

Mapleton, Lane County, Oregon

Conducted by Elyse Niemann

NEAI Projects*

Mapleton Projects				
Year	Applicant	Project	Funding Source**	Amount
1994	Port of Siuslaw	Community Development Project Beautification	FS-RCA	\$293,500
1995	Mapleton Water District	Water System Improvements	CDBG	\$35,000
1996	Mapleton Water District	Mapleton Water Quality Improvement - Phase II & III	CDBG	\$100,000
County-Wide Projects				
1995	Lane County	Lane County Technical Assistance	FS-RCA	\$15,000
1994	Southern Willamette Private Industry Council	Dislocated Worker Training	JTPA	\$461,215
1994	Southern Willamette Private Industry Council	Dislocated Worker Program	JTPA	\$810,000
1994	Southern Willamette Private Industry Council		JTPA	\$554,485
1995	Southern Willamette Private Industry Council	Dislocated Worker Retraining, Timber 10	JTPA	\$1,229,335

* Project funding reflects initial loan and grant totals. Final funding amounts may be different.

** Key to funding sources: FS-RCA = Forest Service-Rural Community Assistance, CDBG = Community Development Block Grant, JTPA = Job Training Partnership Act. BLM = Bureau of Land Management, FWS-JITW = U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service-Jobs-in-the-Woods.

Jobs-in-the-Woods Projects

Year	Applicant	Project Name	Funding Source	Amount
1994		Jobs-in-the-Woods Contracts	BLM/FS	\$1,800,565
1995	NRCD: Siuslaw Soil & Water Conservation District	Deadwood Creek Watershed Restoration	FWS_JITW	\$32,500
1995	Oregon Dept. Fish & Wildlife	Wolf Creek & Wildcat Creek Habitat Enhancement	FWS_JITW	\$108,000
1995	Oregon Dept. Fish & Wildlife	N. Fork Siuslaw Habitat Enhancement	FWS_JITW	\$25,065

Background Context

Nestled in Oregon’s coast range, 14 miles from the Pacific Ocean and 45 miles west of Eugene, Mapleton lies on the banks of the Siuslaw River in Lane County. With a landscape characterized by steep forested slopes and hundreds of waterways, those that have inhabited the area over the past century have survived relative isolation, periodic landslides and floods, and economic challenges associated with being closely tied to natural resources. Mapleton residents rely on both individual determination and community support. Today the community reflects this rugged independence and “pioneer spirit” with an ability to come together in challenging times.

To some travelers, Mapleton is a wide spot in the road on the way to the coast from Eugene, situated at the junction of Highways 126 and 36. Mapleton residents enjoy close proximity to the coast without the frequency of cold fog. Local recreation activities include swimming, fishing, and hunting. Life-long residents recall the “old days” when the salmon runs filled the creeks with so many fish that you could “walk across on their backs.” In the past 30 years, an influx of “back to the landers” and retirees have brought new residents to the area.

For this study, the Mapleton community is defined by the School District boundaries. In 2000, 2,355 residents lived in this area, down from 2,461 in 1990 (U.S. Census tract 5 (2000) and 5.98 percent (1990)). According to most interviewees, the

school is the center of the community and the place that brings everyone together. The district stretches up the Siuslaw River from Mapleton and includes the small settlements of Swisshome and Deadwood.

Brief History

Early Settlement and Logging Practices

The earliest inhabitants of the Mapleton region were the Siuslaw Indians, who lived in settlements along the Siuslaw River. Unlike most Oregon tribes that were forced to relocate to distant reservations during the mid-1800s, the Siuslaw were allowed to remain on their original village sites (Halliday and Chehak 2000). In 1876, however, the U.S. government opened their land to homesteaders (Siuslaw Pioneer 1956). The Indians were given the choice to stay and work the land like the homesteaders or to move to another reservation. Many chose to stay.

Most early Anglo-European settlers of the Mapleton area pieced together a living from logging, fishing, or farming, or some combination of the three. Surrounded by rugged mountains, the Siuslaw River linked Mapleton to the outside world, and a small business district gradually grew up around the river. In 1886, early residents built Mapleton’s first school, post office, and hotel.

The earliest loggers used cable logging techniques and steam engines called “donkeys” to pile the logs next to the creeks. When the floods came,

the logs washed downstream to the mills along the river. The Forest Service started building roads in the 1930s and 1940s and began offering public timber sales. Gradually, small logging companies began to dominate the market in the 1940s and 1950s, but were replaced by the large timber corporations beginning in the 1960s.

Timber Industry in the Post-War Era

The economic boom in the Mapleton area occurred following World War II. The Mapleton Ranger District became a major supplier of timber for the national plywood industry. Two large mills in Mapleton, both initially owned by U.S. Plywood and then purchased by Champion, employed between 300 and 500 people. Several smaller mills operated along the river, running two to three shifts. Current residents who grew up during this time, recall a surplus of jobs and abundant work for high school kids in the woods during the summer. According to some residents, if you were laid off one day, you could stop by the bar and find a job starting the very next day. This lasted into the early 1980s. Several respondents indicated that cutting in the 1970s and 1980s fueled this boom, but it was not sustainable. When wood-product prices began to fall, many big companies consolidated or sold their mills. In the early 1980s, Champion sold both its Mapleton mills to Davidson's Industries, a locally-owned and operated company, which also operated a mill upriver near Swisshome. According to interviewees, Davidson's employed approximately 450 workers at that time.

In 1983, the National Wildlife Federation and others filed suit against the Forest Service, claiming that the steep slopes and shallow, unstable soils on the Mapleton Ranger District were highly susceptible to landslides following timber harvests, which damage waterways. The court ordered the Forest Service to conduct an environmental review and produce an Environmental Impact Statement before offering to sell, "any timber on the Mapleton Ranger District other than limited commercial thinning, commercial and non-commercial firewood, greenery sales, and salvage of dead and downed timber sales (Appendices – Volume I Final Environmental Impact Statement Land and Resource Management Plan Siuslaw Na-

tional Forest p. E1)." Following this injunction, timber harvests fell from 75 million board feet (mbf) in 1983, to 15 mbf in 1984 on the Mapleton Ranger District (Mapleton Ranger District Data). Some study participants claim that this had a significant economic impact on Mapleton, and the community began suffering the social and economic effects of layoffs in the timber industry. Without employment and timber supply data from local mills operating at that time, however, it is difficult to make this link directly since mills often receive timber from an area larger than one ranger district.

By 1989, only four mills remained in the Mapleton area—two near Mapleton and two in Swisshome. By 1991, only Davidson's Industries and American Laminator remained. In 1993, the Forest Service did not sell a single board-foot from the Mapleton District. The only surviving mills were those that had a private land base. While other companies were investing profits in mill expansion, Davidson's bought property. In 1993, they continued to employ approximately 225 workers, relying on their own private forest lands. Today they employ 100 workers, and many people in the community wonder how much longer they will be able to sustain operations.

Back-to-the-Land Movement

In the 1970s, a popular movement of people from urban areas into rural communities changed rural life in many areas in Oregon. During this time, a small group of people started an intentional community, the Alpha Farm, near Deadwood, just upriver from Mapleton. They opened a restaurant and store in Mapleton (the Alpha Bit) and became involved in the community. People who lived on the Alpha Farm generally had different political and social views (e.g., they opposed logging) than longtime Mapleton residents. Many long-standing residents were wary of these newcomers in their community. Some residents, however, went out of their way to welcome them and to encourage the rest of the community to do the same. Reportedly, when the restaurant opened in the late 1970s, every morning before work, the head of the bank, the barber, and the owner of the antique shop would come to the Alpha Bit for coffee. As time passed and several residents of

the Alpha Farm remained and actively participated in the Mapleton community, these “newcomers” became accepted and respected community members. Despite differing political views, community members have found a great deal of common ground and frequently work together on community projects, including those funded through the NEAI.

Relocation of the Forest Service Ranger Station

A source of social distress in Mapleton began in 1995 when the local Forest Service office announced that the Mapleton Ranger Station was required to move to a location beyond the 100-year floodplain. Fearful of losing what little was left of their former economic base, Mapleton residents rallied to find an alternative site for the offices. They wrote letters to Washington D.C., sent petitions, held town hall meetings, wrote letters to newspapers, and found an alternative site that would meet the Forest Service requirements. In the end, however, the Mapleton Ranger District offices relocated to Florence. Agency representatives maintain that Florence was chosen because it was the most cost-effective. The loss of the district office dealt a tremendous blow to the community. “It was like a double negative,” reported one life-long resident. According to several interviewees, first, government regulations restricted timber harvests, and then they picked up and moved out of town. “It was our government bailing out on us,” said another resident.

Community Development Prior to NEAI

Mapleton residents have a history of organizing and activism. In the 1970s, a group of community members raised money to build a competition-size swimming pool for Mapleton. They created the Mapleton Community Foundation to manage tax-deductible donations. The community raised over \$200,000 for this state-of-the-art indoor facility. Contributions from Davidson’s Industries helped to finish the project.

In addition, one community leader secured a grant from Bill Bowerman, the inventor of Nike shoes, in the early 1990s, to upgrade their running track from a muddy, run-down facility to an all-weather, rubberized-surface track. Mr. Bowerman

agreed to contribute \$25,000 to the \$75,000 project. Various individuals and businesses donated approximately \$15,000 in labor, materials, and equipment. The school district paid less than \$1,000 and the community raised the remaining \$35,000 through donations and various fundraisers. Most estimated completion of the track would take two years, but with residents rallying to the cause, the project was completed in just over eight months. The exemplary ability of people in the Mapleton area to pull together to both fund and build these facilities amidst economic hardship (in the case of the track), indicates a community with high capacity to rally around and implement projects.

In 1987, sewage disposal problems plagued the retail businesses along the river. Septic systems were leaking and sewage flowed directly into the Siuslaw River. The Lane County economic development specialist worked with business owners to form a nonprofit organization to manage a sewer system and assisted them with securing loans to develop a sewer system and treatment facility. Thus began a cooperative relationship between Lane County and the community of Mapleton for community and economic development projects.

In 1989, the State of Oregon Community Initiatives Program began working with communities that experienced mill closures to build community capacity and facilitate economic development by training residents in leadership and community problem solving. Lane County recommended that Mapleton be included. The Lane Council of Governments and the University of Oregon Planning Department provided the training for four Mapleton residents. In 1989, the Lane County Community Economic Development Program conducted a Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT) Analysis. Following this analysis, the Mapleton Community Response Team (CRT) formed to write a strategic plan, with the assistance of the Oregon Economic Development Department (today the Oregon Economic and Community Development Department), to prepare Mapleton for future grant opportunities. The CRT never became an “official” organization, but convened “as needed” to address community issues. The CRT has not been

active for the past four years, but residents say that if an issue arises, or someone has an idea, he or she invites various residents to a meeting to organize. One resident described the CRT as the unofficial city council of “butcher, baker, and candlestick maker.” While the CRT may not appear organized to outside observers, the general sentiment is that they get the job done.

Mapleton residents identified community beautification in the SWOT Analysis as a priority for economic development. At one time, the Mapleton business district faced the river. When the highway and railroad came to Mapleton, the businesses “turned their back” on the river to face the highway. River Drive became run down, unpleasant, and residents referred to it as “Back Street.” With help from Lane County and the Port of Siuslaw, the CRT organized a riverfront development project and in 1993, completed a public dock along the river behind the businesses, funded by the Oregon State Marine Board, and the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife.

With the help of Lane County, the Mapleton CRT also pursued infrastructure projects outside of NEAI. Following the floods in 1996, the Lion’s Club, which owns the old high school building, secured funds from Lane County, as well as private organizations to repair flood damage and renovate the building in order to convert it into a community center. Today this building holds a gymnasium, the Mapleton Water District, the Mapleton Public Library, the Lion’s club meeting room and kitchen, a pre-school, and the Siuslaw Area Women’s Center.

Watershed Restoration Efforts Prior to NEAI

In the 1980s, residents of Deadwood became increasingly dissatisfied with the lack of coordination among federal agencies, state agencies, and property owners managing land in the watershed. They decided to form a Coordinated Resource Management Program (CRMP), which brought parties to the table to discuss and plan management of the Deadwood Creek watershed. They created the first detailed map of the Deadwood watershed with scissors and tape (since each agency had a map of only part of the watershed), identified how land use had

altered habitat, proposed remedies, and eventually finished a watershed assessment and plan. If a resource management issue arises, residents of the watershed call a meeting, and agency representatives must attend.

In the past, logging companies cleared streams of debris in order to facilitate log transport, but they also thought that it would facilitate salmon spawning by removing obstacles. Obstacle removal also removed nutrients from the ecosystem and spawning shelters. Without obstacles, the stream flow accelerated and sped the erosion processes along banks and in the streambed. Also, the exposed bedrock in the streambeds absorbed more heat, effectively raising the water temperature. Instream structures involve placing logs and boulders secured with cable in streams in order to slow water flow and provide shelter for fish. In the late 1980s, the State of Oregon launched a watershed restoration campaign. The lack of dams and the presence of salmon in the Siuslaw watershed increased the area’s attractiveness for funding. The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, in cooperation with the Siuslaw Soil and Water Conservation District, began involving landowners in creek restoration in order to enhance salmon habitat.

Key Issues

Changes in Employment Sectors and Poverty

The decline in the timber industry regionally and locally had a severe effect on the working families of Mapleton. Many families left the community to take jobs elsewhere. For those that remained in Mapleton, some respondents reported additional stress on the family structure because the household income earners often had to travel great distances to work. Participation in elementary school free lunch programs can be used as an indicator of poverty. In 1993, 51 percent of children at Mapleton Elementary participated in this program.

Between 1980 and 1990, the number of people over the age of 16 employed in the Mapleton area fell by 10 percent, from 1,039 to 935. The manufacturing sector lost 200 jobs (from 524 to 324) and 43 jobs were lost in agriculture, fishing, mining, and tree falling (from 134 to 91). Service jobs increased by

59 (from 163 to 222) and retail trade gained 35 jobs (from 106 to 141). In 1989, per capita income in the Mapleton area was \$9,994 as compared to \$13,418 for the state. In the Mapleton area, 12.9 percent of the residents lived below the poverty level, while nine percent of the state population lived at this level.

Declining School Enrollment

The decline in enrollment in Mapleton schools was of primary concern to all participants in this study. Mapleton schools received funds based on enrollment as well as annual timber receipts.¹ Thus,

the simultaneous exodus of families and decline of timber harvests heavily impacted Mapleton schools. Enrollment fell from 464 in 1980/81 to 371 in the 1990/91 school year, a 20 percent decline for all grade levels. (Mapleton School District).

Zoning

Strict zoning regulations limit options for commercial development because most of Mapleton lies in the 100-year floodplain. Many residents feel this limits the town's options and potential for economic diversification.

NEAI Projects and Programs

CERT Process

Institutional Structure and Function

Lane County

The Lane Council of Governments, a voluntary association of local governments in Lane County, Oregon, serves the county, the 12 cities within the county, public utilities, and other special districts. They have three divisions: Local Government Services, Regional Technology Services, and Senior and Disabled Services. In addition, the agency serves as a regional planning, coordination, program-development, and service-delivery organization. Typically, Lane Council of Governments conducts or facilitates multi-jurisdictional planning and program development necessary to solve problems or provide services. The Lane Council of Governments' Economic Committee approves and prioritizes CERT projects within the County. In order to keep a geographic and organizational balance, this committee includes 15 representatives from the private sector, government, and education on this committee. The CERT process, currently known as the Needs and Issues Inventory, accomplishes two purposes: (1) it motivates communities to prioritize projects; and (2) helps the State prioritize its own planning by understanding communities' needs.

When the Lane Economic Committee prioritizes and submits its top 15 projects, the com-

mittee attempts to represent all communities who have submitted applications. Project evaluation criteria currently include rural status, project readiness, leverage/match, job and economic impact, support of a strategic plan, community foundation building, and overall value. Projects that have been on the list for a number of years and with a high priority from their community tend to receive higher rankings. While the communities' own ranking generally holds at the county level (Lane Council of Governments would rate a Mapleton water project receiving a top priority at the community level higher than the community's next priority), top priorities are not always funded because of costs.

At the outset of the NEAI, smaller communities without a manager were often at a disadvantage. Despite mailing notices to 300 organizations that included all Lane County communities, watershed councils, nonprofits, and school districts, some communities did not participate. To help address these issues, the Economic Development Administration provided Lane Council of Governments \$95,000 per year between 1994 and 1998 to coordinate the CERT process and provide technical assistance to communities. These monies facilitated the Lane Council of Governments' provision of a broad spectrum of services, including helping smaller communities without staff complete forms, perform project and budgeting

1. Because communities adjacent to public lands did not receive revenues from property taxes, the Forest Service set up a system whereby a portion of yearly timber receipts funded local schools.

assistance, as well as grant writing. The Mapleton area, however, did not receive direct assistance from the Lane Council of Governments.

Mapleton

Unincorporated communities like Mapleton did not have city staff to represent the community in the CERT process. Lane County, recognizing this disadvantage, took the responsibility of representing and assisting 35 unincorporated communities in the CERT process. Lane County secured \$15,000 from an Old Growth Diversification Fund (administered by Oregon Economic and Community Development Department) through the CERT process, and an additional \$20,000 from other sources, for a staff person to work with the county economic development specialist to assist unincorporated communities in accessing funding for projects. These individuals offered assistance to Mapleton in identifying projects, applying for funding, and implementing projects. Several Mapleton residents stated that these county employees have been vital in bringing positive change to Mapleton.

Both Mapleton residents and Lane County employees viewed the NEAI, and specifically, the CERT process, as one of the many methods of funding projects. In fact, neither community members nor county employees made a clear distinction between NEAI projects and projects funded through other methods. They simply followed the prescribed steps to fund their projects. According to one county employee, having all agencies at the table when deciding how to fund a project, while helpful, did not preclude the applicant from putting the funding package together in advance. “It doesn’t materialize by itself,” said one county employee. Furthermore, the majority of community projects that took place in Mapleton were not a part of NEAI—rather they were supported through private monies or directly through Lane County.

CERT Projects

Community Development Projects Beautification

In 1994, the Mapleton CRT partnered with the Port of Siuslaw and applied for a \$293,000 grant from the Forest Service Rural Community Assistance pro-

gram to renovate Mapleton’s riverfront businesses and convert the area into an attractive historic district. As an unincorporated community, Mapleton lacks the structure to administer grants itself. Though the Port had economic development interests in Mapleton, it decided not to contract with the CRT for the historic renovations of the buildings because it did not feel comfortable granting public monies to private businesses. The Cascade Pacific Resource Conservation and Development Council (a quasi-governmental Resource Conservation and Development District based in Corvallis) agreed to contract with the CRT to administer the project. The CRT and Mapleton business owners hoped to build on the dock project by renovating the river-facing sides of businesses and cleaning up the street in order to attract more visitors and possibly new businesses.

Project implementation by many parties, from business owners to government agencies, resulted in a very challenging environment for decision making. Lane County’s Rural Development Coordinator provided technical assistance to write the grant and worked closely with the Forest Service in project implementation. Cascade Pacific Resource Conservation and Development Council (Cascade Pacific RC&D) managed the funds and administered the project. The CRT facilitated communication between Cascade Pacific RC&D and business owners. A University of Oregon Landscape Studio Design Class produced the original conceptual design for this project, but it did not take road setbacks and floodplain issues into consideration. Therefore, part of the grant money was used to hire a professional architect to design and plan the project.

With so many interests at the table and no previously agreed upon plan, deciding exactly how to spend funds proved arduous. Everyone involved experienced frustration. Initially, the parties debated how to spend the money. The architect hired by Cascade Pacific Resource and Conservation District to design the renovations looked at historical photographs of the old riverfront businesses and submitted a design to the business owners. This design included porches, new color schemes, a covered sidewalk linking the fronts of the buildings to the back, a boardwalk along the river, and lattice to hide dumpsters and



Mapleton Community Beautification Project-Business along “Back Street”

other storage devices. Significant disagreement resulted from these plans and tensions rose between the business owners, the architect, and project managers. At least one business owner strongly objected to the color scheme chosen for his business. The business owner with the right-of-way for the covered sidewalk would not allow it to be built. Finally, county-zoning laws prohibited construction of a boardwalk because of the road width, floodplain restrictions, and building code issues. Further complicating project implementation, two floods in 1996 carried mud and water into the lower stories of the businesses.

Despite these obstacles, the project succeeded in securing new signs for the businesses, upgrading and revitalizing six businesses, having a mural painted on the side of one building and building an information kiosk near the dock. Businesses hired local contractors to work on their buildings. Following project completion, members of the CRT organized a Salmon Festival on the river behind these businesses. Most residents agree that prior to this renovation, “Back Street” was an unattractive place where no one would have considered holding a gathering. With the passing of time, however, some of the renovation and upgrades have not held up well. On one building, the old paint bled through the new coat and much of the lattice was damaged during the floods. Some businesses no longer conceal their dumpsters and storage

units and, instead, leave them exposed to the street. Nonetheless, residents report travelers consistently use the park and picnic area.

Local business owners and members of the CRT appreciated the work of Lane County, the Regional Forest Service, and Cascade Pacific Resource and Conservation District to help implement the project, although some expressed frustration with the “strings” attached to federally-funded projects, such as the inflexibility of the architect’s plans, lack of input from the businesses on those plans, and strict contracting guidelines. While business owners recognized the importance of government oversight, they felt that the requirement to comply with the architect’s plans, many of which they did not like, was too restrictive. Some interviewees, involved in the project from outside the community, expressed frustration at the apparent unwillingness of the community to follow protocol. Residents and agency people alike describe the project meetings as contentious, with high levels of frustration and disagreement. Following project completion, all parties were exhausted and the Forest Service had little desire to pursue additional projects which were not embraced by all community interests involved. According to one resident, the CRT tried unsuccessfully to apply to the Forest Service for more money to put in a sidewalk, planters, and parking. Most involved residents, however, recall feeling tired

with little energy to pursue additional projects. In addition, they felt as if they had gotten their fair share of the money available to communities.

Mapleton Area Master Plan

Part of the Forest Service grant money also went toward the Mapleton Area Master Plan, developed by the consulting firm MLP Associates, in Eugene, to move forward on additional community development projects. A primary objective was to integrate past projects with new and emerging opportunities by updating the Mapleton Area Comprehensive Plan. Based on community meetings and mail surveys (948 surveys were mailed to residents within the Mapleton School District and 228 surveys were returned), the consultants identified key issues and outlined specific recommendations for future projects and development. Frustrated with this study, many respondents felt they had enough planning documents (the CRT updated the Strategic Plan in 1994) and that the money could have gone to on-the-ground projects.

Mapleton Water Quality Improvement Phase II and III

In 1994, Mapleton was required to meet new standards for drinking water but lacked resources to do so. Mapleton had four primary issues to address: 1) after four or five days of rain, Mapleton's domestic water source, Birkshire Creek, becomes laden with sediment and cannot be used for drinking water; 2) the community's storage facilities could not store enough water to meet demand during storm events; 3) the system did not guarantee sufficient chlorine "contact time" to kill giardia and other micro-organisms; and 4) old pipes were falling apart and needed to be replaced.

In 1995, the Mapleton Water District applied for a Community Development Block Grant to upgrade its system. Mapleton met the criteria to receive grants and had money in the Water District budget as well as in-kind donations for the required match. Lane County provided technical assistance for the project. Initially, the Mapleton Water district received a \$35,000 Community Development Block Grant to produce a Master Water System Plan for the community. The Water District contracted with Sys-

tems West Engineers, Inc. of Eugene, who completed the study in December 1995. They estimated that upgrading the system would cost \$1,208,500. The Water District received another Community Development Block Grant through the CERT process for \$100,000 in 1996 to design the system. The balance of the funding for upgrading the water system came from a Community Development Block Grant, but not through the CERT process.

Challenges in project implementation included four different engineers working at different times. Though vital to improving the community's water system, many people felt that this project would have been funded without NEAI.

Jobs-in-the-Woods

Institutional Structure and Function

A number of Jobs-in-the-Woods projects, sponsored by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) in partnership with landowners and other state and federal agencies, took place in the Mapleton area. Following the Northwest Forest Plan, the FWS received additional funding to implement the Jobs-in-the-Woods program. In 1994, Oregon only received \$50,000, but in 1995 they received \$1.2 million, and \$680,000 annually from 1996 until today. The goals of the program were to:

support watershed restoration projects on nonfederal lands to improve or restore watershed health, provide employment and training opportunities to timber-dependent community workers, complement ongoing watershed restoration efforts on federal lands, provide benefits to federally significant fish, wildlife, and plant species and their habitats as listed by the National Marine Fisheries Services and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (<http://pacific.fws.gov/jobs/orojitw/default.htm>).

Another important component of projects funded through FWS is outreach and education. Though the FWS lacks sufficient funds to restore watersheds on a large scale, its programs expose landowners to alternative management practices. These landowners in



Stream structures on Deadwood Creek

turn may share this knowledge with others, thus affecting a larger area.

Applicants eligible for funding included non-profit organizations and government entities. The Oregon Economic and Development Department sent information about the program to watershed councils, soil and water conservation districts, tribal governments, and various state agencies and government entities, encouraging them to apply for watershed restoration projects through the CERT process. FWS required projects to take place on non-federal land and in counties affected by the Northwest Forest Plan. Eligible projects had to be part of a watershed assessment or plan.

Applicants submitted proposals to the Lane Council of Governments for consideration in the CERT process. Representatives from the FWS sat on the CERT and participated in the Ecosystem Investment Team, which included representatives from the FWS, Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, and Bureau of Indian Affairs. Agency representatives agreed to fund projects that fit with their agency's mission and requirements. The FWS representatives proposed a longer pre-application for watershed res-

toration projects, and the Ecosystem Investment Team agreed. Thus, applicants for watershed restoration filled out a different form than applicants for other project categories. From 1994 to 1998, the Oregon Economic Development Department administered all Jobs-in-the-Woods grants. In 1999, the Ecosystem Investment Team dropped out of the CERT process. The FWS maintained their program and administered it internally.

In Oregon, the FWS adopted a funding strategy that attempted to fund projects, which varied in scope as well as location. They decided to limit awards to roughly \$60,000 per applicant per year. Because the FWS was not accustomed to addressing socioeconomic aspects of watershed restoration, they had a difficult time incorporating dislocated worker training and employment into watershed projects. They encouraged applicants to include training components into their projects, but relatively few contractors took this option. The FWS did not have specific mechanisms or incentives for hiring dislocated timber workers because of the difficulty in identifying them. The FWS decided to focus on timber-dependent communities and if a worker was from

one of those communities, he or she was considered a dislocated timber worker regardless of whether he or she had worked in the timber industry.

Deadwood Creek Restoration Projects

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service awarded \$32,500 to the Siuslaw Institute² in 1995 to coordinate private property owners in a restoration project, designed by a biologist from the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife for Deadwood Creek as part of the Deadwood CRMP aquatic plan. The Deadwood Creek restoration project came out of a planning process involving multiple agencies and received support in the form of in-kind and monetary support from landowners, the Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board, the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, the Natural Resource Conservation Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and the U.S. Forest Service.

This project focused on building stream structures, planting vegetation for bank stabilization, and constructing fences to prevent livestock from damaging streams. It involved five landowners and several agencies. The project also educated landowners in erosion control techniques. One person expressed excitement about being able to do something to increase the overall value of his land. He would rather run a few less livestock than have his property “become a junkyard” as the stream tears through it year

after year, “What are we gonna have in 20 years? Are we gonna have some logging community with gutted creeks or say no, the creeks are part of the value of this area?” One property owner stated that he could aggressively graze 10 extra cattle if he did not participate in the program, but claimed that no one gets rich off of a few extra livestock, so it is not worth risking the integrity of the land. Unlike these landowners, many community members, especially life-long residents, had a suspicious attitude toward government in general and outright aversion to government activity on their property. As word spread about the benefits of the program, some of those suspicions were dispelled.

Several difficulties arose during the course of the projects. In the first couple of seasons, some of the stream structures washed out or caused a great deal of erosion. Two property owners participated in this study, and both were sympathetic to the learning curve associated with doing this work, but many owners were upset, and others in the community are skeptical about the techniques used on Deadwood Creek. Obtaining materials for the structures posed another challenge. The Forest Service prohibited any extraction from their land, so many landowners donated logs from their property for the project. Also, the rock quarry where many of the large boulders were obtained for instream structures was located in marbled murrelet habitat, so extraction could only

Table 1. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Jobs-in-the-Woods Projects at Deadwood Creek.

Year	Project	Workers (#)	Timber Workers (#)	Work Days (#)	Training Days (#)	Avg. Wage/ Benefits	JITW Funds
1995	Deadwood Creek	11	9	292	0	\$14.00	\$32,500
1996	Deadwood Creek	19	19	302	0	\$13.75	\$53,356
1998	Deadwood Creek	12	12	157	0	\$16.00	\$50,000
1999	Deadwood Creek	Project in process	Project in process	Project in process	Project in process	Project in process	\$53,000

2. At that time the Siuslaw Watershed Council was in its infancy and not in a position to sponsor the project, so the instigator of this project started a nonprofit organization, the Siuslaw Institute.

Table 2. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Jobs-in-the-Woods Projects at Wolf and Wildcat Creek, and the North Fork of the Siuslaw.

Year	Project	Workers (#)	Timber Workers (#)	Work Days (#)	Training Days (#)	Avg. Wage/ Benefits	JITW Funds
1995	Wolf and Wildcat Creek Restoration	30	21	1200	60	\$16.88	\$108,000
1996	Wolf and Wildcat Creek Stream Rehabilitation	11	2	300	3	\$16.67	\$49,004
1995	North Fork Siuslaw Enhancement	20	6	250	10	\$15.50	\$24,751

happen after August 15. In addition, work in the creek had to take place between June 15 and September 15. One criticism of this project was that to receive trees for re-vegetation, landowners had to travel to Mapleton (about 20 miles round-trip) three times for training on how to plant them.

This project employed 11 workers, nine of them timber workers, for a total of 29 worker days (or an average of 2.6 days per worker). There was no training component to the project. The manager hired local people, some with experience in the timber industry operating heavy equipment and others from the fishing industry to help with wiring and securing the structures in place. Although the jobs are not year-round, for many people, they are an important part of their annual employment. For example, the manager hires a particular person every year for one month in the summer, and this job provides a vital part of this person's annual income. One worker marvels that the timber industry once paid him to clear the streams and now he has the opportunity to rebuild fish habitat. The work "feels so good to me," he tried to explain with a satisfied smile. "It's difficult to explain."

Since 1995, the Soil and Water Conservation District has received four grants totalling \$188,856 from the FWS. In addition, the project received \$132,868 in leveraged funds and in-kind goods and

services from landowners, the Oregon Watershed Enhancement Board, the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, the Natural Resource Conservation Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the U.S. Forest Service, the Soil and Water Conservation District, and Pioneer Telephone. There are now 15 property owners along Deadwood Creek participating in the project, and cumulatively, the project has provided over 750 worker days, primarily to workers from timber dependent communities. These people built more than 167 stream structures. Detailed project data appears in Table 1. This project also promoted education, participation, and the benefits of government partnerships with property owners. The FWS funded a fifth project in 2001 for \$37,000.

Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife Projects

From 1994 to 1998, when the Oregon Economic Development Department still administered Jobs-in-the-Woods programs, the projects implemented by the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife had two levels of administrative costs. The Oregon Economic Development Department took five percent and Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife took 10 percent of project money. Since the Jobs-in-the-Woods program dropped from the CERT process, the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife has charged a 24 percent administrative fee.

The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife representative in the Siuslaw watershed applies for federal funds through the Siuslaw Soil and Water Conservation District in order to save on administrative costs.

In the early 1990s, the staff from the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife office put together a list of projects. Originally, they planned to fund the projects primarily through the industrial landowners, but the Jobs-in-the-Woods program presented an additional funding option. The FWS helped fund three of these projects: Wolf Creek, Wildcat Creek, and the North Fork of the Siuslaw. These were three of a suite of restoration projects managed by the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife and funded from a variety of sources. The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife hired a crew of six, plus one bookkeeper, for full-time, year-round positions for four years. During that period, 10 different individuals worked, and three were from the Mapleton area. All field crew-members were trained through the Hire-the-Fisher Ecosystem Workforce Training program. The industrial landowners also provided crews, equipment, and material to build the stream structures. For the Wolf and Wildcat creek projects, the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife received \$157,004 from FWS in 1995 and 1996, and \$707,710 in other funds (primarily landowners). Crews built 760 structures in 1,500 worker days, 63 of which were training days. The North Fork Siuslaw Enhancement project received \$24,751 in 1995 from FWS and \$156,750 from other sources. Crews built 231 structures in 250 worker days, 10 of which were training days. See Table 2 for more detailed information on these projects.

Job Training and Partnership Act (JTPA)

The Lane Workforce Partnership, formerly the Southern Willamette Private Industry Council, was the JTPA service provider for Lane County. When mill closures began in the late 1980s and early 1990s in Lane County, the State of Oregon applied to the Department of Labor for funds intended as emergency monies to offset mass layoffs. Lane Workforce Partnership used these discretionary funds dispersed

to the Lane County to set up a dislocated timber worker program prior to 1994. NEAI resulted in additional Department of Labor funds for dislocated timber workers. Oregon applied to the Department of Labor for these “Timber Grants” and dispersed the money to county JTPA providers to continue running their dislocated worker programs.

The Lane Workforce Partnership used Initiative monies to redevelop its programs specifically for dislocated timber workers. They began adapting curriculum in 1995 by developing short-term training courses, which focused primarily on computers. A Lane Workforce Partnership employee specializing in displaced workers noted that NEAI monies paid for curriculum development, staff salaries, and training materials. In 1996, as dislocated primary timber workers became harder to find, Lane Workforce Partnership sought and received permission to serve secondary and tertiary workers.³

During the early years of the Initiative, the Lane Workforce Partnership participated in the CERT process to receive funding to work with displaced timber workers. They developed and submitted a grant to the Workers and Families Subcommittee. Since the Department of Labor provided grants directly to dislocated worker programs, they viewed the CERT process as an added layer of paperwork with no benefits. Thus, worker-retraining programs stopped participating in CERT in 1996, but continued to provide services.

Two people from the Mapleton area who participated in this study and received assistance from Lane Workforce Partnership had very positive experiences with the program. One was placed into Sweet Home’s Ecosystem Workforce Pilot Program.⁴ He drove 180 miles, round trip every weekday for six months. He learned to perform a variety of jobs in the woods, including stream restoration, tree pruning, survival surveys, thinning, planting, and fire fighting. Utilizing the skills from the training program, he worked for a timber consulting organization for four years. He enjoyed his work despite the significantly lower wage compared to what he made as a timber faller, but eventually the 180-mile drive became too much

3. Defined as those living in timber-affected communities who lost their jobs or businesses as a result of general economic decline.

4. See Sweet Home Case Study for more details.

for him and his family. He worked for the Siuslaw Watershed Council as an ecosystem technician collecting Global Positioning System data for roads, and analyzing culverts for fish passage conditions for eight months before he decided to go back to timber falling. Recently, he has contacted the Lane Workforce Partnership to enter a retraining program.

The second interviewee, after conducting a career search through the Lane Workforce Partnership, decided to embark on an entirely new career. He took two years of classes, commuting 120 miles round-trip, four days per week. The Lane Workforce

Partnership paid a travel stipend that covered auto insurance and gas. He stated, “[Initially] I really had my doubts that I was going to be able to pull it [study and homework] off.” After two years of full course loads and working part-time his second year, he finished the program and found employment. The wage was considerably less than what he made as a timber faller, but he changed his personal expectations to fit a new, simpler lifestyle. Both individuals reported that the Lane Workforce Partnership staff would “fall over themselves” to help. Flexible programs also facilitated the challenging process of retraining.

Current Socioeconomic Conditions and Effects of NEAI on Community Well-Being

Socioeconomic Conditions

Despite projects funded through NEAI, as well as several other community projects, Mapleton’s economy is no more diverse, nor do workers have more options for employment than in 1993. Residents fear Davidson’s Industries may close the mill and no viable alternatives have surfaced. Poverty among children in Mapleton has increased with participation in the free lunch program up to 56 percent in 1999, up from 51 percent in 1993, and enrollment is down 30 percent from 176 to 124. The CRT has not been active for more than four years, reportedly a result of disappointment and burnout. Although the residents of the Mapleton area have demonstrated the ability to pull together and accomplish goals, they have little patience for government regulations or studies and plans that do not directly result in projects or provide economic diversification. The beautification project left both residents and agency representatives feeling frustrated, with little desire to continue working together.

Community Capacity

NEAI was designed to help timber workers transition to new jobs, to diversify timber-based economies, and to improve community well-being. Despite the difficulties that arose as a result of one of the projects, NEAI projects and programs increased Mapleton’s capacity. Community capacity is the col-

lective ability of residents in a community to respond to external and internal stresses, to create and take advantage of opportunities, and to meet local needs. Community capacity consists of five dimensions: (1) *physical capital*, which includes a community physical infrastructure (e.g., sewer systems, business parks, capital assets such as equipment, housing stock, and schools); (2) *financial capital*, which includes money, credit, and other financial resources available for local use; (3) *human capital*, which includes the skills, education, experiences, and general abilities and capabilities of residents; (4) *cultural capital*, which includes the myths, beliefs, norms, and life ways that serve to organize groups and facilitate survival; (5) *social capital*, which includes the willingness of residents to work together toward community goals (and not just self-interested goals); and (6) natural capital, which includes the natural resources available to the community with both market value (timber, springs for drinking water, fish, etc.) and non-market value (scenic beauty, clean air, wildlife habitat, etc.).

Physical Capital

NEAI projects contributed to physical capital in Mapleton both through infrastructure projects and through aesthetic enhancements. The water project brought Mapleton into compliance with federal and state water quality standards through Community Development Block Grants, thus circumventing the

need to increase user fees. The beautification project built upon the public dock project by cleaning up the river-facing side of the businesses and building an information kiosk.

With the help of Lane County, the Mapleton CRT also pursued infrastructure projects outside of NEAI, including renovations of the Lion's Club building for the new community center. Lane County economic development staff (partially funded through the NEAI) worked with one of the community leaders to secure Federal Emergency Management Act funds and offered low-interest loans to homeowners along the river to raise their homes with stilts in an attempt to mitigate future flood damage. Finally, the CRT sought funds for a traffic study. Located at the junction of two highways and the primary route between Eugene and the coast, traffic safety is a big concern for Mapleton residents and for potential future economic development. The study was completed, but has not been utilized.

Human Capital

NEAI projects provided few people new career skills. A few participated in JTPA programs, however, most had to move away from the community to find employment following re-training and thus the larger community did not benefit from the increase in human capital.

The Jobs-in-the-Woods projects indirectly led to human capital enhancement. First, the Deadwood Creek restoration projects educated landowners in conservation techniques and they have become spokespeople in the community for creek restoration and habitat protection. Also, the Wildcat and Wolf Creek project areas have become research sites for watershed monitoring projects in Florence schools and in other schools in the region. Finally, experience in watershed restoration projects enabled several workers employed through the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife to start their own contracting businesses, further their education, or to work for organizations involved in watershed restoration.

Financial Capital

NEAI projects brought discrete amounts of financial capital to the Mapleton area by employing

local workers for the Beautification project, as well as the Jobs-in-the-Woods projects. The Beautification project also led directly to the Salmon Festival that takes place most years (based on whether or not leaders in the community have the time and energy to organize it) on the street between the businesses and the river. This event brings money into the community.

Social Capital

Mapleton residents rely on both individual determination and community support, and have demonstrated an ability to come together in challenging times. During the economic slow-down of the 1980s, many left the area, but for those that remained, their "can do" attitude and collective ability to pull together in challenging times continues to serve them well.

Successful and inclusive community projects demonstrate the ability for this socially diverse community to work together. In the 1970s, when the back-to-the-land movement brought a new social dynamic to the Mapleton area, a new tension developed between groups of differing political and social values. While sharp divisions between these groups persist to this day in some communities, time and active involvement of the newcomers has brought these groups together in Mapleton. Today, members of both groups participate in community events and, when it was active, on the CRT. Members of the CRT do not recall a disagreement or conflict that could not be easily resolved. Many credit the Mapleton schools for bringing the community together socially and fostering mutual respect. One resident commented that it is difficult to spurn someone whose kid plays with your kid on the basketball team or performs with your kid in the holiday show.

Although the community functions well internally, its interactions with funding agencies and outside project managers have brought stress and frustration to all parties. The Beautification project was the first effort that brought about such conflict. Forest Service representatives, as well as other outside groups involved in the Beautification project, reported difficulties in working with Mapleton residents on project implementation. For their part, Mapleton

residents admit that they were unwavering about hiring local contractors to do the on-the-ground work and were pleased that the agencies allowed this.

Concerning the Beautification project, as well as other economic development efforts that followed, several interviewees expressed frustration that government rules and regulations, as well as planning and studies, which cost a great deal of money, often did not materialize in projects on-the-ground. Local leaders reported that all of the outside project administrators of the Beautification project were fine to work with, but they felt that the architect was unnecessarily inflexible in his design for the project. They also reported a poor working relationship with the local Forest Service representatives of the Mapleton Ranger District. To their credit, those involved in project management and Mapleton area residents all stuck to the project and saw it through to completion amidst conflict and mistrust.

By the time it was over, one agency representative reported that there was an understanding that the Forest Service would not fund another project in Mapleton. Another representative reported that, following this project, the Forest Service adopted a policy of not granting public money to private businesses or individuals. Indeed, this was one of the key elements of the conflict—a business owner's right to have a say in what happens on his or her property versus the government's obligation to ensure fair and proper use of public monies. Indeed, many community members understand this dilemma, "With all of the good intentions we have," said one resident, "we are still just us...You can't give public monies to private individuals." The Forest Service did not fund any additional projects in Mapleton through the NEAI.

Frustrated and exhausted with their experiences with the Beautification project and the campaign to keep the Forest Service in town, the CRT has been inactive for the past four years. Lane County, however, continues to work with community members and groups. The Lion's Club building renovations, securing funds for one full-time and one part-time position at the local fire district, and completion of the water system are among the projects that illustrate the perseverance of community leaders and their good working relationship with Lane County.

In the spring of 2001, representatives from the Forest Service regional office held a meeting in Mapleton to offer support for another community center to be housed at the old middle school. At the meeting, residents report that the Forest Service praised Mapleton and its accomplishments. The school superintendent, however, wary of government regulations, has opted to explore other funding options. Apparently, Forest Service officials recognize Mapleton's capacity to accomplish goals and complete projects, despite the difficulties experienced with the Beautification project. Mapleton residents now have a better understanding of government expectations and are a bit wary of accepting government monies. Any future Forest Service funded projects in Mapleton will likely benefit from the lessons learned from the Beautification project—Mapleton residents have a better idea of what protocol they must follow and regional Forest Service officials will not grant money to private businesses.

Natural Capital

Salmon have long been an important element of the culture, economy, and identity of the Pacific Northwest. The salmon fishery, however, has been in decline over the past two decades. The Siuslaw is one of the few Oregon watersheds without major dams and thus is a popular place for agencies and policy makers to devote funds for salmon habitat restoration. A healthy salmon fishery would substantially improve economic and general community well-being throughout the Siuslaw watershed. The FWS Jobs-in-the-Woods projects have begun the long process of repairing damage from years of dredging and scouring waterways.

Worker Effects

As the mills closed in the Mapleton area, many families moved to find employment elsewhere. Those who stayed, had roots in the community with "relatives in the graveyard and children in the schools." For those that remained, a few sought retraining through the Lane Workforce Partnership, three obtained full-time employment with the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife Jobs-in-the-Woods projects, and a few secured seasonal employment on

the Deadwood Creek projects. None of the NEAI projects served a significant number of dislocated timber workers, the primary issue facing the community at the outset of NEAI. Most residents who participated in the study thought NEAI would serve primarily dislocated workers and their families. A few expressed surprise that funds served private business owners and the general community.

Conclusion

The NEAI projects and programs in Mapleton were a part of a larger set of community development projects. The NEAI projects brought positive change to the community as well as helped community members and economic development specialists understand that granting public money to private businesses is problematic. The NEAI enabled Mapleton to access more sources of funding as a timber-dependent community. However, Mapleton residents still face an uncertain economic future with no alternative industry to compensate for the decline in the timber industry. The future of Mapleton depends largely on the energy of local leaders and their abilities to work with outside agencies.

References

- Appendices – Volume I Final Environmental Impact Statement Land and Resource Management Plan Siuslaw National Forest p. E 1
- Halliday, J. and G. Chehak. 2000. Native Peoples of the Northwest (Second Edition). Sasquatch Books: Seattle.
- MLP Associates, Mapleton Area Master Plan, Eugene, OR 1994.
- Oregon Economic Development Department, Mapleton Community Action Plan, 1989 updated 1994,
- Systems West Engineers Inc. Master Water System Plan, Mapleton Water District Lane County, Rr, 1995
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Jobs in the Woods Program, Project Summary Information for Lane County, <http://pacific.fws.gov/jobs/orojitw/summary/lane/lanePage4/htm>

Interviewees

Pete Barrell	Director, Siuslaw Watershed Council
Don Beck	Former Timber Faller
Jim and Caroline Estes	Business Owners
Paul Farmer	Business Owner
Carl Finseth	Equipment Operator, Siuslaw Institute
Jim Grans	Science Teacher
Bill Helphinstine	District Ranger, Siuslaw National Forest, Mapleton District
Jay Hendricksen	Davidson Industries Inc.
Lynne and Mary Hood	Local residents
Ollie Jones	Oregon Coordinator, Rural Community Assistance, United States Forest Service
Pat Letson	Chef
Greg Lindsey	Timber Faller
Eric Nusbaum	District Administrator, Siuslaw Soil & Water Conservation District
Howard Pazdral	Horse Logger, Seahorse Stagecoach Horse Logging
Dan Parritt	Biologist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Terry Saubert	Director, Mapleton Water District
Ron Schelton	Sales Administrator, Siuslaw National Forest, Mapleton District
Stephanie Schulz	Former Rural Development Coordinator, Lane County/ Current Regional Coordinator, State of Oregon
Valerie Standley	Program Coordinator, Lane Workforce Partnership
Peter Thurston	Community and Economic Development Coordinator, Lane County
Kathy West	Vice President, Siuslaw Valley Bank
George Westfall	Biologist, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
Ann and Frank Wilson	Business Owners
Duane Wright	Superintendent, Mapleton School District

Mapleton, Lane County, Oregon