. Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. National Park Service (Redwood National Park), California Department of Parks and Recreation (Humboldt Redwoods State Park), California Department of Fish and Game, City of Arcata, and Humboldt County. The majority of these public sector jobs concern almost everything related to accomplishing restoration objectives except actual project implementation, which in most (but not all) cases is contracted out to private sector entities. Thus they include managing restoration grants programs, conducting the environmental analyses and inventories necessary to prioritize, plan, and obtain permits for restoration projects, contracting, supervising, and working with other partners in the restoration system during the actual implementation of a restoration project, monitoring and report preparation, etc.

The Yurok Tribe is the primary tribal entity that generates full-time employment in watershed restoration work as defined in this study. The tribe’s Watershed Restoration Department has 11 full-time employees. The department’s activities include everything related

¹⁶ If we use the most conservative method of calculating the employment multiplier effect by using Full Time Equivalents instead of number of actual jobs, the number of jobs created by the 123.5 FTE within restoration turns out to be between 209 and 370.

to watershed restoration, from securing funding to project implementation and subsequent monitoring.

Both the Yurok and Hoopa Tribes also focus significant resources, both human and financial, on efforts to restore the salmon and steelhead populations in the Klamath and Trinity Rivers. These efforts include participating actively in twenty years of research and monitoring to determine how best to restore the mainstem Klamath and Trinity Rivers, participation in countless forums, meetings, and planning sessions on this topic, litigation, etc. These efforts, and the associated employment figures associated with them, are not included in our estimate of restoration employment because in this assessment we are focusing on direct restoration employment, by which we mean activities that encompass or are closely related to restoration project implementation. We also are not including watershed restoration employment figures for the Hoopa Valley Indian Reservation because the current upslope restoration program is almost entirely integrated within the tribe's timber harvesting program. It is therefore difficult to separate restoration employment from timber management employment; furthermore in this study we have decided to focus on restoration as an independent activity as it exists separately from resource management and extraction regimes.

Using the relatively narrow definition of restoration used in this study and combining private and public sector and tribal government employment, there are approximately 170 FTE's and 255 jobs in natural resources restoration work in Humboldt County.

Restoration Constraints

The challenges and uncertainty associated with building a restoration system based almost entirely on government support through grants are daunting. Unlike other resource-based sectors of the North Coast economy, in which revenue is generated through the application of labor, skills, and expertise to manage and extract a portion of the region's natural capital, restoration practitioners must manifest their funding "out of thin air," as it were.¹⁷ Their whole aim and purpose is to replenish, not diminish, our stocks of natural capital, and at least to date, their efforts have not been significantly funded by resource extraction activities. In the long run the presumed sustainability of both restoration and resource extraction-related industries will depend on the institutionalization of restoration practices within our dominant resource management regimes in a manner that a portion of the financial capital created by those regimes is reinvested in restoring and maintaining the productive capacity of our natural capital base. This however is not how restoration is currently organized, nor is it feasible to saddle the current resource extraction industries with the costs associated with restoring the region's inheritance of restoration challenges. As a result, restoration practitioners have had to be, and will continue to be, creative and diligent in securing the funding, developing the expertise, and growing the infrastructure necessary to sustain restoration.

¹⁷ However, it is worth noting that economic sectors based on extracting natural capital and restoration reinvestments based on mobilizing social, political, and legal capital are both subject to significant levels of risk and uncertainty. While fiscal uncertainty, i.e. fluctuating funding levels, may challenge restoration efforts, witness the precipitous decline of the commercial fishery due to regulation and declining stocks and the high level of uncertainty and flux in the current regulatory and policy framework that governs the state's timber industry.

Not surprisingly, a wide variety of constraints have made restoration efforts all the more challenging and difficult. These constraints are well known to those who are part of the restoration system, but they are less well known to those outside it. Some of the key constraints that surfaced during this study are briefly discussed below. It should be noted that this is neither a comprehensive discussion, nor do all segments of the restoration system experience these constraints to the same degree – this latter point is not surprising given the heterogeneity of the restoration sector. Furthermore, the reader interested in this topic is directed to the report of the Task Force to Remove Barriers to Restoration released by the California Resources Agency, January 2003. The report, *Removing Barriers to Restoration*, is the result of a collaborative effort involving diverse stakeholders from a variety of state and federal agencies, rural counties, private landowners, and restoration organizations. The report (available at <http://resources.ca.gov/> under “Reports and Publications”) discusses barriers to restoration on private lands and then presents a series of ten recommendations and next steps for addressing them. Most of the issues discussed below (except that pertaining to permitting challenges) are not discussed in the task force’s report.

- Inequity in application of regulatory authority governing the heavy equipment work season. Some restoration practitioners have observed that there are several-week periods when timber corporations are able to implement Timber Harvest Plans but restorationists are enjoined from implementing watershed restoration projects due to concerns about the negative environmental effects of implementing the restoration project. These practitioners suggest that the heavy equipment work season for restoration project implementation should be at least as long as the logging season.
- Cash flow challenges. Many restoration contractors and nonprofits face enormous cash flow constraints due to a combination of the short work season and delays in receiving payment resulting from the grant-based funding structure of restoration. While the severity of the issue often varies depending on the funding source for the specific project, it is not uncommon for contractors to have to wait sixty days after completing a job before receiving payment. This means that some contractors receive their last payment in December for a work season that ended in October, and have to wait until August of the following year for their next payment. In order to pay their expenses, some contractors and nonprofits have obtained credit lines from local banks. This remedy is not ideal because of the expenses incurred by the contractor or nonprofit and the barriers it represents for smaller businesses unable to qualify for a credit line. Revolving loan funds have been suggested to remedy this situation, but such a fund has yet to be established.
- Relatively short or non-complementary grant lifespans. Many restoration projects are funded by combining grants from a variety of different funding sources with different sunset dates by which the money must be used or forfeited. It is extremely important that grants have a lifespan that takes into consideration the lengthy and time consuming environmental analyses and permitting processes that must be completed before actual project implementation may take place; it is not unusual for this planning and permitting process to take more than two years and to consume significant financial and human resources. If grants that are combined to implement a restoration project have different sunset dates or relatively short validity periods, the complex juggling act associated with

grant management gets even more complex; extensions must be applied for and in some cases funding has been forfeited.

- Permitting hurdles. Depending on the nature of the restoration project, restoration projects require permits from and consultations with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, Army Corps of Engineers, the California Department of Fish and Game, Regional Water Quality Control Board, California Coastal Commission, and County Planning Departments. The primary purpose of the permitting process is to ensure compliance with relevant environmental legislation. In this regard, a grant-funded restoration project is treated by regulatory agencies in the much the same way as a “development” project such as a highway, shopping mall, or harbor expansion. The rising costs and time delays associated with the environmental review and permit processing procedures is emerging as a significant and costly hurdle that restorationists are struggling to overcome. An increasing percentage of grant funds are, of necessity, being devoted to the environmental analyses and consultations associated with the permit process. Due to the increasing severity of the issue it has recently been receiving more attention within the restoration community. In July, 2003 a full day workshop, sponsored in part by the Collaborative Learning Circle was convened at the Humboldt County Agriculture Center to address this issue; and permitting issues continue to be discussed at on-going workshops and training sessions within the restoration system.

A plethora of suggestions have emerged from these workshops and sessions concerning how to achieve regulatory compliance in a more timely and cost-effective manner. Additionally, the California Resources Agency’s *Barriers to Restoration* report addresses many of these concerns. Some agencies have proactively addressed the permitting challenges. For example the Department of Fish and Game has worked to get what are called general review permits from permitting agencies such as the Army Corps of Engineers. These are essentially umbrella permits that covers those restoration practices and procedures described in the department’s restoration manual. In other cases, e.g. the Fish and Wildlife Service’s Jobs in the Woods Watershed Restoration and Partners for Fish and Wildlife Programs, the lead agency for a restoration project will contribute the expertise and staff time necessary to secure the necessary permits. Another successful model for addressing this issue is the Partners In Restoration program that has evolved in Monterey County through partnerships between the Natural Resource Conservation Service, the Resource Conservation District, and a nonprofit, Sustainable Conservation. The one-stop regulatory shopping approach that this effort has produced will likely be of benefit and relevance to other regions in the state. With the sunset of SB 271 funding through the Department of Fish and Game in 2003, it is quite likely that other agencies will increasingly take the role of being lead agency for restoration projects. This suggests that the permitting process will likely get more complex, especially because some of the other agencies that fund restoration do not have general review permits for restoration work.

- Multiplicity and complexity of restoration funding sources. The plethora of different sources of funding for restoration is astonishing. Each funding source and grant program has its own application process, guidelines, conditions, payment policies, deadlines, and reporting requirements. They often also have slightly different objectives and purposes,

and varied willingness to support organizational overhead and institutional development. Restoration nonprofits often find it difficult to obtain grant money for organizational maintenance and development. The extent to which they do so influences the degree to which they must self-subsidize their restoration efforts; as one restoration practitioner phrased it, “the more grants we get (to do restoration work) the poorer we become.” The complexity of the funding process for restoration presents serious challenges to restoration organizations that must navigate through diverse funding mechanisms, simultaneously maintaining cash flow, meeting monthly payroll, and planning for future restoration work. The strategic thinking and organizational savvy required to successfully do this is hard to overestimate. The development of a more coordinated restoration funding mechanism, perhaps along the lines of the multi-agency California Economic Revitalization Team (CERT) process associated with the Northwest Forest Plan and the implementation of the Northwest Economic Adjustment Initiative could help address this issue. Part of addressing this issue would also likely entail addressing the challenges and hurdles represented by permitting. This is likely to become a more pressing issue as ballot proposition-supported funding flows for restoration begin to move through funding channels and agencies that have not developed programmatic permitting agreements with regulatory agencies for restoration purposes.

Bringing coherence and consistency to the funding process would improve the current situation. That said however, some of the differences between the organization of restoration funding across different funding entities can prove to be useful to restoration organizations and nonprofits if, as some do, they strategically combine sources of restoration funding in a manner that effectively utilizes the comparative advantages of each funding source. For example, the fact that the Department of Fish and Game currently has programmatic permits makes them an excellent choice for lead agency in a restoration project, with other agencies providing supplemental financial support. Working with the State Coastal Conservancy is desirable from a contracting standpoint because of their prompt payment guidelines, but the agency requires landowners to agree to a deed restriction before funding actual restoration work; not surprisingly, this is unacceptable to most landowners. As a result some nonprofits find Coastal Conservancy support very useful for watershed planning, inventory, and assessment efforts, and rely on other sources, such as the State Water Board, to help fund actual implementation projects. As the executive director of one restoration nonprofit put it, “having a good understanding of the comparative advantages and disadvantages of different funding agencies is absolutely key to success.”

- Difficulty of providing quality jobs in restoration. A variety of factors conspire against efforts to provide a living wage and benefits to some segments of the restoration system, particularly for the contractors that implement restoration projects and in some cases for nonprofit and for profit restoration organizations and businesses. The fact that most restoration work is grant funded exerts significant downward pressure on wages, especially if the nonprofit or forprofit entity managing the contract is forced to choose between maximizing the removal of cubic yards of potential sediment and paying workers benefits and a higher wage. When funding for restoration becomes tighter, this downward pressure increases. This situation tends to be less extreme when federal funds are used for a restoration project, in which case the Davis-Bacon Act applies and wage rates are

governed by the prevailing wage codes under the Davis-Bacon wage determinations.

A second factor that makes it difficult for some to earn a living from restoration work is the dramatic seasonality of the project implementation component of restoration. As discussed above, most restoration work, and especially most ground disturbing work, is restricted to approximately four months, from July through October, each year. During the other eight months of the year heavy equipment operators scramble for other jobs, work less, and/or rely on income and benefits from their spouse's job. Related to the short work window for restoration implementation is the uncertainty regarding the availability of future work. This insecurity challenges efforts at long range planning and discourages restorationists from incurring sizeable debt to finance specialized restoration equipment.

With respect to the non-heavy equipment component of the restoration project implementation workforce, anecdotal evidence suggests that the California Conservation Corps does the majority of it. It is hard to overestimate the contributions the Conservation Corps has made to achieving restoration goals and objectives on the North Coast. Equally important are the life challenges and opportunities the Corps provides its members. In many cases Corps members have gone on to pursue successful careers in restoration. During their residency Corps members receive benefits and are started out at minimum wage; they also receive subsidized room and board. This is part of the structure of the restoration system, both in terms of how restoration projects are budgeted and restoration grants are awarded. In effect, the participation of the Corps in restoration projects is a form of subsidy, a way of providing skilled labor for restoration jobs at below market value. This has the effect of reducing the cost of implementing restoration projects; but it also undermines the development of a viable non-heavy equipment-based restoration implementation workforce. On the other hand, it is highly unlikely that in the absence of the Corps a viable, skilled, labor-intensive workforce would automatically emerge – witness the working conditions and depressed wages of other labor-intensive forms of forest work. This is a complex topic that speaks to the need for in-depth exploration of issues that concern the overall structure of the restoration system, not only the skilled labor-intensive component.

Conclusion

A dynamic restoration system has evolved in Humboldt County. The complex and coordinated institutional infrastructure of this system includes government agencies, public and private lands managers, tribes, nonprofit and forprofit restoration organizations, private contractors and consulting firms. This infrastructure is linked through a dense network of relationships. Its internal coherence stems in part from common commitment to the goals of restoration – to conserve and restore the habitat and aquatic and terrestrial species native to our place that once sustained and may once again sustain the human communities on the North Coast.

The restoration system of Humboldt County is large. It generates significant employment and has the potential to generate much more. The revenue it currently generates rivals and in some instances exceeds the value of other resource-based sectors of the regional

economy. The restoration system demonstrates that employment generation and investment are indeed compatible with, and in this case are mutually supportive of, the enhancement of resource condition.

The restoration system of Humboldt County is socially important. It provides opportunities for communities to come together to identify common ground for collective action, while at the same time engendering a sense of place rooted in environmental stewardship. For tribal communities in particular, restoration is intimately linked with cultural integrity and the sustenance of lifeways.

The restoration system of Humboldt County has been at the forefront of developing the knowledge base necessary to ameliorate the current environmental effects of past land use and management practices on the North Coast. The standardization and codification of this knowledge base constitutes an immediate and direct inheritance that is available to be passed on to other regions engaged in restoration as well as to succeeding restoration practitioners in northwestern California. On-going interaction between researchers and practitioners of restoration promises to continue the productive interaction between restoration practice, scientific inquiry, and knowledge production.

The restoration system of Humboldt County is sustainable. It is true that public funding levels for restoration may fluctuate, and may even drop during periods of fiscal crisis. However, it is clear that the general trajectory of support for restoration is upwards. This is especially evident when we observe the various ways in which restoration-related activities are gradually becoming institutionalized within current resource management and extraction regimes. Even when viewed as an independent sector, as this study has done, it is clear that restoration is here to stay. Consider some recent estimates of the magnitude of the challenge. Addressing the barriers to fish passage and potential sediment delivery problems associated with just the county roads of the five northwestern California counties will require an investment of \$150 million dollars (Trinity County Planning Department 2002). The recent National Academy of Sciences report on the Klamath River recommends an immediate investment of \$25-30 million dollars for restoring coho salmon and sucker populations. The California Department of Fish and Game estimates that a \$5 billion investment is needed to remove the coho salmon from the state's endangered species list. And a recent study by the Center for Environmental Economic Development concerning road decommissioning on Forest Service lands estimates that a nationwide program to decommission 186,000 miles of unneeded Forest Service roads would cost \$93 million per year for twenty years and would generate more than 3,000 jobs annually (Ihara, Hackett and Manning 2003). This ever-increasing awareness of the magnitude of the challenge, when combined with the increasing levels of public and political support for ecological restoration, legal mandates associated with the Endangered Species Act and other federal and state environmental protection laws, and the increasing appreciation for the short term socioeconomic benefits of restoration lead us to conclude that, despite fluctuating fiscal conditions, the restoration system is not only here to stay but that in the foreseeable future it is likely to continue to grow.

References

- Blackwell, Jack, et al. 2003. Northwest Forest Plan Review: Pacific Southwest Region Findings. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region.
- California Agricultural Statistics Service. 2002. Summary of County Agricultural Commissioners' Reports, 2001. Sacramento, CA: California Agricultural Statistics Service.
- California Department of Fish and Game. 2002. Final California Commercial Landings for 2001. State of California, The Resources Agency, Department of Fish and Game.
- California State Board of Equalization. 2003. California Timber Harvest by County, Year 2002 Quarter 1 to 4. (www.boe.ca.gov/proptaxes/timbertax.htm).
- Cunningham, Storm. 2002. The Restoration Economy: the Greatest New Growth Frontier. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Blyther, Ruth, et al. 2002. A Study of Humboldt County's Environmental Restoration Industry. Eureka, CA: Redwood Community Action Agency.
- Davis, Andrea. 2003. Heavy Equipment Work in Ecosystem Restoration. Eureka, CA: North Coast Restoration Jobs Initiative.
- DeForest, Christopher. 1999. Watershed Restoration, Jobs-in-the-Woods, and Community Assistance: Redwood National Park and the Northwest Forest Plan. Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-GTW-449. Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station.
- Flosi, Gary, et al. 1998. California Salmonid Stream Habitat Restoration Manual (3rd edition). Sacramento: State of California Resources Agency Department of Fish and Game.
- Gustaitis, Rasa. 1998. "Mending the Klamath Watershed," California Coast and Ocean (pp.8-15).
- House, Freeman. 1999. Totem Salmon: Life Lessons From Another Species. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Ihara, Dan, Steve Hackett, John Manning. 2003. Reinvestment in Jobs, Communities and Forests: the Benefits and Costs of a National Program for Road Removal on U.S. Forest Service Lands, A Preliminary Analysis (for Wildlands CPR, Missoula, MT). Arcata, CA: Center for Environmental Economic Development.
- Kusel, Jonathan, et al. 2003. Assessment of the Northwest Economic Adjustment Initiative. Taylorsville, CA: Forest Community Research.
- Pacific Watershed Associates. 1994. Handbook for Forest and Ranch Roads. Prepared for the Mendocino County Resource Conservation District in cooperation with the California Department of Forestry and the U.S. Soil Conservation Service.

Pickart, Andrea. 2001. Restoration of Humboldt (CA) Dunes. Final Programmatic Report, Project No. 00-003-001, National Fish and Wildlife Foundation. Arcata, CA: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

_____. 2003 Restoration of Humboldt (CA) Dunes II. Project No. 2001-0029-003, National Fish and Wildlife Foundation. Arcata, CA: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Reichard, Nancy. 1998. Financial Incentives for Stewardship of Nonindustrial Private Forestland in Humboldt County. Eureka, CA: Redwood Community Action Agency.

Spreiter, Terry. 1992. Redwood National Park Watershed Restoration Manual. Orick, CA: U.S. Department of the Interior, Park Service, Redwood National Park Watershed Restoration Program.

Times-Standard. 2003. Editorial: "Is Trinity River Proposal a Settlement, or a Trojan Horse." (October 10). Eureka, CA: Times-Standard Newspaper.

Yoon, Paula. 1998. Displaced Salmon Fishermen and Women Watershed Restoration Employment: Feasibility Report, Humboldt County, CA. Arcata, CA: Fisheries Focus.

Appendix 1: Survey Form Used for Phone Interviews of Private Sector Restoration Organizations

(This was used to generate the private sector employment profile for 2002. Other survey forms were developed to guide in-depth interviews with contractors, non-profit organizations, consulting firms and businesses, and public agencies. They are available upon request.)

Contractor/Consulting Firm Phone Survey¹⁸

Name of contractor/firm: _____

Name of contact person: _____

Address: _____

Phone: _____

Email: _____

Date of interview: _____

1. What kinds of work does this business do? _____

2. How long have you been in business? _____

3. How many PERMANENT employees were in this business in 2002?

Number of full-time employees (32 hrs/week or more)	% time involved in restoration-related work

Part-time employees		% time involved in restoration-related work
number	hrs/week	

4. How many SEASONAL employees were employed in 2002?

¹⁸ The survey form that was used to guide the phone interviews with restoration nonprofit organizations was essentially the same as this one.

Employee	Number of hours	Number of weeks	% time involved in restoration-related work
Employee #1			
Employee #2			
Employee #3			

5. Can you give us a rough estimate, to the nearest \$50,000, of your business' gross revenue in 2002 from restoration work in Humboldt County?

< 25K___ 25K-50K___ 50K-100K___ 100K-150K___ 150K-200K___ 200K-250K___
 250K-300K___ 300K-350K___ 350K-400K___ 400K-450K___ 450K-500K___ 500K-
 550K___ 550K-600K___ 600K-650K___ > 650K (but if greater than 650K, try to specify which
 50K interval it is between)

6. Over the last five years has your business a) remained the same size, b) grown, c) gotten smaller? (Note: if possible, ask for more specific information, e.g. estimate of highest and lowest annual gross revenue.)

7. What are the largest roadblocks or hurdles, if any, that stand in the way of your company obtaining restoration work? _____

8. Would you be willing to participate in a face-to-face interview to more fully discuss the challenges, barriers, and opportunities your organization faces? (Note: be sure to mention that agreeing to this does not guarantee we'll be able to meet with them. We will, time and other resources permitting.)

9. Would you like us to send you a copy of the report from this study?
 Yes No

Appendix II People Interviewed

(these in-depth interviews were in person unless otherwise noted)

Dan Averill, US Bureau of Land Management
Corrine Black, US Forest Service, Six Rivers National Forest
Jean-Louis Carmona, Restorationist
Mitch Farro, Pacific Coast Fish, Wildlife, and Wetlands Restoration Association
Gary Flosi, CA Dept. of Fish and Game
Paula Golightly, US Fish and Wildlife Service
Tom Hedt, US Natural Resource Conservation Service
Matt House, Simpson Resource Company
David Kahn, Full Circle Forestry
Mark Lancaster, Trinity County Planning Department
Chris Larson, Mattole Restoration Council
Tyler Ledwith, Ledwith and Associates
Sungnome Madrone, Redwood Community Action Agency
Tim Metz, Restoration Forestry
Jack Monschke, Monschke Watershed Management
Ted Oldenburg, Hoopa Tribal Forestry (phone)
Andrea Pickart, US Fish and Wildlife Service (phone)
Bob Rohde, Yurok Watershed Restoration Department
Michelle Rose, California Conservation Corps, Fortuna Center
John Schwabe, CA Dept. of Fish and Game
Matt Smith, Environmental Restoration Services
Terry Spreiter, US National Park Service (Redwood National Park)
Bill Trush, McBain and Trush
Harry Vaughn, Eel River Salmon Restoration Project
Jan Vaughn, Restoration Educator
Mark Wheatley, CA Dept. of Fish and Game
Carol Vander Meer, Friends of the Dunes
Jude Wait, Collaborative Learning Circle
Bill Weaver, Pacific Watershed Associates
Tom Weseloh, Cal Trout
Chris Whitworth, Humboldt County Public Works Department
Paula Yoon, Fisheries Focus

People Contacted Regarding Restoration Investment Information

Mark Andre, City of Arcata Dept. of Environmental Services
Dan Averill, Jennifer Wheeler US Bureau of Land Management
Jeff Barrett, Rich Bettis, Robert Darby, Pacific Lumber Company
Chris Berresford, CA Dept. of Parks and Recreation
Corrine Black, US Forest Service, Six Rivers National Forest
Janet Blake, State Water Resources Control Board
Ruth Blyther, Redwood Community Action Agency
Ruthanne Cecil, Center for Environmental Economic Development
Scott Clemons, Wildlife Conservation Board
Beth DeCarolis, National Fish and Wildlife Foundation
Rick Elliot, CA Dept. of Forestry
Karyn Gear, Nadine Hitchcock, Jamie Schmidt Coastal Conservancy
Paula Golightly, US Fish and Wildlife Service
Tom Hedt, US Natural Resource Conservation Service
Nicole Hileman, Yurok Watershed Restoration Department
Matt House, Simpson Resource Company
Curtis Ihle, Humboldt County Resource Conservation District
Kim Karcher, Robin Carlson, CA Dept. of Fish and Game
Katherine Luscher, River Network
Tom Mattson, Humboldt County Public Works Department
Dennis Orthomeyer, CA Waterfowl Association
Michelle Rankin, California Conservation Corps
Ron Rekker, US Bureau of Indian Affairs
Terry Spreiter, US National Park Service (Redwood National Park)
Chris Whitworth, Humboldt County Public Works Department