

**QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT: Institutional Capacity of Counties' Interface with
Federal Land Management.**

PREPARED BY:

R. RODRIQUEZ

199.5

INTERIOR COLUMBIA BASIN
ECOSYSTEM MANAGEMENT PROJECT



Qualitative Assessment

Institutional Capacity of Counties' Interface with Federal Land Management

Background Report Supplement for the Social Assessment for the Columbia River Easin
Interior Columbia River Basin Ecosystem Management Project



Prepared For:

Eastside Ecosystems Management Strategy Project

112 East Poplar, Walla Walla, W-4 99362

Order # 40-0E00-5-5277
Purchase Order AD35 - Vendor (APOS 6/94)



1630 No. Wenatchee Avenue, Suite 12
Wenatchee, WA 98801
509-665-0924

Qualitative Assessment

re: institutional Capacity of Counties' Interface with Federal Land Management

*Background Report Supplement for the Social Assessment for the Columbia River Basin
Interior Columbia River Basin Ecosystem Management Project*

GOAL

To qualitatively assess the processes and comparative institutional capacities of county governments (in the Project Area) as they affect counties' abilities to interact with federal land management agencies.

APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

This study has been focused by the use of "key questions" developed with attention to the goal, above. The body of the report is organized under the key questions, listed below:

- A. What are the reasons for the breakdown of relationships between some counties and federal land management agencies?
- B. How can county officials interact more effectively with federal land management representatives ?
- C. How can the local federal land-management officials (e.g., USFS, BLM) interact more effectively with county representatives ? What policies should be modified or adopted to facilitate local interactions?
- D. What distinguishes county governments that work effectively and cooperatively with federal agencies ("X" counties) from those that do not ("Y" counties)?
- E. How have county governments interacted with local organizations on community land use issues?
- F. What are some of the key issues that make it difficult for counties to deal with changes imposed on them by federal land management agencies?
- G. What are some of the dynamics in local leadership which are impacting the current county-federal relationships?

Interviews

Given the short timeline and limited financial resources for this study, it was not feasible to assess the institutional capacities of the approximately 100 counties in the 4-state project area. However, a global qualitative perspective of the issues has been derived from interviews with over a dozen consultants and rural development practitioners who interact within the framework of county governments in the project area, primarily Oregon, Washington, and Idaho. In addition to providing valuable information and perspectives about the issues and relative institutional capacities of project-area counties, these interviews provided a focus for selecting pertinent data and identifying documents for the study. The interviews also helped to frame the questions, topics, and issues that have been addressed.

Documents Research

A number of news articles, legal briefs, County resolutions, newsletters-and books were studied and consulted for this evaluation. A bibliography is provided in the attachments.

Case Studies: Quantitative Comparisons and Analysis

In addition to conducting a global evaluation, a Case Studies approach was designed to offer further insight into the dynamics and variation among counties as they relate to federal land management policies/initiatives. Twelve counties from the project area were identified for the evaluation; six in Oregon and six in Washington.

All twelve counties are involved in a variety of interactions with federal land management agencies; half of the case-study counties were assigned an "X" designation for their ability to (thus far) "successfully" interact with federal land management agencies. The other six counties (three in each State) which have adopted a contentious or confrontational approach (e.g., adoption of Catron County style ordinance) to their relationships with the agencies were assigned a "Y" designation.

A matrix was developed as a tool for making quantitative comparisons between the "X" and "Y" counties in the case study, and for drawing some conclusions about the general character of all the counties in the project area. The analysis was limited by the differences in the availability and organization of data for the counties in the two States, and is limited by the fact that counties in only two States were evaluated. Nevertheless, some of the findings indicate clear distinctions between "X" and "Y" counties. Equally interesting, however, are the areas in which all the project area counties share common characteristics.

Following is a partial list of some of the variables that were evaluated in the matrix for each of the twelve counties:

- County Expenditures
- Federal Aid to Counties
- County Expenditures per Capita
- Total Square Miles
- Total Assessed Land Value
- Percentage of land in Federal Domain
- Total Current Population
- Population in 1980
- Percentage of population in Unincorporated Area
- Per capita Income
- Annual Average Unemployment
- Percentage of Employment by Industry Sectors (top two sectors)

The raw data collected for this project is presented in the Attachments, under the title "County Data". Summary comparisons of the data are presented in the Attachments, under the title "Comparison of Quantitative Characteristics of X and Y. Counties".

BACKGROUND

A volatile mix of land use issues, Special Interest Groups (SIGs), and community economics have created significant challenges for county and local federal administrators in the project area. Very simply stated, federal regulations and changes in resource-extraction and utilization policies (to protect threatened and endangered species, manage growth, and achieve other environmental goals) increasingly impinge upon existing local culture, traditional employment sectors, and sources of local tax revenue in the project area.

Many individual communities (cities and towns) and counties ("X" counties) have responded to these challenges creatively and constructively and with a spirit of cooperation, communication, and negotiation. Although there may be considerable internal debate and instances of conflict, these communities have resisted intense community polarization over land-use issues. Also, many of them have proactively sought the use of a variety of federal resources to develop their local economies and infrastructure.

Many other counties ("Y"), however, have adopted a more confrontational approach to deal with these challenges: The Utah-based National Federal Lands Conference contends some 200 counties in the West have passed ordinances or are considering ordinances directly challenging federal supremacy over public

lands. These counties are pursuing means to usurp the federal land management responsibilities of the U.S. Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, and other federal land-management agencies.

Several of the primary resource issues which have become the source of distress, confrontation and debate in project area counties include: Reduction in federal timber sales to protect endangered species; limits on the availability of water irrigation and hydro-power due to measures intended to save endangered fisheries; mandates of the Clean Water Act; and increased fees and limits on grazing permits. Federal lands which appear to be the subject of most conflict include National Forests (including wilderness and roadless areas), Grazing Districts, Wildlife Refuges, and Reclamation Withdrawals.

In response to the issues above (and other issues, as well), grassroots organizations have coalesced, at the county level, to challenge the federal government's authority. These Special Interest Groups (SIGs) are associated with several "movements" which share some common philosophies and are popularly referred to as "Wise Use", "Catron County", "County Supremacy", or, generally, the "Sagebrush Rebellion". These SIGs have begun to exercise influence over local county leadership and are developing their organizational infrastructure on a regional and multi-State scale.

While the strength in the SIGs above is rooted in local, rural project-area communities, the strength of Environmental Movement SIGs is based in their national and largely urban constituency. Although environmental SIGs do generally have a presence at the local level in project area counties, they do not appear to attract the relatively high level of local membership and local financial and institutional support that the other ("Sagebrush Rebellion") SIGs enjoy.

Land use management agencies (at the federal, state and county levels), frequently find themselves in the middle of the clash between the opposing views of "Sagebrush" SIGs and environmental movement SIGs. "Wise Use" SIGs aspire to repeal or limit the scope of major environmental protection laws of the past two decades, while environmental SIGs advocate vigorous enforcement and implementation of environmental laws.

The clash between the two groups also represents another symptom and cause of the "county authority versus federal control" conflict. There is a significantly different constituent base of support of these disparate groups: the "Sagebrush" SIGs enjoy strong, local grassroots support and favor limiting federal control over land-use planning by asserting local control over public land decisions; whereas environmental SIGs have historically supported federal stewardship because their accomplishments have been largely achieved, not through grassroots efforts, but through the centralized power of the federal government and the courts. This

duality has fed the “us and them” attitude which has characterized unsuccessful attempts at meaningful dialogue amongst all the parties involved in these issues.

KEY QUESTIONS and FINDINGS

A. What are the reasons for the breakdown of relationships between some counties and federal land management agencies?

Although most of the rural counties have historically benefited from the land use and resource extraction policies of federal land management agencies, in recent years those policies have been altered in response to environmental and growth pressures, and, to some degree, resource depletion. One result: the flow of dollars (to project area counties) that once were generated from federal lands through forestry, mining, and livestock has been progressively declining.

Replacing the revenues that once flowed into county coffers and the resource-processing jobs (e.g., in lumber mills) are new regulations that impact not only the industrial and employment base of the communities affected, but also the culture of the rural population: restraints on firewood gathering, hunting, fishing, road closures, and the re-introduction of “predatory” wildlife are frequently perceived as just one more “big government” attack on the “way of life” in the project-area counties. A clear example of the distress and paranoia which accompanies this perception is expressed in a recent letter to the editor in the Wenatchee World, a daily newspaper serving four counties in North Central Washington: The letter, referencing the Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project, explained that the project clearly included the “elimination” of local communities.

The decline of resource-based economies and impositions upon the culture of impacted rural communities can only partially explain the relationship breakdowns between counties and federal agencies, however. A nationwide political and philosophical shift favoring the transfer of more regulatory control to the local level fuels the debate and conflict in county - federal land management relationships. This shift is abetted by an apparent cynicism among local citizens regarding institutional Public Involvement processes. Many of the interviewees observed that locals simply do not feel that anyone (with decision-making authority) has really listened to their concerns. This feeling has fed the “us and them” attitude.

At the local level, resource-dependent industry groups (e.g., cattlemen’s associations, timber processors, mining interests) are becoming increasingly organized and influential in their political influence at the local level, motivated by a desire to wrest as much control as possible over the resources on federal lands and to counter the environmental regulations which they ‘believe threaten their livelihoods and culture. These organizations are, increasingly, driving natural resource issues into the center of local politics: land use issues are fast-becoming the primary issues in many county commission elections. In counties where the politics favor election of commissioners which will challenge federal land

management, one might expect to see a further degradation of the county - federal relationship.

B. How can county officials interact more effectively with federal land management representatives ?

Given the complexity of issues and multi-tiered levels of interaction with federal land management agencies, county officials would elevate the effectiveness of their interactions through greater participation in the established Public Involvement processes incorporated into the federal land management planning process. This could be accomplished through personal involvement of the county commissioners or designated staff, and/or also through the involvement of existing local organizations, or specially created citizen task forces.

Although personal involvement of one or more commissioners to represent the county in planning sessions is preferable, it is also important that competent county staff be involved to interpret and brief the county's elected officials regarding local impacts and options related to land management decisions. If county budgets or staffing seriously prohibits dedication of staff time to such participation, the county commissioners may consider creating a special task force or advisory committee to simply monitor and study the issues, participate in the public involvement process, and report to the commissioners.

A variety of local organizations may have a history of frequent (and positive) interactions with federal agencies; and these organizations could/should be viewed as a resource by county officials seeking to enhance their relationships and communications with federal agencies. (This subject is discussed more thoroughly in Section "E".)

A few key recommendations for county governments follow:

- Take advantage of the public involvement opportunities that are already provided under federal laws like NFMA and NEPA.. Many County Commissioners have historically ignored land use planning meetings staged by the USFS and others. They should make a greater effort to attend such meetings, or assign staff to attend.
- County authorities can assign more (or more qualified) staff to interpret SEPA and NEPA and to work with the planners of local federal land management agencies.
- MOUs: "Memos of Understanding" are a structural mechanism which has been used to define numerous relationships between counties and federal

agencies (e.g. re: law enforcement). MOUs should be pursued more creatively to address the concerns of local governments.

C. How can the local federal land-management officials (e.g., USFS, BLM) interact more effectively with county representatives ? What policies should be modified or adopted to facilitate local interactions?

A number of suggestions for addressing the above question were compiled in the course of this study. The suggestions pertain to the activities/status of local federal land managers, public meetings, federal policies, and community economic stability. Several of the recommendations are quite specific, others generalized.

Note: These suggestions have been compiled from various sources and have not been evaluated or ranked. The author makes no claims regarding their efficacy.

Regarding the activities/status of local federal land managers:

- Federal land management staff are transferred too frequently, according to several rural development practitioners. Rural communities take a while to accept newcomers. These federal staff persons are too frequently removed from the local community before the community has an opportunity to develop a relationship . . . to feel that they have any influence or chance to educate that land manager. The community is not, in this way, permitted to develop any sense of trust with the individual(s) assigned to regulate local uses and to manage local planning processes. Perhaps, if the federal managers were stationed in the community longer, they would develop a more intimate familiarity with the land and community and better and more community-sensitive decisions would result. The Rural Development Councils, in the West are advocating that federal land management agency staff be stationed in the community for longer periods of time.
- Local land managers of federal lands should be granted greater decision making power with regard to the management of lands in his/her jurisdiction.
- Federal officials and staff should become involved in the communities in which they reside (e.g., joining local clubs, participating in events, etc.)
- Support and encourage the training of field staff in their advisory skills to assist current federal land users (e.g., ranchers) to understand the benefits of and need for changes in use patterns.
- To build upon successes, local federal officials should share stories of successful interactions and resolutions of community issues with others

(land management officials) to stimulate the replication of successful strategies.

Public Meetings

- Federal officials could have more and better public meetings. One interviewee suggested a change is necessary in the approach to public involvement. That change, he suggested, could be facilitated by a paradigm which, instead of staging Public Hearings would host “Public Listenings”.
- Local federal officials should personally encourage counties officials and citizens to participate in the public involvement opportunities that are already provided under federal laws like NFMA and NEPA.

Community and Economic Development

Clearly, the local economic impact of shifting land management policies and land uses is at the core of issues polarizing relationships between local and federal governments and officials. Wherever possible, federal resources for mitigating negative economic impacts and for developing diversified economic opportunities should be encouraged. Local federal land management officials may facilitate sourcing of federal assistance for local economic development initiatives and achieve some local recognition and acceptance for such participation. A few recommendations follow:

- Help rural communities diversify their economies and find new sources of revenue.
- Lend agency resources to community development projects.
- Federal strategies should promote and complement existing community initiatives.
- Establish certainty and stability in federal forest policies so that communities can plan for their economic futures.
- To lessen the impacts of reduced timber harvests, policy makers could make it easier for small, community-based contractors to successfully bid on federal harvest, thinning and restoration contracts. They should also consider granting forest communities exclusive rights for the commercial harvest of specialty forest products from adjacent federal lands. (Opponents argue that such policies would, however, result in a “restrain of trade” and are, therefore, unacceptable.)

- Improve the incentives for ecologically and economically sustainable management of private lands.

D. What distinguishes county governments that work effectively and cooperatively with federal agencies (“X” counties) from those that do not (“Y” counties)?

An attempt to quantify distinctions between X and Y counties has revealed some significant contrasts and similarities. Interpreting the meaning and relevance of these findings to the question (above), however, is speculative and subjective. Also, many of the findings seem to raise more questions . . . which suggests that more in-depth research and analysis may reveal more about the differences between the X and Y counties.

Summary Interpretation of quantifiable differences between X and Y Counties

It appears that the (Y) counties which have adopted a confrontational approach to the federal land management agencies have a distinctly more rural character than those (X) counties that have maintained more cooperative relationships. The Y counties are larger in area but have significantly smaller populations; they are sparsely populated in comparison to X counties. They also have smaller retail employment sectors, and larger agriculture/forestry/mining employment sectors. These traits could be interpreted to mean that Y counties have a stronger, more traditional rural culture than X counties. (Note: *It is the “rural way of life” that is cited by many as that which is most threatened by changes in federal land management policies.*)

Another interesting discovery is the fact that, on average, county budgets in Y counties are more dependent on federal aid than X counties. Although this finding bears further analysis, one might speculate that Y counties are more disposed towards resisting federal policy changes because many of those changes translate into decreases in the relatively large percentage of federal dollars upon which the counties have relied.

The comparatively strong retail employment sector in X counties suggest more urban cultural elements are active in X counties, and citizens employed in these sectors are less likely to feel threatened or challenged by land management issues than those employed in resource-based industries. The greater populations, higher densities, and nature of the leading two employment sectors, in X counties suggests that X county citizens are likely to experience a higher volume and mix of personal and organizational interactions than those in Y counties. (Note: *Several observers have stated that “isolation” has been a contributing factor in the development of confrontational approaches to federal agencies adopted by several Y counties. This theory embraces the notion that counties and individuals that are geographically isolated, and that isolate themselves and have little interaction with larger bodies, seem to be less*

informed and more likely to become intensely preoccupied with a particular issue or paradigm.)

Similarities between X and Y Counties

- ***Unemployment levels among the counties, on average, were almost identical.*** Average annual unemployment for both X and Y counties was 11% (rounded to the nearest .5%) While an 11% rate reveals that a relatively high unemployment level pervades the project area, the lack of a difference between the X and Y counties suggests that while unemployment is a concern for all counties, it does not seem to be a deciding factor in the relationships between counties and federal agencies.
- ***Per capita incomes also do not vary considerably between the X and Y counties.*** Only a 6% spread between average per capita incomes was discovered, with X counties' residents' incomes of \$14,811 at 94% of Y counties' resident incomes.
- ***The percentage of land in federal domain within the counties only varies 72% between X and Y counties.*** On average, 49% of the land in X counties is in the federal domain; in Y counties, 56% of the land is owned by the federal government.
- ***Government is, on average, the largest employment sector in both c/asses of counties.*** Although it is not as large an employer in X counties (27%) as in Y counties (32%), the local, state, and federal government job sector is a critical element in the economies of the counties studied.

Key Distinctions Between X and Y Counties

- ***The assessed land values in Y counties are significantly lower than those in X counties.*** The assessed values in Y counties average approximately \$160,000 per square mile compared to \$620,000 per square mile in X counties; Y counties properties are assessed, therefore, at approximately 26% of the value of X counties.
- ***Y counties have significantly smaller populations than X counties; in fact, their average populations are less than half that of X counties.*** The average Y county has a population of approximately 15,000; X counties, an average population of approximately 33,000.
- ***Y counties are considerably larger in area (by 35%) than X counties.*** The average Y county encloses 3,672 square miles; the average X county contains 2,393 square miles.

- ***Y counties are sparse/y populated compared to X counties.*** The average Y county population density is approximately 4 persons per square mile, the average X county density is approximately 14 persons per square mile.
- ***County expenditures per capita in Y counties are over 40% higher than they are in X counties.*** The average expenditures in Y counties was approximately \$1,100 per person versus \$580 per person in X counties.
- ***Federal cash aid has twice the impact on Y county coffers as it does to X counties.*** Federal aid averages only approximately 19% of X county budgets, but 36% of Y county budgets.
- ***Y counties have weaker retail sectors than X counties.*** Retail trade was the second largest employer in only two of the six Y counties; whereas it ranked second place in four of the six X counties. Also, in X counties, retail trade accounted for a larger percentage of the total employment than it did in any of the Y counties where it ranked as second largest employment sector.
- ***Agriculture/Forestry and Mining sectors in Y counties ranked higher in terms of total employment (in terms of percentages per county) than in X counties.*** In two of the six Y counties this sector ranked a strong second place in terms of employment; whereas this sector was not a ranked in first or second place in any of the X counties.

E. How have county governments interacted with local organizations on community land use issues?

A variety of local organizations interact with county governments and federal agencies. Some organizations wield political influence and actively pursue legislative agendas and support/oppose local (county government) political candidates. Others are more apolitical, simply pursuing generic goals, e.g., economic development, tourism development, community revitalization.

Frequently, local organizations are the catalysts for new initiatives and partnerships forged to address community issues and opportunities. In many instances they are responsible for bringing together county officials and federal land management agency personnel with positive results. On the other hand, some single-issue organizations pursue their goals in a manner which effectively polarizes their communities, generating “us and them” attitudes which can impact the relationships between county government officials and federal agency staff.

In any case, grassroots organizations and non-profit agencies in small, rural communities are important players in **the** development of public opinion and local government policies. Observers of rural communities have noted that

programs/projects/initiatives/policies which have the combined support and cooperation of these organizations and local government officials are far more likely to succeed; those policies that lack this combined support may never be successfully implemented.

Many county commissions have formal relationships with some local organizations (e.g., contract for services, membership, Memorandums of Understanding). In these cases, communication between the county commission and the organization can, be relatively frequent, elevating the opportunity for them to inform and influence each other, and to pursue joint activities.

Where no formal relationship between a local organization and the county exists, there may still be a level of interaction and influence, but these factors are likely to be more dependent upon the individuals involved, the size of the organization's membership, the organization's mission, and the credibility of the organization within the community.

Several observers have commented that county commissions which interact with a mix of local organizations are better informed and educated about the complexity of issues (including land-use issues). These county commissions, they claim, are more inclined to pursue constructive dialogue with federal agency staff to resolve problematic issues, and to even pursue joint community development opportunities.

Following are some interesting observations from information collected in the course of addressing this subject:

- Active community development groups like Economic Development Councils, Chambers of Commerce, Resource and Conservation Development Districts, and Economic Development Districts are often high-profile organizations that interact frequently with the counties and federal land management agencies. Their unique position in the community permits them to inform, constrain, and influence all parties involved in land management issues. They have initiated public meetings to resolve land-use issues and have initiated community development projects leveraging the resources of county government and federal agencies with positive results.
- Land use issues/battles often involve input, influence, and arguments from a variety of local organizations. Local environmental groups or individuals seem to represent a relatively minority share of the grassroots organizations which are more likely to represent industry concerns.
- "County Supremacy" philosophies and supporters overlap with "Wise Use" groups, which in some cases are funded by timber, mining, and ranching concerns. A strength of the Wise Use and County "grassroots" movements is their knowledge that "change can only be implemented locally".

- County commissioners of “Y” counties are in the process of trying to form a coalition of 85 rural counties in Washington, Oregon, and Idaho to support each other in County Supremacy issues.
- Citizen advisory committees - appointed by County Commissioners - may or may not be representative of all community interests or populations. Frequently, citizens who are active in a SIGs (special interest groups) will be appointed, because they are visible and vocal and can be considered “representative” of a body of local opinion.
- Several types of industry associations appear to be increasing their influence over County Commissioners and other local elected officials, e.g., Farm Bureau, Cattlemen’s Association, mining associations, etc.

F. What are some of the key issues that make it difficult for counties to deal with changes imposed on them by federal land management agencies?

Inadequate local capacity appears to be the primary issue that makes it difficult for many rural counties to deal with the changes in land use that are implemented or advocated by federal agencies. Rural communities frequently lack the funds, knowledge, or experience necessary to deal constructively and pro-actively with land-use issues in general, whether precipitated by federal agencies or development pressures.

Rural communities (county governments) are notoriously short of financial resources and adequate staff. They also suffer from-a shortage of volunteers who have the time and willingness to serve in local leadership positions. According to an analyst for the Northwest Policy Center, “Their resources are frequently consumed by short-term needs. This can make implementing long-term development strategies virtually impossible.” To emphasize the point, one county official claims “We don’t have grant writers, organizers and activists or local professionals who can fill leadership roles. It makes it very difficult to deal with government agencies that have an enormous impact on our community”.

Reflecting on this issue of capacity and correlating it with the quantitative findings discussed in section “D”, suggests that the counties experiencing the greatest difficulties (“Y” counties) have a “capacity gap” that is perhaps a function of their “economy of scale”. The average “Y” county has fewer citizens (smaller leadership and tax-revenue pool) which are spread thin over a large area. County expenditures per capita are very high, which can be interpreted to mean that the cost of delivering basic services is just more expensive in these counties. The result is that there is little capacity within the county government to respond to new changes and requirements or the need for long-range planning.

In addition to impaired capacity based on economics and a smaller leadership pool, it also appears that many rural communities are *uninformed about "successes"* in other counties; they have been presented with few examples, if any, of how to constructively deal with the changes in recent years. This is a capacity issue which is perhaps more critical in "Y" counties which tend to be more geographically, socially, and/or philosophically isolated from other counties.

Another issue, somewhat related to capacity, is that rural county officials do not have much opportunity to develop long-term relationships with the federal agency staff assigned to their communities. The traditional "culture" in rural communities strongly favors long-term residents and "familiar faces". So it is not surprising that the frequent transfers of federal staff can frustrate county representatives and citizens who desire to communicate with the local federal staff to better understand the policy changes, resolve differences, and develop projects to mitigate community impacts. The frustration arises when the staffer(s) with whom they have been communicating is (are) transferred out of the area, and a "newcomer" arrives; and the process of trust-building, community familiarization, and education must begin again . . . if there are difficult and contentious issues in the balance, the prospects for their constructive resolution may be seriously threatened by the transfer of key federal agency staff.

Further exacerbating the challenge that project area counties face in dealing with federally mandated changes is the general preoccupation with trying to adjust to the significant economic changes confronting them. Almost all the counties in the project area suffer from high unemployment (about 11 %). The West, in general, has had an historic economic stability problem: shifting industries; boom and bust cycles of resource extraction industries; the booming expansions when money flowed for construction of new dams; real estate booms reacting to Californians relocating; timber harvest on massive scales.

G. What are some of the dynamics in local leadership which are impacting the current county-federal relationships?

Natural resource issues have become increasingly more pivotal in the election of county officials in recent years. The outcomes of these elections, where the resource/land-use issues predominate, is frequently a determining factor in the character of local leadership. It is not just the county commission elections which are affected; sheriffs, assessors, and judges in some locations are also being challenged to state their positions on county-federal relationships in their campaigns.

Resource issues are now polarizing issues in many communities. A polarized situation places different demands on leadership and, in fact, on the campaign process for local officials.

Another dynamic impacting county-federal relationships is the role of city and town leaders. There is frequently a significant difference between the relationship a particular city/town may have with a federal agency versus the relationship between the county and the same agency. The county may have a philosophy which differs considerably from that of any particular town. Contributing to this distinction is the fact that in large rural counties there can be significantly different economic sectors operating within several geographic regions within the county . . . which in turn generate differing attitudes, problems, and opportunities.

The cities and towns, of course, also interact on a regular basis with the county government. How much these interactions influence the county-federal relationship remains to be evaluated.

ATTACHMENTS

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Warner, Tracy, 'Using a bludgeon as a cure,' *The Wenatchee World*, January 18, 1995.
- Durbin, Kathie, 'The Battle for Okanogan County,' *Seattle Weekly* January 11, 1995, p. 16-24.
- Opinion-editorial, "They are Federal Lands," *The Oregonian*, January 15, 1995.
- McCoy, Charles, "Catron County, N.M., Leads a Nasty Revolt Over Eco-Protection," *The Wall Street Journal*, January 3, 1995, p. 1.
- Eure, Rob, "Fiery defender of property rights," *The Sunday Oregonian*, January 1, 1995.
- Branton, John, "Clark County Militia," *The Cofumbian*, November 13, 1994. p. A1.
- Metteer, Lanny, 'The Oregon Plan for Public Land: Do Oregon counties have control over public lands within their geographical boundaries?' *The Watchman*, March 1994.
- Andrist, John P. *Okanogan County Citizens Coalition (OC3) Newsletter*, December 1994.
- Snow, James B. "Memo from James B. Snow, Deputy Assistant General Counsel, Natural Resources Division, USDA to Jack Ward Thomas, Chief, Forest Service re: "Catron County" Ordinances : Local Enactments Regarding Federal Land Management Activities Update," March 9, 1994.
- Test of "Chelan County Government Coordinating Ordinance for Actions Affecting Land And Natural Resource Use."
- Test of: "Wallowa County Measure #32: Initiative to affirm "federal" lands unconstitutional in Wallowa County, Oregon."
- Refenberg, Amo, 'Letter from Amo Refenberg, Regional Attorney, USDA to Russell B. West, Union County District Attorney re: Union County Ballot Measure 3 1-10 and Wallowa County Ballot Measure 32-1", December 5, 1994.
- Marston, Ed, 'Clashing Cultures, Clashing Economies, Clashing Values," Paper presented at the University of Colorado Natural Resources Law Center's conference: Who Governs the Public Lands?, Boulder, Colorado, September 30, 1994.
- Feller, Joseph, "Constitutional and Congressional Requirements Directing Public Lands Decisionmaking," Paper presented at the University of Colorado Natural Resources Law Center's conference: Who Governs the Public Lands?, Boulder, Colorado, September 28-30, 1994.
- Yates, Richard and Charity, editors, 1992 Washington State Yearbook: A Guide to Government in the Evergreen State. Eugene, Oregon, The Information Press, 1992.
- Conniff, Richard, "New Showdowns in the Old West: Federal Lands," *National Geographic* ,Vol. 185, No. 2, February 1994, p.2-39.

Washington State Office of Financial Management, Washington State: 1993 Date Book,

Stokes, Samuel N. and Watson, A. Elizabeth, Savine America's Countryside: A Guide to Rural Conservation. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press. 1989.

State of Oregon, Employment Department, Workforce Analysis Section, "Labor Trends Packet: April 1995."

McMahan, Mike, Regional Economic Profile: Region 10: Crook, Deschutes & Jefferson Counties. State of Oregon, Employment Department, 1993.

McMahan, Mike, Regional Economic Profile: Region 11: Klamath & Lake Counties, State of Oregon, Employment Department, 1993.

Yohannan, Jason, Regional Economic Profile: Region 13: Baker, Grant, Union & Wallowa Counties. State of Oregon, Employment Department, 1993.

Johnson, Kirk, Beyond Polarization: Emerging Strategies for Reconciling Community and the Environment. University of Washington: Northwest Policy Center, March 1993.

Barrier, Jay, Tri-Cities Profile, Labor Market and Economic Analysis Branch, Washington State Employment Security, February 1993.

Barrier, Jay and Lukin, Jay, Kittitas County Profile, Labor Market and Economic Analysis Branch, Washington State Employment Security, September 1994.

Barrier, Jay, Columbia County Profile, Labor Market and Economic Analysis Branch, Washington State Employment Security, December 1993.

Central Oregon Economic Development Council, "Central Oregon Area Profile: Crook, Deschutes, and Jefferson Counties," 1994.

Washington State Auditor, Local Government Comparative Statistics, 1994.

Independent auditor's reports for Lake, Union, Wallowa, Deschutes, Baker, and Grant Counties, Oregon.

Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project, "Oregon and Washington County Data," Walla Walla, Wa.

SOURCES AND CONTACTS

Following are the names and addresses of individuals and organizations cited in this report. Not specifically listed are those sources with whom the author has communicated in his past ten years of community development work in Eastern Washington.

Phil Brick
Professor of Political Science
Whitman College
Walla Walla, Washington

Kurt Danison
Principal, Highlands Associates
P.O. Box 143 1
Okanogan, Washington 98840

Division of State Lands
State of Oregon
Brian Nickleberry, Information Manager
775 Summer Street NW
Salem, Oregon

Hal Fossum
Policy Analyst
Northwest Policy Center
University of Washington, Graduate School of Public Affairs

Kerri Simmons
Community Revitalization Team
Washington State Department of Community, Trade, and Economic Development
West 808 Spokane Falls Boulevard, Room 625

Judith St. Claire
Executive Director, Oregon Rural Development Council
P.O. Box 40204
Portland, Oregon 97240

Andy Stahl
Association of USFS Employees for Environmental Ethics
Eugene, Oregon

Washington Association of Counties
206 10th Avenue S.E.
Olympia, Washington 98501

Comparison Of Quantitative Characteristics of X and Y Counties

	County Expenditures	County Expenditures per Capita	Ratio: Fed Aid to County Expenditures	Total Sq. Miles	Total Assessed Land Value (000,000)	Assessed Land Value per Square Mile	% of land in Federal Domain	Total Current Population	Population in 1980	% in Unincorp Area	Per capita Income	Annual Avg. Unemp.
X counties avg.	\$13,255,000	\$580	19%	2,393	\$1,489	\$622,200	49%	33,317	27,439	49%	\$14,811	11%
Y counties avg.	\$10,130,200	\$1,100	36%	3,672	\$ 601	\$163,700	56%	14,908	12,991	49%	\$15,715	11%
X/Y as %	131%	53%	52%	65%	248%	380%	88%	224%	211%	100%	94%	100%
% difference (X/Y% - 100%)	31%	-47%	-48%	-35%	148%	-280%	-12%	124%	111%	0%	-6%	0%

Percentage of Employment by Industry Sectors

(Only the leading two sectors of employment in each county were referenced for this Table)

	Government	Retail Trade	Services	Manufacturing	Ag/Forestry/Mining
X county AVERAGES	27%	18%	4%	8%	NA
Y county AVERAGES	32%	7%	3%	8%	7%
X/Y	84%	257%	NA	NA	NA
% difference (X/Y% - 100%)	-16%	157%	NA	NA	NA

Important Note/Disclaimer:

Twelve counties from the project area were identified for this evaluation; six in Oregon and six in Washington. All twelve are involved in a variety of interactions with federal land management agencies; half of the case-study counties were assigned an "X" designation for their ability to (thus far) "successfully" interact with federal land management agencies. The other six counties (three in each State) which have adopted a contentious/confrontational approach to their relationships with the agencies were assigned a "Y" designation. The assignment of a county to one designation or another was based on highly subjective opinions of interviewees, the author, and official actions of county governments (e.g., adoption of Catron County style ordinances).

Also, caution should be used in referencing the numerical data utilized in this analysis. Information was not readily available in consistent formats or for similar years from all counties or States. For that reason, conclusions based on analysis of this data have been limited to categories where the percentage differences between X and Y counties exceed 25%.

County Data

X Counties	County Expenditures	Federal Aid to Counties	County Expenditures per Capita	Total Sq. Miles	Total Assessed Land Value (000,000)	% of land in Federal Domain	Total Current Population	Population in 1980	% in Unincorp Area	Per capita Income	Annual Avg. Unemployment %
Baker	15,404,000	1,924,541	956	3,089	522	52%	16,100	16,134	30	14871	9.5
Deschutes	*15,600,000	6,037,141	180	3,055	5109	76%	86,800	62,142	NA	16946	8.6
Kittitas	13,608,000	1,062,557	466	2,297	1024	37%	29,200	24,877	42	15029	14.1
Pend Orielle	10,448,000	1,373,017	1034	1,400	606	59%	10,100	8,580	71	13768	14
Stevens	13,560,000	2,076,452	406	2,478	1050	22%	33,400	28,979	74	13445	13.1
Union	10,910,000	2,321,152	449	2,038	625	48%	24,300	23,921	26	14807	7.9
AVERAGE	\$13,255,000	\$2,465,810	\$582	2,393	\$1,489	49%	33,317	27,439	49%	\$14,811	11.20
Y Counties											
Chelan	20,396,000	2,335,511	364	2,921	2376	77%	56,000	45,061	45	17857	11.1
Columbia	6,768,000	1,139,887	1650	868	168	30%	4,100	4,057	35	16261	12.7
Ferry	7,651,000	844,630	1109	2,204	252	38%	6,900	5,811	85	12414	11.7
Grant	6,400,000	8,713,735	810	4,528	239	60%	7,900	8,210	36	15774	11.7
Lake	10,761,000	7,214,590	1464	8,359	273	73%	7,350	7,532	NA	15114	9.2
Wallowa	8,805,000	1,550,482	1211	3,153	296	57%	7,200	7,273	44	16868	10.4
AVERAGES	\$10,130,167	\$3,633,139	\$1,101	3,672	\$ 601	56%	14,908	12,991	49%	\$15,715	11.13%

*This figure represents revenues, not expenditures. Expenditure information was not readily available.

Percentage of Employment by Industry (Top Two Employers by Industry Sector per County)

Note: The "0" s in the table below are to be ignored; sectors which were not among the two highest in a county were rated "0".

X Counties	Government	Retail Trade	Services	Manufacturing	Ag/Forestry/Mining
Baker	28	29	0	0	0
Deschutes	0	28	24	0	0
Kittitas	33	25	0	0	0
Pend Orielle	45	0	0	19	0
Stevens	27	0	0	26	0
Union	28	24	0	0	0
AVERAGE	27%	18%	4%	8%	0%
Y Counties					
Chelan	0	0	17	0	22
Columbia	34	0	0	30	0
Ferry	37	0	0	0	18
Grant	43	0	0	20	0
Lake	43	21	0	0	0
Wallowa	37	19	0	0	0
AVERAGES	32%	7%	3%	8%	7%