

# Olympic Peninsula Resource Advisory Committee and Title III Case Study

Katie Bagby<sup>1</sup>  
Sierra Institute for Community and Environment



<sup>1</sup>Katie Bagby and Stephanie Pendergrass completed the field research for this case study.



## Background

The Olympic Peninsula Resource Advisory Committee (RAC) advises the Olympic National Forest in Washington State. The RAC is made up of the four peninsula counties—Clallam, Jefferson, Mason, and Grays Harbor—and also includes representatives from Thurston County, which is adjacent to, but does not include, national forest land.

The Olympic Peninsula is the western-most landmass of the state of Washington and includes diverse rainforest, riparian, agricultural, and coastal habitats. Mt. Olympus receives more rainfall than any other location in the contiguous United States—more than 220 inches per year—while the town of Sequim, just 34 miles away on the east side of the Olympic Mountains, receives less than 20 inches.<sup>2</sup>

The vast majority of the landmass on the Olympic Peninsula is publicly owned and managed. The largest land manager on the peninsula is Olympic National Park, over 922,600 acres in the middle of what was once the Olympic Forest Reserve (designated in 1897), and is now the Olympic National Forest. The Olympic National Forest manages over 633,600 acres. Washington State manages 14 state parks and other lands on the peninsula. There are 13 Native American tribes associated with the Olympic Peninsula: Chehalis, Jamestown S’Klallam, Hoh, Lower Elwha Klallam, Nisqually, Makah, Port Gamble S’Klallam, Quileute, Quinault, Shoalwater Bay, Skokomish, Squaxin Island, and Suquamish. The peninsula is largely rural with the largest urban centers being Port Angeles in the north (population 18,530) and Aberdeen in the southwest (population 16,420). Other towns on the peninsula have populations of less than 10,000. Management of the public lands, tourism, and development on the peninsula are influenced by Washington’s largest urban cen-

ters, Seattle and Tacoma across the Puget Sound, and Olympia, the state capitol to the south.

The Olympic National Forest manages 2,178 miles of roads, 270 miles of trails, and 20 campgrounds. It affects and is affected by 13 key watersheds and provides habitat for six threatened and endangered species. To manage all of this, the forest has just under 100 full-time permanent staff working at forest headquarters in Olympia and two ranger districts, the Hood Canal District in Quilcene and the Pacific District-North in Forks and the Pacific District-South in Quinault. Since 1990, the forest’s budget from Congressional appropriations declined by more than 63%, four ranger districts have been consolidated into two, and staffing on the forest has been cut by 70%.<sup>3</sup>

The Olympic National Forest manages land in four counties: Clallam, Grays Harbor, Jefferson, and Mason, ranging from 127,000 acres in Mason County to over 199,000 acres in Clallam County. Since the late nineteenth century, Olympic Peninsula counties have relied heavily on timber from private and public lands. In 1944, Congress passed the Sustained Yield Forest Management Act to stabilize the forest products industry and timber-dependent communities with a steady stream of timber and local processing, as well as to secure forest benefits for waterflows, climate, wildlife, and soils. In 1946, the Shelton Cooperative Sustained Yield Unit was formed as a public-private partnership between the U.S. Forest Service and Simpson Logging Company, the only such unit that consisted of both private timberlands and national forest. And in 1949, the Grays Harbor Sustained Yield Unit was established, stipulating that all logs harvested on the Quinault Ranger District (now the Pacific Ranger District – South) must be processed in Grays Harbor County.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Olympic National Park website: [www.nps.gov/olym/](http://www.nps.gov/olym/).

<sup>3</sup> Unless otherwise noted, all information about the Olympic National Forest is drawn from the Olympic National Forest website: <http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/olympic/>.

<sup>4</sup> In 1981-1985, the restriction was gradually relaxed to 50% of the logs harvested.

Olympic Peninsula Resource Advisory Committee and Title III Case Study

In recent years, some have questioned the sustained yield units—the Grays Harbor unit for potentially inequitable effects on surrounding counties,<sup>5</sup> and the Shelton unit for what had become an unsustainable and often ecologically damaging harvest.

Since the 1980s, timber harvests on state and private lands on the peninsula have fluctuated, declining more in some counties than others. Harvests on national forest lands have dropped precipitously. Prior to 1990, harvests on the Olympic National Forest averaged more than 250 million board feet annually; today, the timber harvest ranges from 0-20 million board feet annually.<sup>6</sup> Table 1 shows the private, state, and national forest timber harvests in Olympic Peninsula counties from 1986 to 2001.

Beginning in the 1970s and 1980s, national recessions, changes in the export markets for forest

products, competition from mills in the South and imports from Canada, corporate buyouts and consolidations, and increased mechanization coalesced to bring decline to the timber industry, pushing large companies to look for profits elsewhere, and forcing smaller, family owned companies out of business. Timber harvests on the Olympic National Forest declined with the setting aside of reserve and wilderness areas, reduced availability of big timber due to prior harvesting practices, the stipulations of the Olympic National Forest Plan and the Northwest Forest Plan, and state and federal legislation regarding clean water and endangered species protection, including the Dwyer spotted owl injunction. Reduced access to timber on state and federal lands contributed further to an already declining and increasingly concentrated timber industry.

**Table 1. 1986–2001 Timber harvests by ownership & county** (thousand board feet, Scribner rule)

	<b>Clallam</b>	<b>Grays Harbor</b>	<b>Jefferson</b>	<b>Mason</b>
<b>Private</b>				
1986	199,985	577,256	194,883	212,427
1990	237,287	534,107	58,904	277,468
1995	192,692	515,705	61,283	186,746
2001	191,852	402,070	50,420	131,504
<b>State</b>				
1986	105,090	45,447	313,348	6,921
1990	67,309	34,528	121,147	15,150
1995	48,252	45,612	17,457	5,041
2001	34,937	25,501	11,422	12,623
<b>National Forest</b>				
1986	140,253	38,846	43,935	24,311
1990	52,303	19,012	27,924	3,600
1995	1,960	2,662	1,709	4,098
2001	771	399	0	237

Source: Washington State Department of Natural Resources, annual timber harvest reports

<sup>5</sup> Schallau, Con H and Wilbur R. Maki. 1986. Are Federal Sustained Yield Units Equitable? A Case Study of the Grays Harbor Unit. Research Paper PNW-369. Portland, OR: US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station.

<sup>6</sup> Olympic National Forest website: [www.fs.fed.us/r6/olympic/about/](http://www.fs.fed.us/r6/olympic/about/).

By the mid-1970s, market downturns had pushed Simpson to close its Shelton insulating board plant and a plywood plant. By 1986, Simpson had stopped its mountain logging operation, shut down remaining logging camps, and closed its large log sawmill in Shelton, laying off 600 workers. In 2002, Simpson terminated the Shelton Sustained Yield agreement, citing changing federal land management values, although others argue that by the mid-1980s—and prior to the Dwyer spotted owl injunction—the amount of available wood on the forest unit had diminished dramatically.<sup>7</sup> Rayonier, one of the largest private landowners on the peninsula, which had closed its rayon pulp mill in Shelton in 1968, eventually closed its research lab in Shelton in 1995, forcing a cadre of the peninsula's highly educated to relocate. This matrix of pressures affected not only the large employers on the peninsula, but forced many small and medium sized-businesses associated with timber harvests, wood product processing, and transport out of business.<sup>8</sup> International trade agreements played a role as well—the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) precipitated closure of nine mills in the Forks/Beaver area between 1991 and 1997.<sup>9</sup>

The declines in timber harvests have rendered the counties of the Olympic Peninsula vulnerable to significant economic decline and the loss of family-wage jobs. In 2003, Washington's Employment Security Department identified Clallam, Grays Harbor, and Mason Counties as three of 19 “distressed” counties in Washington, based on average unemployment rates that are 120% of the statewide rate. While not listed as “distressed,” Jefferson County shows unemployment rates and median household incomes significantly below the statewide average. With relative geographic isolation, high unemployment rates, and among the highest forest dependency rates in the state, a U.S. Forest

Service study argues that Olympic Peninsula counties are particularly vulnerable to land management decisions, but nevertheless show solid “socioeconomic resiliency”—or capacity to adapt to changing conditions.<sup>10</sup>

While the eastern side of the peninsula has fared better with greater economic diversity, tourism, and in-migration of people and wealth from the Seattle area, the western side has been especially affected by socioeconomic downturn since the early 1990s.<sup>11</sup> The “Westside” has smaller population centers (with the exception of Aberdeen), is more geographically isolated, and its economies are much more dependent upon forestry and fisheries. Seasonal unemployment and poverty rates are high on the lands of the Quileute Tribe, the Makah Tribe, and the Quinault Indian Nation. There is a growing population of immigrant Latino workers in natural resources who are largely isolated from civic participation. Interviewees report that there seems to be less political capital, civic engagement, and volunteerism on the Westside, with the effect that there are fewer community groups at the table in natural resource planning and project development. Portions of Grays Harbor County appear to be an exception, given its proximity to Olympia, Aberdeen's port, and tourism in its coastal communities.

Despite significant socioeconomic challenges in the region, the successes of the Olympic Peninsula RAC process and the Title III county programs build on civic capacity and a culture of collaboration that has been developing on both sides of the peninsula since the early 1990s. For example, for over 20 years, the Dungeness River Management Team—composed of representatives from city and county governments, the Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe, property owners, user groups, local conservation groups, state departments of ecology and fish and wildlife, and the U.S. Forest Service—has

<sup>7</sup> For example, see the Summer 2003 issue of Forest Magazine, the newsletter of the Forest Service Employees for Environmental Ethics.

<sup>8</sup> Kusel et al. 2002. Assessment of the Northwest Economic Adjustment Initiative. Taylorsville, CA: Sierra Institute for Community and Environment.

<sup>9</sup> North American Integration and Development Center at the University of California, Los Angeles. Cited in Kusel et al., 2002.

<sup>10</sup> Daniels, Jean M. 2004. Assessing Socioeconomic Resiliency in Washington Counties. General Technical Report PNW-GTR-607. Portland, OR: US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station.

<sup>11</sup> Olympic Natural Resources Center, University of Washington.

been collaboratively working to identify community-wide watershed needs, develop watershed management plans, and implement projects.<sup>12</sup> Non-profit organizations are working with Latino floral greens harvesters and natural resource workers in Shelton, Belfair, Aberdeen, and Forks to build community capacity to participate in civic and natural resource decision-making processes, and to help them learn how to monitor their own harvesting practices.<sup>13</sup> The Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission coordinates collaboration among state and

tribal fisheries managers. Finally, the peninsula has a strong history of committees to advise federal resource management agencies on land management, research, and public education. These include the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Olympic Coast Sanctuary Advisory Council and the Olympic Province Advisory Committee (OPAC), which advises the Olympic National Forest on Northwest Forest Plan implementation.<sup>14</sup> Three current or former members of the Olympic Peninsula RAC serve on the OPAC.

### County Elections for Titles II and III

The Olympic Peninsula counties receive significant payments from P.L.106-393. While the payments are modest in comparison to what some counties in Oregon receive, they provide critical funds for maintaining roads, keeping school budgets afloat, and accomplishing projects. Table 2 shows how counties associated with the Olympic Peninsula RAC elect to allocate Title I, Title II, and Title III funds. While P.L.106-393 requires that counties allocate a minimum of 15% of their total payments to Titles II and III, the Olympic Peninsula counties allocate 20% of their total payments, the maximum allowed, to Titles II and III.

At the time of charter for Titles II and III, Washington counties received an orientation by Karl Denison, the USFS Legislative Liaison for Washington State, and Tom Robinson of the Washington State Association of Counties (WSAC). The purpose of the trainings was to help county officials understand the intent and obligations of the legislation and how Title III allocations interact with federal Payment In-Lieu of Taxes (PILT) payments. In Washington State, counties receive three major sources of governmental funds in

forestry: Washington State DNR trust funds, PILT payments, and P.L.106-393 funds. WSAC created an interactive website to enable counties to simulate what their PILT payments would be with different Title III allocation scenarios to assist in sound decision-making. In addition, the trainings highlighted that legislators intended that the funds accomplish projects that (1) improve federal lands, and (2) were chosen through citizen involvement; there was significant interest in seeing funds allocated to Title II, while allowing counties as much autonomy as possible. The counties on the Olympic Peninsula have chosen to allocate anywhere from 92.5% to 50% of their Title II and III eligible funds to Title II, demonstrating significant commitment to the RAC process and the types of projects the RAC can fund through Title II.

Counties receiving less than \$100,000 are not required by law to allocate dollars for Title II and Title III. Thurston County receives only about \$4,000 and does not contain federal forestlands apart from Olympic National Forest headquarters; thus, it retains all of its funds for Title I.

Interestingly, county officials make their final elections for Titles II and III after the RAC

---

<sup>12</sup> Dungeness River Management Team webpage: [www.olympus.net/community/dungenesswc/](http://www.olympus.net/community/dungenesswc/)

<sup>13</sup> These include the Sierra Institute, the Jefferson Center, Mason County Literacy, CIDERS, and the Northwest Researchers and Harvesters Association. Some of this work has been accomplished with support from the USDA Fund for Rural America and the U.S. Forest Service Region 6.

<sup>14</sup> Regional Ecosystem Office website: [www.reo.gov/general/aboutPAC.htm](http://www.reo.gov/general/aboutPAC.htm).

**Table 2. Receipts, Elections, and Allocations for P.L.106-393, 2002-2005**

<b>County</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Full PL-106-393 Payment</b>	<b>Title II/ Title III split (percent)</b>	<b>Amount Allocated for Title II</b>	<b>Amount Allocated for Title III</b>
<b>Clallam</b>	2002	\$2,341,246	50/50	\$234,125	\$234,125
	2003	\$2,359,976	50/50	\$235,998	\$235,998
	2004	\$2,388,295	50/50	\$238,830	\$238,830
	2005	\$2,419,343	50/50	\$241,934	\$241,934
<b>Grays Harbor</b>	2002	\$689,954	70/30	\$96,594	\$41,397
	2003	\$695,474	92.5/7.5	\$128,663	\$10,432
	2004	\$703,820	92.5/7.5	\$130,207	\$10,557
	2005	\$712,969	90/10	\$131,899	\$10,695
<b>Jefferson</b>	2002	\$3,157,724	70/30	\$442,081	\$189,463
	2003	\$3,182,985	70/30	\$445,618	\$190,979
	2004	\$3,221,181	70/30	\$450,965	\$193,271
	2005	\$3,263,057	70/30	\$456,828	\$195,783
<b>Mason</b>	2002	\$742,732	50/50	\$74,273	\$74,273
	2003	\$748,673	50/50	\$74,867	\$74,867
	2004	\$757,658	50/50	\$75,766	\$75,766
	2005	\$767,507	50/50	\$76,751	\$76,751
<b>Thurston</b>	2002	\$3,850	0	0	0
	2003	\$3,880	0	0	0
	2004	\$3,927	0	0	0
	2005	\$3,978	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>		\$28,168,229		\$3,535,399	\$2,095,121

Source: USFS Payments to States website

has recommended projects for that federal fiscal year. While the RAC has preliminary allocation figures to work with, the counties retain final judgment on whether the slate of projects the RAC recommends will receive the full Title II allocation.

This appears to reflect not only a philosophical orientation to maintain county control of funds, but also the fact that the counties are dealing with three different fiscal year calendars: federal, state, and county.

### **Title III Projects**

Title III projects funded by Clallam, Grays Harbor, Jefferson, and Mason Counties are discussed in this section. As of June 2005, Olympic Peninsula counties had allocated a total of 32 Title III grants totaling nearly one and a half million dollars. At the time of writing, 2005 project allocations had yet to be finalized. Mason and Grays Harbor Counties receive significantly smaller Title III payments than the other two counties, and tend to allocate their entire annual allocation to one project. Clallam and Jefferson Counties receive much larger payments and parse them out to a diversity of grantees and county departments. Clallam and Jefferson Counties have not allocated their full payments for 2002 through 2004, reserving approximately \$131,000 and \$76,000, respectively, to carry over into 2005.

#### **Project Solicitation, Prioritization, and Selection**

In Olympic Peninsula counties, the process for soliciting projects and allocating Title III dollars varies, with some counties making an open call for project proposals and others making decisions through commissioner allocations to programs in the county.

In Clallam County, the Title III program is publicly advertised each year, inviting written proposals. The county administrator reviews project proposals and writes a memo of recommended project allocations to the county commissioners. Project proponents make presentations to the board at a public meeting. Then the board of commissioners makes project allocation decisions.

In the other Olympic Peninsula counties, there is no public call for proposals. Projects and allocations are decided internally as part of the counties' normal budget allocation process. In Mason County,

the 4-H Youth Forestry Education Program submits a project proposal based on a county template, but, to date, it has been the only program to apply. In Jefferson County, all Title III dollars are allocated to projects within county departments. Department heads submit their annual budget requests and, if requesting Title III funds, provide brief project descriptions in the budget narrative, as well as the amount requested as a budget line item. In Grays Harbor County, where county commissioners have elected to allocate more to Title II, leaving a limited amount of Title III dollars, the board makes an administrative allocation based on their knowledge of needs and programs within the county. There is no formal application process for projects. In all counties, there is a public budget hearing and decisions undergo a 45-day public comment period.

Consistent with the requirements of the legislation, the Olympic Peninsula counties have published a list of proposed expenditures within the appropriate time frame and have notified the RAC, but some of the counties have blurred the distinction between a budget allocation and a project as a discrete activity or event with a competitive proposal that includes stated purposes, objectives, and actions associated with a budget. With the exception of Clallam County, the Olympic Peninsula counties do not broadly solicit project proposals for Title III funds. Project solicitation is delineated from internal allocations in that solicitation involves a request for proposals, in effect opening access, while the latter involves internal county decision-making that is not open to others. As such, project notification involves a statement of already determined plans. This comes at the expense of developing discrete projects, and providing an open and transparent

Olympic Peninsula Resource Advisory Committee and Title III Case Study

process involving parties beyond county administrative units, as was intended by the legislation.

**Approved Projects**

With their Title III payments, Olympic Peninsula counties have supported a diversity of worthy projects and programs that demonstrate collaboration and leverage significant monetary and in-kind contributions. Ascertaining the

number of discrete Title III projects funded by Olympic Peninsula counties proved challenging, because for some counties it was unclear which allocations to county departments were tied to a particular project proposal. However, for the most part, projects and allocations appear to fall within the categories of activities consistent with the legislation. Table 3 provides an estimate of the types of grants by county.

**Table 3. Title III Grants 2002-2004 by Category, County, and Amount.**

Type of Project	Number of Grants*	Clallam	Grays Harbor	Jefferson	Mason	Total Amount
Search & Rescue	1			\$328		\$328
Community Service Work Camps	3	\$206,390				\$206,390
Conservation easements and acquisitions	5	\$75,000		\$109,046		\$184,046
Forest Education	14	\$106,441	\$20,989	\$185,000	\$224,906	\$537,336
Fire Prevention and County Planning	4	\$94,800		\$21,687		\$116,487
Community Forestry	0					\$0
Other: Emergency generator	1		\$41,397			\$41,397
Flood control	1			\$171,830		\$171,830
Trail development	2	\$80,000				\$80,000
Recreational law enforcement	1	\$10,000				\$10,000
Project carryover funds	NA	\$4,979		\$9,672		\$14,651
<b>Total</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>\$577,610</b>	<b>\$62,386</b>	<b>\$497,563</b>	<b>\$224,906</b>	<b>\$1,362,465</b>

\*Some programs have received multiple one-year grants.

Clearly, forest education is a high priority for all of the Olympic Peninsula counties, with well over \$500,000, or just under 40% of all funds, dedicated to this category. Grants have been made to Washington State University (WSU) Cooperative Extension's 4-H forestry after school programs in Mason, Jefferson, and Clallam counties, as well as the Pacific Northwest Trail Association's SKY (Service Knowledge Youth) Project in Clallam County, and the Pacific Student Corps in Grays Harbor County.

The forest education programs serve diverse children and youth—from WSU's 4-H programs to the SKY employment project for at-risk youth—and offer a remarkable range of educational opportunities to help youth understand their communities' historical and current relationship to timber harvesting, as well as to gain skills for the future of natural resource management and community development. Two programs are highlighted below.

Mason County grants 100% of its Title III dollars to the WSU 4-H Youth Forestry Education program, totaling approximately \$75,000 per year. Since its inception in 2002, the program has reached over 3,500 Mason County children and youth with educational programs, training, and service learning projects on county and national forest lands. Programs range from forestry education with preschoolers at the Shelton Head Start, to after school programs in local schools and boys and girls clubs, to paid summer internships for local teens. Youth learned to use Geographic Positioning System tools to map historical logging camps and conducted oral history interviews with elders to understand the area's natural resource heritage. In the first two summers of Title III funding, youth participating in the 4-H Forestry Leadership Summer Program contributed over 4,000 hours of trail building, harvesting native grass seed, landscaping a Habitat for Humanity House, restoring wildlife habitat, inventorying native plants, and planting 2,500 trees after logging. In addition, youth gained experience working with local governments and advisory committees. One program graduate has earned his firefighting red-card and another is

exploring a career in wildlife biology. The program has also trained teachers to incorporate forestry into their curriculum. The program has gained momentum and recognition countywide, and a diversity of in-kind donations has expanded resources two to three-fold. Program leaders made clear, however, that Title III funding is the core of the program, and without it, they would cease to exist.

The 4-H forestry education program in Jefferson County provides after school programs for children and youth, with particular success in two of the county's most economically depressed areas, Quilcene and Brinnan. Not only does the 4-H program provide traditional hands-on forestry education, but includes technological and media components such as Geographic Information System Tools robotics, digital camera, web design, and video tools to build skills to participate in the future of forestry, ecotourism, and community development. Like the other forest education programs, the Jefferson County program leverages Title III dollars with substantial contributions of other funds and partnerships. The after school programs are complemented by the Quilcene Ranger Corps, supported in part by Title II funds to provide summer employment for 17 youth aged 13 to 15 to work on trails. Title II and Title III funds are leveraged synergistically to advance both programs.

The second category of Title III investment is community service work camps. Each year, Clallam County has granted funds totaling over \$200,000 to the sheriff's "forest chain gang" to do campground clean-up and repair, noxious weed and brush clearing, roadside maintenance, and work on the Olympic Discovery Trail.

The third category that Olympic Peninsula counties have funded is conservation easements and acquisitions. Clallam County granted three years of Title III funding to the North Olympic Land Trust to identify and purchase easements on important forested lands. In Jefferson County, conservation acquisitions have been closely linked to salmon restoration and flood control; the county has committed over \$280,000 in Title III funds for conservation acquisitions and flood control efforts

on the Quilcene and Dosewallips Rivers. Along the Dosewallips, the county contributed \$54,000 in Title III funds to a large multi-entity partnership totaling \$400,000 to clean up and acquire 75 acres of property to maintain the health of the river and estuary, where there are two Endangered Species Act listed fish species. Title III provided critical funds to leverage other dollars. Partners include the Salmon Recovery Fund Board, the Washington State Department of Ecology, the Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe, Washington Trout, and Washington State Parks. Upon completion, Washington State Parks will hold the deed to the properties. County officials highlight that the estuary provides important spawning grounds for fish that use the Olympic National Forest upstream.

On the Quilcene River, Jefferson County used Title II and Title III dollars synergistically to address community and riparian health. The county allocated \$100,000 of its Title III funds to a large, multi-partner project that included conservation acquisitions along the Quilcene River. Quilcene is a town that has experienced severe economic downturn with the declines in timber harvest, and many of the properties in the floodplain, owned by lower income people, flood repeatedly. The multi-year process included the U.S. Forest Service, the local community flood board, and other agencies to develop and implement a plan to protect homes and properties, restore spawning and riparian habitat, and prevent and control flooding. Title II dollars (approximately \$30,000) were used to supplement other grants for the flood planning process. Title III dollars were used to supplement and leverage other grant sources for the purchase of properties on the north side of the river to allow for future restoration projects to return the river to a more natural flow. County officials comment that this project offers the Forest Service (through Title II and III dollars) the opportunity to give back to a community where the river has filled up with gravel due to runoff from logging roads that the agency has abandoned in the upper watershed. Officials also pointed out that this work would never have been accomplished without the Title III funds.

The fourth category of projects Olympic Peninsula counties have supported is fire prevention and county planning. Jefferson County made allocations totaling \$22,000 to its Fire Wise programs, aimed at educating homeowners on how to maintain their properties to prevent fires. Clallam County allocated approximately \$15,000 toward the portion of its Comprehensive Plan Update relevant to forestland and the wildland/urban interface. In addition, Clallam County granted \$80,000 over two years to a project proposed by a local fire district to purchase a backcountry fire fighting vehicle and train a crew in wildland fire fighting. The crew and equipment will be used across the county, including, but not exclusive to, national forestland. It is useful to note that counties across the nation have struggled with the question of using Title III dollars for equipment and vehicle purchases and have come to differing interpretations of the legislation. In the absence of clear guidelines, the Washington State Association of Counties has cautioned counties to pro-rate Title III expenditures on these items based on how much of the time the vehicle or equipment is actually used to benefit national forest resources. Identifying the percentage of use dedicated to fighting fires that are on or are likely to impact national forest resources is one way that Clallam County can justify using Title III funds for a portion of a vehicle purchase and thereby improve overall program accountability.

The fifth category of grants is search and rescue. Jefferson County allocated \$10,000 for search and rescue on national forest lands. Because these funds are set aside and only billed out as needed, \$9,700 is listed in Table 3 as project carryover funds.

The remaining Title III expenditures were for single projects or allocations. With its first year of Title III funding, Grays Harbor County allocated \$41,000 to purchase an emergency generator to be housed at the local school in Lake Quinault in the event of a power outage from weather events or other disasters. While the generator purchase meets an emergency services need for a community that is surrounded by national forest, it blurs the line on the requirement that Title III funds be used for emergency services performed on or affecting

federal lands. Clallam County granted \$10,000 to a joint project between the sheriff's department and the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife to employ a deputy and wildlife officer to enforce regulations related to forest recreation and to assist with search and rescue. And Clallam County granted \$80,000 to a project to develop the western forestland portion of the Olympic Crest Trail.

In sum, Title III grants and county allocations on the Olympic Peninsula have supported diverse work across the legislative categories, and several also contribute to accomplishing Title II ends. Several grants demonstrate productive, collaborative partnerships and leverage funds and in-kind goods and services, multiplying the scope and potential outcomes. This is particularly true of several forest education projects. Jefferson County has effectively leveraged grant sources and partnerships to magnify effects on the land and for multiple stakeholders, such as the flood control and conservation acquisitions along the Quilcene and Dosewallips Rivers. Two Title III allocations in Jefferson County dovetail with Title II projects—the Quilcene River project mentioned above, and the WSU forestry education program which draws on the provisions of both Title II and Title III funds to provide a well-rounded program of afterschool programs and youth employment in forestry and forest conservation.

Clallam County is the only county that has funded a number of project proposals put forward

by outside organizations such as the local land trust, the Pacific Northwest Trail Association, and local fire districts. This is due to the fact that Clallam County allocates the largest amount to Title III and because it has a formal and open public project application process.

In interviews, officials and project leaders from all counties highlighted that the Title III funds helped them to complete work they otherwise would have been challenged or unable to accomplish, particularly given losses to their budgets such as those that followed the repeal of the state car tax. Most like the openness and flexibility of the legislation, even though it sometimes poses challenges for interpreting intent and limitations. For example, Jefferson County officials expressed interest in how other counties have interpreted the legislation regarding conservation easements and whether this allows for actual property acquisition for conservation. And while Clallam County officials felt it was within the legislative intent to purchase a vehicle for wildland fire fighting, staff from other programs such as the weed boards and the forest education programs felt that the legislation did not allow them to purchase a program vehicle. County officials noted that the training they received from USFS legislative liaison Karl Denison and Tom Robinson of the Washington State Association of Counties provided them with the information they needed to make decisions consistent with the intent of the legislation.

## **Title II Projects**

The Olympic Peninsula Resource Advisory Committee was consolidated from two RACs administered by the Olympic National Forest: the Grays Harbor RAC and the Olympic Peninsula RAC. The two RACs were consolidated in late 2004 after there were not enough applicants to re-charter a Grays Harbor RAC. Projects from the two RACs are presented together to give an overall picture of Title II projects associated with the Olympic National Forest. During federal fiscal years 2002-2005, the Olympic Peninsula RAC (including the Grays Harbor RAC) allocated approximately \$3,503,400

to support 84 projects. An additional \$3,584,000 was leveraged from Forest Service funds and other sources to complete project work on the ground.

The total of the approved projects largely matches the Title II allocations for each county, as shown in Table 4. This is not surprising, given that allocations are essentially decided in county caucuses before being approved by the entire RAC. Some RAC grants support projects that extend beyond one year, but proponents must re-apply each year for funding. Thus, each grant is presented below as a project.

**Table 4. RAC Projects and expenditures approved by county, Fiscal Years 2002 - 2005**

County	Number of projects supported	Total funds allocated for projects in county	County Title II election
Jefferson	34	\$1,778,262	\$1,795,492
Clallam	28	\$940,548	\$950,887
Grays Harbor	16	\$486,126	\$487,363
Mason	6	\$298,519	\$301,657

The legislation stipulates that 50% of Title II dollars should be allocated to restoration of streams and watersheds, or road maintenance, decommissioning, or obliteration (Section 204(f)). The Olympic Peninsula RAC meets this objective. It has devoted well over \$3 million dollars, or 86% of its funds, to roads and projects that benefit fish and watersheds, including sediment reduction, fish passage, habitat, and watershed restoration.

Those interviewed are proud that the Olympic Peninsula RAC has supported what they feel is a balanced slate of projects that meet the legislative intent. When asked about outcomes, they agree that Title II puts funds back on the national forest, enabling it to accomplish its mission and work that otherwise would not be done, and that the RAC process encourages cooperative relationships among the federal agency, counties, and citizens involved.

#### **Project Solicitation, Review, and Selection**

The Olympic Peninsula RAC relies primarily on the Forest Service and county commissioners to get the word out to solicit project proposals. Generally, the agency solicits project proposals through an annual news release to local newspapers, the Olympic National Forest website, a letter to previous project proponents and usual forest contacts such as tribes, watershed councils, and state natural

resource agencies, as well as informal contacts by forest personnel, RAC members, and county commissioners. Given delays in the initial release of funding, in 2002, each RAC was charged with allocating funds for both fiscal years 2002 and 2003.

Overall, the Olympic National Forest has led the way in developing project proposals for the RAC's consideration. The forest invests a tremendous amount of resources into project development so that the projects the forest proposes to the RAC have already gone through a variety of planning screens, including the National Environmental Protection Act, and are "in lock-step" with forest management plans. Thirty-eight of the 84 projects supported by the RAC were developed by staff on the Olympic National Forest, and an additional 17 projects were co-sponsored by the forest in partnership with county governments or other groups.<sup>15</sup> Several projects proposed by the Forest Service included participation by other groups, such as the Washington Conservation Corps or the Quilcene Ranger Corps. Counties, the state, tribes, and other organizations outside of the national forest have received 29 RAC grants. Table 5 summarizes the number of projects and dollar amount awarded by type of proponent.

Forest Service personnel indicate that most of the proposals from outside groups have come from

<sup>15</sup> A couple of projects listed on Forest Service spreadsheets as joint projects are categorized here as agency projects (e.g., the Big Quilcene/Dosewallips Road Sediment Reduction projects). In interviews, county officials identified them as Forest Service projects, perhaps since the additional project funds came from Forest Service sources.

**Table 5. RAC funded projects by proponent, Fiscal years 2002-2005**

Year	USFS # of Projects	USFS Amount	USFS-Other # of Projects	USFS-Other Amount	Other # of Projects	Other Amount	TOTAL
2002	8	\$581,517	6	\$153,573	4	\$111,981	18 projects
2003	8	\$532,238	5	\$158,533	7	\$189,398	20 projects
2004	6	\$354,773	3	\$97,000	9	\$355,342	18 projects
2005	16	\$480,234	3	\$106,614	9	\$382,252	28 projects
<b>Total</b>	38	\$1,948,762	17	\$515,720	29	\$1,038,973	84 projects \$3,503,455

groups that already have experience with government programs and processes such as watershed councils, state timber plans, county noxious weed boards, and state or county youth programs. Thus far, there have been no proposals from grassroots or community groups who would be considered “outsiders” to government processes.

The author observed the June 2005 meeting at which the Olympic Peninsula RAC voted on its project recommendations for fiscal year 2006. Interviews and RAC minutes indicate that the project review, prioritization, and selection process has been similar in recent years. Six weeks prior to the meeting, RAC members are mailed a packet including a copy of the agenda, by-laws, and all project proposals, color-coded by county. Included in the packet for FY 2006 decisions was a letter from the forest supervisor indicating that two of the proposed projects might not meet the intent of the legislation.

At the beginning of each RAC meeting, the county commissioners report briefly on their respective county’s allocations of Title III funds for the previous year. Then Bill Shelmerdine, Title II project coordinator for the Olympic National Forest, presents on progress and outcomes of Forest Service

projects previously supported by the RAC. Then, he presents the projects that the Forest Service proposes for the upcoming fiscal year. For the 2005 meeting, RAC members asked the Forest Service to prioritize their proposed projects, so Mr. Shelmerdine shared a spreadsheet indicating projects in order of priority. To help them in apportioning limited Title II dollars, RAC members also asked if certain projects could be accomplished on the forest through other funding sources.

Following Forest Service presentations, project proponents from the counties and non-profit organizations give brief presentations on their proposed projects. If the group has been previously funded by the RAC, they also present on outcomes to date. For the Olympic Peninsula RAC, this is the sole reporting on progress and outcomes of previously funded projects. During presentations, RAC members ask questions or make comments.

Then the Olympic Peninsula RAC breaks into caucuses by county to discuss and develop project recommendations based on the dollar amount allocated to that county.<sup>16</sup> Each caucus makes recommendations for only those projects that will be accomplished in their county, though they may

<sup>16</sup> For its fiscal year 2002 and 2003 allocations, the RAC as a whole discussed and decided on projects, but did not have a clear process in place to facilitate efficient ranking or prioritizing of projects. At the May 2003 meeting to select FY 2004 projects, the RAC chair suggested county caucuses to enable efficient decision-making, and since then, this has been the project selection process.

choose to support the rare project that extends into more than one county. Thurston County representatives may choose to join a county discussion or try to float between caucuses. Toward the end of the meeting, RAC members gather and each county group presents their slate of recommended projects and funding levels. Finally, the RAC votes by voice; the vote is not by individual project, but on the entire slate of projects.

### **Approved Projects**

As of June 2005, the Olympic Peninsula RAC (including projects supported by the Grays Harbor RAC) had supported 84 projects over four rounds of funding, and recommended an additional slate of projects for FY 2006. At the time of writing, FY 2006 projects had yet to be approved by the U.S. Forest Service Washington Office.

The projects the Olympic Peninsula RAC and the former Grays Harbor RAC have supported are categorized according to their primary purpose and funding levels and presented in Table 6. The information comes primarily from a spreadsheet prepared by Bill Shelmerdine, of the Olympic National Forest. Many of the projects the Olympic Peninsula RAC has supported serve more than one forest function. For example, many roads projects maintain safe passage for drivers, while improving fish passage or reducing sediment to streams; some of the trails projects improve recreation access while also improving watershed health; a conifer release project may be classified as a forest health project, but in a riparian area, the ultimate goal may be watershed improvement. In interviews and site visits with project leads, the primary purpose of the project was estimated and projects were categorized accordingly; thus, categorization here may vary slightly from that provided by the Forest Service. Project types are discussed by category, and key projects are highlighted.

It is not possible at this time to provide a complete and accurate summary of Title II project accomplishments to date, such as number of acres treated or culverts replaced. This is due to (1) diversity of projects with different types

and measures of outcomes, (2) no requirement for project completion reports, (3) inconsistent tracking and lack of compilation of outcomes from different types of contracts and agreements, and (4) the length of time required to bring a project from RAC approval to project completion. Some roads and watershed projects selected as early as FY 2003 have yet to be completed. Project completion can be delayed by a number of factors, including unforeseen complexities of design and weather, short windows for project completion due to water flows and seasonal wildlife habitat restrictions, and the administrative time needed to award contracts and disperse funds. Given these limitations, project accomplishments are highlighted below.

### *Roads and Trails*

The Olympic Peninsula RAC spends nearly 60% of its funds on grants to maintain roads. With over a century of timber harvesting and two Sustained Yield Units on the forest, the Olympic National Forest has an extensive road system totaling over 2,100 miles. The forest's road budget is historically tied to timber sales, and, with the decline from over 250 million board feet harvested annually prior to the spotted owl provisions and the Northwest Forest Plan, to zero to 20 million board feet today, the forest is currently working with 20% of the funds identified as needed to maintain its road system. Most of the roads on the forest were built by logging companies with a focus on expedient and cost-effective log removal, rather than long-range functionality and ecosystem health. Title II dollars allow the forest and counties to do roads projects, particularly decommissioning and restoration, both of which are inadequately funded through existing budget appropriations.

On the Olympic Peninsula, roads maintenance cannot be separated from watershed health and fish habitat. While some roads projects primarily focus on maintaining passage for vehicles, with so many road miles to maintain and 13 key watersheds, the roads system on the Olympic National Forest is tightly linked with riparian habitat for salmon and other anadromous fish. The RAC is a venue

**Table 6. Approved Olympic Peninsula (OP) and Grays Harbor (GH) RAC projects, Fiscal years 2002-2005**

<b>Project Category</b>	<b>Type of Project (sub-category)</b>	<b>No. of Projects OP RAC</b>	<b>Amount OP RAC</b>	<b>No. of Projects GH RAC</b>	<b>Amount GH RAC</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>Roads, trails &amp; infrastructure maintenance</b>		22	\$1,802,715	8	\$273,893	\$2,076,608
	Road maintenance & road culverts	9	\$963,115	3	\$141,893	
	Fish passage culverts, LWD, washouts	5	\$211,500	4	\$107,000	
	Sediment reduction	5	\$409,446	0	\$0	
	Decommissioning	3	\$218,654	1	\$25,000	
<b>Watershed restoration &amp; maintenance</b>		17	\$517,075	1	\$41,500	\$558,575
	General restoration	6	\$89,200	1	\$0	
	Fish habitat restoration	8	\$396,806	1	\$41,500	
	Stream monitoring	3	\$31,069	0	\$0	
<b>Wildlife &amp; fish habitat</b>		4	\$79,800	0	\$0	\$79,800
<b>Noxious &amp; exotic weed control</b>		9	\$283,724	4	\$118,333	\$402,057
<b>Re-establishment of native species</b>		0	\$0	0	\$0	\$0
<b>Recreational infrastructure</b>		14	\$328,015	1	\$15,400	\$343,415
	Trail maintenance	13	\$325,015	1	\$15,400	\$340,415
	Facilities	1	\$3,000	0	\$0	
<b>Soil productivity improvement</b>		0	\$0	0	\$0	\$0
<b>Forest ecosystem health</b>		0	0	1	\$30,000	\$30,000
<b>Other</b>	Forest Education	2	\$6,000	1	\$7,000	\$13,000
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>68</b>	<b>\$3,017,329</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>\$486,126</b>	<b>\$3,503,455</b>

through which the Forest Service, as well as state and county agencies, is able to educate citizens on the connections between roads and watersheds and habitat, and gain their support for roads projects that restore fish passage and manage sediment loads in riparian areas. In a number of its roads and watershed projects, the Olympic Peninsula RAC has leveraged other federal funding sources toward the Northwest goal of restoring salmon habitat.

The RAC has supported 12 projects focused primarily on maintaining safe passage for vehicles. Most involve washout repairs or replacing deteriorating culverts that can cause road failure. Another group of culvert replacement projects prevent road failure but also provide restoration and habitat benefits, enabling salmon and other fish to pass through. A number of the old culverts are rusting out, are too small to ensure needed flows of water or handle flood flows, and have large drop-offs from the culvert to the stream bed below, making it impossible for fish to make it back upstream to spawn. One project of note was the culvert replacement on the FS 3000 Road on the Pacific Ranger District-North. A RAC grant of \$21,500 paid for the survey and design, and the Forest Service contributed another \$119,000 for project implementation. A three-foot pipe was replaced with an arch culvert that spans the entire width of the stream channel, restoring a natural streambed and flow. Field reconnaissance showed Coho salmon fry swimming in the stream above the culvert, indicating that adult Coho had indeed returned upstream and spawned.

The FS 3000 Road project exemplifies a strategic approach the forest and the RAC have taken toward large-scale projects. They encourage project proponents to break down projects into steps that can be supported incrementally, enabling the project to progress while other funds are sought for the next steps. Survey and design can be difficult to fund with appropriated dollars. When the RAC supports this phase of a project, the Forest Service or county is frequently able to secure funds from other sources for project implementation in its entirety, or as a match to a second RAC

grant. This approach enables the RAC to leverage funds, addressing more needs on the forest and surrounding lands.

The Olympic Peninsula RAC has supported nine road maintenance projects focused on improving fish passage and habitat through culvert replacements, repairing streamside road washouts and using large woody debris (LWD) and log jams instead of riprapping to improve hydraulic control and stabilize banks. An additional four projects focus on reducing sediment flows in streams.

Finally, four projects involve decommissioning roads, three with the Forest Service in the lead, and one led by the Quinault Indian Nation. Forest Service personnel report that, in general, it is very difficult to garner public support for closing or decommissioning roads unless they can make the argument that the road is going to fail if use continues, or its failure will affect roads and streams below it. Staff feel the crunch of an unfunded mandate to maintain the forest's many miles of roads in one of the wettest places in North America. These roads were initially created for logging access, but, over time, the public has become accustomed to using them for recreation and other purposes.

The Gold Creek project, developed by the Forest Service, involved a series of complementary projects that upgraded another road to arterial standard, removed a stream crossing (which was a fish passage barrier) and all cross drains (which generated landslides), decommissioned the Gold Creek Road to take it out of the riparian corridor, and converted a portion of the road to trail. The RAC supported three grants to accomplish this from planning through completion. The project was accomplished through a variety of arrangements including a bioengineering contract for planning with a Montana contractor, two contracts with a local contractor to remove the fish passage barrier (including bank stabilization and restoring natural stream flow) and decommission the road, and revegetation work by the Washington Conservation Corps.

The Gold Creek project is exemplary in accomplishing multiple goals and objectives of

the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act. The project provides for maintaining road passage and for decommissioning a failing road the agency could not afford to maintain. It provides a recreational trail and restores watershed and habitat health. It provided employment to local youth and a local contractor who hires a local, permanent crew. RAC funds for strategic phases of the project leveraged over \$300,000 in other funds that would otherwise not have been available (i.e., RAC funds paid for planning while capital improvement funds paid for road stabilization). If there is a criticism of the project it is that the largest contract (though not paid with RAC dollars)—for roads stabilization—went to an out of state contractor. Breaking the project into phases, however, allowed discrete project components to be developed so that small, local contracting firms could successfully bid on them.

Forest Service contracts like this, says local contractor Val Addleman of Addleman Construction, have “saved our company.” Addleman is a logging and construction company based in Port Angeles that keeps a year-round crew of 10 to 20 local workers. Like many small contracting firms, they have faced severe challenges to survive in the face of downturns in timber harvests on public lands. However, they have diversified their equipment and their skills to include decommissioning, culvert replacement, road restoration, stream crossing removal, and bank improvement/erosion control on public lands. With the help of dedicated Forest Service staff, they have learned how to bid on and complete federal contracts—which Addleman comments can be very intimidating for a small company—while addressing wildlife and habitat restrictions. She estimates that today, 30 to 50% of their work is with the Olympic National Forest, some of which is funded through RAC grants.

#### *Watershed Restoration and Maintenance*

The second largest category of projects the Olympic Peninsula RAC funds is watershed restoration and maintenance. The RAC has supported well over \$500,000 of restoration

projects. Some of these projects look very similar to some of the projects categorized under “roads.” They serve multiple purposes, including road maintenance, but the primary intent of the project is watershed health. For example, Jefferson County received two RAC grants totaling \$189,000, matched by \$6,100 of county funds, to replace a fish passage culvert on the Duckabush Road. The road leads directly into the Olympic National Forest and the culvert replacement will benefit juvenile salmon habitat. While the RAC grants were made in 2002 (as a roads maintenance project) and 2003 (as a watershed project), the project is not yet complete. Officials report that culvert replacement projects are slow, expensive projects for counties, because they have to keep the road open during construction and acquire right-of-way permission from property owners. The Jefferson County roads system currently has 80 fish passage barriers. Without Title II funds, the county would be unable to complete projects such as this.

The Olympic Peninsula RAC has supported several watershed restoration projects that engage community groups in in-stream work. Clallam County’s Streamkeepers, which has over 100 volunteers, has received three grants to involve volunteers in cooperative stream monitoring of seven streams on the Pacific Ranger District. The Hood Canal Salmon Enhancement Group has received three RAC grants totaling over \$200,000 to do watershed restoration projects that benefit fish habitat. These grants leveraged an additional \$327,060, including Forest Service funds.

Finally, the Olympic National Forest received four grants to employ youth crews through the Washington Conservation Corps (WCC) to work on a diversity of watershed restoration and maintenance projects, including willow planting, tree planting, soil restoration and erosion control, road obliteration, culvert access, and noxious weed control. A field visit to a WCC hillside restoration and erosion control project above Walters Creek showed a remarkable example of ingenuity, adaptive learning, and the strength of young laborers. The four-year project included

a major bioengineering design and adaptive learning effort by WCC staff Darryl Borden and the youth crew. On a hillside grade of up to 80%, the crew put in log terracing, removed noxious weeds, and planted over 20,000 native trees and shrubs. All four crewmembers grew up in timber towns in Grays Harbor County. They come from a diversity of socioeconomic and educational backgrounds ranging from recent high school or GED graduates to an ecology graduate of University of Washington. All wanted hands-on work experience, and expressed satisfaction in what they were learning and pride in the fruits of their labor. Through the WCC, youth crewmembers are Americorps volunteers, and, in addition to a stipend, they earn a scholarship for college or to pay off student loans.

#### *Wildlife and Fish Habitat*

The Olympic Peninsula RAC has supported four projects focused primarily on habitat improvement. These are distinguished from the watershed restoration projects listed above that have broader watershed health goals, but that also include wildlife and fish habitat benefits. In 2002, the Olympic National Forest received a \$7,100 RAC grant, leveraging an additional \$22,500, to prioritize the hundreds of fish passage culvert replacement needs on the forest. This has served as a strategic planning document for subsequent grant requests. Jefferson County has received three RAC grants totaling nearly \$73,000 and leveraged twice that amount to identify critical areas and develop and implement plans to connect wildlife habitat corridors between county and national forest lands. The county is working in cooperation with the Jefferson Land Trust and the Forest Service.

#### *Noxious Weeds and Native Species*

The Olympic Peninsula RAC has granted significant funds to each county's efforts to control exotic and invasive plants on the forest and gateway lands. Noxious weeds are reported to be the second leading cause of species threat

on national forests. By state law, the U.S. Forest Service is mandated to control invasives on its lands, but with an annual weed control budget of \$5,000, the Olympic National Forest is challenged to address the issue. Pat Grover, botanist on the forest, works with county weed programs and Washington Conservation Corps crews. The support of the Olympic Peninsula RAC has been critical in advancing the work of the Clallam County and Grays Harbor County weed boards, and reestablishing or building the staffing capacity of county weed boards in the other two counties. The Clallam County noxious weed program is a model program that other counties, state and federal agencies, and tribes look to for assistance. In fact, since learning from the Clallam County weed program, the Quileute Tribe has secured funds and is implementing weed control on its lands. Support for the weed program accomplishes work on the ground by buying four weeks of WCC youth crew time, working with the chain gang (funded through Clallam County Title III grant), and with their own crew. RAC grants have been used to inventory and map weeds along Forest Service roads, develop a plan for control, and send out crews to implement pulling and other control measures. Prior to receiving its first RAC grant in 2002, the Jefferson County Weed Board was largely unstaffed. Jefferson County partnered with Clallam County Weed Board staff Cathy Lucero to help Jefferson County establish part-time coordinating staff, and to share weed crews between the two counties. Ms. Lucero is helping to train weed crews for the recently established Mason County Weed Board. Since the advent of Title II dollars, all four counties on the peninsula now have active weed boards with staff to accomplish work on the ground.

The noxious weed grants the RAC has supported are models in meeting the intent of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act. The RAC grants have helped counties launch work on the ground, supported regional collaboration between counties and state and federal agencies, leveraged multiple funding

sources, and fostered collaboration and synergies among multiple RAC-supported projects as well as Title III projects. Ultimately, RAC funds have enabled the Olympic National Forest to address noxious weeds to protect forest resources, work it would otherwise be unable to accomplish.

#### *Soil Productivity and Forest Ecosystem Health Improvements*

The Olympic Peninsula RAC has made one grant in this category for a pre-commercial timber harvest and elk habitat development project in Grays Harbor County. The Columbia Pacific Resource Conservation and Development Council and the Olympic National Forest jointly developed this grant. Forest Service personnel indicate that not as many vegetation management projects have been proposed and supported by the RAC as perhaps intended in P.L. 106-393. However, they highlight that there are a number of other mechanisms for accomplishing these goals, such as the Northwest Forest Plan requirements in Late Successional Reserves.

#### *Recreation Infrastructure*

The Olympic Peninsula RAC has dedicated considerable support to summer youth employment projects for trail construction and maintenance, including noxious weed control, as well as some restoration and habitat improvement work. Fourteen RAC grants totaling over \$340,000 have gone to the Quilcene Ranger Corps, the Pacific Northwest Trail Association's SKY (Service Knowledge Youth) Education program, and the Pacific Student Resource Corps. The Quilcene Ranger Corps is a summer internship program for youth aged 14-17, run through Washington State University's 4-H program. Youth interns work with the Hood Canal Ranger District and the Pacific Northwest Trails Association. The Pacific Northwest Trails Association also leads youth trails

crews with the SKY Education Program, which provides paid service-learning opportunities for at-risk and adjudicated youth in Jefferson and Clallam Counties. Pacific Student Resource Corps youth work on trails, weed control, and restoration projects on the Pacific Ranger District. The programs have been very successful in giving youth job readiness training; leveraging additional funds (\$28,710 from the Forest Service and \$260,791 from other sources); building collaboration across agencies, counties, and organizations; and accomplishing miles of trail work on the Olympic National Forest. Another small RAC grant (\$3,000) in this category funded environmental education interpretive displays at the Kloshe Nanitch Lookout.

#### *Other*

Finally, the Olympic Peninsula RAC is supporting a unique forest education project involving youth from Forks and Lake Quinalt High Schools to develop educational videos and PowerPoint presentations in Spanish. The education effort focuses on Latino workers who earn a significant portion of their livelihoods by harvesting floral greens and other special forest products. Grays Harbor, Clallam, and Jefferson Counties are contributing a total of \$13,000 of their Title II funds to this project, with the goals of educating harvesters on conserving forest resources, sustainable harvesting, and the boundaries of permissible harvesting areas (e.g., national forest vs. national park lands); raising awareness of the floral greens workforce; and increasing communication across cultures. Pacific District Ranger Eduardo Olmedo proposed the project in collaboration with the high schools. He has also consulted with the Quileute Tribe and Quinalt Indian Nation, who are interested in educating others about their treaty rights and cultural resources, including salal. The project may also include community workshops.

## **RAC Formation, Operation, and Relations**

This section focuses on the formation and operation of the Olympic Peninsula Resource Advisory Committee. Included is a discussion of the ways that the RAC process has cultivated relationships among local communities, interest groups, county governments, and the federal agency, and has built capacity for mutually beneficial collaboration. This section also explores the decision-making process the RAC employs and its implications for collaborative outcomes.

### **RAC Formation**

In 2001, the Olympic National Forest chartered two Resource Advisory Committees: (1) the Olympic Peninsula RAC comprised of members of Clallam, Jefferson, Mason, and Thurston Counties and (2) the Grays Harbor RAC. While the Forest Service encouraged one RAC for the forest, county commissioners in Grays Harbor County wanted to ensure local autonomy in allocating resources and wished to establish a separate RAC.

The current RAC functioned as two separate RACs for the first three years of implementation. Forest Service personnel describe the former Grays Harbor RAC as functional, but it struggled to have a quorum of members from each voting group at its meetings. At the time of re-charter, despite concerted outreach, only nine of the required 18 prospective RAC members applied for the Grays Harbor RAC. Forest Service personnel proposed to the county commissioners that the two RACs merge, and, in late 2004, the consolidated Olympic Peninsula Resource Advisory Committee was chartered.

The Olympic National Forest solicited prospective RAC applicants through press releases in local newspapers, on the forest website, through announcements to other collaborative groups such as the Olympic Province Advisory Committee, personal outreach, and through the recommendations of local county commissioners.

All Resource Advisory Committees are required to include representatives of interests in three major categories, or voting groups. The Olympic National Forest takes seriously the charge to fill each category of representation outlined in the legislation. While there are no grazing allotments nor wild horses and burros on the forest—two of the interest groups in the legislation—leadership has tried to look at the representational intent in a manner appropriate to the region. A member of the Washington State Backcountry Horsemen serves on the committee to address the animal stock interest. An archeologist served on the committee at the beginning, but that individual relocated and the agency has been unable to fill the slot since. Each voting group has a replacement member, should a member of the committee leave mid-term, though that replacement member may or may not represent the interest of the vacated position.

The forest prioritizes having a balanced representation from each county and a commissioner from each county serves on the committee; however, to ensure that Group C is not only comprised of elected officials to the loss of tribal or educational interests, some commissioners serve as representatives of other interest groups they are involved with, such as dispersed recreation. Two members of the committee were commissioners at the time of RAC formation, but were not reelected. They continue to serve on the committee in other categories, but in Mason County, a newly elected commissioner will apply to be on the committee and the current representative will likely step off to allow his participation.

While Thurston County has no national forestlands in its boundaries, and thus does not receive Title II or Title III funds, members of the county are represented on the RAC as users of forest resources and stakeholders in management activities on the forest. The Olympic National Forest is headquartered in Thurston County in Olympia.

### **RAC Operation**

The Olympic Peninsula RAC meets once per year to review project proposals and vote on funding recommendations. In addition, it meets for an orientation meeting at the beginning of each three-year charter.

In early 2002, the Forest Service held an orientation meeting for each of the originally chartered RACs to train members on the intent and limitations of the legislation and responsibilities of serving on a federal advisory committee, as well as to agree upon by-laws and elect a chair. The by-laws were drafted by Forest Service Public Relations Coordinator Ken Eldredge and presented to the RAC as subject to change according to RAC discretion and vote.

Voting on projects requires a quorum in each of the three voting groups. At the outset, both RACs wished to change their by-laws to allow replacements to act as alternates if a voting group lacks a quorum for any given meeting. Under direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, this is not permissible. A member has to leave or be removed from the committee in order for a replacement member to become a full voting member. Both RACs developed absentee voting procedures for excused absences when a voting quorum is not present. The Olympic Peninsula RAC added a provision for voting by teleconference. The Grays Harbor RAC chose to not formally add a by-law for absentee voting, but when this issue arose during its vote for 2003 projects, the group improvised and the chair called a member of the group lacking a quorum and asked for their vote the following day.

After the consolidated Olympic Peninsula RAC was chartered, a welcome and training meeting was held in May 2005 to orient the 50% of its members who were new to the RAC process, incorporate members of the Grays Harbor RAC, agree upon by-laws, and elect a chair. Clallam County Commissioner Mike Doherty was re-elected chair and Grays Harbor County Commissioner Al Carter was elected vice-chair.

At its annual meetings, the RAC is focused on efficiency in decision-making, balanced with trying to gather sufficient information from project proponents, Olympic National Forest personnel, and the counties to prioritize projects. The specific process the RAC uses to evaluate and make project recommendations is described in the previous section.

RAC members view their role as that of a grant committee designed to advise the forest supervisor on which projects to support with Title II funds. In general, interviewees feel that the Olympic Peninsula RAC functions efficiently and effectively, and has supported worthy projects that benefit the forest and local communities. Any disagreements at RAC meetings were generally related to whether projects met the intent of the legislation or were the highest priority given limited dollars. Overall, RAC members are proud of the work that they have accomplished, and pleased that there has been no significant contention to date.

However, observations of the 2005 RAC meeting, and comments by interviewees in this study indicate that the process the Olympic Peninsula RAC employs, while it makes for relatively efficient decision-making, limits the RAC's ability to discuss projects in detail and achieve its full potential as a collaborative and representative advisory body.

### *Limited Time*

The Olympic Peninsula RAC is challenged to develop shared priorities and to complete project selection in one six-hour meeting per year.<sup>17</sup> At the 2005 meeting, project presentations and questions extended significantly beyond the allotted time, leaving little time for discussion and decision-making. The meeting ran 1.5 hours past the planned adjournment. There was a palpable tension between expediency and having sufficient time to gather information and address questions. Some members focused on expediency and expressed frustration that other RAC members asked questions or made comments that "slowed down the process." However, in interviews with current and former RAC members

---

<sup>17</sup> The one-day meeting was initially agreed to by the RAC, and also reflects the lack of funds set aside for travel costs associated with a longer meeting.

and agency staff, several individuals commented that meeting one day per year was not enough time for meaningful discussion of projects and priorities, or to identify shared goals and develop collaborative relationships. The limited meeting time can create a disincentive to raise questions or to ask for discussion on challenging or unclear topics. For example, at the 2005 RAC meeting, the tribal representative repeatedly raised the issue of the importance of consulting with affected tribes when planning projects. While individual project proponents responded to the question when asked, there was no time for discussion on the intent and legal obligations of consultation relative to Title II and how the RAC might build consultation with the 13 tribes associated with the peninsula into its processes.<sup>18</sup> In addition, there was not time for the RAC to discuss a project that the Forest Service felt did not fit the intent of the legislation.

To date, the Olympic Peninsula RAC has not visited any projects in the field. During the 2005 meeting, the RAC chair indicated that although the option of field trips had been offered in the past and there had not been interest, they could consider doing field trips if members were interested. However, the limited time did not encourage discussion of whether RAC members would find field trips useful. RACs in other areas have scheduled field trips that have been well attended and useful tools to help members understand project goals and outcomes, evaluate the effectiveness of projects they have supported, and discuss issues of concern. Besides project-specific information, field trips can offer opportunities to discuss environmental and social issues relevant to the work, help develop shared priorities, and build a sense of group identity and ownership in the outcomes.

The limited time allotted for RAC gatherings places constraints on building cooperative relationships and collaborative decision-making processes, as intended by the legislation. The Olympic Penin-

sula RAC might consider (1) increasing the number and/or length of its meetings and, (2) scheduling trips to look at projects in the field.

#### *County Caucus Process*

Decisions for project funding are essentially made during the county caucus process. At the 2005 meeting, after the county caucuses, each county read their recommendations to the RAC and, without discussion,<sup>19</sup> a vote was held on the entire slate of projects, rather than on individual projects.

Some RAC members like the county caucus process and expressed a number of benefits including: (1) it ensures that each county gets its full Title II allocation, (2) it allows members to make decisions on projects in the geographic areas they know best—they may not know the other areas of the peninsula well and do not feel they should question the recommendations of those who live there, and (3) it is an efficient way to make decisions.

However, the county caucuses truncate collaborative decision-making by a diverse, representative body of interests. Approving projects by county caucus is inconsistent with the spirit and intent of the legislation, which requires that the entire RAC, including three categories of groups and at least three members from each of the groups, vote on each project. A supermajority— or three votes from each subgroup—is required for project approval. In interviews, current and former RAC members and some Forest Service personnel raised a variety of concerns about the county caucus process. These included (1) lack of meaningful participation for those from Thurston County, (2) lack of representation of each intended interest group in the decision-making process, (3) weakened checks and balances to ensure that projects met legislative intent, and (4) geographic fragmentation of priorities.

---

<sup>18</sup> The Olympic Province Advisory Committee (OPAC) offers a useful model. OPAC held two brief trainings on tribal consultation during its meetings to build the understanding of Forest Service personnel and OPAC members.

<sup>19</sup> In previous years there may have been more time for discussion of recommendations prior to the vote, but interviewees differed on whether the time was adequate.

The county caucus process constrains the ability of the RAC as a whole and of each representative to address issues and concerns related to all of the proposed projects. The process prevents members from one county from discussing another county's projects. Members whose interests extend beyond one county are challenged—both by the structure of the county caucus process and by limited time—to participate in discussions and decision-making in other caucuses. The Olympic Peninsula RAC process also defeats the purpose of having broader interest group participation on the RAC because only a county subset of them are part of any project decision. Indeed, one long-term RAC member didn't believe they were allowed to vote on anything other than their own county's projects, and another talked about “my RAC” in the context of each county being its own RAC. The process also excludes RAC members from Thurston County (which does not have Title II funds) from meaningful participation; if they choose a caucus to sit in on, they may not feel it is their place to influence the discussion, given that it is not “their” money.

Without a process to engage the entire RAC as an advisory body, there are limitations on the RAC's ability to explore and support multi-county projects and to address forest-wide or multi-county watershed issues. Choosing projects by county can fragment approaches to ecosystem and community health. There are, however, important exceptions. In 2004 and 2005, Jefferson County chose to support a youth project that benefited both Jefferson and Clallam counties. Title II dollars enabled Clallam County's strong noxious weed program to build the capacity of the previously unstaffed weed board in Jefferson County, and a Spanish translation and education project aimed at educating special forest product harvesters was supported by three counties.

Revising its decision-making model and process will enable the Olympic Peninsula RAC to assure that a full, representative body collaborative advises the Olympic National Forest on Title II projects.

### **Public, Agency, and Interest Group Relationship Building**

One of the purposes outlined in the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act is “to improve cooperative relationships among the people that use and care for Federal lands and the agencies that manage these lands” (Section 2(b)).

People interviewed for this study appreciate that the Title II program involves community members in decisions to allocate funds for projects that benefit the national forest. They feel that the RAC process provides people from different interest groups and counties the opportunity to better know the Forest Service and the way it operates. While some point out that significant collaborative efforts such as the watershed councils and the Northwest Forest Plan existed prior to the establishment of the RAC, all interviewees in this study spoke positively about the people and relationships involved in the RAC process, and noted positive outcomes from the Title II program. As one person commented, “People are there that would never talk to one another. Everyone is respectful.”

All federal advisory committees are subject to a Civil Rights Initiative Assessment (CRIA), and the Olympic National Forest has submitted CRIA reports on behalf of the Olympic Peninsula and Grays Harbor RACs. There are 13 Native American tribes associated with the Olympic Peninsula; the Quileute Tribe is represented on the RAC. The Quinault Indian Nation was represented on the former Grays Harbor RAC and has received one RAC grant. The Jamestown S'Klallam tribe was awarded a small RAC grant to contribute to a large estuary restoration project. Apart from these, tribes have not submitted Title II proposals. One explanation given is that, for some tribes, the allowable rate for administrative fees is too low for a Title II proposal to be feasible. In addition, the tribes already interact with the Olympic National Forest on a variety of topics. Agency personnel report that some tribes are aware of and have even written letters of support for a number of the Title II projects that the Forest Service has developed.

Apart from recruiting a representative from the Quileute Tribe to serve on the RAC, there has not been outreach to the 13 tribes specifically regarding P.L.106-393 and its provisions. The Title II program offers an opportunity for further relationship building and collaboration among the agency, tribal governments, and the RAC.

The peninsula has a growing population of Latino natural resource workers and their families, particularly in Aberdeen, Shelton, and Forks. The RAC is supporting a unique education project targeted for Latino non-timber forest product harvesters, and Pacific District Ranger Eduardo Olmedo has consulted with Latino community leaders in Forks regarding the project. However, when asked if anyone was missing in the RAC process, none of the interviewees in this study mentioned the local Latino community as a group that should be included or represented, although urban communities of color in the Seattle area were mentioned. This is not unusual in rural settings where immigrants are largely “invisible” in civic processes, but a public involvement process like the Resource Advisory Committee presents a remarkable, and yet untapped, opportunity for outreach, relationship building, and creatively engaging Latino communities in forest processes, projects, and outcomes.<sup>20</sup>

### **County Government-RAC-Forest Service Relations**

All RAC members and Forest Service personnel interviewed spoke positively of the relationships between the agency and RAC members, and felt that their work together was congenial and efficient. While the RAC process brings people together who have very different viewpoints, there

was no acrimony among RAC members, county officials, or the participating Forest Service personnel.

The Olympic National Forest has faced severe staffing cuts in the last 15 years, consolidating ranger districts and closing district offices. Given reduced staff presence in the field, the Title II program and the RAC process provide a venue for local communities and county officials to remain in touch with the agency and to build relationships with agency staff. As one county commissioner noted, “When we had local ranger districts, we had a closer relationship with the Forest Service. We lost some of that. But the RAC brought us together again and we’re getting to know some of the folks at headquarters.” At the project level, the Title II program has fostered county-agency collaboration in new ways. In particular, the Title II funds and process opened the doors for active collaboration between the Forest Service and the counties to address noxious weeds.

Leaders at the Olympic National Forest are positive about the RAC process as a means for citizens to be involved in decision-making about projects that benefit forest resources. The forest places a premium on positive community relationships, to the point that staff have chosen to live with a couple of projects that the RAC supported, but that staff didn’t feel met the legislative intent of benefiting resources on the forest and for the general public. As one forest staff member commented, “It’s part of the idea of not having all of the say so. It’s part of inviting people into the process.” In return, interviews with RAC members and project proponents indicated that there was significant understanding and empathy for what the agency is mandated to accomplish with limited staffing and funds.

---

<sup>20</sup> It is important to note that the Olympic National Forest has no administrative budget specifically for coordinating the RAC or for outreach to community groups currently outside the process. Several staff commented that a challenge of the program is that it creates more work without additional funds for travel or staff time. While project budgets include an administrative fee, the Forest Service has chosen to feed these fees into the forest’s overall administration budget, rather than for RAC-specific activities. Even if retained specifically for Title II, current administrative fees may cover little more than grant and contract administration costs. Whether the Forest Service dedicates more internal administrative funds, which is unlikely given the continued decline in agency funding, or obtains money from Title II administrative overhead charges, funds are needed to coordinate the RAC in a manner that best enables it to accomplish its work.

## Conclusion

The Title III programs in Clallam, Grays Harbor, Jefferson, and Mason Counties and the Title II Olympic Peninsula RAC effectively advance the intent and purposes of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act. They promote “employment opportunities through projects that improve the maintenance of existing infrastructure, implement stewardship objectives that enhance forest ecosystems, and restore and improve land health and water quality” (P.L.106-393 2b). A number of the Title II and III projects dovetail with other collaborative planning and program efforts involving local, county, state, and federal partners, such as the Dungeness River Management Team, and help to advance objectives that extend beyond the scope of a discrete project.

The Title III projects approved by commissioners in these counties accomplish work on the ground that, overall, upholds the intent of the legislation, often complementing the intent and projects of the Title II program. Many projects promote collaboration and leverage partnerships, funds, and in-kind goods and services, multiplying the potential effect of project outcomes. Title III dollars are enabling counties to implement projects for ecological and community health that they would not otherwise be able to accomplish.

That said, counties on the Olympic Peninsula could make their Title III programs even more successful by improving their project solicitation and selection processes. Some counties have blurred the distinction between the discrete projects envisioned in the legislation and internal administrative allocations to county programs. Title III programs in Olympic Peninsula counties will “improve cooperative relationships” as called for in the legislation by developing a public and competitive process for funding projects that includes a call for project proposals that is open to groups beyond county programs. Clallam County provides a good model.

The guiding priority of the Olympic Peninsula RAC is to invest in projects that

maximize benefits for the intertwined goals of sound road access and watershed health. More than 75% of the funds the RAC has allocated have gone to watershed and roads projects, including fish barrier removal and culvert replacement, decommissioning, sediment reduction, washout repair, hydraulic management, erosion control, and stream monitoring. Paired with the wildlife and fish habitat improvement projects and noxious weed control projects, which support watershed health, the percentage rises to 89%. Finally, many of the activities of the youth employment projects focus on watershed maintenance and improvements.

To its credit, the Olympic Peninsula RAC recognizes the magnitude of managing the massive roads system and watersheds on the forest, in the context of a changed political and economic landscape. The RAC occasionally funds planning processes (such as a project to prioritize the most critical culvert replacements) and at times strategically funds projects in phases, including the design phase. Whether always by design or at times serendipitous, this method appears to be strategic on multiple levels:

1. Funding the design phase of a project allows the project to advance and enables the Forest Service to seek other funds for implementation, thereby leveraging RAC investments.
2. Complex projects that meet multiple management objectives can take multiple years. Funding discrete phases of a project increases the likelihood of overall project success by ensuring completion of more manageable steps before allocating additional funds.
3. Restoration projects seem to be particularly amenable to adaptive management—that is, they can pose unforeseen challenges

and puzzles. Funding complex projects in phases can allow the time needed to figure out the best way to accomplish it, and return to the RAC the following year with a second proposal that includes an adapted implementation plan.

4. Breaking the project into discrete phases opens the door for local contractors to bid for the portions of the overall project that match their capacities.

In keeping with the overall goals of the legislation, the RAC has been successful in helping to generate and/or maintain local employment through roads and restoration projects that are appropriate for local contractors and crews. Of the 12 contracts that have been awarded on projects to date, 10 have gone to local contractors. One of the two non-local contracts was a project design contract, which a local contractor implemented. In addition, the RAC invests in building job readiness skills and a stewardship ethic in the youth of its communities—the future caretakers of the peninsula. If there is a critique that RAC members have of project accomplishments, it is that a few are not sure the Title II and Title III dollars are attaining their promise of generating local employment—family wage jobs—for communities struggling to survive in a changing economy. While most see value in training young people, some question investing so much money into youth programs – given that so few funds are focused on generating projects in the woods and former timber workers and their families are struggling. Others point to the importance of investing in the futures of youth put at-risk by socioeconomic dislocation in their communities and building protective factors like job training, sense of place, and stewardship. As in so many cases of limited dollars and competing priorities, the best option for healthy communities is not “either/or” but “both.”

Finally, the Olympic Peninsula RAC has very successfully leveraged additional dollars, more than doubling funds available to accomplish projects on the ground.

Without diminishing these successes, there is room for improvement in the Olympic Peninsula Title II program. Three areas that could be improved include developing a project prioritization process that engages the Resource Advisory Committee as a whole, undertaking strategic planning with a forest-wide view, and creating mechanisms for reporting and monitoring project outcomes. These measures will help the Olympic Peninsula RAC be even more successful in building collaborative relationships, upholding the intent of the legislation, and moving toward its full potential as an advisory body to the Olympic National Forest.

The Olympic Peninsula RAC currently uses a process to select projects that (1) does not allow adequate time for discussion and collaborative decision-making and (2) does not fully engage the entire RAC in the decision-making process. The RAC and the agency might consider more frequent or longer meetings and perhaps field trips. Field trips can help deepen understanding of the management issues at stake, and foster a sense of group identity from which to articulate shared goals. The meeting agenda can be adjusted to limit project presentations to ensure that there is adequate time for discussion of priorities as a group. Finally, representation of diverse interests, and the creation of voting groups based on clusters of interests, were carefully outlined in the legislation; county caucuses are inappropriate as the primary decision-making groups. However the Olympic Peninsula RAC chooses to balance county discussions with RAC discussions, prioritizing and selecting projects should engage the entire RAC as a representative advisory body.

The RAC’s process of selecting projects—meeting one day per year and for all intents and purposes deciding by county caucus—discourages building a landscape level awareness to guide the RAC’s work. While RACs in general are challenged to make project selections based on a forest-wide vision and plan, given over a decade’s experience of watershed-level thinking and planning on the peninsula, and the capacity for multi-layered collaboration, the Olympic Peninsula RAC has the potential to begin addressing

landscape-level needs and priorities. Its project selections show a clear prioritization of the relationship between roads and watershed health, and it has had four years of successful working together (including integrating two RACs into one) to accomplish beneficial outcomes. The RAC maintains productive relationships among counties, within the RAC, and with the Forest Service. Given that dollars are limited and the watershed management needs on a forest of this size and diversity are great, with its second charter, the Olympic Peninsula RAC might consider ways to develop more of a forest-wide vision among its members, in partnership with the Olympic National Forest.

Finally, there is room for improvement in monitoring and reporting project outcomes. Apart from the project proposals and presentations by proponents for continuing funds, the Olympic Peninsula RAC does not have a mechanism to monitor or receive reports on project outcomes and employment created or maintained. Although county commissioners may informally follow progress of various projects in their areas, for the most part, RAC members do not see monitoring as part of their charge. Interviews with Forest Service personnel indicate that monitoring of Title

II projects is focused on contracts and agreement implementation rather than on project effectiveness and outcomes. The Olympic National Forest does not have the time or dollars necessary to monitor project outcomes. The legislation requires that Title II project proposals include monitoring plans. Follow-up on monitoring for outcomes and effectiveness is a challenge for RACs and forests across the nation. As a start, the Olympic Peninsula RAC might consider developing a simple report form to require of all projects upon completion. This will help the RAC develop a sense of its shared accomplishments to help guide its future work.

These critiques notwithstanding, the Title II and Title III programs have successfully implemented the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act to accomplish a range of worthy projects that benefit the social and ecological conditions of the communities and national forestlands of the Olympic Peninsula. The collaborative work of Clallam, Grays Harbor, Mason, and Jefferson Counties, the Olympic National Forest, and the Olympic Peninsula Resource Advisory Committee provide valuable lessons from which others implementing P.L.106-393 can benefit.

**Olympic Peninsula Resource Advisory Committee  
Interview Participants**

**In Person:**

Brando Blore, Former RAC member, Clallam County  
Marilyn Bremer, WSU Cooperative Extension/4-H, Mason County  
Al Carter, RAC Member, Grays Harbor County  
Carol Dargatz, Jefferson County Noxious Weed Control Board  
Phil Decillis, Olympic National Forest  
Karl Denison, Olympic National Forest  
Mike Doherty, RAC Chair, Clallam County  
Ken Eldredge, Olympic National Forest  
Jim Freed, RAC member, Mason County  
Ginnie Grilley, Acting Forest Supervisor, Olympic National Forest  
Delann Haglund, RAC Member, Grays Harbor County  
Dale Hom, Supervisor, Olympic National Forest  
Glen Huntingford, RAC Member, Jefferson County  
Richard Hsu, RAC Member, Clallam County  
Wes Johnson, RAC member, Mason County  
Katie Krueger, RAC member, Clallam County  
Cathy Lucero, Clallam County Noxious Weed Control Board  
Maureen McCracken, WSU Cooperative Extension/4-H, Mason County  
David Morrison, RAC Member, Grays Harbor County  
Eduardo Olmedo, Pacific Ranger District, Olympic National Forest  
Bonnie Phillips, Former RAC member, Thurston County  
Tami Pokorny, Jefferson County Natural Resources  
Monte Reinders, Jefferson County Public Works  
Pamela Roberts, WSU Cooperative Extension/4-H, Jefferson County  
Tom Robinson, Washington State Association of Counties  
Bill Shelmerdine, Olympic National Forest  
Bob Simmons, Washington State University, Cooperative Extension/4-H, Mason County  
Frank Trafton, RAC Member, Jefferson County  
Karen Vohnhoff, Olympic National Forest  
Russell Westmark, RAC Replacement/Former member, Clallam County  
Darryl Borden, Washington Conservation Corps, Crew lead  
Jake Shaddox, Washington Conservation Corps, Crewmember  
Kevin Robbins, Washington Conservation Corps, Crewmember  
Amy Spoon, Washington Conservation Corps, Crewmember  
Jesse Udem, Washington Conservation Corps, Crewmember

**By Phone:**

Val Addleman, Addleman Construction  
Scott Haggerty, Olympic National Forest  
Roland McGill, Washington Conservation Corps  
Larry Ogg, Olympic National Forest  
Craig Ottavelli, RAC Member, Thurston County  
Allen Sartin, Jefferson County (short interview)  
Max Stocks, Former RAC Member, Grays Harbor (partial interview)  
Bill Whitson, US Forest Service Region 6 (short interview)