

# Bushler Bay and Hood View, 40 Years on: Gender, Forests and Change in the Global North

Carol Jean Pierce Colfer, *Cornell University*

*In 2017, Carol Colfer revisited the communities of Bushler Bay and Hood View on the Olympic Peninsula, where she had spent three years doing ethnographic research in the 1970s. The purposes were two-fold: to test several rapid rural appraisal techniques and, as emphasized here, to assess the changes that had taken place in the interim. The ultimate goal was to contribute to USFS efforts to collaborate more effectively with women and men in forest communities. Her findings suggest that changes occurred in three (or more) spheres: livelihoods, demography, and gender relations, each of which is discussed below for each time period. Striking changes include the reduction in logging with a concomitant shift toward tourism, the demographic shift to a more elderly population (many of whom are now ‘amenity migrants’), and a reduction in conflict and hostility between men and women and between ‘Locals’ and the USFS, some of which is replaced by dismissal and social distance between longtime residents and newcomers/environmentalists. The penultimate section discusses the losses and gains sustained by different elements within the communities; and the conclusions argue for the integration of the kind of information contained herein – complemented by ongoing facilitation – to strengthen truly adaptive, collaborative management of U.S. forests.*

**Keywords:** Gender, masculinity, logging, social structure, demography, collaboration, USFS, retirees, amenity migrants

**S**ome in the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) have been struggling to find a management model that recognizes and incorporates the stakes that local people have in the forests around them. The USDA has developed the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program, known informally as ‘Collaboratives’ (see e.g. Wagner and Fernandez-Gimenez 2008; Walpole et al. 2017). USFS colleagues have sought guidance on how to build on and improve such efforts, including more meaningful involvement of the full range of local stakeholders.

My USFS colleagues and I agreed that elements of the approach called ‘Adaptive Collaborative Management’ (ACM),<sup>1</sup> in which I have been intimately involved and which has been widely used in developing countries, could be helpful to the USFS in improving its own collaborative efforts. One of these elements involves serious attention to the lifeways of local communities, as a prelude to collaboration in which local communities have much stronger voices than has been the case in the US version to date. ACM, like the USFS ‘Collaboratives,’ is built on iterative shared learning:

Adaptive Collaborative Management (ACM)...is a value-adding approach

<sup>1</sup> See [www.cifor.org/acm/](http://www.cifor.org/acm/) for numerous examples, Colfer 2005, or Gonsalves et al. 2005.

whereby people who have interests in a forest agree to act together to plan, observe, and learn from the implementation of their plans while recognizing that plans often fail to achieve their stated objectives. ACM is characterized by conscious efforts among such groups to communicate, collaborate, negotiate, and seek out opportunities to learn collectively about the impacts of their actions (Colfer 2005:4).

As implemented in over a dozen countries, a solid grounding in the community context, concern to enhance equity among participants, numerical dominance of local stakeholders, and routine involvement of a comparatively neutral facilitator have also been key elements. We hoped that this study could clarify the context in Bushler Bay and Hood View,<sup>2</sup> as well as provide a model for future research to understand local contexts better and involve local stakeholders more fully in the process.

We also realized that this study – which compares the 1970 context with that of 2017 – could contribute to this special issue looking at the aftermath of the ‘Timber Wars.’ We wondered what happens when an anthropologist returns in 2017 to a community originally studied in the 1970s? What has changed in the community and how many earlier observations and insights still apply? What can we learn about gender and forests?<sup>3</sup> These were also key questions that prompted this analysis.<sup>4</sup>

In May-June 2017, I returned to Bushler Bay, a community in which I had conducted ethnographic research from 1972-1976. The return visit had three important goals: 1) to examine how the community had

changed in the preceding 40+ years; 2) to contribute to our understanding of gender and forests in the global North; and 3) to test six rapid rural appraisal (RRA) tools for use by the US Forest Service (USFS) as a prelude to facilitating more intensive interaction with communities (see Colfer et al. N.d.). Only the first two are systematically addressed here.

The 1970s research focused on the Bushler Bay school, which had obtained a five-year grant from the Rural Experimental Schools Program of the National Institute of Education. A. M. Colfer and I were part of a team responsible for producing an ethnographic case study documenting changes in the school and the community between 1972 and 1976 (Colfer and Colfer 1975; 1979). Cambridge-based researchers conducted quantitative, cross-site studies that included Bushler Bay and nine other rural schools (Corwin 1977; Doyle 1976; Herriott and Gross 1979). I wrote two additional monographs on this material: one on women’s communication and family planning (Colfer 1977); and another unpublished study, focused on the ways the school system replicated local social structure (Colfer N.d. [ca 1978]).

In 2017, time and budgets constrained me to two intense weeks of fieldwork. My USFS colleagues and I selected the RRA tools described in Box 1, supplemented by ‘ethnography lite’ and a questionnaire. One hundred and one people participated formally in the study, including 54 individual interviews, 22 survey responses, and three group interviews (total: 25 individuals). These results, given the short time in the field, cannot be considered definitive; however, my own

<sup>2</sup> Bushler Bay and Hood View are pseudonyms.

<sup>3</sup> Another question, addressed elsewhere, was “How do methods, used widely in the ‘South,’ translate when applied in the ‘North?’”

<sup>4</sup> This research was prompted and funded by the USFS Pacific Northwest Research Station, and planned in collaboration with Susan Hummel and Lee Cerveny.

### Rapid Rural Appraisal tools

These methods were used individually and in groups. The respondents' ages were skewed toward the elderly and female, despite serious efforts to seek a representative sample.

*Bean (or Pebble) Sorting* – Two one-page matrices, with women and men across the top and activities and forest products (respectively) in column 1. I invited 30 women and 17 men, each to allocate 100 beans among the cells, depending on their perceptions of gendered community involvement in the activities and forest product collection, respectively.

*Visioning* – I invited 13 women and 5 men to draw a picture of their ideal future and explain it.

*Guided Interview* – This minimally structured, in-depth interview covered the four research questions: whether men and women think differently about the forest, engage with the forest differently, go to different natural places, and/or have different visions of the future of the forest and their community (4 women, 3 men).

*Participatory Mapping* – Using an existing map of the area, I invited 8 women and 4 men to specify 5-10 places they went for outdoor activities, specifying what they did in each place.

*Who Counts Matrix* – A one-page form with key stakeholders listed across the top and seven dimensions pertaining to people's right to a voice in forest management in column 1: proximity to forests, pre-existing resource rights, dependency, poverty, local knowledge, forest/culture integration, and power deficits. I interviewed 4 women and 3 men knowledgeable about the community.

See Colfer et al. (N.d.), for further elaboration.

### Box 1. Brief summary of Rapid Rural Appraisal tools used.

conclusion is that building on prior knowledge of a site, supplemented by focused RRA tools, can yield a valuable introduction to a community. The particular topics discussed below, livelihood strategies, demography and gender, were selected to build on my own prior knowledge, and to address issues I considered likely to be helpful in possible future collaborative efforts (based on my international experience with ACM).

Bushler Bay and Hood View are small, unincorporated communities on the eastern shore of Washington State's Olympic Peninsula, fronting on Hood Canal. The spectacular images on a clear day – snow-capped Olympic Mountains to the West, fast running clear streams, forested hillsides festooned with wild pink rhododendrons in spring, warm waters of a shallow bay ideal for swimming in summer – are counterbalanced by a dreary winter, when high rainfall (39"/year) means near-constant cloud cover and drizzle, chilly temperatures, and high humidity. Most land is part of the Olympic National Park or the Olympic National Forest (Headwaters

Economics 2012; McLain et al. 2013). The forest was central to people's livelihoods in the 1970s, far less so now, due in part to concerns about the spotted owl (*Strix occidentalis caurina*). This change in forest management has been a key factor in the changes discussed below.

The three spheres in which change has been most dramatic are in livelihood strategies, demography, and gender relations. These spheres parallel social structural features important in the 1970s: splits between 'Public Employees' and 'Locals,' among people of different ages, and between women and men. Change has resulted in serious losses for many of Bushler Bay's long-time residents and serious gains for in-migrants.

Here, I address the changes in each of these three interconnected spheres—fully recognizing the intersectional nature of these classifications and the impossibility of truly separating them. The penultimate section describes losses and gains to different actors (see also Charnley et al. 2008). I briefly summarize and discuss the implications of the

findings for collaborative management in the final section.

### Livelihood and Social Structural Changes<sup>5</sup>

USFS personnel who have examined human issues in the forest, have traditionally paid more attention to livelihoods than to other sociocultural features. Male loggers have interacted routinely with the USFS; but the newer attempt to collaborate with communities spurs broader interests in community social structure and livelihood values. There is now a need to know who is doing what, and something of the history of relations within communities, while also examining social equity.

Women's involvement with the forest, for instance, has not been acknowledged.

Table 1 summarizes some key sociocultural differences between the 1970s and 2017.

#### *In the 1970s*

One segment of the communities, 'Locals,' were involved in private industry (logging, oyster farming, brush picking) and another segment, 'Public Employees,' in government employ (USFS, US Park Service, Washington State Shellfish Lab, US National Fish Hatchery, public schools).

**Table 1.** Comparison of Livelihood & Sociocultural Features at Three Time Periods – Bushler Bay and Hood View

| <b>Factor</b>    | <b>1972-1976<sup>1</sup></b>                                       | <b>1990-2003<sup>2</sup></b>   | <b>2017<sup>3</sup></b>   |
|------------------|--|--|---|
| Social Structure | Locals (=Loggers 1/3, business people 1/3), Public employees (1/3) | Locals & Public Employees decreasing percentage, increasing retirees | Locals & Public Employees still decreasing, Retirees dominant   |
| Age Grading      | extreme  |  | extreme   |
| Volunteering     | high, focused on traditional clubs                                 | high   | high, clubs plus focused action groups  |
| Income gap       | minimal differentiation - middle to low incomes                    | bipolar income distribution; 19% 'poor' in 1990; 15% in 2000         | extreme gap - luxurious second homes, trips to Europe, recreational lifestyle vs. free/reduced price lunch for students increasing in Hood View from 48% in 2000-2001 to 72% in 2011. 13% of Bushler Bay 'lives in poverty' |

<sup>1</sup> Three years of ethnographic research, targeted studies afterwards and statistics from *Jefferson County Office of Economic Opportunity Plan 1971*.

<sup>2</sup> Retrospective study to monitor effects of the 1994 Northwest Forest Plan (Buttolph et al. 2006)

<sup>3</sup> Return two week visit (ethnography 'light' plus multiple methods testing); US Census, 2016

<sup>5</sup> Condensed from Colfer 1977; Colfer and Colfer 1978.

In both groups, occupation for men and husband's occupation for women were central to identity. Occupation functioned in social structural terms like tribal affiliation or caste in other societies; and there were corresponding differences in lifestyle and values. The following synopsis reflects an ideal type; Gender and age interact with and moderate these 'ideals.'

Public employees were oriented toward their respective bureaucracy; their approach to life was universalistic.<sup>6</sup> They stressed organization and efficiency. They received year-round steady incomes, were frugal, and interested in acquiring the material symbols of the middle class. They had paid vacation, sick leave, and could look forward to adequate retirement income. Their employment was "...a fixed fact, and other aspects of their life [could] be planned, scheduled and organized around that fact" (Colfer 1977:13). At the same time, they were very mobile: in the 1970 research, no USFS employee had been there more than eleven years and many transferred out within months. Almost half the teachers left in 1973. This mobility ensured a shortage of kin within the community and encouraged orientation toward the bureaucracy.

Logging, the quintessential symbol of the Local lifeway, was marked by financial insecurity and short-term jobs. Loggers' incomes fluctuated wildly with the seasons. In summertime, if fire danger did not close the forests, work was abundant. But as winter drew nigh, the snows began in the mountains and gradually closed them off. Nor were the fluctuations in work and income predictable, except in the grossest terms. Onset of snow or drought were not subject to human intervention or accurate prediction, nor were fluctuating international timber prices. Loggers

(and other Locals) were unable to plan in the ways that Public Employees could, nor did they typically have paid vacation, sick leave or retirement benefits. On the other hand, they were often paid better when they did work than were Public Employees.

The value systems of the two groups differed accordingly. Where Public Employees sought stylish clothes, a lovely home, a well-kept lawn, Locals' paths to higher prestige typically involved "housing relatives in need, buying rounds of drinks at the local tavern or sponsoring a community party, and contributing to various community projects" (Colfer 1977:16). Many Locals, without steady reliable incomes, built their own homes slowly over the years, often on inherited land. Extra funds were often spent on capital investments (log trucks, equipment, land, a pickup truck).

The tensions between these two groups were obvious and ubiquitous. Public Employees' jobs limited the freedoms of Locals to pursue their economic interests. The Forest Service managed the National Forests so vital to loggers' employment, and enforced associated rules and regulations. The Washington Shellfish Lab similarly had responsibilities relating to shellfish. The school cared for Local children, seeking to instill a more universalistic orientation.

Each had uncomplimentary stereotypes about the other (Colfer 1977:18):

...Public Employees see Locals as lower class, uneducated, underprivileged, and sexually promiscuous. The Locals see Public Employees as lackeys of the bureaucracy without independence of thought or action, practical know-nothings, and slaves to middle class propriety. Neither stereotype

<sup>6</sup> Universalism is "an orientation that honors rules that apply to all, irrespective of social position and relationships. Mottos: 'A rule is a rule;' 'there is one truth'" (Colfer et al. 2017:xxiii). Particularism, in contrast, is "an orientation that honors personal relationships and cultural context above following rules intended for all. Mottos: 'Relationships evolve;' 'things change;' 'people see things differently'" (Colfer et al. 2017:xxii).

is accurate in an objective sense, but the stereotypes have a reality in the village as guides to interaction and the categorization of human beings.

These uncomplimentary stereotypes did not encourage socializing together. Men from a given occupation tended to socialize with others from their work context. For women, though their interactions were moderated by age grading (discussed in the next section), crossing this divide also did not come easily. Sherman's (2017) symbolic capitals – e.g. norms of speech, choice of vehicle, clothing – were potent barriers to interaction and mutual understanding.

Because these communities were unincorporated, community-level statistics were rare. The 'average' income in Jefferson County was \$7,752, with 20% of the population on welfare, 22% receiving less than \$3,000/year and 3.5% receiving food stamps (Jefferson County 1971). Unemployment in the total labor force in 1969 was 7.4%. Though the community was not wealthy, there were no food banks, the churches provided no free lunches, and the natural environment provided supplements to people's subsistence.

These communities, like the rest of the Pacific Northwest, were soon to be embroiled in the Timber Wars (Bari 1994; Dietrich 1992; Lien 1991) – sometimes violent confrontations pitting timber concerns against environmentalists.<sup>7</sup>

### *In 2017*

Although the significance of logging in the community has drastically reduced, there re-

main vestiges of the previous era, particularly among the old. I went to the café where loggers used to cluster in the morning, drinking coffee, some looking for work. There was still a table, occupied every day by two to six elderly Local men dressed in jeans, some with red Loggers World suspenders. None were looking for work, some had chronic injuries. One ex-logger replied, when asked if he was retired, "The State retired me; they got tired of paying for my operations." His comment on the Forest Service:

The Forest Service folks, they always felt they were better than us, and that don't fly around here. Some of them were alright, but the higher-ups, they were the worst

Even though the USFS remains in town, he spoke in the past tense.

A local restaurant, Loggers Landing, recently closed – one where ex-loggers clustered, and where 'spotted owl soup' was reportedly on the menu. I heard tales of earlier conflicts between loggers and environmentalists. One logger told of students from Evergreen College coming in the '90s in droves to protest logging.<sup>8</sup> At the time, someone put a corrosive in his loader, costing \$60,000 to fix. Four or five small logging companies remain, operating mostly on private land. I spent a morning with one man in his 80s who had made a success of his logging company. He remained enthusiastic, experimenting with different trees on his own land, opinionated about the current management by the USFS, responsive to the changes in the market.

Another retired ex-logger expressed gratitude for the spotted owl furor. He said

<sup>7</sup> The USFS, which was seen locally as supporting the environmentalists, found itself caught in the middle, as its personnel tried to maneuver the complexities of changing policy, legal challenges, and day-to-day forest management.

<sup>8</sup> See <http://wafreepress.org/21/Timber.html>, for a 1996 report of this conflict (accessed 15 Nov 2017).

he'd gotten out of logging, gotten a job that paid regularly and well, and included health and retirement benefits. Another man had shifted his efforts to dealing with trees in people's yards, and also found it more profitable than logging. Both noted that, even in the 1970s, logging company owners had made a lot of money, but their workers were always on the grim edge financially.

The changes were also evident in more formal results. In the bean sorting on activities (see Table 2), individuals and groups (n=47) were invited to allocate 100 beans among 13 forest-related activities

(adapted from McLain et al. 2013, under contract with the USFS). Only four of these activities are livelihoods-related, which in itself is of interest and indicative of a change in USFS perspectives as well. I asked participants to allocate according to the importance of the activity in the community. Averaged responses ranged from 1.5-5.5 beans/cell. 'Logging' was one of only two activities with marked gender differentiation (discussed below); but even for men, logging only got 4 beans. For women, logging averaged 1.5. Two surprises: that logging was not seen as significantly more important than the other

**Table 2.** Bean Sorting among Forest-Related Activities

| Activity           | Average Bean Counts | Activity               | Average Bean Counts |
|--------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| <b>Gathering</b>   |                     | <b>Biking</b>          |                     |
| Women              | 4                   | Women                  | 1.5                 |
| Men                | 4                   | Men                    | 2.5                 |
| <b>Logging</b>     |                     | <b>Bird Watching</b>   |                     |
| Women              | 1.5                 | Women                  | 4                   |
| Men                | 4                   | Men                    | 3.5                 |
| <b>Hunting</b>     |                     | <b>Camping</b>         |                     |
| Women              | 2.5                 | Women                  | 3.5                 |
| Men                | 5                   | Men                    | 3.5                 |
| <b>Fishing</b>     |                     | <b>Water Sports</b>    |                     |
| Women              | 4.5                 | Women                  | 3.5                 |
| Men                | 5.5                 | Men                    | 4.5                 |
| <b>Hiking</b>      |                     | <b>Winter Sports</b>   |                     |
| Women              | 4.5                 | Women                  | 1.5                 |
| Men                | 4.5                 | Men                    | 2                   |
| <b>Photography</b> |                     | <b>Admiring Beauty</b> |                     |
| Women              | 3                   | Women                  | 5                   |
| Men                | 3                   | Men                    | 5                   |
| <b>Picnics</b>     |                     |                        |                     |
| Women              | 3                   |                        |                     |
| Men                | 3                   |                        |                     |

activities, and that women were seen to have any role at all in this once-quintessentially male activity.

In a conventional questionnaire<sup>9</sup> (N=13 women, 9 men, self-selected in public settings), I asked what each did in the forest for income. Only one man gained income from the forest, saying he currently worked in the woods for money. Five women reported obtaining income from the forest: one worked for an environmental NGO, three (caregiver, waitress/bartender, and rental cabin owner) may have obtained tourism-related income, and another saw the forest as spurring her income-related creativity.<sup>10</sup> That more women than men reported obtaining income from forest-related activities is noteworthy – particularly in a context where men outnumber women in the working age population.<sup>11</sup> A 2015 census estimate found no one claiming their income came from “farming, fishing or forestry occupations” (United States Census Bureau N.d.) an improbable finding, but indicative of a big change.

In 2017, the two big income-earners for the community are tourism and retirement.<sup>12</sup> Entering Bushler Bay one is greeted by a big sign claiming its special appeal on the Olympic Peninsula. Community volunteers have spruced up the Community Center. Another group has developed and expanded a Museum. This group also bought and is refurbishing a grand old house that had belonged to Bushler Bay’s only wealthy inhabitant in the 1970s. CMIBB (Count Me In for

Bushler Bay) is another group encouraging tourism in the community – led by one of the many in-migrating female retirees. As in the 1970s, women are more involved in community action/volunteering than men.

One middle aged Local man, speaking of the trend toward tourism, highlighted the reduction in cutting allowed on National Forest.

Now they only cut trees to make a road or maintain it for tourists, granola crunchers and fire suppression. Look at the cars: Subarus outnumber F150s<sup>13</sup> twenty to one in the woods. Go up to Scar Pass and count, or count the cars headed for Hood Canal bridge to see both the kinds and the numbers. Sometimes they are backed up [half-way to Bushler Bay].

Many people move to Bushler Bay and Hood View to enjoy its beauty. One couple, who make a good living from nature photography, built a lovely, nature-centered home on a nearby Peninsula, where they view Bushler Bay’s clear waters and snow-capped Mt. Constance. Another couple, who live ‘off the grid’ in a dilapidated trailer on another

<sup>9</sup> The questionnaire was six pages long, with demographics, perceptions of forests, forest use in general and by season.

<sup>10</sup> Smith (2017) reports a current rural American pattern in which good jobs for men (with benefits and reasonable salaries) have been replaced by bad jobs for women (in service industries, with low wages, few benefits, and uncertain, inconvenient hours).

<sup>11</sup> In the age range 20-64, there are 177 men and 113 women in Bushler Bay (<https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?src=CF>, accessed 12 Sept. 2017).

<sup>12</sup> Jefferson County’s (1971) Overall Economic Development Plan does not mention tourism as a then-current employment opportunity, though it suggests parks, tourism and recreation as possible future job sources that could reduce the “single-sector economic predominance” (p. 29) of the wood/timber industry.

<sup>13</sup> Ford F-150s are a preferred truck of Locals; Subarus are popular cars with tourists – an example of symbolic capital, discussed later.



nearby peninsula enjoy a similar view, stewarding someone else's land.<sup>14</sup>

There have always been people who love nature living in the area – both the comfortably well off and those living on the edge, newcomers and old-timers. Indeed, the visioning and guided interview results showed unanimous concern for maintaining the area's natural beauty. But there has been a sizable increase in retirees and what Charnley et al. (2008) call 'amenity migrants,'<sup>15</sup> discussed below.

Although I do not have proof that income differentials have widened, anecdotal material suggests they have (also noted by Charnley et al. 2008, in a broader study incorporating Bushler Bay). Bushler Bay now has a weekly Food Bank for those in need.<sup>16</sup> With a total Bushler Bay population of 437 in 2015, the Food Bank drew 260 visitors on 24 May 2017. The Community Center Director reports that, on average, they serve 250-300/week – drawing also from the surrounding countryside. These visitors are ill, living off the grid, un- or under-employed – what some have called 'the precariat,' those living a precarious existence. A community worker reported that 46% of Bushler Bay's and 99% of Hood View's students were eligible for a 'backpack program,' which provided free food for the weekend. On the other hand, several would-be interviewees discussed their trips (Europe) and cruises (Alaska, the Caribbean). Besides the trailers and small rural farm houses, there are many beautiful, expensive homes. The 2016 US census estimates \$49,300 as the median income in Bushler

Bay and \$51,042 for Hood View, compared to \$55,322 for the nation.<sup>17</sup>

As in the 1970s, several Public Employees and environmentalists stressed their purposeful avoidance of community involvement. A barrier also existed between the recently arrived retired folks and Locals, suggesting continuing community conflict. One newcomer, when asked if she was in any of the local clubs – active in the 1970s – said "Oh, I don't hang out with *those* people." Yet she and other newcomers were actively involved in various community action groups. A community-involved man highlighted the antagonism between Locals and environmentalists, many of whom are retired or semi-retired newcomers:

The community is divided in two between the older pioneers, lumberjacks who remember a time when there was lots of work, three gas stations. Enter the spotted owl. A neighbor's father went to the mill, was laid off, and came home and blew his brains out.

The other half is what are termed 'environmentalists' or 'tree huggers.' The two groups have nothing to do with each other. Won't work together. But the lumberjacks are dying off and environmentalists are increasing, so they will 'win.' I try to trod a fine line between the two.

Referring to environmentally oriented newcomers as 'granola crunchers,' 'tree huggers,' and drivers of the disdained Subarus

<sup>14</sup> Sherman (2017), writing about two other Washington communities, discusses the social capital that can grant the locally well-connected needy reduced housing costs by trading caretaking of property for rent. This Bushler Bay couple guarded the land from poachers and collectors of forest products, as well as cleaning up after any who managed to enter.

<sup>15</sup> "In-migration that occurs in a place because people are drawn to its natural and social features is termed 'amenity migration'" (Charnley et al. 2008:744).

<sup>16</sup> See Coleman-Jensen and Steffan (2017) for discussion of similar food pantries, food deserts, and transportation costs throughout rural America.

<sup>17</sup> U.S. Census; <https://factfinder.census.gov/>.

indicate Local dismissal of such folks (all examples of Sherman's [2017] symbolic capital). As with Locals and Public Employees in the 1970s, there are differences in value orientation and assumptions that make routine interaction problematic. Three environmentalists who 'keep their distance,' for instance, a) felt they had little in common with longstanding community members and b) did not want to spark overt conflict on sensitive issues (like clearcutting and other aspects of forest management, among other topics). Locals also have longstanding networks, so may feel little need to integrate the newcomers – though aged newcomers and old-timers both attended the free lunch at a Bushler Bay Church and there was also mixing in Hood View's Senior Organization (age-grading at work).

Another factor that I believe functions to limit interaction is the theory of class. From an ethnographic perspective, the theory of class has not fit particularly well in these communities. Yet, newcomers (and Public Employees in the past) consider themselves to be 'middle class' and Locals to be 'lower class' – based on the kinds of symbolic, particularly cultural, capital mentioned above. Cultural capital, interpreted as reflective of class differences, creates/reinforces hierarchies that become major stumbling blocks (see also Colfer and Colfer 1978), important if we are interested in encouraging interaction and collaboration among segments of a population. Seeing these differences as simply differences, without assigning value to them, would go far in developing broader community feeling within Bushler Bay and Hood View.

### **Demographic Changes**

Within this context of sociocultural and livelihoods change, there have been demographic changes as well, changes that have

altered the fundamental nature of the communities. Although equivalent data are not always available, I have summarized what is in Table 3.

#### *In the 1970s*

In the winter of 1973, about 100 people worked for public institutions in the two communities, aged between ~25-55, meaning there were ~350-400 individuals in Public Employee families (including the surrounding area). Family size was slightly smaller for Public Employees; Local children predominated in Bushler Bay's school, also because the school drew from the Local-dominated surrounding area (including Hood View high schoolers). Bushler Bay School had 290 students (K-12) and Hood View Elementary School, 50.

Data on Bushler Bay and Hood View age distribution is unavailable, but for the county at large, individuals 60 or older comprised 12% of the population. The county was 97% white, with 3% "other" (Jefferson County 1971). The school portrayed the community's social organization in microcosm. One prominent feature was the age-grading that continued into adulthood. Children of similar age were grouped together all day (as is true throughout the US); the tendency to interact with people of similar age continued throughout life, though age bands broadened as people aged. Women began also to include other women whose children were the same age as theirs. Men similarly preferred others of their own age, though age ranges varied more in work settings (see Colfer 1977, for more detail).

Although Public Employees were more mobile than Locals, the population in general was mobile: only 8% of a 1974 survey of 99 randomly selected respondents (Muse 1974, unpublished computer data) were lifelong residents and 29% had lived there under five years.

**Table 3.** Demographic Comparisons of Bushler Bay/Hood View Past and Present

| <b>FACTOR</b>              | <b>LOCATION</b> | <b>1972-1976<sup>1</sup></b>  | <b>1990-2003<sup>2</sup></b>                       | <b>2017<sup>3</sup></b>                |
|----------------------------|-----------------|---|--|--|
| <b>Population</b>          | The County      | 10,232  | 20,246 in 1990;<br>25,953 in 2000                  | 29,872 (2016)                          |
|                            | Bushler Bay     | 500-600 (local estimates); 830 (County estimate)                        | 478 in core area in 1990; 375 in 2000              | 596 (2010) to 437 (2015)               |
|                            | Hood View       | 200-300+ (local estimate); 270 (County Estimate)                        |  | 797 <sup>++</sup> (2010) to 705 (2015) |
| <b>Median Age</b>          | The County      | 28  | 41 in 1990; 47 in 2000                             | 53                                     |
|                            | Bushler Bay     |   | 32 in 1990; 40 in 2000                             | 49                                     |
|                            | Hood View       |   |  | 60                                     |
| <b>Over 60s</b>            | The County      | 12%   |  | 38%                                    |
|                            | Bushler Bay     |   |  | 31%                                    |
|                            | Hood View       |   |  | 48%                                    |
| <b>Gender Distribution</b> | The county      |   |  | 50% male, 50% female                   |
|                            | Bushler Bay     | about equal   |  | 58% male, 42% female                   |
|                            | Hood View       | about equal   |  | 53% male, 47% female                   |
| <b>FACTOR</b>              | <b>LOCATION</b> | <b>1972-1976<sup>1</sup></b>  | <b>1990-2003<sup>2</sup></b>                       | <b>2017<sup>3</sup></b>                |
| <b>Racial composition</b>  | The County      | 97% white, 3% other   |  |  |
|                            | Bushler Bay     |   |  | 90% white <sup>+</sup> Hispanic        |
|                            | Hood View       |   |  | 96% white <sup>+</sup> Asian, other    |
| <b>Household income</b>    | The County      | \$7,752 (“average”); 20% on welfare; 22% <\$3,000/year; 7% unemployment |  | \$50,928 (Median)                      |
|                            | Bushler Bay     |   | \$25,378 in 1990;<br>\$40,094 in 2000 <sup>#</sup> | \$49,300.00                            |
|                            | Hood View       |   |  | \$51,042.00                            |

<sup>1</sup>Three years of ethnographic research plus targeted studies afterwards; statistics from Jefferson County Office of Economic Opportunity Plan 1971.

<sup>2</sup>Retrospective study to monitor effects of the 1994 Northwest Forest Plan (Buttolph et al. 2006)

<sup>3</sup>Return two-week visit (ethnography plus multiple methods testing); US Census, 2016

<sup>+</sup>Local estimates reported in A. Colfer and Colfer 1979; Preliminary Overall Economic Development Plan for Jefferson County, 1971

<sup>++</sup>Locally, Bushler Bay is universally considered (and looks) considerably bigger.

<sup>#</sup>The 1990 and 2000 median incomes are adjusted for inflation.

*In 2017*

Although the County has grown (see Table 3), both study communities have lost population in recent years. The census interpretation of Hood View's size differs from longstanding local interpretations (Bushler Bay being larger), but the *loss* in population is also reflected in the Hood View census figures. The most dramatic change is the increase in the elderly:<sup>18</sup> in Bushler Bay, over-60s comprise 31% of the population, in Hood View, a whopping 48%. The median age has also risen sharply. Bushler Bay has become less 'White,' with 10% primarily 'Hispanic,' while in Hood View, non-Whites ('Asian' and 'other') now constitute 4% of the population.<sup>19</sup> There are more males than females in both communities, and students in Bushler Bay School are 66% male.

Bushler Bay's school enrollment in 2017 decreased to 202, with 16% minority and 51% 'economically disadvantaged' (U.S. News 2017) while Hood View's elementary school enrollment remained the same (51 students).

The previously observed age grading remains in effect. When I re-activated contacts from the 1970s – like me, now in their 70s – I found more of like age. Two friends arranged focus group discussions: all participants were over 50, and more than half of these were over 70. As the fieldwork progressed, I began seeking younger people explicitly. My age-mates (and others) had difficulty suggesting young people. This is partly due to the scarcity of people of working age; there are so few jobs available locally (also noted by Sherman 2017 and others). The

school remains organized by age, with continuing implications for parents (school-related activities with others whose children are of similar age).

Of 23 people who attempted bean-sorting tasks (Tables 2 and 5) for instance, I could only find five individuals between 18 and 50.<sup>20</sup> All in all, slightly less than one third of the 79 respondents were under 50 – due to the difficulty of *finding* younger people. There were few refusals at any age. Many were working away from the community, and age grading reduced the likelihood of finding them via snowball sampling. Eventually, I resorted to 'hunting' in public places, with some success.

A local woman and I set up and monitored tables at the Bushler Bay Food Bank and a Hood View Festival, offering the opportunity to all who passed by to fill in a questionnaire (n=22). One topic of interest was length of time in the communities. Of the 19 usable responses,<sup>21</sup> 11% classified themselves as 'old-timers,' 32% as newcomers, and the rest in between.

Community mobility does not appear to have changed a great deal, with the possible exception of the USFS. The two USFS personnel I interviewed were newcomers and claimed ignorance about the community – neither actually lived there. All of the staff commuted in. One person who had worked for the USFS before retirement said that in the past the agency had hired local people as technicians and thereby gotten access to more knowledge about local conditions. Not so anymore.

<sup>18</sup> This trend is visible throughout much of the rural U.S. (Johnson 2017).

<sup>19</sup> Although there were a few minority individuals in the group interviews, the numbers were too small to analyze. Time constraints precluded special attention to this important issue.

<sup>20</sup> Due to interest in simplifying the IRB review at Cornell University, I opted not to include individuals younger than 18 – a decision I came to regret.

<sup>21</sup> I excluded three visitors from the 22.

## Gender Changes

In the interlude between the 1970s and the present, my work has focused on gender in the tropics – where the topic has gained acceptance and interest. Only recently has it become clear that material on gender and forests in the U.S. is in short supply (Colfer et al. 2017). Using a framework originally developed for communities living in tropical forests, I estimated and compared the values for four gender-relevant dimensions, in these study communities in the past and present (Table 4).

## *In the 1970s*

In Bushler Bay in the 1970s, daily segregation was the norm for men and women in the productive age range: men were away working, and women were home taking care of the house and children (though more women wanted to work outside the home than could). Bushler Bay women were active in community ‘clubs,’ performing many of the functions of local government. Of the 17 formal clubs, 15 were segregated by gender, only four of which were for men (Colfer 1977).

Among Locals, male dominance was

**Table 4.** Qualitative Estimates of Gender Differentiation at two Time Periods<sup>1</sup>

| Time              | Social Group            | Clear Division of Space | Strict Division of Labour | Strong Male Dominance | Hostility to Women in Public Arenas |
|-------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| mid-1970s         | <i>Locals</i>           | 5                       | 5                         | 4                     | 3                                   |
|                   | <i>Public Employees</i> | 3                       | 4                         | 3                     | 2                                   |
| 2017 <sup>2</sup> |                         | 2                       | 3                         | 2                     | 1                                   |

<sup>1</sup>Features of gender differentiation used in ACM (Colfer 2005)

<sup>2</sup>Short time in the field precludes confidence in within-community differentiation

Note: 1 = low; 5 = high degree

Ideas about gender and forest use were also examined systematically in this most recent research. The changes observed suggest that attempts by the USFS to involve women more meaningfully in forest management are unlikely to encounter some of the barriers they would have met in the past. There is also evidence that both women and men have knowledge of local forests that would be of use in collaboratively improving forest management, economically and socially.

overt; much of Reed’s (2003) analysis of gender discrimination in the forest communities of nearby Vancouver Island, and the parts women play in maintaining it, apply to 1970s Bushler Bay (Colfer 1983). Both men and women idealized strength, toughness, courage, even dominance, in the Local version of masculinity. Marriages were brittle, with about half ending in divorce, according to County statistics (consistent with a national trend, Plateris 1980). This version of masculinity also depended on the forest for its preferred professional manifestation, logging. Brandth and Haugen (1998; 2000) document

similar ideals of masculinity among forestry workers in Sweden in the 1980s; as do Reed and Davidson (2011) for contemporary forestry workers in Canada; see also Grindal (2011) for ‘rednecks’ in the southern US.

Public Employee gender relations were less overtly characterized by male dominance, but these men and women ‘did gender’ as culturally prescribed (husband as head of household, final decision-maker, wage earner, and wife as housekeeper, nurse, household manager, in charge of children). These ‘appropriate’ gender roles for boys and girls were clearly played out in the school’s ‘hidden curriculum,’ whether in:

- basketball games (Colfer and Colfer 1976) – where boys played, and girls cheered them on;
- teacher-student interactions – where male teachers focused on the boys and female teachers on the girls, each teaching gender-stereotyped courses; or
- the distribution of power within the school – where middle aged white men pulled the strings (Colfer N.d.).

See Kennedy (2016), Mallory (2006, 2010) and Norgaard (2007) for more recent gender analyses of relevance to US forests.

Discussion of forest use in Bushler Bay and Hood View tended to emphasize logging, a central element in the Local life-way. However, it was clear at the time that both women and men also made use of the forest, gathering mushrooms, berries, salal, and other non-timber forest products, as well as non-consumptive use. At that time, neither the community nor the researchers considered such forest uses of particular interest,

however. So, I cannot make any quantitative comparisons.

### *In 2017*

The most obvious change has been the reduction in gender segregation.<sup>22</sup> Men and women hung out together in 2017. This was clear in results from the collaborative mapping study<sup>23</sup> (where individuals expressed their preferences for leisure activities with their spouse); in the bean sorting (where activities were given similar scores ‘because we do them together [with a spouse]’); and in the visioning<sup>24</sup> (where there was no identifiable differentiation between men’s and women’s visions for the future). The clubs, where I had anticipated finding single sex groups to interview (Lions Club, Volunteer Firemen, Presbyterian Women’s Club), turned out to be gender mixed, as did all the groups I was able to convene or visit.

Marriage seems to have become comparatively uninteresting to Bushler Bay and Hood View citizenry. According to the US Census estimates<sup>25</sup>, 34% of the people never married. Fifty five percent of Bushler Bay’s men are single (never married, divorced, and widowed) and 56% of Hood View’s men (US Average: 50%). Among Bushler Bay men, 42% never married; among women, 25% (U.S. overall average: 36%). All of the births in the previous 12 months were to unwed mothers in both communities.

<sup>22</sup> Pini et al. (2015:196) conclude in their collection on ruralities and feminisms that “In the industrialized west, the greater equality that undoubtedly exists between men and women in many walks of life (most notably education and access to employment) has detracted from the idea of men’s universal power over women and questioned the existence of patriarchy.” Such trends are evident in these communities.

<sup>23</sup> A variation of the Human Ecology Mapping protocol, a public participatory GIS tool used on the Olympic Peninsula for planning on public lands (Cervený et al. 2017a, b; McLain et al. 2013).

<sup>24</sup> Adapted from Evans et al. 2006.

<sup>25</sup> December 2017, <http://www.towncharts.com/Washington/Demographics/XXX-CD-WA-Demographics-data.html>

I used the Who Counts Matrix<sup>26</sup> to identify groups who should have a strong say in forest management – anticipating strong differentiation by gender. In this measure, the lower the score between 1 and 3, the stronger the right to a voice; a score of <2 usually suggests the right to a strong voice. Surprisingly, Retired men and women *both* averaged 2.2; Local men and women, 1.3. USFS men were seen as slightly more deserving of a voice (1.8) than USFS women (2.0).

In the first bean sorting task – which asked respondents to allocate 100 beans according to community involvement in each of 13 activities – the scores were remarkably evenly distributed among the activities, with no single activity dominant (Table 2). Respondents allocated the same average number of beans to both men and women for five activities. But logging was allocated an average of only 4 beans for men and 1.5 for women. Men were seen to be more involved in hunting (2.5 for women, 5 for men). None of the other activities differed more than one bean

between men's and women's scores. Overall men were seen to be more involved in forests than women, but not by much.

The differences are greater when we turn to bean sorting for products gathered from the forest (Table 5). Again, participants were estimating community involvement in the collection of these products. The only product for which women were seen to dominate is berry picking (7.4 for women, 4.9 for men). Women and men were seen as very similarly involved in mushroom picking (5.7 for women, 5.8 for men) and 'Christmas trees, wreaths, etc.' (5.7 for women, 5.9 for men). The collection of 'salal, brush, etc.' was differentiated in people's minds between subsistence (in which [white] women were seen to be more involved) and commercial (which [non-white] men were seen to dominate). Among all interviewees, non-timber forest product collection was for subsistence use.

In the questionnaire – which asked about personal involvement rather than the

**Table 5.** Bean Sorting Mean Scores for Products (Groups and Individuals Combined)

| Product                               | Average Bean Counts | Product               | Average Bean Counts |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| <b>Salal, brush, etc.</b>             |                     | <b>Shellfish/fish</b> |                     |
| Women                                 | 4.3                 | Women                 | 9.1                 |
| Men                                   | 7.8                 | Men                   | 13.5                |
| <b>Berries</b>                        |                     | <b>Mushrooms</b>      |                     |
| Women                                 | 7.4                 | Women                 | 5.7                 |
| Men                                   | 4.9                 | Men                   | 5.8                 |
| <b>Firewood, poles, etc.</b>          |                     | <b>Animals/game</b>   |                     |
| Women                                 | 3.7                 | Women                 | 5.6                 |
| Men                                   | 9.4                 | Men                   | 10.8                |
| <b>Christmas trees, wreaths, etc.</b> |                     |                       |                     |
| Women                                 | 5.7                 |                       |                     |

<sup>26</sup> This is a matrix filled in with a few persons knowledgeable about a community (here, n=7; 4 women, 3 men; all but one elderly). Participants assign 1, 2, or 3 to each of seven dimensions---1) proximity; 2) pre-existing rights; 3) dependency; 4) poverty; 5) local knowledge; 6) culture/forest link; and 7) power deficit---as they apply to local stakeholders, categories of which are listed on the top row (Colfer et al. 1999).

community in general – participants were asked to fill in the blank: “The woods near Bushler Bay/Hood View are places for me to...” Thirty two percent of the women responded with hiking, walking, or roaming, whereas only 14% of men did so. This is a bigger differentiation than was evident in the bean sorting – where men and women were seen as equally involved in hiking, perhaps because only the one term was offered. The questionnaire also asked about regularity of forest use. Forty six percent of women respondents said they “visited the local woodlands, forests, meadows” daily, with 38% of men reporting doing so; 23% of women visited “often,” in contrast to 12% of men.

Another important change is an increase in women’s employment. Of the 81 readable demographic and informed consent forms, 47 were women who listed a profession, two claimed to be retired, and one identified her profession as “house management.” Thirty men listed a profession, and one claimed to be retired.

Martz et al. (2006) document the recent shortage of desirable jobs for women in rural Saskatchewan. Reed et al. (2014) show the predominance of women in part time, seasonal, low paying jobs in Canada. Although this was also true for Bushler Bay, there was little evidence that men had an easier time finding employment. Bushler Bay’s USFS office, once a male preserve, was later dominated by (non-resident) women, including a female Acting District Ranger. Around three-quarters of Bushler Bay School’s staff was female.

As before, female volunteerism thrived in Bushler Bay (as shown also in nearby Vancouver Island, Reed 2000). Women were more involved than men in the Museum, the Food Bank, the Presbyterian Women’s free lunch program for the elderly.

Women were in charge of and/or dominated several clubs (e.g. two garden clubs) and community action groups (e.g. CMIBB).

Whereas in the past, community action was oriented toward providing needed community services (e.g. funding street lights, organizing preschool and community functions, monitoring the school levy), some present-day group activities were designed to make Bushler Bay and Hood View more attractive tourist destinations (e.g. the development of the museum, the refurbishment of the mansion, the Hood View Shrimp Festival, and others).

Attitudes have also changed markedly. Men and women of all ages likely to have expressed antagonism to gender equality in the past<sup>27</sup> now acknowledged women’s capabilities and right to equal treatment. Women said they “can do anything a man can do.” In the bean sorting exercise, for instance, the recognition that women had *any* role in logging would have been unlikely in the 1970s; yet those interviewed recently noted women’s involvement in various roles in the industry. One retired logger claimed with pride to have consistently hired the only woman log truck driver in town.

Besides accepting women’s worth more clearly, acceptance of other sexualities, beyond the heteronormative, has grown. One tough, middle-aged, heterosexual Local man told how disastrous being gay would have been for one’s social status when he was a teenager, but that now, if he were gay, he would live openly with his partner.

### **Losses Sustained; Benefits Accrued**

Any system of forest management entails gains and losses. Charnley et al. (2008:757) note:

<sup>27</sup> In the 1970s, I did not deny my feminist leanings in the community. Many Locals saw this self-identification as a ‘ball buster’ (a shrew who attacks men’s masculinity). My husband was sometimes ‘jokingly’ accused of being ‘pussy-whipped’ (dominated by his wife), despite the lack of any pertinent behavioral evidence.



Qualitative data indicate that amenity migration has had mixed effects on community capacity, cultural identity, economic conditions, and quality of life, some of which threaten both the natural and social amenities of non-metropolitan communities.

A fuller understanding of such issues will be crucial for successful implementation of collaborative management. Here I consider those losses and gains sustained by these two communities.

### *Losses*

One interview with an elderly Local man was particularly poignant and makes clear how much has been lost.<sup>28</sup> B, a gentle man, had spent his life in Bushler Bay and had the respect of his peers. I initially contacted him to tap his extensive knowledge of non-timber forest products. As he talked, gently, sadly, without rancor, about the town and the forest, these losses emerged:

- Logging was central to the Local way of life in the 1970s; its importance dwindled, and along with it, key aspects of that lifeway (e.g. income for those without other skills; capacity for men to adhere to the Local ideal form of masculinity; the opportunity to work outdoors in nature and to manipulate heavy equipment).
- Brush picking was once a thriving, if relatively informal, commercial concern for local folks – a supplement in times of need, a source of ready cash for young people, full time employment for a few. Access was free, everywhere. Now Pope and Talbot (a large logging company and land owner) for instance, leases out 3,000

acres nearby. It requires significant capital to gain legal access to large concessions. Local people and USFS personnel confirm that teams of immigrants now collect the brush, some reportedly illegally.

- In the past, more people used readily available firewood for heat. Firewood permits have been available from the USFS for decades, particularly after a logging job or blowdown (tree falls by wind). With almost no logging jobs from the USFS, legal access to firewood in nearby National Forests has been seriously diminished. For the most part, people who need firewood must rely on private land or obtain it illegally.
- Anyone could collect the abundant shellfish (oysters, clams, geoducks) along the shore in the 1970s. The land is (and was) privately owned, but the norm was open access; norms have changed. Landowners now reportedly prevent access.
- Mushrooms, once common for subsistence use, are now collected commercially by Southeast Asians (though there are still some for local folks).<sup>29</sup>
- Subsistence fishing has been consistently popular with men and women. In the 1970s, the fishing regulations allowed 20 fish per day at least 6" in length. Now the rule is one a day of at least a foot in length.

Another serious loss mentioned by many community members was the absence of jobs for the young. Most leave – a source of pain for young and old alike (also observed by Sherman 2017, for two other Washington communities).

<sup>28</sup> See Buttolph et al. (2006) and McLain et al. (2013) for additional evidence on losses in the region.

<sup>29</sup> See Cook (2013) for a recent study of mushroom gathering in the Pacific Northwest; or Tsing (2015) for a global perspective on mushrooms.

There are serious resentments and feelings of loss that come from the actions of outsiders (Government, in-migrants, timber companies). Barnett et al. (2016) propose a ‘science of loss,’ and provide suggestions for how to help communities deal with such loss. Reed and Davidson (2011) liken the losses that Canadian non-aboriginal folks experience to those experienced by aboriginals. Turner et al. (2008) describes the latter as ‘invisible losses.’

As painful as are the *material* losses outlined above, Locals particularly also have a sense (as before) that their needs and wants have been ignored, that their rights have been violated.<sup>30</sup> Reed (2004) writes of the oppositional politics that have sometimes been reinforced by ‘moral exclusion’ – something that hit the Local Bushler Bay and Hood View communities remarkably hard (see also Sherman’s 2017 discussion of symbolic capital; or Colfer and Colfer 1978 for a theoretical discussion). Essentially, the value systems of these communities have been subjected to sustained assault – from the school system, the government agencies, the media. Logging, a central symbol of their way of life, has been widely vilified as forest-destroying; within the universalistic values instilled in the school – where we are all competing for the same gold stars – Local community members have been seen as ‘losers’ (in a contest they have actually not chosen to enter); their children have been lured away, using the same rationale, reinforced by fewer and fewer jobs locally. I see this as a contest between competing cultural systems rather than as a class conflict. If the universalists ‘win,’ as predicted by the community member quoted earlier, Local families will lose out, but forest management will also be poorer

and biocultural diversity reduced. In this case, moral exclusion cuts two ways. Locals also disapprove of Public Employees and conservationists, but their disapproval does not carry the same weight; it is not reinforced nationally, bureaucratically, and economically.

Overcoming such antagonisms – in search of viable collaborative solutions (genuinely needed) – will have to begin with humility and willingness to *learn from* local (including Local) people more than to *teach* them.

### *Gains*

On the other side of the equation, there is universally enthusiastic appreciation for the area’s beauty and natural wealth (see McLain et al. 2013 and Cerveny et al. 2017a, for discussion of such appreciation in the Olympic Peninsula more generally). For Locals, neither the beauty nor the appreciation of it is new;<sup>31</sup> but many in-migrants express effusive newfound delight. Many have moved to Bushler Bay and Hood View from cities across Puget Sound, where their lives have been urban, work-focused, traffic-laden, and hectic. Retirement in such a beautiful place is a dream come true. Many throw themselves into community improvement, nature preservation, historical research; others take up outdoor hobbies (skiing, fishing, hiking, photography and more); some simply soak up the peace and beauty. One older, female, amenity migrant sums up a common view:

I love it, don’t want it to change, don’t need a supermarket. I don’t like to camp, but I want the forest nearby for hiking. I love to watch the changing

<sup>30</sup> In some cases, this plays out in rightwing political action.

<sup>31</sup> I concur with Charnley et al’s (2008:958-9) observation: “Often community members we interviewed who had worked in the wood products industry expressed a deep care for the forests around them, held local ecological knowledge about them, and felt a sense of stewardship toward them.”

seasons, the slow growth of flowers, the sounds of the forest. I still go there even though I have hay fever.

Some Locals also feel they have gained from the changes, painful though many have been. Two men, discussed earlier, spoke of their ultimate gratitude for the loss of logging, which pushed them to change professions (also noted by Rebecca McLain in various communities in the Pacific Northwest in the early 2000s, pers. comm., 11 November 2017). Two women spoke in depth about their work (nature photography, a small store), both now thriving with the increase in tourism. Others expressed gratitude that the environment remains beautiful.

### **Conclusions and Implications for Collaborative Management**

The two main purposes of this paper have been to document significant changes in Bushler Bay and Hood View over the past forty years, and to convey changes in gender relations there. Both issues are important a) as potentially applicable to other one-time logging communities, and b) as a backdrop from which to undertake genuine collaborative management of the forests there.

Recognizing the short length of my stay (and therefore the preliminary nature of these findings), I formed the following conclusions. There has been a diminution of the Local way of life, as exemplified by logging; a reduction in the availability of employment opportunities; an increase in women's involvement in paid work; an influx of 'amenity migrants,' mostly of retirement age and with strong environmental concerns; a shift from a 'normal' age distribution to one heavily biased toward the elderly; and an increased gap between the rich and the poor. In terms of gender, there has been a reduction in hegemonic masculinities; greater acceptance of and adherence to gender equity; more and

friendlier husband-wife interactions publicly; continued involvement of both women and men in forest activities beyond timber; considerable local knowledge, differing somewhat by gender, about and use of local forests for a variety of purposes.

Here, I consider some of the implications of this work for collaborative forest management. The aging population suggests different uses of the forest (less extractive, more passive and lower energy). Insofar as men's and women's forest use differs, given the usual sex ratio at older ages, women's uses will be increasingly germane as time goes by. The increased longevity, often accompanied by reasonably good health (particularly among women), suggests also that this population may be more available for collaborative forest management than in the past (Bateson 2010, proposes 'Adult II' as a name for this new category of active elderly, capable of contributing significantly).

The gap between rich and poor appears to have widened considerably in this region, as comparatively wealthy people (mainly retirees) move in from the cities. Their knowledge of forests and the environment will certainly be different and less robust about the forests in this area than that of 'old-timers.' On the other hand, they will have skills and knowledge obtained elsewhere that can bring new insights and networks to collaboration.

The extreme antagonism between Locals and Public Employees that characterized Bushler Bay in the 1970s has moderated, partly because those most adversely affected by the cessation of logging are dying. Some antagonism between those who have been in the community for decades and the newcomers remains. Such conflict will need to be managed carefully if collaboration is to proceed smoothly.

One of the biggest changes has been the loss of the extreme gender segregation, both in terms of action and expectations, that

characterized the earlier community. Husbands and wives do many things together now. The degree to which this is a common pattern related to aging and retirement, whether it reflects the influx of a population more inclined to gender equality and/or a broader social change is unclear (though all three may be operative).

Notions particularly of masculinity have in most cases moderated, as has acceptance of gender diversity. The men interviewed no longer emphasized their own strength, toughness, fearlessness (though such notions were not totally absent).<sup>32</sup> Hegemonic masculinity is on the decline. Most Bushler Bay women were proud of their own strength and resourcefulness in earlier times and remain so. Unlike in the 1970s, no woman expressed a submissive attitude toward her husband. Such changes strengthen the likelihood that women's involvement in collaborative management could be significant. There is ample evidence of local (and other) women's organizing abilities and practices; and of their interest in local forests. Mobilizing them more effectively in collaborative forest management should not be difficult, with a little focused effort.

The knowledge that some elderly have about forest products should be tapped before this generation dies off.<sup>33</sup> There is concern in the community that the young in general are less interested and less knowledgeable about the forest as a habitat for animals and plants of use to people (also noted by Creighton et al. 2016). The fact that elderly women, for instance, know a great deal about berries (their timing/seasons, habitats, varieties, tastes, uses, spines, vines, size, cuisine) was clear (e.g. Ballard and Huntsinger 2006, or Collins et al. 2008). Their

knowledge – not common among forest scientists either, given the tendency to focus on timber – may not be passed on without explicit attention.<sup>34</sup> It is definitely not being used by the USFS now.

The longevity and time availability of the elderly compared to other age sets suggests a group of potential collaborators for forest-related projects. There is already a vibrant volunteer group, including the active elderly, that helps maintain trails in the area; and there is near-unanimous support for protecting the region's beauty – of which forests are an integral part.

These results represent a good first step in a process that could bring formal forest management by the USFS in line with the hopes, dreams, and capabilities of rural people. Ultimately sustainable forest management will require collaboration with local communities.

Looking at USFS attempts at collaboration (most recently, the USDA's Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program, called 'Collaboratives'; see e.g. Walpole et al. 2017; Wagner and Fernandez-Gimenez 2008) through my own eyes, which have focused on international collaborative attempts, I note four characteristics I would change. The first is the degree to which local communities' ideas in these collaboratives are required to fit in with pre-existing national policies and laws. There is little flexibility at the local level. This minimizes opportunities for creative, locally relevant, iterative problem-solving. Some new people are invited to the table, but the table has already been set and the menu prepared. For people whose lives have been seriously disrupted by USFS policies (like those in Bushler Bay and Hood View), this would seem like 'more of

<sup>32</sup>See Pini et al. (2015) and Sherman (2015) for good discussions of this change in the US more broadly.

<sup>33</sup> Non-Locals can also have pertinent knowledge about the forest, of course.

<sup>34</sup> Several studies show women's lesser forestry knowledge than men, but the emphasis in these studies remained on timber (e.g. Follo et al. 2016; Redmore and Tynon 2011).

the same' – i.e. invitations to comment, but without any hope of influencing a decision.

Secondly, there is a large percentage of non-local individuals involved in the collaboratives (e.g. many USFS personnel). In a recent study, 75% of the participants in 26 Oregon collaboratives, for instance, were male, 52% had a median income of \$80,000 or more, and only 26% identified as 'citizens' rather than representative of a formal group (Davis et al. 2015).<sup>35</sup> This suggests that many people with forest-related concerns and knowledge may not have been involved. USFS researchers' recognition of this was one factor that led to this study. How do we gain access to the views of the 'missing middle' (those not strongly committed to a particular political view)? In the 1970s and now, most residents of Bushler Bay and Hood View would be unlikely to respond to an invitation to discuss forest management unless there was a particularly controversial decision being considered (see, e.g. such a controversial case in Cervený et al. 2017b). Truly collaborative management will require longer term and more intensive interactions, trust building and rapport building with forest communities.

Third, policymaking and other decision making within the US Government is universalistic. Rules (most developed at the national level) are meant to be followed by all employees and citizens. There is also a narrative – popular in many circles – that rural peoples are backward, under-educated, poor, 'losers.'<sup>36</sup> The reluctance of some community

members to involve themselves in community life is partially because of this kind of stereotype. The facts that no USFS personnel a) live in the community or b) came to the meeting I called to discuss the community, suggest it may well be common among them. It would certainly have been the case in the past. In collaborative efforts, this kind of stereotype does not help; and insofar as it applies among would-be collaborators, it plays out in disrespect for local knowledge and is unlikely to encourage trust and cooperation (recognized as necessary for effective collaboration, e.g. Hopkinson et al. 2017).

Fourth, the USFS needs to take on the findings of social scientists whose research protocols necessarily differ from those used in the study of trees. Understanding how communities function, their interests and goals, is not amenable in most cases to the experimental method. Ethnographic approaches, open-ended interviews, surveys, and RRA tools are all legitimate ways to study communities, yet these are not widely accepted within the USFS.<sup>37</sup> I believe that adaptive collaborative management as implemented in developing countries<sup>38</sup> has potential for use in improving the collaboratives and other efforts to collaborate with communities. It is an approach that builds on firm knowledge of the local context, continuing engagement and 'neutral' facilitation with local women and men, the development of shared goals, planned local monitoring, regular re-assessment of progress toward those goals, and iterative re-planning as needed. I

<sup>35</sup> Davis et al. (2015) also found that two thirds of the participants were over 50, indicating that there is already some participation by the elderly.

<sup>36</sup> Keller (2015), for instance, considers rural residence itself to be a marginalizing factor.

<sup>37</sup> This ignores another serious problem, which is that any survey that asks the same question of more than nine individuals needs approval by the Office of Management and Budget, a reportedly unwieldy and lengthy process with an uncertain outcome. On two occasions, my research plans have had to be altered due to USFS reluctance to initiate this process.

<sup>38</sup> Extensive use of adaptive collaborative management around the world is documented on this website: [www.cifor.org/acm/](http://www.cifor.org/acm/). See the lead article here for a recent example: <https://cgiargender.exposure.co/international-day-of-rural-women>.

hope that this study, which has actively involved local community members in forest-related research, will contribute to ongoing efforts both a) to strengthen our knowledge of forest communities and gender in America's forests and b) to establish and maintain the people's trust (Brown and Reed 2009; Battle 2017) for future collaboration.

---

*Carol Colfer is a cultural anthropologist, a Senior Associate at the Center for International Forestry Research and a Visiting Scholar at Cornell University's Southeast Asia Program. She has specialized in work with people in forests, particularly in the developing world, through much of her professional life, with a few side trips into reproductive health.*

**Acknowledgments** The USDA Forest Service's Pacific Northwest Research Station funded this research. I am grateful to Susan Hummel and Lee Cervený who helped to craft the research plan and collaborate on an earlier analysis. Special thanks also go to Shelley Feldman, Virginia Kennedy and Rebecca McLain who kindly critiqued earlier versions of this paper; Diane Besser who provided me with maps used in participatory mapping; and three excellent anonymous reviewers whose suggestions improved the paper considerably. I also thank Linda Huberman, Larry McKeehan, and Nancy Wyatt for special help during fieldwork; and all the many participants from Bushler Bay and Hood View who shared their time and thoughts so freely. Cornell University provided ethical oversight and superb library resources for the analysis and write-up.

---

### References

- Ballard, Heidi L., and Lynn Huntsinger. 2006. "Salal Harvester Local Ecological Knowledge, Harvest Practices and Understory Management on the Olympic Peninsula, Washington." *Human Ecology* 34:529–547.
- Bari, Judi. 1994. *Timber Wars*. Monroe, Maine: Common Courage Press.
- Barnett, Jon, Petra Tschakert, Lesley Head, and W. Neil Adger. 2016. "A Science of Loss." *Nature Climate Change* 6:976–978.
- Bateson, Mary Catherine. 2010. *Composing a Further Life: The Age of Active Wisdom*. New York: Knopf.
- Battle, John. 2017. Lessons from California. Presented at *Cornell Department of Natural Resources Weekly Seminar*. Ithaca, New York.
- Brandth, Berit, and Marit S. Haugen. 2000. "From Lumberjack to Business Manager: Masculinity in the Norwegian Forestry Press." *Journal of Rural Studies* 16:343–355.
- Brandth, Berit, and Marit S. Haugen. 1998. "Breaking into a Masculine Discourse Women and Farm Forestry." *European Society for Rural Sociology/Sociologia Ruralis* 38(3):427–442.
- Brown, Gregory G., and Pat Reed. 2009. "Public Participation GIS: A New Method for Use in National Forest planning." *Forest Science* 55(2):166–182.
- Buttolph, Lita P., William Kay, Susan Charnley, Cassandra Moseley, and Ellen M. Donoghue. 2006. "Northwest Forest Plan—The First 10 Years (1994–2003): Socioeconomic Monitoring of the Olympic National Forest and Three Local Communities." *General Technical Report, PNW-GTR-679:84*. Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station.
- Cervený, Lee, Kelly Biedenweg, and Rebecca J. McLain. 2017a. "Mapping Meaningful Places on Washington's Olympic Peninsula: Toward a Deeper Understanding of Landscape Values." *Environmental Management* 60(4):643–664.
- Cervený, Lee, Kelly Biedenweg, and Rebecca McLain. 2017b. "Values Mapping and

- Counter-mapping in Contested Landscapes: an Olympic Peninsula (USA) Case Study." *Human Ecology* 45:585–600.
- Charnley, Susan, Rebecca J. McLain, and Ellen M. Donoghue. 2008. "Forest Management Policy, Amenity Migration, and Community Well-Being in the American West: Reflections from the Northwest Forest Plan." *Human Ecology* 36:743–761.
- Coleman-Jensen, Alisha, and Barry Steffen. 2017. "Food Insecurity and Housing Insecurity." Pp. 257-298 in *Rural Poverty in the United States*, edited by A. R. Tickamyer, J. Sherman and J. Warlick. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Colfer, A. Michael, and Carol J. Pierce Colfer. 1979. *Big Money, Small Change: Cultural Paradigms in an American Village*. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates.
- Colfer, Carol J. Pierce. 1977. *Women's Communication and Family Planning in Rural America: The Case of Bushler Bay*. Honolulu, HI: East-West Center Communications Institute.
- Colfer, Carol J. Pierce. N.d. (ca 1978). *That All Men are Created Equal...: American Paradigms in a Rural School*. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates.
- Colfer, Carol J. Pierce. 1983. "On Communication Among 'Unequals.'" *International Journal of Intercultural Communication* 7:263-83.
- Colfer, Carol J. Pierce. 2005. *The Complex Forest: Communities, Uncertainty, and Adaptive Collaborative Management*. Washington, DC: Resources for the Future/CIFOR.
- Colfer, Carol J. Pierce, and A. Michael Colfer. 1975. "A Social and Educational History of Quilcene-Brinnon, Washington." Pp. 857-918 in *Rural America: A Social and Educational History of Ten Communities*, edited by S. J. Fitzsimmons, P. C. Wolff and A. J. Freedman. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates.
- Colfer, Carol J. Pierce, and A. Michael Colfer. 1976. "Baskets, Baskets, Baskets, Boys..." Presented at the American Anthropological Association Annual Meeting. Washington, DC.
- Colfer, Carol J. Pierce, with A. Michael Colfer. 1978. "Inside Bushler Bay: Lifeways in Counterpoint." *Rural Sociology* 42 (2):204-220.
- Colfer, Carol J. Pierce, Lee Cerveny, and Susan Stevens Hummel. N.d. "Using Rapid Rural Appraisal Tools to Explore Gender and Forests in the Global North." USFS, Cornell University [submitted to *Human Organization*].
- Colfer, Carol J. Pierce, Marlène Elias, Bimbika Sijapati Basnett, and Susan Stevens Hummel, eds. 2017. *The Earthscan Reader on Gender and Forests*. London: Earthscan/Routledge & CIFOR.
- Colfer, Carol J. Pierce, with, Ravi Prabhu, Mario Gunter, Cynthia McDougall, Noemi Miyasaka Porro, and Roberto Porro. 1999. *Who Counts Most? Assessing Human Well-Being in Sustainable Forest Management*. C&I Toolbox #8. Bogor, Indonesia: CIFOR.
- Collins, Don, Juan Cruz, Bob Smit, and Members of the NRHA (Northwest Research and Harvest Association). 2008. "She Fell Out of the Sky': Salal Harvesters' Reflections on Participatory Research." Pp. 115-129 in *Participatory Research in Conservation and Livelihoods*, edited by L. Fortmann. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Cook, Langdon. 2013. *The Mushroom Hunters: On the Trail of an Underground America*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Corwin, Ronald G. 1977. "Patterns of Federal-Local Relationships in Education: A Case Study of the Rural Experimental Schools Program." Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.

- Creighton, Janean, Keith A. Blatner, and Matthew S. Carroll. 2016. "For the Love of the Land: Generational Land Transfer and the Future of Family Forests in Western Washington State, USA." *Small-Scale Forestry* 15:1-15.
- Davis, Emily Jane, Meagan Nuss, and Eric White. 2015. "Forest Collaboratives in Oregon: A Brief Overview." In Oregon Forest Collaborative Network Workshop. Redmond, OR (October).
- Dietrich, William. 1992. *The Final Forest*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Doyle, Wayne. 1976. *The Birth, Nurturance and Transformation of an Educational Reform*. Washington, DC: National Institutes of Education OEC-0-71-4751.
- Evans, Kristen, Sandra J. Velarde, Rocio P. Prieto, Sheila N. Rao, Sandra Sertzen, Karina Dávila, Peter Cronkleton, and Wil De Jong, eds. 2006. *Field Guide to the Future: Four Ways for Communities to Think Ahead*. Nairobi, Kenya: Center for International Forestry Research, ASB, World Agroforestry Center.
- Follo, Gro, Gun Lidestav, Alice Ludvig, Lelde Vilkriste, Teppo Hujala, Heimo Karpinen, François Didolot, and Diana Mirzaraite. 2016. "Gender in European Forest Ownership and Management: Reflections on Women as 'New Forest Owners.'" *Scandinavian Journal of Forest Research* 2:174-184.
- Gonsalves, Julian, Thomas Becker, Ann Braun, Dindo Campilan, Hidelisa De Chavez, Elizabeth Fajber, Monica Kapiriri, Joy Rivaca-Caminade, and Ronnie Vernooy. 2005. *Participatory Research and Development for Sustainable Agriculture and Natural Resource Management: A Sourcebook* Vol. 1-3. Laguna, Philippines and Ottawa, Canada: CIP-UPWARD and IDRC.
- Grindal, Bruce. 2011. "Confrontation, Understanding, and Friendship in a Redneck Culture." *Anthropology and Humanism* 36(1):89-100.
- Headwaters Economics. 2012. *The Economy of the Olympic Peninsula and Potential Impacts of the Draft Congressional Watershed Conservation Proposal*. Bozeman, MT: Wild Olympics Coalition.
- Herriott, Robert E., and Neal Gross. 1979. *The Dynamics of Planned Educational Change: Case Studies and Analyses*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.
- Hopkinson, Peter, Ann Huber, David S. Saah, and John J. Battles. 2017. "A Word to the Wise: Advice for Scientists Engaged in Collaborative Adaptive Management." *Environmental Management* 59:752-761.
- Jefferson County. 1971. *Preliminary Overall Economic Development Plan for Jefferson County, State of Washington*. Port Townsend, WA: Jefferson County.
- Johnson, Kenneth M. 2017. "Where is Rural America and Who Lives There?" Pp. 3-27 in *Rural Poverty in the United States*, edited by Ann R. Tickamyer, J. Sherman, and J. Warlick. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Keller, J. 2015. "Rural queer theory." Pp. 155-166 in *Feminisms and Ruralities*, edited by B. Pini, B. Brandth, and J. Little. New York: Lexington Books.
- Kennedy, Virginia. 2016. "Living Conservation Values: Women and Conservation Easements in Central New York." Pp. 33-52 in *Gender and Forests: Climate Change, Tenure, Value Chains and Emerging Issues*, edited by C. J. Pierce Colfer, B. Sijapati Basnett and M. Elias. London: Earthscan/Routledge/CIFOR.
- Lien, Carsten. 1991. *Olympic Battleground: The Power Politics of Timber Preservation*. San Francisco: Sierra Club.
- Mallory, Chaone. 2006. "Ecofeminism and Forest Defense in Cascadia: Gender, Theory,



- and Radical Activism.” *Capitalism, Nature, Socialism* 17(1):32-49.
- Mallory, Chaone. 2010. “The Spiritual is Political: Gender, Spirituality, and Essentialism in Forest Defense.” *Journal for the Study of Religion, Nature and Culture* 4 (1):48-71. DOI: 10.1558/jsrnc.v4i1.48.
- Martz, Diane, Maureen Reed, Ingrid Brueckner, and Suzanne Mills. 2006. *Hidden Actors, Muted Voices: The Employment of Rural Women in Saskatchewan Forestry and Agri-Food Industries*. Ottawa, Ontario: Status of Women Canada.
- McLain, Rebecca J., Lee Cerveney, Diane Besser, David Banis, Alexa Todd, Corinn Kimball-Brown, and Stephanie Rohdy. 2013. “Mapping Human-Environment Connections on the Olympic Peninsula: An Atlas of Landscape Values.” *Occasional Papers in Geography No. 7*.
- Norgaard, Kari Marie. 2007. “The Politics of Invasive Weed Management: Gender, Race and Risk Perception in Rural California.” *Rural Sociology* 72 (3):450-477.
- Pini, Barbara, Jo Little, and Berit Brandth. 2015. “Conclusions.” Pp. 195-203 in *Feminisms and Ruralities*, edited by B. Pini, B. Brandth, and J. Little. Lanham MD: Lexington Books.
- Plateris, Alexander A. 1980. “Divorces and Divorce Rates: United States.” In *Vital and Health Statistics*. Washington DC: DHEW Publication No. (PHS) 78-1907, Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 77-141000. Retrieved May 29, 2018, ([https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/series/sr\\_21/sr21\\_029.pdf](https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/series/sr_21/sr21_029.pdf)).
- Redmore, Lauren E., and Joanne F. Tynon. 2011. “Women Owning Woodlands: Understanding Women’s Roles in Forest Ownership and Management.” *Journal of Forestry* 109:255-259.
- Reed, Maureen, and Debra Davidson. 2011. “Terms of Engagement: The Intersections among Gender, Class and Race in Canadian Sustainable Forest Management.” Pp. 199-220 in *Reshaping Gender and Class in Rural Spaces*, edited by B. Pinin and B. Leach. Surrey, UK: Ashgate Publishing Ltd.
- Reed, Maureen G. 2004. “Moral Exclusion and the Hardening of Difference: Explaining Women’s Protection of Industrial Forestry on Canada’s West Coast.” *Women’s Studies International Forum* 27:223-242.
- Reed, Maureen G. 2000. “Taking Stands: A Feminist Perspective on ‘Other’ Women’s Activism in Forestry Communities of Northern Vancouver Island.” *Gender, Place & Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geography* 7(4):363-387.
- Reed, Maureen G. 2003. “Marginality and Gender at Work in Forestry Communities of British Columbia, Canada.” *Journal of Rural Studies* 19:373-389.
- Reed, Maureen G., Alyssa Scott, David Natcher, and Mark Johnston. 2014. “Linking Gender, Climate Change, Adaptive Capacity, and Forest-based Communities in Canada.” *Canadian Journal of Forestry Research* 44:995-1004.
- Sherman, Jennifer. 2017. “Rural Poverty and Symbolic Capital: A Tale of Two Valleys.” Pp. 205-230 in *Rural Poverty in the United States*, edited by A. R. Tickamyer, J. Sherman and J. Warlick. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Smith, Kristin. 2017. “Changing Gender Roles and Rural Poverty.” Pp. 117-140 in *Rural Poverty in the United States*, edited by A. R. Tickamyer, J. Sherman and J. Warlick. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Tsing, Anna Lowenhaupt. 2015. *The Mushroom at the End of the World*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Turner, Nancy J., Robin Gregory, Cheryl Brooks, Lee Failing, and Terre Satterfield. 2008. “From Invisibility to Transparency: Identifying the Implications.” *Ecology and Society* 13(2):7[online].

- United States Census Bureau. N.d. "American FactFinder." Retrieved June 12, 2017 (<https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml>).
- US News. 2017. "Quilcene High and Elementary in Quilcene, WA - US News Best High Schools." Retrieved May 26, 2018 (<https://www.usnews.com/education/best-high-schools/washington/districts/quilcene-school-district/quilcene-high-and-elementary-21108#close-modal>).
- Wagner, Cheryl L., and Maria E. Fernandez-Gimenez. 2008. "Does Community-Based Collaborative Resource Management Increase Social Capital?" *Society and Natural Resources* 21:324–344.
- Walpole, Emily H., Eric Toman, Robyn S. Wilson, and Melanie Stidham. 2017. "Shared Visions, Future Challenges: A Case Study of Three Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program Locations." *Ecology and Society* 22(2):35[online].