

Draft  
December 14, 2001

# Consequences for the Community

Denise Lach,<sup>1</sup> Leslie Richards,<sup>2</sup> Corinne Corson,<sup>3</sup> and Patty Case<sup>4</sup>, Oregon State University

## Summary

In this chapter, we review the consequences of the decision to curtail Klamath Reclamation Project water on communities and individual community members. In addition to looking at available data from local, county, state, and national sources, we conducted focus groups and individual interviews with residents of the affected communities.

We found that, in general, the population of the three counties within the Project area—Klamath County, Oregon, and Modoc and Siskiyou Counties, California—has decreased over the past decade. In addition, these counties routinely experience a higher-than-average rate of unemployment and have a slightly lower-than-average per capita income. We also found an aging population in all three counties: over one-third of the residents in these counties is more than 45 years old.

There is emerging evidence that needs for social services such as food banks, physical and mental health care, and job training have increased over the past year. However, much of this data is impressionistic and data collection has been inconsistent over the years, so it is difficult to determine any changes that can be attributed directly to the water situation. Social service providers, however, are very anxious for their clients and their own organizations.

We found that many new groups have emerged throughout the basin to help individuals and communities deal with any losses due to the decision to curtail water. These groups have been able to raise impressive amounts of money for local social assistance such as supplementing food bank supplies and funding legal challenges.

We organized the stories we heard in the focus groups and interviews into five different topics. This information provides a snapshot of what was happening in the Basin from September through November 2001.

- **Community support and community polarization.** Almost all of our participants described how the water situation had drawn the community together in many ways. Getting 6,000 people to a rally in Klamath Falls, raising money to help community members throughout the Basin, and organizing multiple approaches to getting the story across to people outside the area were all offered as examples of how the community had coalesced around the concerns of the farmers and ranchers. Yet almost all of our participants also described incidents of polarization in the community around issues related to the water situation. These ranged from tension in long-term relationships to highly confrontational incidents between farmers and environmentalists, between farmers

---

<sup>1</sup> Co-director , Center for Water and Environmental Sustainability, Oregon State University

<sup>2</sup> Assistant Professor, Department of Human Development and Family Sciences, Oregon State University

<sup>3</sup> Research Faculty, Department of Human Development and Family Sciences, Oregon State University

<sup>4</sup> Professional Faculty, Family and Community Development, Klamath Extension Service, Oregon State University

and state and federal agencies, between farmers and tribal members, and/or between farmers and farm workers.

- **Uncertainty about the future and long-term planning.** All our participants described the situation similarly: intolerably uncertain and increasingly frustrating. The farmers talked about how not knowing whether there will be Project irrigation water next year only exacerbates the uncertainty inherent in agriculture. And for those not directly involved in farming, the uncertainty has rippled through social service agencies, schools, state and federal agencies, and local businesses. And yet we also heard from farmers and others that this “crisis” was unexpected *only* in its appearance in 2001. Many have been planning and working to shift reliance from irrigated fields and the agricultural economy to alternative crops and new business sectors.
- **The role of information.** While all participants we talked with agreed that information was needed, there was little agreement about just what constituted “good” information that could help move conversations and decisions forward. There was almost unanimous disapproval of the way the media had handled the situation, although some claimed that the media was too biased toward the farmers and others claimed that the farmers weren’t getting a fair shake. Others were highly critical of the media for sensationalizing the situation and actually leading to more polarization. Farmers and others believed that the basic science exists to develop reasonable recovery plans, although there is great concern about whether or not that information is being used appropriately and legitimately.
- **Getting help.** All the participants expressed concern about helping the farming community and others affected by the situation. Everyone recognizes that without assistance of many different kinds, the farmers, farm workers, and others in the community will continue to be negatively affected. Participants generally rely most strongly on their personal networks, and support primarily comes from family and friends. Very few told us that they had asked for assistance beyond the family. Some farmers are knowledgeable about various assistance programs and have begun using them. Assistance for other members of the community is limited and social service providers are concerned that increased needs precipitated by the water situation will limit services for the neediest members of the community.
- **Needed: visionary leadership.** It is clear to many of our participants that the visionary leadership needed to craft workable solutions in the Klamath Basin is not there. However, it is not clear from our interviews what participants would like from leadership beyond bringing people together. Farmers would like leaders to “make sure that agriculture stays whole to protect our society,” while others look for someone to get a broad-scope discussion going, provide concise national policy from the top, promote education about the situation, and see the big picture and bring people together.

The communities affected by the curtailment of Klamath Irrigation water during the growing season of 2001 took a social hit, the impact of which is likely only to be fully realized in the months and years ahead. To date, they have worked together as a community to help members who have been most affected, have polarized around already existing stress lines, and have learned quickly how to operate in a highly visible political arena—contradictory and complex responses to a dynamic and ambiguous situation. It appears that most members of these communities are committed to finding solutions that are acceptable to all. Residents of the Basin,

however, are likely to craft workable solutions only if they can apply the lessons they're learning this year as they move forward into the uncertain future.

## **Background**

As described above, more than 1,000 farmers in the Klamath Project lost all access to Project water from April to July 2001, at which point Secretary of the Interior Gail Norton allowed surplus water to flow through the Project for about 6 weeks. During the season, farmers and community members expressed great concern about the fate of their planted fields as well as fears for the coming year. Stories about the farm supporters were seen frequently in the *New York Times*, the *Wall Street Journal*, and the *Oregonian* during this period. The reports were not only of farmers challenging the decision through civil disobedience but of the increased need for community services, the ideological divisions emerging throughout the community, a sense of loss of a way of life, and betrayal by elected officials. This section reviews these and other consequences for the communities of Klamath, Modoc, and Siskiyou counties that were affected by the water shut off to the Klamath Project.

We begin this chapter with a brief discussion of our research methodology, providing details about the sources of interview data and community statistics. Next, we describe the demographic characteristics of the counties in which the Klamath Basin lies. This demographic portrait is followed by information about the availability and use of social services and social support organizations in the area. Finally, we present the findings from our interviews with 69 members of the Klamath Basin community. Using the words of local farmers, social service providers, businesspeople, tribal representatives, federal and state employees, and conservationists, we paint a portrait of a community under stress. While the details of stories shared with us may not be entirely accurate, belief in the stories certainly shapes the behavior of Basin residents.

## **What we did**

Consequences of the decision for the affected communities can be seen at least partially in the economic data provided above and through publicly available data that describe changes in community services. We looked at data from the U.S. Census, county and state agencies, and non-profit organizations including churches and other community social service providers. In order to get some sense of whether the past year has been unique in any way, we wanted to collect data for 3 years: 1992 (drought year), 1997 (normal precipitation), and 2001. Unfortunately, data collection and reporting methods for the information we wanted were inconsistent, making a quick assessment impossible. Instead, we are typically limited to a few indicators for the years 1997, 2000, and 2001 (to date). In the summaries below, we report any available 1992 data.

Calculation of changes in the economy and social services can help us understand some aspects of consequences for the communities when we collect data over the years, average it, and compare it with other years to see whether the situation has changed. This information will be essential for understanding impacts to the community over the long term; however, it does not give voice to the people who are living through the current events as individuals, families, and community members. Numbers and graphs cannot fully capture the complexity of the community's concerns and responses. For that, we turned to a qualitative research approach and asked individuals to describe their own experiences and perceptions.

Qualitative research can be seen as a companion to quantitative research as well as an independent research method following certain processes for thinking about, collecting, examining, and interpreting data. Qualitative research is a way to provide first-hand accounts of the life experiences and perceptions of individuals from their unique perspective regarding moments, events, and situations, and to elicit and make sense of the meaning of this phenomenon in the lives of individuals. Proponents of quantitative investigation might question the validity of this analysis because there is no hypothesis testing included within the design; rather, it is a method that builds theory and attempts to bring out both the subjective and objective meaning of an event—in this case the water situation in the Klamath Basin—in the lives of those affected (Denzin and Lincoln 1994; Gilgun, Daly, and Handel 1992).

## **Who we talked with**

For this study, we conducted 11 focus groups and 15 one-on-one semi-structured interviews (total: 69 people) to explore impacts on individuals, families, and communities. The questions we asked are attached as Appendix A. Focus groups were chosen as a data collection method for several reasons. First, focus groups allowed us to talk in depth with many people over a relatively short period of time. We also believed that talking and listening with neighbors and colleagues about common experiences would provide participants with an opportunity to describe their own experiences and learn from others. Although Stewart and Shamdasani (1998) note the advantages of using focus groups to collect data, it is important to remember that the groups are not random samples of the entire population; therefore the results are not generalizable to all people living in the Klamath Basin.

Instead, the samples are “purposive” in that we intentionally selected respondents who have been involved in various ways in the current events and activities. Purposive samples are used when we want to explore a complex situation in great detail with exactly the people who are involved—those who have the most experience or knowledge about a situation. Purposive samples do not necessarily represent the general public, but they can provide insight about the situation from multiple perspectives. For these reasons, the information reported from the focus groups should be considered a snapshot of the experiences and understanding of several community members from September to November 2001. Experiences and emotions change over time, and our results might have been different if we had conducted the research prior to September 11, 2001, for example, or after the drought ends and farmers are ensured that they will have irrigation water.

We convened two groups of farmers (trying to separate those who relied most heavily on Project water from those who didn't), using a random selection of names from a list of farmers kept by the Klamath County Extension Service and the Tulelake Research and Experimental Station. We did this to make sure that we heard from respondents in both Oregon and California to capture any differences due to state-related variables (e.g., regulations, tax laws, state relief programs).

One group of farm workers was convened with the assistance of a local translator. He invited participation through announcement of the focus group at a local resource center for farm workers. This focus group was conducted in Spanish with the assistance of the translator in both the interview and translation of the transcript.

A purposive sample of social service providers was selected from Tulelake, California, using a “snowball” sampling technique in which we asked a key informant who had been active in the area for a long time to provide the names of others who might be willing to participate in a

focus group. We then asked each of those people, whether or not they agreed to participate, to suggest the names of other people who might be interested and willing to participate. A matching focus group of service providers from Klamath Falls was then convened (e.g., a food bank director was in both groups). We included individuals who worked in existing organizations that provided a variety of social services including food banks, health care, mental health, education, and emergency shelter. Again, we conducted a group in Oregon and another in California to capture any differences based on state variables, and also, in this case, to talk with social service providers working in both a larger community like Klamath Falls as well as those working in smaller rural communities.

Purposive samples of federal and state agency staff who are on the “front lines”—they meet regularly with community members—were selected with assistance from a key informant at one of the agencies. A single focus group was convened with both state and federal agency participants.

We also used a “snowball” sampling technique to identify individuals who were self-identified as conservationists. While all of these participants claimed membership in local, state, and and/or national environmental groups, their level of personal activism ranged from quite passive to very active.

Two focus groups were convened with a purposive sample—one with business owners from Klamath Falls and the second matched with similar types of businesses in smaller towns (e.g., grocery store, restaurant).

A member of the Klamath Tribe helped to organize a conversation with tribal members. This conversation was held at the reservation offices.

In addition, we conducted 15 in-depth semi-structured interviews with individuals who were unable or unwilling to participate in a focus group. These interviews were conducted using the same questions used in the focus groups. Table 1 describes the categories of participants in the focus groups and interviews.

Table 1: Categories of participants in focus groups and interviews.

<b>Focus groups (11)</b>	<b>Interviews (15)</b>
Klamath Tribe	Manager of grocery store
Bonanza farmers	State/federal agency staff (2)
Klamath business owners	Conservationist
Tulelake business owners	Farmers –(5)
Tulelake service providers	Urban business owner (not taped)
Klamath Falls service providers	Urban business owner
Tulelake farm workers	Rural service provider
State/federal agency staff	Klamath Falls service provider
Conservationists	
Merrill farmers (2)	

## **How the focus groups worked**

For focus groups to be successful, participants need to be comfortable sharing information in a semi-public setting. While it is the facilitators' primary responsibility to ensure that people are able to participate, other strategies also are used to create effective focus groups. Every effort is made to keep participation confidential, especially for reporting purposes, by using first names only in the discussion and on the transcript, and by deleting any information that can easily identify an individual. Because participants may know each other through other community contacts and confidentiality is difficult to maintain, other techniques are used to create an environment where people feel safe to respond to questions and to interact with each other. One way to do this is to create groups of relatively homogenous people to ensure that existing animosity or enmity is not exacerbated, conversations move beyond arguments, and participants hear from others in similar situations.

Each focus group had 2 to 14 participants and most were conducted with two facilitators. One facilitator directed the conversation, asking questions and probing in more depth as issues were raised. The second facilitator took notes and watched to ensure that all participants were heard. The group with farm workers was conducted in Spanish with a translator.

All focus groups and all but one interview was tape recorded (with participants' permission) and professionally transcribed for analysis. Extensive notes were taken for the interview that was not recorded. We examined the transcripts to identify and characterize the major issues raised by participants as they described their experiences of the consequences of the decision to stop water delivery to Project farmers. Once the issues had been characterized, a draft was developed using participant's own words when appropriate. Brackets are used to indicate where we modified participants' words to enhance readability or protect confidentiality.

## **The affected communities**

Klamath County is located in the eastern foothills of the Cascade Mountains, bordering northern California. It covers 6,151 square miles, making it the fourth-largest county in Oregon. Klamath Falls, the county seat and largest town, rests on the southern shore of Upper Klamath Lake, one of the largest bodies of fresh water in the Pacific Northwest. Oregon towns in Klamath County and in the Klamath Project area include Merrill, Malin, and Klamath Falls.

Two California counties are served by the Klamath Project. Siskiyou County is directly south of the Oregon border and Modoc County is located in the northeast corner of California. Yreka is the county seat and the largest town in the county. The only Siskiyou county town within the Klamath Project is Tulelake, just south of the Oregon border. Alturas is the county seat and largest town in Modoc County. Newell, a small, unincorporated town, is the only community within the Klamath Project in Modoc County. While all three of the counties can be described as "rural," Klamath Falls (population 19,462) provides major services for most of the basin communities. Table 2 describes the three counties in more detail.

All three counties have significant populations of Native Americans and Hispanics. As described below in Table 3, American Indians constitute about 4 percent of the population of each county, although the national population is only about 1percent. While there are about twice as many Hispanics as Native Americans in the three counties, this population concentration is quite low for California, where almost one-third of the population identifies themselves as Hispanic. The Hispanic population in Klamath County is about average for the state of Oregon. The 2000 Census also shows that the small communities affected by the decision to curtail water

have a high percentage of Hispanic residents: 45 percent of Tulelake is Hispanic, 54 percent of Malin, and 33percent of Merrill.

Due to the seasonal, temporary, and ephemeral nature of their jobs, determining the number of migrant workers is difficult. As shown in Table 3, migrant workers in the basin are most likely to reside in California rather than Oregon.

Although these three counties and several towns were most directly impacted by the water situation, the impact of the decision rippled throughout the Klamath Basin to other farmers and non-farming community members outside of the Klamath Project area.

Table 2: Description of counties in Klamath Project: 2000.

County	Area: sq miles	County: population	City/towns: population (2000)	Major industrial sectors
Klamath	6,135	63,755	Klamath Falls: 19,462 Merrill: 897 Malin: 638	Service Forestry Manufacturing <sup>5</sup>
Modoc	3,944	9,449	Tulelake: 1,029	Government (44%) Agriculture (14%) Retail (14%)
Siskiyou	6,281	44,301	Newell (unincorporated)	Government (26.5%) Services (22.5%) Retail (20.6%)

Source: U.S. Census 2000

Table 3: American Indian and Hispanic populations in Klamath Project counties: 2000.

	American Indian County	American Indian State	Hispanic County	Hispanic State	Migrant workers (estimated) <sup>6</sup>
<b>Klamath County</b>	4.2%	1.3%	7.8%	8%	~200
<b>Modoc County</b>	4.2%	1%	11.5%	32%	662
<b>Siskiyou County</b>	4%	1%	7.6%	32%	2658

Source: U.S. Census 2000

## Demographics

In the following section, we review information about social trends in the Project Counties including population, age, employment rates, and income, using demographic data available from the U.S. Census at the national, state, and county levels. As displayed below in the first row of Table 4, the population of Klamath, Siskiyou, and Modoc counties had all

<sup>5</sup> The largest employers in Klamath County include Merle West Medical Center, Jeld-Wen, Sykes Enterprise (High Tech Support), Collins Products (particleboard, plywood, siding), and Columbia Plywood.

<sup>6</sup> Migrant & Seasonal Farm workers Enumeration Profits Study, 9/2000; includes seasonal and migrant, excludes those working with livestock, poultry, fisheries.

declined more than 5 percent in 2000, after generally growing during the period from 1992–1997 (although Modoc County posted a small loss of population in 1997).

Table 4: Demographic data for Klamath Project counties.

	1992	1997	2000
<b>Population:</b>		<b>Pop/ (% change)</b>	<b>Pop/(% change)</b>
Klamath	62,074	67,491 (+9%)	63,775 (-6%)
Modoc	10,536	10,496 (-.5%)	9,449 (-10%)
Siskiyou	45,568	47,648 (+5%)	44,301 (-7%)
<b>Population 45+</b>	<b>% of total pop</b>	<b>% of total pop</b>	<b>% of total pop</b>
Klamath	21,199 (34%)	24,530 (36%)	16,041 (25%)
Modoc	3,933 (36%)	3,961 (38%)	2,771 (29%)
Siskiyou	17,157 (38%)	18,192 (38%)	20,643 (47%)
<b>Per capita income</b>			
Klamath	\$15,968	\$19,485	\$20,886
Modoc	\$15,913	\$19,054	\$21,427
Siskiyou	\$16,658	\$19,898	\$21,092

Source: U.S. Census 2000. Bureau of Economic Analysis

**An aging population:** As described in the second row of Table 4, one-third or more of the people in the three Project counties are more than 45 years old. The general age of a population is a reflection of the distribution of experience, knowledge, skill, and (usually) wealth accumulation across the generations. This imbalance of age in the Klamath Project counties suggests, among other things, that farmers and ranchers who lose their ability to make a living on their land may be (or feel they are) too old to find other occupational opportunities. Another fear is that families with children are leaving the area because parents are unable to find jobs. With the loss of students comes loss of funding for public education. We found that this demographic is of concern to community members. Apprehension was expressed regarding the ability of aging farmers and other affected community members to retrain for new jobs or even to find alternative employment opportunities if farms or ranches were lost. One 50-year-old farmer told us:

It's very, very frustrating when you read career-oriented materials. Bachelor's degree, Master's degree. For god's sake, I've got to go to school three more years to get there. And, who's going to hire somebody who's in their mid-fifties? I guess realistically the only chance you've got in most cases would be somewhere in the public sector. There's very few private enterprises that are going to hire someone that old, because how long are they going to get to use you?

Older farmers were also discouraging their children from going into farming. One farmer told us:

I have a son that was kind of wanting to go into farming a few years ago. And he's 22 now and I love farming and it's a fantastic life and I wouldn't want to change unless I absolutely had to. But he was wanting to go into farming and I sort of discouraged it. Because the situation, the way things were going around here.



Another concern of the aging population has been the reliance on the farm and land to provide for retirement funds, either through a leasing arrangement or outright sale. Without water for irrigation, the property values of farms have declined and there are few willing to take on a farm or ranch without water. One of our participants told us about an elderly family in the neighborhood. The husband has farmed all his life, on a small farm of less than 200 acres:

They are at a position where their acreage is too small to warrant drilling a well. They don't have any extra finances; they're living off their savings. All they have is their home and their property. And that's what their retirement is. That's what they've worked their whole lives for, for the land.

**Income and employment:** As shown in the second row of Table 4, the per capita income continues to grow in the three counties of the Klamath Project, although in 2000 all three lag behind the average per capita incomes of the country as a whole (\$21,684) as do the California counties lag behind the average per capita income of that state (\$22,770). Klamath County per capita income is slightly higher than the average for Oregon (\$20,718) (U.S. Census Bureau 2001).

As described in Table 5 below, average unemployment rates are typically quite high in the Klamath Project counties compared to unemployment rates at either the national or state level. The unemployment pattern for all three counties is similar in that unemployment rates are highest during the months of December, January, February, and March, at which point rates start to decline through summer (June, July, and August) and then start to rise again. This cyclical pattern, common to most areas dominated by the farming economy, has held over the past decade, even during those years (such as 1992) when average unemployment rates were very high. Interestingly, unemployment rates in the three Klamath Project counties started out high this year as usual, but have continued to decline over the year with no upturn at the end of the growing season (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics).

Table 5: Unemployment rates for Klamath Project counties.

	1992	1997	2000	1/01–10/01 (avg)
<b>Klamath County</b>	10.2%	9.8%	8.1%	8.7%
<b>Oregon</b>	7.5%	5.6%	4.9%	5.7%
<b>Modoc County</b>	11.1%	11.5%	8.3%	6.4%
<b>Siskiyou County</b>	15.0%	12.0%	9.5%	8.3%
<b>California</b>	9.1%	6.3%	4.9%	5.0%
<b>United States</b>	7.5%	4.9%	4.0%	4.6%

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics

### Social service use and provider impressions

We wanted to determine whether there have been changes in the types or amounts of social services that have been requested and/or provided to community members over the past year as a result of the water cut-off. We started out to collect information that could be used to document changes over the past decade (1992–2001), which saw drought years as well as years

with normal amounts of precipitation. Unfortunately, we found that little data had been consistently collected by the social service providers' organizations. For those groups and organizations that did collect data, it was common to find that collection methods had changed sometime during the decade and it was difficult to compare data from 1992, for example, to more recent information. More information about social service delivery may be available for analysis with more resources than were available for this review.

Instead, we decided to use the available data and interviews with service providers to present a snapshot of the impressions and concerns about social service needs in the Klamath Basin. This information should be used cautiously because, as mentioned, the figures cited below are mostly provider impressions of the current situation and no rigorous methods were used that would allow us to indicate the water curtailment was indeed responsible for increased problems and/or social service usage. The past year has been stressful for all of us with the contentious and prolonged Presidential election, the economic downturn, and the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, all of which are likely to contribute to the social impacts observed by our respondents and which cannot be disentangled from the results reported below. The information, however, can be valuable in helping to get a sense of how residents of the Klamath Basin understand what's happening.

Difficulties in finding service provision information are exemplified by the data provided by the Klamath County Health Department. The current system for data collection began in 1997, although those data are problematic for our purposes because they cover only the period from February through December and include only information about Adult Outpatient Services without any sub-provider information included. The 2000 and 2001 data include all services provided by the Klamath County Mental Health Department along with those of the sub-providers (to whom patients are referred or who contract to provide specific services at the Mental Health department). Therefore, it is impossible to compare changes in service provision with the 1997 data.

Due to the difficulties in collecting robust information in the three counties, we present for interest only an example of changes in the amount of mental health services provided in Klamath County. Information about some of the services provided by the Mental Health Department during 2000 and 2001 are described in Table 6 below. Because the data for 2001 were for January 1, 2001 to October 1, 2001 only, we extrapolated the data to the end of the year, assuming that service levels would stay the same; we recognize that this assumption may be flawed.

Table 6: Changes in a sample of services provided by the Klamath County Mental Health Service.

	<b>2000 service count</b>	<b>2001 service count<sup>7</sup></b>	<b>% Change in service</b>
<b>Assessment:</b> Determination of need, concluding with diagnosis	1,177	1,069	-9%
<b>Referral screening:</b> Assessment for referral to non-mental health services	193	212	+10%
<b>Crisis screening:</b> Assessment of immediate need and provision of intervention treatment	694	1,067	+54%
<b>Precommitment investigation:</b> Services for determining commitment to Mental Health Division	441	610	+38%
<b>Family therapy:</b> Planned treatment for a consumer that includes family participation	831	761	-8%
<b>Individual therapy:</b> Planned treatment for a consumer	3507	2419	-31%

Source: Klamath County Mental Health Department

While this data must be considered cautiously, it appears that there has been an increase since last year in the services provided for crisis screening and precommitment investigations. Yet other services, including family and individual therapy, have actually declined this year. In addition to providing the data, staff at Klamath County Mental Health talked with us about what they were seeing in their day-to-day practice. They told us that one of the big differences this year is the amount of support Mental Health is providing to the primary care physicians in the community. They have consulted with physicians so that affected families could be served by the physicians they are familiar and comfortable with. One staff told us, the “most affected by the water crisis were those not eligible for the Oregon Health Plan due to land and equipment holdings. They were experiencing increased stress and anxiety, needing an [anti-anxiety] drug or sleep medication, not a referral or treatment by the mental health department.” Mental Health Department staff recommended that we talk directly with the primary care physicians working with families and individuals in the area.

Following that suggestion, we talked with a family practitioner and asked him to describe what he saw happening with his patients. He reported a 70 percent increase in the number of patients he saw this summer. One predominant complaint, he reports, is depression. He estimates that prior to this summer, depression in his clients was about 1:15; now it is 1:3. In addition to

---

<sup>7</sup> Using the information available through 10/01/01, we extrapolated the data through the end of 2001 by assuming an equal level of service each month.

depression, he reports a long list of ailments that he attributes to stress in the community including heart attacks, kidney infections in adult men (uncommon and stress related), approximately three times more hypertension than a year ago, five cases of bleeding ulcers that led to surgery, and elevated triglyceride and cholesterol levels in people directly working on the water issue. He also told us that he knows of 14 or 15 divorces since last June, two suicides that occurred late winter and early spring, and three heart attacks he feels he can attribute to events related to the water curtailment.

We also talked with another health provider in a small town clinic who reported that overall client numbers are down at her clinic. She told us that she knows of at least 50 families, mostly Hispanic, who have left the area. She has not experienced the same increase in stress-related services as reported by above.

The Klamath Crisis Center/Harbor House provides shelter for women and children who are the victims of domestic violence. Because this is their first year in operation, they are unable to compare service delivery with previous years. Wanda Powless of the Center reported a general increase in depression and anxiety-related after-hours crisis calls over the summer and into fall. The shelter (Harbor House) was full during June, July, and August, with 32 women and children in residence. September and October occupancies, however, were down again.

Stan Gilbert, Executive Director of the Klamath Youth Development Center, was able to give us information about service provided during March, April, and May in both 2000 and 2001. As displayed in Table 7, all categories of service increased in 2001 compared with 2000 services. Emergency response calls, for example, increased over 100% in both March and May 2001. Gilbert said he believes that “these increases are a result of the water crisis, although I have no real proof to support the claim.”

Table 7: Services provided by Klamath Youth Development Center in selected months of 2000 and 2001.

	Total appointments		Emergency response calls		New referrals	
	2000	2001	2000	2001	2000	2001
<b>March</b>	1,441	1,782	12	29	65	79
<b>April</b>	1,460	2,350	17	23	67	104
<b>May</b>	1,513	2,348	13	29	79	127

Source: Klamath Youth Development Center

Niki Sampson, Director of the Klamath-Lake Counties Food Bank, told us that during the 1997–1998 fiscal year (July 1–June 30), 1,300 households received food assistance one to seven times. During the 2000–2001 fiscal year, 2,250 households received food assistance 1 to 10 times. Between July 1 and September 30, 2001, she reports that 3,200 households received food assistance one to three times. However, approximately 1,025 have received food *one to four times per month*. Sampson speculates that the increase is due directly to the irrigation shut-off and people losing their jobs in agriculture, or a cut back in work hours. She anticipates continued increases as winter heating bills begin taking a larger portion of the family income.

Debi Worch at the Migrant Education Service for Modoc and Siskiyou counties told us that there were 290 participants in Migrant Head Start and 178 during 2001 to date. All families in her Head Start program have been in the area for less than 3 years.

As shown in Tables 8 and 9, crime rates in Klamath County and the towns of Merrill and Malin were not significantly higher than they have been in the past decade. If we assume that we can double the rates for 2001 since we have data for only the first 6 months, crime rates will still be mostly lower than the rates for 1997. This is supported by staff at Tulelake City Police and Klamath County Sheriff offices, who commented that they thought crime rates were down.

Table 8: Total offenses in Klamath County (not specially arrested or cleared).

	1992	1997	YTD <sup>8</sup>
Crime against person	763	969	424
Crime against property	2,251	3,353	1,210
Behavioral crime	1,476	2,260	918

Source: Oregon Uniform Code Reporting, and includes Klamath County Sheriff, Oregon State Police-Klamath Falls, and Klamath Falls Police

Table 9: Total reported crimes and incidents for Merrill and Malin, Oregon.

	1992	1997	YTD <sup>5</sup>
<b>Merrill PD</b>	49	140	73
<b>Malin PD</b>	NA	21	15

Source: City Recorder for Malin and Merrill Police Clerk

As described above, some of this data is anecdotal, and that which is not is difficult to compare with other periods due to the lack of information in both current and past years. Some of the impacts that people attribute to the “crisis,” for example, occurred before April 6, 2001. In the focus groups and interviews, our respondents told us how they were experiencing this year’s events; they may be able to go back sometime in the future with more data and/or time to reflect and re-attribute consequences and impacts of the decision to curtail water in 2001. But for the time being, almost all of the service providers we talked with and collected information from reported increased need for their services. “Real” or perceived, the needs are felt as real in the present moment and that is what they use to understand the current situation and make decisions for themselves and their organizations.

<sup>8</sup> YTD is for 6 months Jan–June, 2001. Source: Report # DRI NO-ORO180000

These social service providers were anxious not only for their clients, but for their organizations and groups as well. They were concerned about continuing to provide services to everyone who needed them and about staff “burn-out” from the increased workloads and/or anxiety associated with community response to the water situation. One exception to this trend is that we heard concern from some educational services about how reduced numbers and subsequent reduced funding will impact their ability to provide services.

## **Social capital**

For many reasons, life is easier in communities that are connected through multiple social organizations that create networks and trust as people work and play together. Civic and religious organizations, bowling leagues and reading groups, little league and soccer teams—these and other types of involvement with others in the community can create a dense web of relationships that cross political, economic, and ideological boundaries. It is believed that these informal relationships are critical in helping community members develop strong and vital communities. By analogy to physical and human capital, some people call this notion of networking “social capital” (Putnam 1995). All three forms of capital are believed to enhance individual and community productivity and effectiveness in solving problems.

A brief assessment of the traditional forms of social capital revealed a large number of churches, most with energetic congregations, in all communities affected by the water situation. There are 7 churches, for example, in the Tulelake and Newell area, 3 in Malin, 4 in Merrill, and 58 functioning churches in Klamath Falls. Traditional networking opportunities for farmers also appeared to be working in the area. One example is the grange in Tulelake and the three granges in Klamath County—fraternal organizations that provide benefits such as insurance programs, credit cards, and support for legislative action. The Klamath County Farm Bureau, an advocacy group for farmers that is connected to the larger Oregon and American Farm Bureaus, also provides multiple services and programs as described in Table 10 below. As you can see from the lists, professional services are provided by the Farm Bureau. These services are especially helpful to many farmers who are self-employed and have little or no access through other mechanisms. Other types of social services are also included, such as education activities for farmers and future farmers, community service programs, and even opportunities for members to express themselves artistically through a photo contest.

Table 10: Benefits and programs of the Klamath County Farm Bureau.

Member benefits	Programs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insurance programs</li> <li>• Credit card</li> <li>• Telephone discount</li> <li>• Prescriptions/eye care</li> <li>• Travel and entertainment</li> <li>• Vehicle discounts</li> <li>• Labor/employer services</li> <li>• Ag trading online</li> <li>• Accuweather</li> <li>• Industrial supplies</li> <li>• Citizens network for foreign affairs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Young Farmers and Ranchers</li> <li>• Leadership Farm Bureau</li> <li>• Rural Health and Safety</li> <li>• Ag Crime—R.I.P.</li> <li>• Ag in the Classroom</li> <li>• FELS Labor Service</li> <li>• Scholarship Foundation</li> <li>• Photo Contest</li> <li>• Food Check-out Day</li> <li>• Water Quality Program</li> </ul>

Source: Klamath County Farm Bureau

In addition to the Farm Bureau, other professional associations are available for farmers and ranchers in the Klamath Basin, including the Klamath Water Users Association, the Klamath Cattlemen’s Association, the Klamath County Cattlewomen, the Klamath Potato Grower’s Association, the Tulelake Grower’s Association, and the Tulelake Horseradish Grower’s Association. State Extension offices also are available in all three counties, providing research and education specific to the community’s needs.

If a community has a robust stock of social capital, they should be able to respond effectively to challenges as they arise. We found that farmers, ranchers, and other community members were able to organize several responses to the drought and subsequent water curtailment. Community members created a Web site that became a clearinghouse for information about what was happening, a place for on-line discussions and sharing of information, and where notices about meetings and other gatherings were posted (see [klamathbasincrisis.org](http://klamathbasincrisis.org)). Almost 300,000 people have visited since April 26, 2001 when the site went up. The Klamath County Chamber of Commerce established the “Klamath Ag Relief Fund” in April of 2001. As of September 25, 2001, they had collected \$17,000 from businesses and individuals. To date, about \$5,000 has been disbursed (meat bought for the County Food Bank), with the remaining \$12,000 to be distributed through programs such as Operation School Belle to purchase winter clothing.

In August of 2001, the “Klamath Bucket Brigade” was formed and then registered as a Nevada for-profit corporation doing business in Oregon. Fund organizers say they have plans to convert to nonprofit status. They have collected \$157,000 to date through auctions, relief convoys, and a \$15-per-plate benefit dinner. About \$1,000 has been spent fixing a pump and the rest is in accounts for distribution to farmers.

The Klamath Water Foundation was also formed in August 2001 and hopes to unite the agricultural, retail, and other community entities. The Foundation is comprised of various

specialized departments, such as communications, education, political awareness, and the environment, each chaired by a Klamath County resident. The departments offer opportunities for community members to participate in various activities. The Foundation is seeking formal certification as a non-profit organization and a second certification as a political action committee. This organization has raised about \$25,000 and expects to use the funds for legal cases involving water issues, supporting a bill for amending the ESA, and assisting County Commission efforts to privatize the water delivery system. The stated mission of the Klamath Water Foundation is to “enhance productive co-existence among Klamath Basin water users, to sustain traditional livelihoods, and to protect the local communities, economy, and environment.”

Another group, the Farmers Against Regulatory Madness (FARM), has collected \$11,500 primarily through collections at the head gates and through direct solicitation of area businesses. It is obvious from the amount of money raised by these various groups that the communities of the Klamath Basin want to support the farmers and ranchers as they live through this drought year. The rapid response of group organization and fund raising suggests that the farmers have a tight social network of relationships developed through other social efforts that enabled them to quickly organize responses as the situation changed throughout the spring and summer of 2001.

## **Personal, family, and community impacts**

As described above, we talked with nearly 70 people living and working in the Klamath Project counties to find out how the decision to halt water deliveries to Project irrigators was affecting them, their families, and their communities. As you always find when talking in-depth with people, our participants’ experiences are complex and complicated, and they are only beginning to learn what the long-term impacts might be for themselves and their community. We found that an individual’s descriptions of experiences and perceptions were contradictory from moment to moment, inconsistent in the retelling, but always painfully raw. In addition, as Klamath Basin residents began to adapt to new circumstances, the tragedy of September 11, 2001, took the Klamath Basin off the front page of the country’s newspapers and turned the attention of many of the people we talked with to other concerns. It is in this context that the discussion of our findings from the interviews is presented below.

After reviewing the transcripts of the interviews and focus groups, several themes emerged that help organize the reporting of participants’ experiences and perceptions. In order to tell the story of the participants’ experiences, we use their own words when appropriate (always concealing their identity), or develop a summary with information from multiple people. The extent and strength of the responses is described only qualitatively. Unless noted otherwise, we use the word “community” to refer to the entire area supported by the Klamath Project because this is how our participants used the term.

We want to reiterate that participants’ responses were complex and complicated and this summary cannot do justice to their experiences. We hope, however, to capture the wide range of experiences and perceptions they described during the interviews through a method that juxtaposes the contradictions and conflicts in their stories, letting the reader sense the difficulties that our participants have in talking about, explaining, and understanding what was happening. Our report represents the perceptions of participants and does not assess the accuracy of those perceptions.



## Community support and community polarization

In addition to the traditional social impacts caused by a sudden change in economic and/or environmental conditions such as changes in employment, population, and income, we found that many participants in our groups talked about the farmers' response to the decision to halt delivery of water. Their highly visible strategies for publicizing the irrigators' situation rippled throughout the community, creating strong emotions that are entwined with concerns for the farmers themselves.

**A sense of support:** When first asked how the water situation affected the community, many participants told us that it has brought the community together. A service provider described the unity she saw in the community during a public rally: "You saw, if you were at that rally, 6,000 of us were at the fair grounds. Where and when have 6,000 of us ever gathered for anything? Short of giving away money, you aren't going to get that many people anywhere." The highly visible and publicized actions such as the "bucket brigade" and turning the water back on at the head gates suggested to this woman and others we talked with that there was a strong sense of community and unity among the residents of the Klamath Basin in their support of the farmers who did not receive irrigation water. This theme was illustrated in other ways as well. For instance, a farmer told us that

the one positive thing, if there is something, is that it has pulled the whole community together. There's been a lot of support from Klamath businesses.... I think it has always been there, but [I] just wasn't aware of it. When they started shutting off the water people came together; I mean the letters to the editor were 99% pro ag. A lot of them were not from farmers in the Project area. If it's someone local you recognize the name, there were people we didn't even know that were supporting us.

Another farmer noted that he was surprised by the support "we got from Eugene, the liberal capital of the world, up there with Berkeley." He cited the positive press in the *Eugene Register-Guard* along with articles in the *New York Times* and the *Sacramento Bee* as evidence that "it's finally waking some people up to what's going on in this country."

Another respondent described the 4-H livestock sale this past summer as an example of public support. People thought that the annual sale would be really low because of the water situation; instead there was a record year with a high number of sales and high price per pound for the heifers raised by members. A Klamath Falls business owner told us that this was "because people want to show support for that community and make sure it continues." This support is also shown by directly helping one another. A small-town business owner told us about how this year "where I live there's been more help when you're working cows, there's more help there [if needed] like driving a truck in the spud field or jump[ing] on a hay rake or something." He believes this is indicative of the strong support between families, friends, and other businesses that came together through the "tragedy" to help each other.

Another Klamath Falls business owner described how the water issue was considered "just a farmer problem" in the spring. Then with the public-relations activities such as the newspaper articles, the bucket brigade, and other community wide programs, it "very much became a community problem. And it kind of pulled everybody back together." While a federal/state agency worker who has lived in the basin for 6 years did not describe the events as pulling community members together, she did believe that the "incredibly small

community—people that lived here all their lives in a very intertwined network, saved us from escalation.”

**A sense of division:** Yet only slightly below the surface of these descriptions of a community coming together to support the farmers were dissensions that continued to erupt throughout the interviews. These ranged from tension in long-term relationships to highly polarized and confrontational incidents between farmers and environmentalists, farmers and state and federal agencies, farmers and tribal members, and/or farmers and farm workers. There is friction among farmers themselves over who received water this year, who received drought assistance, and who was willing to sell their land. For some basin residents, the perception of a farming community under siege is strong enough to provide evidence of a conspiracy to rid the West of all farmers. And, for others, the racism that mostly lies below the surface of social life in the basin emerged as some framed the issue as “Indians vs. farmers.” While each of these will be discussed in more detail below, a service provider’s joking comment about his family is a description of the tensions in the community:

My family is all over the board and isn’t very tolerant of each other. My [kids] go out on the bucket brigade. My wife is [an ethnic minority] and a liberal Democrat. She says, ‘Why are the farmers doing all this griping, what about the laborers? They are the ones that were slave labor in the first place. The farmers got property money. What about those immigrants?’ And I’m a maniac. I think that we [should] organize and take over the state and feds [agencies].

While farmers can describe and appreciate support for the farmers from the larger community, they were finding that the relationships among their professional colleagues—farmers and nonfarmers—were becoming weaker, leaving them isolated from other people, news, and events. It was common for farmer participants to note a loss of sense of community. For example, one farmer from the Merrill area described the situation this way:

People just don’t go out and socialize in any venue. They have just disappeared. And when you talk to them they look down a lot. They don’t have a lot to say. And these were formerly talkative people, people you might see in the coffee shop every morning, . . .and they’re not conserving 75 or 80 cents of a cup of coffee. It’s just, it’s a little bit of shame, anger, I don’t know.

Two other farmers echoed these concerns:

People are just not as friendly. You know this is a small town, everyone knows each other. Everyone talks to everyone else; now people just don’t talk, they don’t go out and socialize, don’t go to festivals like the Potato Festival. It’s been an annual event for 60+ years. I didn’t even go this year.

Every other weekend someone would be having a party or barbecue. You’d go over and have a few beers and cook a steak. I don’t know that I went to one barbecue all this summer. Nobody wants to socialize, there’s nothing to celebrate.

While most farmers told us that this retreat from socialization was to be expected as people dealt with their problems individually, we were also told of differences with potential for polarization emerging in the farming community itself. One farmer was concerned that “people will get upset because I’ve got a job ... will they start looking at people who are maybe a little more insulated maybe as much by dumb luck as anything?” He described this feeling as “a big cloud hanging over the community.” Another farmer told us that the “willing seller, willing buyer issue” has divided some people. He and others described the tension felt by individuals who would like to sell their farms and leave, yet feel they are betraying the community somehow. He said that he doesn’t “even want to talk about that with anybody unless I know what their way of thinking [is]. Because there’s been a lot of bad situations in the basin because of that.” Another farmer provides more detail about these concerns:

So if you do sell your ranch out to the “willing seller,” you wouldn’t have the community to keep business open. If we lose two or three of these businesses, where do we go for parts? You can’t blame the farmers for wanting to sell out, you know, if the money is there and [there is] some way of getting out of this thing. But what does the rest of the community do? It’s just a domino effect. Even if they get out, they’re not going to spend their money here. They’re going to go somewhere else and spend it.

Another farmer said she “didn’t know the whole story behind every single person that wants the buy out. But I resent the government wanting to spend money for a buy out.”

Participants also talked about the tension emerging as they continue participating in civil disobedience and planning meetings while maintaining their farms and ranches and living their lives. One participant told us that “all of a sudden you have to go bail hay, and I took a lot of criticism for leaving, they wanted me to stay at the head gates and help them.” Another described his life:

You’re on all these committees you make a commitment to. Then they turn on the water and you have to get out to the farm to take care of things, equipment and stuff for 3 weeks, trying to generate a few dollars. For a while, all I did was meetings, that was my job. Got all these commitments and plus this other job, there only so many hours in a day....How do I balance this out and then, oh yeah, I forgot I had a family, where do they come in?

Another farmer also reported that he’s starting to see how the pressures on the farmers involved in the planning and organizing are becoming less appreciated by some who have

less tolerance with some of the organizations because they’re not getting anything done. We want to see them doing everything they can. And the people in the organizations are just starting to get really burnt; they’re just burnt out. They meet two, three, four times a day, every day....And there are a few that are moving away and just not going to the meetings and just complaining like most other farmers do most of the time.

**Us against them.** In addition to the conflicts within the farming community described by our participants, other sources of conflict have emerged within the larger community. One of the major issues described by our respondents was their concern that framing the issue as “farmers vs. fish,” “farmers vs. Indians,” or “farmers vs. feds” has oversimplified the situation and created a sense that others are “out to get the farmers.” Environmentalists, Native American Tribes, and federal and state agencies have all been blamed for the current situation, which has created a tense environment for many residents of the basin who may support the farmers as members of the community but hold other perspectives as well. Members of these groups told us that those individuals who have become especially vocal and vociferous in their support of the farmers and ranchers have silenced their own voices and concerns.

**Farmers and conservationists.** Community members who described themselves as conservationists had concerns as well. All but one of the participants in this group had resided in the Klamath Basin for 20+ years. The concerns shared by the group about the media bias regarding the situation can be summed up in the words of one participant: “There is an assumption that everyone in Klamath Falls feels this way and that it is fine to put down a big bucket in front of the court house and that it represents all of our feelings.” A common response of these participants is a sense of embarrassment about these actions, illustrated by the following quote:

I guess I knew that this was a small community and a very conservative community. At the same time there are a lot of people here who are more broad-minded. So when I see the signs on the highway [criticizing the decision] and I know a lot of people coming into Klamath Falls are seeing that, I am embarrassed.<sup>9</sup> I know there are a lot of people here who don't feel that way.

This embarrassment also extended to the local media who were described as presenting biased and one-sided information about what was happening. One participant told us

I resent the image the media created and you had to go outside of the basin to get balanced representation of the real problem and what the impacts were. Personally this was the first time in my 30-plus years of living in the basin that I considered moving away...the local media feeding the idiocy, the poor law enforcement. It makes us look ridiculous and I really resent that.

Several members of this group also talked about their fear that violence could erupt during public rallies or during heated conversations with farmers. One told us that she “felt a real sense of being afraid in my own community. I [need to] go by the head gates every day as I ride to work. [I'm afraid that they might think that] ‘someone on a bike must be against what I have to say.’ Watching the sheriff not enforcing laws...city policy not enforcing laws. So I feel unprotected and that has not happened since I lived here.” Another told us that she would never go near the head gates, worried that someone “might be firing a gun around there.”

---

<sup>9</sup> During our trips to the area, we observed roadside signs expressing concerns including: “New Addition to the ESA: Tulelake Farmers,” “Stop Playing God – You Don't Qualify,” “An Opinion is Killing our Communities,” “No Water, No Barley, No Beer,” and “Federally Created Disaster Area.” We also saw many signs that were more restrained, including: “73 Years of Water Until Now,” “Where Water Flows, Your Food Grows,” and many creative versions of “Support Our Farmers.”

Another member of this group went to the head gates for the first bucket brigade and was surprised at the talk of violence. He heard people name specific environmentalists who they claimed would be hung if they came down the street. He had the sense that his farming community friends, whom he describes as “wonderful; you can’t find bigger heart[s],” would participate in a lynching if prominent and active environmentalists ever showed up at a rally.

A conservationist we talked with during a one-on-one interview described how the polarization with the farming community led to, in his words, a “completely ridiculous” outcome:

[An employee at a state agency] was [head of the sailing club] this year. It got so far out this year that they were accusing him of holding back water in Upper Klamath Lake so he’d have enough water to sail his boat. You know, it is completely ridiculous, but you know it makes good press: self-serving agenda as [head of the sailing] club. And, not only that, the farmers say, ‘Oh well, you guys aren’t supporting us, all you care about is sailing your boats.

None of the conservationists we talked with was happy about the situation in which farmers found themselves. Almost all described themselves as having many friends who had farms and ranches and knew of the trouble they were having. Furthermore, some are at least as disappointed in the agencies responsible for managing natural resources as the farmers are. One told us that he was

ashamed of our agencies. Like I mentioned earlier, I was involved in some of the same agencies which helped created this problem. We were talking about how not to let this happen and here we are 20 years later and haven’t done that. So I have little empathy for these agencies being in the hot seat right now.

Yet, to a person, the conservationists who participated in focus groups and interviews believed that any solution for the Basin would have to involve the consideration of multiple perspectives, including those of the farmers. They were discouraged, however, that years of friendship and working together on community projects were being destroyed by the short-term actions taken to resolve what they believe is a problem that has been a long time coming. As one told us, “Even before the water crisis, there’s been a long and steady decline in the ag economy for reasons way beyond the water issues. You know, the consolidation of multi-national corporations, the grain cartels, NAFTA. The ag economy isn’t what it used to be.” He was concerned that after years of work with community members trying to find solutions for allocation of water rights, the farmers’ desperate response this year would create irreparable splits with others interested in resolving the problems of the Klamath Basin.

**Farmers and Indians.** Another framing of the issue as “farmers vs. Indians” revealed a strain of racism that usually ran “quietly beneath the surface,” as one farmer participant said. Members of all groups noted incidents where Tribal members were shunned or treated badly, and all disassociated themselves from this behavior. A service provider described an incident about an annual fundraiser held every year for a local treatment facility. The pow-wow was designed to

honor people in recovery, who have gotten jobs, gotten families back, who aren’t doing crimes anymore. And its 90 percent non-Indian. We go around to

corporations and places in town and they donate money—\$200–\$500—because a pow-wow is expensive. This year 90 percent of them said no because you're associated with the Klamath tribe. Most of our clients aren't tribal members, so what's that about?

The social service providers, many of them working with the non-white population of the basin, described multiple incidents where their clientele were treated rudely or even violently.

Tribal members we talked with described how an intentional decision was made for the tribes and individuals to stay as far from confrontational situations as possible. Tribal members were advised in the tribal newspaper and through word of mouth to “walk away” from arguments or other tense situations. This may have been what this Klamath Falls business owner was seeing when she described the following:

We have a lot of Native Americans that come in to use [this service]. And before they were very vocal when they were standing in line, somewhat loud when they were talking with their friends and around everybody else. .... But after this happened they would come and they would walk with their head down, they walked slowly, they stood in line quietly, they didn't talk with other people in line, they looked straight ahead, they were very courteous.

Instructions to remain nonconfrontational were hard on the tribal members, according to one of our participants, “because we had guns pulled on us, were run off the road, there was one beating where a guy ended up in the hospital pretty bad.” This participant also described an incident in an elementary school where each student was asked to take a position on the water issue:

[When] they finally get to an Indian child in this classroom, because of our prompting and parents telling him ‘just stay out of it,’ the student said, ‘I want to stay out of it, I don't want to have a response.’ The teacher told him it was a class project and he had to have a response. And, he said, ‘Well, I really don't want to say anything.’ The kid was sent down to the principal's office and they actually expelled the kid from school.

The tribal government intervened, sending a letter to the school asking that the child be immediately reinstated and that this type of teaching be discouraged. The student went right back to school, but tribal members were left feeling betrayed by the portrayal of the problem in the public school.

Tribal members believe that they have supported the farmers from the beginning; they have gone back to Washington, D.C. “several times and seen congressman, senators, and other legislative people. We've asked for funding and are trying to come up with a solution. Because we didn't want to see anybody lose their livelihood because we know, we've been there.” They also have maintained a low visibility throughout much of the spring and summer, trying to remain out of confrontational situations as illustrated by the following quote:

Imagine, if you will, what would have happened if there would have been a confrontation? We've had offers from other organizations throughout the country,

just as agriculture has, to come in the area. This could have become a full-blown civil war in the area and that's not good for anyone.

The tribal members we talked with were convinced that the relationships built with the irrigators through the Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) process can be salvaged and solutions can be found. One described how through the ADR, great strides were being made for the adjudication of irrigation water, even traveling to Washington D.C. to describe to others how well they were doing. He continued:

Then all of a sudden the drought of 2001 comes along and that's put everything to a screeching halt. But right now we're trying to pick it back up again. We've had meetings with the irrigators where one of them actually said that 'everything that was built up to this point was gone. We're going to have to start at the beginning again.' I told them, 'well, I don't know about that. You know, we think we can just kind of pick up where we left off.' It took a little encouraging, but finally they said, 'We can go ahead and things that we've already built we'll just keep adding to that.' We're still trying to work with them as much as we can.

Just as the conservationists are willing to keep working with the irrigators to find solutions that work for everyone, according to our participants, so are the tribes. It is important to note that all of the people we talked with are local—they live and work with farmers and their families and they seem to see the farmers' problems as their problems as well. As one person put it, "We're never going to have a sustainable community if one component of the community is ... in the dumper."

**Farmers and state/federal agencies.** Finally, we talked with representatives of state and federal natural resource agencies who work in the Basin, most of them for many years. Many in the farming community hold the agencies responsible for their problems because of the decision to halt water delivery in the Basin during the drought of 2000–2001. Agency folks we talked with are frustrated by the anger from the farming community because they believe staff have been supportive in many ways over the years. In addition, they are frustrated because

to a large degree we have lost what little authority we had. Now it is virtually impossible to do anything without regional offices and/or Washington offices involved. I think that it is frustrating that those of us at the local level have a clearer idea of what the problems are and what the possible solutions are, but have no authority to do anything. It is really out of our hands.

Despite their own frustrations with the agencies involved, local employees of the agencies still describe themselves as treated as "outsiders," with hostility, and uncomfortable in many public situations. One participant said:

You know, you are really reluctant to go out into the community and freely associate with people. You try to avoid situations where the water crisis might come out. I feel reluctant to tell people who I am employed by, what my job is."

Another person described herself as “shrinking” because she was unable to express her own views.

Agency staff members also believe that most of the community remains unheard and the voices that *are* heard represent the “more extreme views and certainly [don’t] represent the range of views that the community has.” Instead, there is intimidation to only express the single view that the farming community “must be made whole.” Many agency staff report feeling “threatened” as they performed their duties, wore their uniforms, or interacted with the public. They believe that people pretty much recognize that individuals in the local offices aren’t making the decisions, but “collectively, like at the head gates, you run into problems. Because of mob mentality.”

These agency staff perceive their relationships with the public to have changed as a result of the drought and subsequent water decisions. People are asked for identification and are frisked as they enter federal buildings, setting up an adversarial relationship right away. One person described how the trust with the agriculture community has been harmed, remembering “the times I used to be able to go out on a guy’s ranch” and following up with, “there is more reservation there now.” Another claimed that the strategy of keeping farmers at the head gates is

just to keep up the image without physically taking over...we have to provide guards and I imagine we’ve spent well over a million dollars on protecting the head gates. You stop and think about it—there might be something better to do with that money.

### **Uncertainty about the future and long-term planning**

While all of our participants described a complex and dynamic situation, with many contradictory personal and community experiences, they all shared one way of describing the circumstances: intolerably uncertain and increasingly frustrating. The farmers talked about how not knowing whether there will be Project irrigation water next year only exacerbates the uncertainty inherent in agriculture from other sources such as weather, prices, and disease. And for those not directly involved in farming, the uncertainty has rippled through social service agencies, schools, state and federal agencies, and local businesses. And yet, we also heard from farmers and others that this “crisis” was unexpected *only* in its appearance in 2001. Many have been planning and working to shift reliance from irrigated fields and the ag economy to alternative crops and new business sectors.

**Living in limbo.** Farmers routinely told us that their greatest need is water and some kind of assurance that they would consistently receive water. Without that, they couldn’t plan, as this farmer indicated: “Usually you have a plan, you know what you’re going to do with your operation. You’re going to do this and do this and at the end of the year you hope it works out and you’ve made a little money.” A younger farmer said that “[I am] young enough, I have [a business degree]. I’ve had some offers at banks and different places. They say if I ever want to change careers, come see me. If they would come out and say you’re never going to have water again, you’re done, then I could move.” He went on to say:

Where am I going to be 10 years from now? I don’t even know where I’m going to be next year. You can’t make any long-term plans right now. When I got out of college I had a plan with goals, knew what I was going to do. This is where I wanted to make my career.



We were told by farmers that without a definite decision one way or the other about the availability of water, they wouldn't be able to make it economically. A Merrill farmer told us that couldn't mean

waiting until April 6<sup>th</sup> for a decision, saying, 'oh yeah, you get some water.' I mean, planning and planting takes a lot of time. You don't decide to do this tomorrow. It's a 6, 8, 10-month lead time for an individual crop.

Some business owners, especially those in farm-related businesses, have seen a decline in their business this year. They, too, are unsure how to plan for the future, how much inventory they should stock, how long they can hang on to employees. One Klamath Falls business owner mentioned, "I think people are pretty nervous about how to spend, how to plan for their business futures, and then I think personally people are really nervous too because there's a lot of people out of work." An outdoor sport-related business owner that has been affected by the water decision wonders whether to make [other arrangements] for other parts of the state. Finally, a business owner wonders, "How easy will it be to attract new industry here if you don't know if you can keep an educated work force?"

The business owners in the small towns of the southern basin were more unsettled about the future than were the Klamath Falls owners. As the small towns have relied heavily on the ag industry for years, any downturn in that sector will affect them quickly. And they were concerned that the true impact of the season without water will only be seen this coming winter. One business owner pointed out:

There's a lot of people right now that aren't doing too badly because they still have the income coming from last year's potato crop. So they have income and they don't have the outgo of cash that they would have had to plant this year's crop. But when they run out of that money, then this community is really going to feel it. They've all cut back trying to conserve this money and stretch it as far as they can, which has hurt the business community. But when that money's gone, then we're looking at real big problems.

A farmer explained further how many effects will be delayed until next winter:

In this business you grow crops in one calendar year and 75 percent of that is sold in the next calendar year. So your income comes a year later. All our income from last year, 75percent comes in this year. We didn't operate our farm [this season] so we don't have the fertilizer bills, the rent payments, the this and that, all the ongoing expenses to offset the income so we're looking at bankruptcy and possibly a \$200,000 tax liability. And no way to generate any money to pay any of it. And there was no way to do any tax preparation or planning because you didn't know it was coming.

The social service providers in the basin are also seeing how the uncertainty has affected those parts of the community that have had little voice in the conflict to date: the farm workers,

the unemployed, and other traditional clients of the social service agencies (e.g., Head Start, County Health, Mental Health, etc.) One service provider from a small community reported:

Suicide calls have increased, they want to end life. They feel like they have no choice—‘I can’t do this anymore.’ We bring it around to what they can’t do anymore and it is the fear of living in the unknown. Not knowing what to expect. What’s going to happen? What’s going to happen to my family? What’s going to happen to my kids? I can’t take care of myself anymore and no one understands.

Other service provider participants described a “feeling of powerlessness” and uncertainty, a “constant up-in-the-air feeling” for both staff and clients. This was echoed by a Klamath Falls service provider who said:

one of the things that I think we are all affected by personally is what the future has in store for us as far as what we all do if this place is going to become a dustbowl. Do you buy a home? Do you buy a car? Do you do anything if you’re not sure what the future has in store? ...you just don’t know what is going to happen year to year.

Another described how some of her clients were hoarding food just out of fear. “They are not using it, they are hoarding it. They want to make sure that they can get through next year.”

**Alternative arrangements.** Yet farmers also told us that they have plans underway for alternative crops, other jobs, and other ways of organizing their farms. Almost every farmer we talked with had alternative sources of income—either another family member worked off the farm, they held another job themselves, or they were experimenting with “value-added crops.” One said that “We’re not sitting around twiddling our thumbs either, we’re probably trying to be as busy and as inventive as we ever have been to find other venues.” A Merrill farmer was somewhat typical in his arrangements:

I’ve got a wife who teaches and so I do have some security. None of my children are involved in agriculture. ...I’m looking at transportation, trucking, more and more outside seed sources. And, I’m trying to grow higher value crops that we can sell elsewhere.

While most farmers were modest about their planning for the future, they were all involved in making choices that left them alternatives to their irrigated farms. One farmer we interviewed talked about diversifying through different crops. He’s been looking the last couple of years to find some different ways of making money. According to him, “that’s a given.”

Some business owners told us that their businesses have not been affected by the water situation, that they too have been planning for an economy that is not primarily ag-related. One shop owner told us how she had been buying carefully but was surprised to find that her business remained strong. She worked with other local business owners to promote a “buy locally” campaign that she believes has been successful. She found that her sales stayed up and she was

almost embarrassed. I was afraid to tell anyone I was doing well here. ... You know how people are suffering and things are happening. So I began to talk slowly to other friends and businesses...[and found that] the other businesses...were doing well.... We have people shopping now that I haven't seen before. So there are new customers, not only old customers....[I'm] making sure that we have items that are like in the \$20 and under range...making sure that we can capture the feel-good dollars.

This business owner identified businesses that weren't doing as well, including ag-related businesses, many restaurants, and hair salons. Ice cream, espresso, and gift shops didn't seem to be affected, in her view. She reported that the Small Business Development Center at Oregon Institute of Technology told her that most local businesses were up except for a "select few that were down."

One group of people who have not been able to develop alternative sources of income have been the farm workers, some of them undocumented, who work the fields and harvest the crops of the Klamath Basin. All of the workers we talked with had lived in the Basin for at least 3 years, many for up to 20. They and their families consider this area their home. Some have incomes that are non-ag related, but most rely on at least two family members working in the fields. They told us, however, that there was little work this summer and most workers were unemployed and waiting for a change in the situation, or they had left the area to find work.

One farm worker described how the foreman of the packing shed where her husband worked said, "They were [told by the farmer that he was] gonna pay them as if they were still working. That'd be about 20 hours a week, that they were gonna pay them that...but there's never been a check that they've gotten." Another in the group joined in to continue the story:

As an owner I think he would feel terrible [for not being able to pay his workers]. So you might say something stupid like 'I'm going to pay you.' [But when the workers didn't get paid] it felt like they were playing a joke on them. It's a terrible thing because then you plan. Whew, I'll have some work.

Another participant finished the story, "This farmer got money, they gave him money for not planting because there was no water. But the workers got nothing."

Some of the farm workers qualify for unemployment, although assistance ran out early in the season. Workers with children born in the U.S. were eligible to receive about \$80–100 a month in food stamps for a family of four. Undocumented workers did not receive any assistance beyond that provided by nonprofit service agencies such as the local food banks. When asked what they needed, one farm worker said, "What we need most of all is work. Because when you're not working, you feel sick."

## **The role of information**

While all participants we talked with agreed that information was needed, there was little agreement about just what constituted "good" information that could help move conversations and decisions forward. There was almost unanimous disapproval of the way the media had handled the situation, although some claimed that the media was too biased toward the farmers and others claimed that the farmers weren't getting a fair shake. One farmer learned through personal experience not to believe everything he reads in the paper or hears on the news. He told

us about attending a hearing with Congressional representatives, listening carefully and taking notes: “And then you see an article in the paper by an individual that you know is pro the other side and it was as if he had been at a completely different meeting.”

Others were highly critical of the media for sensationalizing the situation and actually leading to more polarization. One agency staff told us that she thought “the level of attention has not been equivalent to the amount of adverse effects; that it has been a lot of hype.” She believes that the media language prevented people from coming together to find a resolution. Many respondents report getting calls from family and friends outside the area concerned about their safety after reading or hearing reports in the media about what’s been happening in the Basin. A farmer told us that when his brother-in-law flew in over Klamath Lake he couldn’t believe it: “From everything I’ve read in the paper, I thought the lake was dry.”

The decline of the suckerfish was serious enough that the Klamath Tribe stopped harvest on the lake in 1986, 2 years before the Endangered Species Act was invoked to protect the fish. When asked, a tribal leader described the type of information that is needed to restore the system:

We need some tremendous studies on the system itself and to start doing some restoration work from the headwaters to the ocean. It’s a massive task. We used to have salmon runs before the dams came in and we lost those you know... We need studies done on the full aquifer system, from the head waters to the ocean. We need studies on the terrestrial system, what effect logging and everything has had on the watershed and how to do some restoration work for wildlife. ... We need to get the studies first for comparison and begin on how to do some restoration work.

We heard that the farmers in the Basin believe that much of the science has been done and now needs to be applied, and they echo this call for good information. They express concern that decision makers who only listen to science that supports their agendas have ignored data. This farmer told us that he believes that the federal agencies

are not looking at all the facts that are available. There are a lot of noted scientists out there, some of them work right up here at Klamath Falls, world-renowned even we’ve got. I mean they know their business. They’ve presented it to the Fish and Wildlife at some of those meetings we had last winter on those suckerfish. And they just disregarded it. They picked out what they wanted; they just disregarded some very pertinent information on studies that have been done on suckerfish up here for years.

Another farmer told us that he believes that “most everyone in the county is capable of making an intelligent decision on something if they have all the facts.” There appears to be great frustration that science has been unable to provide “facts” that would allow water allocation issues to be resolved. Challenges to the science used to make the decision are commonplace, and challenges to scientists’ credibility are frequent. Farmers would like their own local knowledge and experience to count for more in the decision process “because we live this and we know that some of this stuff is just outright boldfaced lies.” Environmentalists have challenged the data provided by both the agencies and the farmers, while the tribes have been collecting their own

data all along. The National Academy of Science met in November 2001 to review the science behind the latest biological opinion, but farmers we talked with were convinced that it would be the “same old, same old” and no academic scientists would be challenged on their findings.

You get people all pumped up about that [the NAS review] until you find out who is on the review committee. Same old people, same old science, same old answers. They say, ‘oh no, you’ll get a fair review.’ Bullshit.

When the media is suspect for sensationalizing the news and science is suspect for not being able to solve the problems of the community, people end up with no shared understanding of the world. Their disagreements are amplified by any lack of common explanations of what’s happening. One result has been farmers and business owners who interpret actions and information they receive about the agencies’ decisions as additional evidence of a conspiracy to “save the West from being developed and growing food out here and turn this into huge wetlands.”

A general distrust of government was expressed by many of the participating farmers, business owners, and social service providers. Whether the current situation created or enhanced existing feelings is difficult to determine. One farmer told us that the “general feeling in the Basin is betrayal. And our government is doing nothing. Rural America elected the Bush administration and they’re not helping us hardly at all.” He went on to explain:

We got the \$20 million, but how long did it take them to get that done? Overnight we can find billions of dollars to go to New York. How many flags do you see in Merrill? There are people in Merrill that won’t give the Pledge of Allegiance and I’m one of them.

## Getting help

All the participants we interviewed expressed concern about helping the farming community and others who were not used to receiving assistance. As one social service provider noted, “Food stamps and public assistance really isn’t in the vocabulary especially in the ag community. There is no way.” Yet everyone recognizes that without assistance of many different kinds, the farmers, farm workers, and others in the community will continue to be negatively affected.

**Personal support networks.** When asked, most participants told us that their personal networks were strong and support primarily came from family and friends. Very few told us that they had asked for assistance beyond the family. One farmer described how he and his brother have begun to take on more responsibility with their mother because she lost the rental payment from her farm:

Social security is not there to support her, pay for insurance, the things on her land, taxes. If the farm is not operating and generating money she is down to her flat social security check. How does she keep her insurance or the house or car? Right now we’re all here, but if we all leave to find work she’ll be left out here by herself.

Another woman described how she was pitching in to help her son's family by babysitting so that her daughter-in-law could work outside the home.

Agency staff told us that, in general, their offices were close-knit and supportive of each other. One reported, "We have been trying to keep everyone aware of what's happening. That way nobody gets blindsided by some activity." Another person told us that the staff had had a "lot of counseling...I have lost several employees and am losing another one now. And, quite frankly, it is tough to get people to come here." One agency has tried to keep individuals out of the media as much as possible. Agency staff also reported that they have received support and encouragement from agency and professional colleagues from around the country. Another woman told how her children tried to protect her from the unfolding events. They hid the newspaper one day and she "never found it. There was a bunch of bad news in it, so they rented a comedy at Blockbuster....So they put up with me being crabby."

**Resistance to change.** Underneath the stories of solid support, we also heard stories of increased drinking, isolation, and separation and divorce. One farmer talked about how his wife has left, saying that she just couldn't take how the uncertainty and resulting depression affected their marriage. The stress of the situation undoubtedly exacerbated existing problems in the marriage.

Conservationists and agency staff expressed frustration with the farmers and their supporters who insisted on claiming the right to continue current practices even though others were starting to recognize that multiple concerns will need to be considered for any permanent solution. One agency participant remembers how difficult shifting to considering multiple perspectives has been for him and others:

Well my God, a paradigm shift for me. ...After the 1994 drought we found people knocking at our door. 'Hey what about us? We are the Indians upstream.' 'What about us, we are the Indians down stream.' 'What about us, we are the ORNC' (Oregon Natural Resources Council). 'What about us, we are the fishermen.' Open the door and you have to let them all in and start listening to all of them...that shift—we are a multi-faceted agency and we're listening to everybody.... It is easy to have a guidebook that says once you get to this point you lean this way to the farming community or maybe you...And it isn't that way anymore. Now you come to a decision point and you don't have a book anymore. How do you do it and make everyone happy? Our guidelines are so fuzzy anymore....

We heard from a conservationist who notices that

people in the agricultural community every year just expect to get their water and now all of a sudden things have changed. How are they responding? Are they being proactive and saying, 'I have to do something differently? Or find water somewhere else? Dig a well? Find a different crop?' Or, are they just saying, 'The government is doing this to me and I am going to lash out and wait for my water to come back.'

Other participants reinforced this perception that the farmers feel a sense of entitlement to a stable world that others have been asked to move past long ago. A farmer declared, "So I guess

somehow someone has to decide is this community worth having? And to do that as it stands today, that involves irrigation water. ...If these people are going to be allowed to live and pursue their happiness and their occupations as they've been pursuing them, there has to be a tolerance of the use of the land as we've been using it."

A business owner in Klamath Falls described how a

lady comes in and starts crying because they didn't know how they were gonna make it because the rent that they received from someone farming their property was their way of life....And, they're not going to go to Wal-Mart and become greeters. They're just not. Their pride's too thick, it's just too strong to do that.

And tribal members want to remind the farming community that they have been asked to give up their traditional ways of life many times.

Yet farmers, business owners, conservationists, agency staff, and tribal members all described assistance programs that farmers had access to. One woman described her husband as very successful "with a lot of the assistance programs and the water buyout programs, the set-aside acreage program." She thinks that older farmers might not know how to access these programs or maybe don't use them because of pride and unwillingness to ask. One farmer told us

we've never played government games before. And just in the last couple of years that we've been getting some at all. So now this year is really full bore in trying to get everything you can out of everything...if it wouldn't have been for the government programs this year, we'd be in big trouble.

### **Needed: visionary leadership**

As the farmers became more politically active and experienced over the summer, it became clear to many of our participants that the visionary leadership needed to craft workable solutions in the Klamath Basin is not there. A social service provider from a small town found the most frustrating thing was the "complete void in leadership." She explained:

[That is] is not to say that our local politicians and community leaders aren't doing a good job in managing the situation, but in a year from now we are going to be in the same place. Five years from now we're going to be in the same place. And, 5 years ago we were in the same place but just didn't know it because the water was flowing.

Tribal members and agency staff shared their concerns about the leadership void in almost identical terms. It is not clear from our interviews what participants would like from leadership beyond bringing people together. Farmers would like leaders to "make sure that agriculture stays whole to protect our society," while others look for someone to get a broad-scope discussion going (conservationist), provide concise national policy from the top (agency staff member), promote education about the situation (business owner), and see the big picture and bring people together (service provider).

Concerns about the lack of leadership were supplemented by concerns about slow responses by the agencies and the courts to problems that were experienced in the here and now by most of our participants. One of the farmers who is supportive of the new administration said

we're learning a lot about how slow the process is. Once you appoint the Secretary of the Interior, then the under secretaries, and there's a whole level under that. And until the new people are appointed, all the old ones are still there. I think we're finding out how powerful bureaucrats are.

Another farmer, however, recognized any solution was going to take time, regardless of changes in the national bureaucracy. Yet, he reminds us all

you just can't put a career or a life on hold for 10 years while you truly take the time you need to take. The lives and occupations and the farms that are at stake—it's instant.

## Conclusions

The Klamath Basin area is facing a number of challenges in the coming years. Although the water restrictions in 2001 had a dramatic effect on approximately 1,000 farm families, the effects of the water limitations rippled out far beyond those farms. Furthermore, the families directly affected by lack of Klamath Reclamation Project water were not facing difficulties only in 2001, but rather have faced many years of restricted incomes due to high costs and low prices for their crops and are likely to face an extended period of recovery.

It is clear from our conversations with farmers, business owners, government employees, representatives from the Hispanic and Native American communities, conservationists, and social service providers, that the impact of water restrictions is both deep and wide. While many participants talked about the ways in which the community had come together to support the farmers, many also talked about the ways in which the community had become polarized. Farmers who were thinking of selling their farms feared being scorned by those who wished to continue farming. Environmentalists and government workers were particularly scorned, although participants were quick to point out that it was not the local environmentalists or government workers who were at fault. Some farmers were quick to blame tribal members, and farm workers reported that farmers were not doing enough to help them out. The polarization had resulted in community members pulling back and avoiding social situations they perceived to be risky.

In addition to polarization, uncertainty about the future and the inability to make long-range plans troubled our participants. This was particularly true for farmers who were older and faced the prospect of finding a new occupation. Although the unpredictability of water access has encouraged many affected individuals to begin thinking about alternative sources of income and farming strategies, most people we talked with who rely on farming income are still hoping that with some rain and/or a court decision they will be able to continue their current practices.

The uncertainty was exacerbated by a perceived lack of information. Many community members felt that information was being withheld; others noted that the media was presenting a very biased view of the situation. The work of scientists was viewed as the "same old science" when answers to the communities' problems were not forthcoming.



Farmers in particular questioned the lack of forthcoming assistance on a large scale, although accepting direct and immediate aid already available through social and financial assistance programs was rare (except possibly food bank usage). Community members, however, were willing and did seek and receive social support from family members and friends. This support appeared to be mutual only within one's particular group at this point.

Finally, frustration was expressed frequently about the resistance to changing how both the water and the land are managed. There was an acknowledgment, most likely precipitated by frustration with current natural-resource management policies, that the community is desperate for active and unified leadership that considers the voices of all those concerned.

The communities affected by the curtailment of Klamath Irrigation water during the growing season of 2001 took a social hit, the impact of which is likely only to be fully realized in the months and years ahead. To date, they have worked together as a community to help members who have been most affected, have polarized around already existing stress lines, and have learned quickly how to operate in a highly visible political arena – contradictory and complex responses to a dynamic and ambiguous situation. It appears that most members of these communities are committed to finding solutions that are acceptable to all. Residents of the Basin, however, are likely to craft workable solutions only if they can apply the lessons they're learning this year as they move forward into the uncertain future.

## References cited

- Denzin, Norman K., and Yvonna S. Lincoln (eds.). 1994. *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Sage Publishing, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Gilgun, Jane F., Kerry Daly, and Gerald Handel. 1992. *Qualitative Methods in Family Research*. Sage Publishing, Newbury Park, CA.
- Milstein, Michael. 2001. Klamath Basin Farmers Still Wait for Relief from Weather, *Congress. The Oregonian*: November 19, 2001: A5.
- Putnam, Robert. 1995. Bowling Alone: America's Declining Social Capital. *Journal of Democracy* 6(1): 65–78.
- Stewart, David, and Prem Shandasani. 1998. Focus Group Research. Pp 505–526 in Bickman and Rog, Ed., *Handbook of Applied Social Research Methods*. Sage Publishing, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- United States Census Bureau. 2001. <http://www.census.gov>.

# Appendix X

## Klamath Basin—social impact assessment

### Focus group and interview protocol

1. Introduction: Name and pertinent background information (e.g., where they work, what they do, how long they've lived in the area...general, get-to-know-each-other details)
2. How has the current water shortage/situation affected your community, friends, and neighbors, and any other social group that is important to you (e.g., church groups, membership organizations)?  
How has the current water shortage/situation affected your family?  
How has the current water shortage/situation affected you personally?

Probe for details about *changes* in physical/mental health, relationships with others, job opportunities, general sense of the world.

Additional questions for farmers/ranchers, business owners, and others as appropriate:

- Did you look for alternative income earning opportunities to compensate for lost income from irrigated agriculture? How successful were you in finding alternative income?
  - Can you estimate the percentage of the losses due to water restrictions that was offset with supplemental earning?
  - Including government payments, what percentage of the losses due to water restrictions was offset by all supplemental sources of income?
3. How has the current water shortage/situation changed the way you do your job(s)?  
  
Probe for details about *changes* in the way they work, the types of people they interact with, how they approach their job.
  4. What types of support or help do you receive from others such as family, friends, neighbors, church groups, public service providers, etc. in dealing with the impact of the current water shortage? Is this different—in type or amount—from the assistance you've received in the past?
  5. What other kinds of support or help do you need to get along over the next 6 months? What about in the longer term (1–2 years)?

## **Focus group and interview participants' demographic information**

In order to compare the results across the several focus groups we are doing, we would appreciate some general information about you. Your answers to this questionnaire and the things you said during the focus group will be held in strict confidence. All of our reports will summarize statements within and among the focus groups without direct reference by name or details to individuals.

Thank you for your time in the focus group. If you are interested in seeing a copy of our report, please provide your name and address on the sign-up list.

1. How long have you lived in the area?
2. What is your occupation?
3. How long have you been in this occupation?
4. What is your age?
  - 18–25
  - 26–35
  - 36–45
  - 46–55
  - 56–65
  - 65+
5. What is your gender? Male \_\_\_\_\_ Female \_\_\_\_\_
6. What is your race/ethnicity?
  - White
  - Hispanic
  - Native American
  - African American
7. What is your level of education?
  - \_\_\_\_\_ less than HS
  - \_\_\_\_\_ HS degree
  - \_\_\_\_\_ some college
  - \_\_\_\_\_ college degree
  - \_\_\_\_\_ some graduate school
  - \_\_\_\_\_ graduate degree