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Memorandum

To: "Quality Jobs" Forum Participants

From: Bob Rheiner, Co-Chair Regional CERT

Subject: Forum Report

Attached are copies of a summary report of the forum held November 7 and 8, "Quality Jobs for Quality Ecosystem Outcomes", the roster of participants and the agenda for the two day meeting. The Bureau of Land Management is pleased to provide the mailing for the report. The forum planning partners collaborated to produce the report, relying on the excellent records provided by the meeting and breakout group facilitators.

It is exciting to be a part of this process. I hope the report will be useful to you as you work with your local and regional partners to move forward on the important next steps for 1996.

It is not too early to begin thinking about what kind of forum we need at the end of the coming season. Please talk this over with your partners and share your thoughts with me, Ron Ochs or Charles Spencer.

Thanks again to all of you for making the forum a great success, and for the hard work and commitment you have invested in our work "on the ground".

Bob Rheiner

Attachments (as stated)
Quality Jobs for Quality Ecosystem Outcomes

Sponsored by
USDI BLM, USDA Forest Service,
Labor Education and Research Center, U of O
Oregon State University Extension Service
Oregon Economic Development Department;
Beaverton, Oregon; November 7-8, 1995

SUMMARY REPORT

Introduction

The Quality Jobs for Quality Ecosystem Outcomes Forum was held to bring Jobs In The Woods (JITW) program partners together to review progress and plan for 1996. The first day of the forum addressed key issues relating to JITW in general. The second day focused on demonstration projects as a way to advance the goals of JITW. (Approximately 10% of 1995 JITW project work was done in innovative demonstration projects.)

In attendance were 144 Oregon, Washington and California representatives from a wide variety of organizations involved with JITW and related demonstration projects, including: USDI Bureau of Land Management, USDA Forest Service, Oregon State University Extension Service, Labor Education and Research Center, Oregon Economic Development Department, dislocated worker programs (JTPA), US Department of Labor, Oregon Apprenticeship and Training Division, private contractors, community organizations, labor representatives and community colleges. According to the evaluations, participants felt that the Forum provided a supportive atmosphere for discussion of tough issues, and that the breakout sessions provided a much-appreciated opportunity for information exchange.

This report details specific successes and challenges of the 1995 demonstration projects and the JITW program in general as defined by Forum participants. Each section discusses the common themes which surfaced during the facilitated discussions throughout the conference and small group breakout sessions. The report was prepared by staff of the Labor Education and Research Center, with grant support from the Northwest Area Foundation.

General Themes

Refining the Vision: One participant wrote down what could be a vision statement for the JITW program: “Locally-based partnerships of all stakeholders managing congressionally designated dollars to provide on-going training and skills upgrading for long term community-based stewardship of public and private lands.” The Forum was the first time that a large, multi-state group of program partners met to discuss Jobs-in-the-Woods. It allowed participants to identify some gaps in the vision:
• Some participants wanted a clearer understanding of the assumptions, goals and objectives, resources, and long-term vision of the JITW program.
• Others felt that the balance of job creation and resource management was not well understood.
• Still others felt some training on project design and procurement options is needed (both within government agencies and among other JITW participants).
• Some felt that different agencies had differing purposes and goals regarding ecosystem restoration as well as training.

As JITW continues forward, more participants and partners are welcomed aboard. It is important to maintain a consistent level of understanding among the partners. As we begin our third year we must be careful not to neglect the learning curve of new partners and to continue to keep everyone aware of the progress, pitfalls, and opportunities we encounter.

**Funding:** The message heard throughout the forum was that stable, flexible and adequate funding is critical to the continued success of JITW. A self-generating funding process must be created to be in place after 1998. Participants had several suggestions about how funding could be stabilized and expanded, all of which required that participating agencies meet to pool current and potential resources:
• dual benefits could attract dual funding (noxious weed dollars combined with recreation dollars to achieve both ends),
• workers' compensation cost could be reduced for restoration projects vs. production projects,
• redistribution of current funding, rather than depending on increased funding, might be a more immediate way to address the issue.
• develop private land owners as full partners,
• access more of the total federal dollars in OR, WA and CA beyond just JITW,
• explore options for funding restoration projects with revenue from sustainable small log utilization,
• do away with match requirement on participating agreements.

**Partnerships:** Forum participants most enthusiastically named partnerships established through demonstration projects as the major successes of the program. The commitment and motivation of all partners provided a lot of the personal satisfaction. The diversity of viewpoints, experiences, problem-solving skills, and work styles was seen as critical to the achievements made thus far.

Forum participants also suggested:
• Improve the breadth of involvement by current and new partners.
• Involve contracting and procurement people in the planning and design phase.
• Partners should be recruited from private industry and non-profits, forest products associations, grassroots community agencies, and more land managers (public and private).
• Community needs and local economic considerations should be fully integrated in management activities and decisions to establish more
community ownership of the program through more local non-agency leadership.

- Bring SAF and workers compensation partners into the project; especially to explore the potential for saving costs.
- Develop and strengthen a cross-regional network.

There was also concern that some partnerships were simply an association based on a flow of funds from one to the other, and this did not reflect the spirit or the needs of JITW. While stronger partnerships naturally develop over time, we can provide more occasions for dialog via regular update reports, use of e-mail, and phone conferencing.

**Cultural Change:** Throughout the conference, participants referred to the impact that JITW will have on the work culture within the government organizations involved. These organizations have been operating under the same general procedures for years and have seen small, add-on programs come and go with each new administration, so there is some resistance to JITW. It is difficult for large federal agencies to be flexible and change quickly. However, there was a strong consensus that JITW and its underlying philosophy about land management must become an integral part of the way that federal agencies do business. This requires a shift in the goals and objectives of these agencies which is not likely to occur without a change in their work culture. It was suggested that assistance be provided to help agencies make the cultural and philosophical shift through training, facilitation of the change process, and support along the way.

**Procurement:** Aside from the philosophical and internal culture changes that government agencies will have to facilitate, specific and complicated changes in the project design, procurement, and bidding procedures were identified as necessary before this project can mature:

- Projects would have to be designed to include a broad scope of restoration work over an extended period of time. (As an example, it was noted in the Project Work breakout session that pre-commercial thinning competes with existing contract crews that can meet management goals.)
- Procurement rules may have to be modified or alternative contract processes (e.g., RFP) applied to JITW projects to ensure that multi-task, multi-year, local-contracted, watershed-based stewardship contracts are available. Performance issues should also be made part of the contract.
- JITW project costs are potentially higher than traditional project costs, though there was consensus on the need to build the cost savings of better quality and watershed restoration into the contracting process.
- Many Forum participants believe that using small log sales to fund restoration work is one option.
- Changing the contracting focus from short term and low bid to longer term and negotiated contracts will help provide stability to small rural communities, promote the idea of a sustainable ecosystem and provide for the interests of all partners.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address 1</th>
<th>Address 2</th>
<th>City, State, Zip</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Fax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leni Oman</td>
<td>US Dept. Of Fish And Wildlife - Jobs For The Environment, State Of Washington - Habitat Management Prog. 600 Capitol Wayn N Olympia WA 98501-1091 Phone: 360-402-2592 Fax: 360-402-8296</td>
<td>Tillamook OR 97141</td>
<td>503-842-2155</td>
<td>503-842-5212</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Pierce</td>
<td>Pierce, Inc. PO Box 488</td>
<td>1300 Airport Ln No Bend OR 97459</td>
<td>503-756-0100</td>
<td>503-756-9303</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duane Rose</td>
<td>GCAP 31985 Squaw Valley Road Gold Beach OR 97444 Phone: 503-247-7178 Fax:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Pack</td>
<td>USFS Oakridge R.D. 46375 Hwy 58 Oakridge OR 97463 Phone: 503-782-2291 Fax:</td>
<td>1717 Faby Rd SE Salem OR 97302 Phone: 503-375-5646 Fax: 503-375-5622</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Prather</td>
<td>BLM/Salem 1717 Faby Rd SE Salem OR 97302 Phone: 503-375-5646 Fax: 503-375-5622</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Ruddig</td>
<td>USDA Forest Service 1835 Black Lake Blvd SW Olympia WA 98512-5623 Phone: 360-956-2449 Fax: 360-532-5949</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Paulson</td>
<td>PO Box 3623 Portland OR 97208 Phone: 503-326-5434 Fax:</td>
<td>2955 N.W. Division St. Gresham OR 97030 Phone: 503-666-0791 Fax: 503-666-0641</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Radlet</td>
<td>USDA Forest Service PO Box 324 Hebo OR 97122-0324 Phone: Fax:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen Sachet</td>
<td>Mt. Hood National Forest 2955 N.W. Division St. Gresham OR 97030 Phone: 503-666-0791 Fax: 503-666-0641</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristen Peckham</td>
<td>Trinity Occupational Training, Inc. PO Drawer 1430 Weaverville CA 96093 Phone: 916-623-5538 Fax: 916-623-4109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alisa Ralph</td>
<td>US Fish &amp; Wildlife Service 3704 Griffin Lane SE Suite 102 Olympia WA 98501 Phone: 360-753-4064 Fax: 360-753-9008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Saranich</td>
<td>USDA Forest Service 4th Floor, SE Wing Auditors 201 14th Street, S.W. Washington DC 20090-6090 Phone: 202-205-1389 Fax:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Perritt</td>
<td>USFWS 2600 SE 98th Ave, Suite 100 Portland OR 97266 Phone: 503-231-6179 Fax: 503-231-6195</td>
<td>2795 Anderson Ave Klamath Falls OR 97603 Phone: 503-883-6916 Fax: 503-884-2097</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Regan-Vienop</td>
<td>BLM 2795 Anderson Ave Klamath Falls OR 97603 Phone: 503-883-6916 Fax: 503-884-2097</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave Schmidt</td>
<td>Linn County Commissioner PO Box 100 Albany OR 97321 Phone: Fax:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc Peters</td>
<td>Oregon Dept Of Agriculture - NRD 635 Capitol St. NE Salem OR 97310 Phone: 503-886-4714 Fax: 503-886-4730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Reidel</td>
<td>Washington State AFL-CIO 314 1st Avenue West Seattle WA 98119 Phone: 206-283-6121 Fax: 206-288-5805</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandy Schmidt</td>
<td>USDA Forest Service 3225 Hwy 20 Sweet Home OR 97386 Phone: 503-367-5168 Fax:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances Phillipk</td>
<td>BLM/Salem 1717 Faby Rd SE Salem OR 97302 Phone: 503-375-5646 Fax: 503-375-5622</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelle Reynolds</td>
<td>Deschutes National Forest PO Box 208 Crescent City OR 97733 Phone: 503-433-3258 Fax:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Segal</td>
<td>USAID 121 SW Salmon St. #240 Portland OR 97202 Phone: 503-229-6754 Fax: 229-6113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Phillips</td>
<td>USDA Forest Service PO Box 3623 Portland OR 97208 Phone: 503-326-5292 Fax:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Rheiner</td>
<td>BLM PO Box 2965 Portland OR 97208 Phone: 503-952-6015 Fax: 503-952-6121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Shafer</td>
<td>Salmon Outreach Program 311 SW 11th Newport OR 97365 Phone: 503-574-9187 Fax:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie Pichel</td>
<td>SWPIC 78 Centennial Eugene OR 97401 Phone: 503-687-3800 Fax: 687-3858</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Richards</td>
<td>Bureau Of Land Mgmt. 1300 Airport Ln No Bend OR 97459 Phone: 503-756-0100 Fax: 503-756-9303</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Shapiro</td>
<td>BLM PO Box 2965 Portland OR 97208 Phone: 503-280-7227 Fax: 503-280-7312</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strategic Questions

Several issues surfaced during the two-day forum that call for clarity on the precepts, the assumptions, and the vision under which JITW operates:

- How can we measure the current and long-term job outlook in ecosystem management?
- How do we provide incentives for private sector involvement?
- How can we apply the JITW approach up to all federal projects and funds, not just watershed restoration?
- What base lines can we establish to help monitor all aspects of JITW (worker skill base, training delivery, contractor capacity, employment and earnings)?
- How do we balance ecosystem goals with employment and wage goals?
- Do we measure customer satisfaction in terms of community, land owner, worker, industry? What does this mean for project packaging options?
- How can we enhance the value of demonstration projects as laboratories to test our theories?
- What's the best way to establish a multi-agency clearinghouse for projects that are geographically managed?

Breakout Session Summaries

The following sections summarize the four breakout session held the second day of the forum for the purpose of gathering the lessons of 1995 demonstration projects in California, Washington and Oregon. In each section, the successes, challenges, and opportunities are briefly outlined.

Local Program Administration

Many successes were identified, especially in the areas of partnership, teamwork and collaboration:

- Partnerships were formed among diverse individuals and organizations; this brought creativity and flexibility to problem-solving. (Interestingly, diversity was also noted as a weakness in the system.)
- The successes of the project demonstrations themselves were motivational and satisfying. JITW demonstration projects provided excellent training, skills enhancement, and learning experiences for the workers as well as federal agency partners.
- Land management agency flexibility allowing for work project adjustments to meet local needs was seen as a program strength.
- The participating government agencies were congratulated for their contributions and support: the tenacity and perseverance of agency personnel, Forest Service and BLM operating in the open to allow public participation, and the advancement of funds from the USFS were all noted as significant efforts that resulted in program success.
- These factors led to broad support at the community level as well.

Weaknesses and challenges:

- One of the objectives for 1996 is to move away from the public agencies serving as employer-of-record. Several demonstration project steering
committees are developing plans to make this change. No conclusions have been offered identifying procurement options to meet that goal. Several suggestions arose on reducing the financial risk of the employer-of-record, either by simplifying the process and/or providing more support for fund administration.

• There was some concern about demonstration project decision processes. Suggestions for modification included advance (4-6 months prior to program start) cooperation between agency planners, education providers and the employer to identify appropriate projects and assure integration with educational objectives.

• Several participants cited the negative and wait-and-see attitudes among some agency staff. The JITW objectives are seen as extra work by many in agencies struggling with downsizing.

• A list of committed project work should be available before hiring begins.

Project Work
The successes recognized in the Project Work breakout group included:

• Most demonstration projects viewed as successful had a broad variety of project work.

• Many smaller work projects bundled together provided better learning opportunity and better quality work.

• The state funding process for Washington’s Jobs for the Environment program provided greater procurement flexibility than was possible in the federal JITW.

Weaknesses and challenges:

• Long, uninterrupted activity in one type of work provides less learning potential than a more varied work schedule.

• Must include more input from non-federal stakeholders in project selection.

• It's important to know agency goals and sideboards for project work, and how flexible and creative we can be within that context to achieve our objectives.

• There must be clearly defined goals for everyone - managers, workers, employer, and program staff. These would go a long way in helping guide daily decisions.

• Steering Committees at demonstration projects should provide an opportunity for participants to discuss and record their own expectations.

• There must be some measurement of customer satisfaction with regard to ecological, social and economic outcomes.

Other comments dealt with how the expectations of the JITW demonstration project workers were not always in synch with ours. Specifically, problems arose with camping at the work site, transportation to and from the site, and workers unprepared (or unwilling) to take on an entrepreneurial role.

Recruitment and Career Development
The Recruitment and Career Development breakout group listed factors that seemed to lead to a successful demonstration project:

• recruiting from a broad (2-3 county) area;
• good use of media (PSAs, Employment Division posting, and cable ads in rural areas);
• early partnership with JTPA service delivery agencies;
• including union representatives in the demonstration project planning and implementation, especially recruitment of workers;
• high worker satisfaction with the cooperative learning environment; they speak positively about it;
• wages were as high as possible;
• steering committees respected worker participants as their customer as well as their product;
• steering committees were flexible and responsive to trainee/project needs.
• planning for a large support budget (larger than usual for JTPA), recognizing that long-term unemployed workers may incur more support expense;
• bringing participants to talk about the demonstration project to groups like DOL.

The group recommended that recruiters continue to hire locally and use criteria that give priority to displaced workers who are enthusiastic about training and a career change, and target people who have good communication skills and experience working in the woods on a team. They emphasized the need to be thorough and honest in describing job activities, project work, expectations and working conditions, and to allow applicants to self-select.

Several recommendations summarized the group’s experience so far:
• build career development and skills identification into the early part of the training process; avoid tacking job search on at the end without adequate development;
• thorough and early assessment of supportive services needs: clothing, tools, transportation, car repair/gas/insurance, fines, food, housing, etc.;
• critical to accommodate non-native English speakers throughout the project;
• be very clear about the JITW goals and requirements; share JTPA goals and requirements with partners on steering committees;
• accept and appreciate that each project community is different;
• be sensitive to needs of employer but balance them with EEO/AA and project priorities;
• learn the internal language used by government agencies (e.g., forestry and training/development);
• define what we mean by career development and be able to articulate that to participants and partners;
• be sure the participant understands that major responsibility come with program;
• tap into funding grants or loans from Small Business Development Center(s) to support trainees interested in starting a contracting business;
• continue to involve case managers on an on-going basis.

Education - Training - Apprenticeship
In general, this session addressed the design and delivery of a core curriculum which combines classroom and field training. General conclusions were:
• hands-on training is better than theory/lecture; however a balance of field-based and classroom formats is needed;
• the project provided employment as well as encouragement for the future;
• some strong partnerships emerged from the training portion of the project, specifically among federal, state, private, and non-profit groups; project funds and training resources were pooled;
• there must be common core elements of training design across the three states, but with the flexibility to make the training design appropriate to specifics of the local watershed.

The challenges for 1996 are:
• develop a high-quality and consistent core curriculum which allows customization to meet local community and industry needs;
• make training appetizing to workers who may be reluctant to re-enter the classroom, interesting despite the sedentary nature of classroom learning, and non-threatening despite the seemingly massive amount of information to be covered;
• enlist employers to provide some of the training components, to help set training standards, to share the cost burden and to facilitate movement into private industry (but with a caution not to let go of training completely);
• training hours should correspond to apprenticeship hours;
• find funding to training existing workers as well as dislocated workers;
• provide standardized training certificates for all graduates;
• establish standards re: length/duration of training;
• how should we provide long-distance training where necessary (Are telecourses viable?)
• how do we accommodate/incorporate long-term training for workers or contractors?
• how do we best link JITW training to a next step (degree or job) for worker participants?
• how can we improve our partnership with DOL to meet standards as they are applied?
• how can we attract more of the younger dislocated workforce?
• how can we monitor, review and adapt the training?

Conclusion

The successes of the JITW program in the last two years have generated a growing enthusiasm for the concept of a healthy, prosperous and stable relationship between the woods, the workforce and their communities. The forum discussion as summarized in this report shows that much has been accomplished, but the work has only just begun.

An estimated 90% of Jobs-in-the-Woods work was completed through conventional contracting. The Regional Ecosystem Office is compiling employment results and should have a report available in early 1996. It will be difficult to determine how many dislocated workers were employed on contracted work. There is no evidence of any formal training efforts associated with these projects.
The demonstration projects are committed to linking dislocated and at-risk timber workers with training and sustained employment offering family wages and benefits; and to reliance on community involvement and community-based employment models. They also want to see the constructive changes in procurement practices necessary to make these results happen. To accomplish this will require changes in federal agency culture and project design, and clarity on contracting options available to procurement managers. Progress must be made in these areas in 1996 if we are to succeed in accomplishing the watershed restoration and economic objectives of JITW through either contracting alternatives or innovative participating agreements.

The breakout discussions as well as the general themes and strategic questions identified at the Forum suggest several key tasks for 1996:

- Provide consistent and adequate federal agency planning resources to deliver the watershed restoration projects called for in JITW;

- Implement project design and packaging options necessary to achieve the employment and training outcomes called for in the JITW program;

- Implement procurement options necessary to achieve the employment and training outcomes called for in the JITW program;

- Establish common training and competency standards which provide flexibility to address local watershed and labor market contexts, while assuring a competent and competitive workforce across the region;

- Bring together partners necessary to help land management agencies make the cultural and philosophical shift through training, research, support and facilitation of the change process.

- Plan and implement programs for employment of demonstration project graduates through joint efforts of:
  - participating JTPA Service Delivery Agencies, supported by state JTPA staff;
  - participating BLM and Forest Service contracting officers, Forest Supervisors and District Managers;
  - local demonstration project coordinators
  - apprenticeship JATC and support staff;
  - participating contractors and contractor associations;
  - technical assistance staff of the Ecosystem Workforce Project.

- Report prepared by Ecosystem Workforce Project partners, with the support of a grant from the Northwest Area Foundation, and distribution by the regional office of USDI BLM; 1/10/96
Quality Jobs for Quality Ecosystem Outcomes
A Forum Sponsored by the Northwest Economic Adjustment Initiative
November 7 & 8, 1998
Beaverton, Oregon

AGENDA: November 7, 1995

Registration 8:00 a.m.

Meeting Overview By Today's Emcee 8:30 a.m.
Presenter: Darrel Kenops, Willamette National Forest and Oregon CERT

Welcome & Keynote 8:45 a.m.
Presenters: Denny Scott, United Brotherhood of Carpenters
Bill Bradley, BLM Deputy State Director for Resources
Peter Green, representing Oregon Governor John Kitzhaber

Social & Economic Aspects of Natural Resource Management 9:45 a.m.
Presenters: Margaret Hallock, Labor Education & Research Center
Kent Connaughton, Office of Forestry & Economic Development

Effective Partnerships 11:15 a.m.
Presenter: Brett KenCairn, Rogue Institute of Economy & Ecology

LUNCH 12:00 – 1:00 p.m.

Assessment of Current Situation 1:00 p.m.
Panel Members: Neil Summers, Northwest Reforestation Contractors Assoc.
Dana Shuford, Tillamook BLM
Louise Bilheimer, Pacific Rivers Council
Bob Brandow, Washington Dept. Of Natural Resources
Mathew Carrol, Washington State University
Dave Schmidt, Linn County Oregon Commissioner

Natural Resource Partnership Proposal 2:30 p.m.
Presenters: Kevin Smith, Oregon Economic Development Department
Bob Warren, Oregon Economic Development Department

Procurement Processes to Meet the Goal 3:30 p.m.
Presenters: Rick Evans (GCAP) and Contracting Officers (land management agencies)

What Do You Think? 4:15 p.m.
A Facilitated Discussion with the Audience:
• What are the major issues/concerns that you see?
• Is there clarity of vision regarding the social/economic aspects of ecosystem management?
• What are some possible solutions to the hurdles we are facing?

Wrap-Up of Day One 4:45 p.m.
Presenter: Darrel Kenops, Willamette National Forest and Oregon CERT
AGENDA: November 8, 1995

Registration, Coffee & Visiting 8:00 a.m.

Welcome Back & Day Two Preview by Today’s Emcee 8:15 a.m.
Presenter: Bob Warren, Oregon Economic Development Department

Overview of Efforts That Lead to the "Jobs In The Woods" Goals & Objectives 8:30 a.m.
Presenters: Charles Spencer, Labor Education & Research Center
Flaxen Conway, OSU Extension Service

Highlights of Three Innovative Projects 9:15 a.m.
Presenters:
Lynn Jungwirth, Watershed Research & Training Center, Hayfork, CA
Brad Leavitt, 1995 Ecosystem Workforce Demonstration Project, Sweet Home, OR
Tom Ross, Columbia Pacific RC&D, Aberdeen, WA.

LUNCH 12:00 - 1:00 p.m.

Learning From The “FY 95 Experiences”: Concurrent Breakout Sessions 1:00 p.m.
There will be four, facilitated, work sessions providing partners from each of the FY95 demonstration sites and interested possible FY96 sites to discuss in detail the successes and challenges regarding one the following topics:

1) Program Administration (such as steering committee membership, employers, participating/agency/entity agreements and relationships, hiring, pay and benefits, worker supervision, working relationships, etc.
2) Project Work (such as types of work, project design, project packaging, equipment management and needs, customer satisfaction, geographic range, duration, scheduling, etc.)
3) Recruitment/Career Development (such as recruitment, background/previous skill base, career development, geographic range, union representation, demographics, etc.)
4) Education/Training/Apprenticeship (such as training partners, scheduling, duration, siting, certificates of completion, apprenticeship, etc.)

Highlights of the Breakout Sessions 3:15 p.m.
Reports from Each Session for All to Hear

So What's Next? 4:00 p.m.
A facilitated discussion of desired future condition for FY96 and beyond.
* How do we get started?
* How do we involve our partners back home?
* How can we work together to get results from our efforts?

Let's Get Going! 4:45 p.m.
Presenters: Charlie Krebs, USDA-Forest Service
Bob Rheiner, DOI Bureau of Land Management
# Forum: Quality Jobs for Quality Ecosystem Outcomes
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## Forum Roster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title/Position</th>
<th>Organization/Location</th>
<th>Phone/Fax</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rolf Anderson</td>
<td>USDA Forest Service</td>
<td>3225 Hwy 20, Sweet Home OR 97386</td>
<td>Phone:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fax:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Black</td>
<td>USDA Forest Service</td>
<td>PO Box 3623, Portland OR 97208</td>
<td>503-326-6600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fax:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Brumm</td>
<td>OEDD/JTPA</td>
<td>255 Capitol St. NE, Salem OR 97310</td>
<td>503-373-1995x225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Bowman</td>
<td>Rural Human Services</td>
<td>811 C Street, Crescent City CA 95531</td>
<td>707-465-7441</td>
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<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Washington State University, Pullman WA 99104-6410</td>
<td>509-335-2235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fax: 509-335-7862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>PO Box 4915, Olympia WA</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fax: 360-586-8380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerry Brodsky</td>
<td>Public Knowledge</td>
<td>2828 NE Stanton, Portland OR 97212</td>
<td>503-581-0878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fax: 503-287-7323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Cason</td>
<td>USDA Forest Service</td>
<td>1835 Black Lake Blvd. SW, Olympia WA 98512-5623</td>
<td>360-956-2300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fax:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Phone:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
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<td>Fax:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>777 NW Garden Valley, Roseburg OR 97470</td>
<td>503-440-4930</td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
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<td>Fax:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Clancy-Burns</td>
<td>Community Services Consortium</td>
<td>545 SW 2nd, Suite A, Corvallis OR 97333</td>
<td>503-752-1010</td>
</tr>
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<td>Fax: 503-752-2348</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
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I. Introduction.

The following observations on the 1995 Ecosystem Workforce Demonstration Projects in Oregon are an early product of the 1995 evaluation process. The report is an attempt to consolidate lessons soon enough to be useful to partners at local and state-wide levels who are engaged in planning for 1996, whether for similar demonstration projects or other innovative strategies for achieving the goals of the Jobs-in-the-Woods initiative.

Though information for a full evaluation of 1995 projects is not yet available, two major successes are clear:

1) Fifty-seven worker trainees at six sites in western Oregon received the opportunity to significantly expand their knowledge, skills and abilities, through work experience and training on a variety of ecosystem management projects while earning family wages and benefits.

2) Strong collaborative local partnerships were built in seven rural communities to plan and implement ecosystem workforce demonstration projects. The working relationships established by these local steering committees give new capacity for those communities as they face resource-related and other challenges.

The workers, steering committees and their partners have made major contributions to Oregon's rural community and economic development. We look forward to being able to tell the whole story as the demonstration projects complete their 1995 activities and gather data and conclusions from the experience.

The evaluation effort is offered by Ecosystem Workforce Project (EWP) staff working with the support of a grant from the Northwest Area Foundation, and collaborating with the Ecosystem Investment Team (EIT) of the Oregon Community Economic Stabilization Team (CERT). EWP staff have provided technical assistance to local and state partners in planning, implementing and evaluating initiatives aimed at linking dislocated timber workers with family wages and benefit, training and sustained employment. The demonstration projects are only one part of the innovation associated with Oregon's experience with the Jobs-in-the-Woods portion of President Clinton's Forest Plan. Partners engaged in the demonstration projects agree that success will be measured by our ability to move innovative solutions into the private sector contracting arena, so that "demonstration projects" will become a thing of the past.

Preliminary observations rely on questionnaires and on-site interviews. In many cases the questionnaires and forms have not been completed. Thus detailed cost, project type, training delivery and other data will not be available until the final evaluation is complete in January, 1996. Local steering committees for at least three of the demonstration projects are preparing their own evaluations and plans for 1996. The final evaluation will cite these reports.
II. Overview of the Ecosystem Workforce Demonstration Projects

A. History

The Northwest Economic Adjustment Initiative (NEAI) arose out of President Clinton's Forest Conference in 1993. The NEAI has addressed four program areas of assistance: workers and families, business and industry, communities and infrastructure, and ecosystem investment.

The Ecosystem Investment Team was formed in late 1993 as a subcommittee of the Oregon CERT to address the ecosystem investment program area. Its mission is to link forest ecosystem restoration activities on priority watersheds (on both federal and non-federal lands) with dislocated workers and with businesses in affected communities resulting in improved social, economic and environmental outcomes.

B. 1994 Pilot Project

A collaborative team of partners from the Labor Education and Research Center, University of Oregon (LERC), the Oregon State University Extension Service (OSUES), the Oregon Economic Development Department (OEDD) and others have worked under a grant from the Northwest Area Foundation, and in collaboration with the NEAI to help land management agencies meet the EIT goals. In 1994 local land management agency and JTPA staff worked with this team to create the 1994 Ecosystem Workforce Pilot Project in Sweet Home. The goal of the Sweet Home pilot was to link local workers with watershed restoration job opportunities and training at family wages. Classroom and work-based training of over 216 hours focused on the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed to successfully complete ecosystem enhancement projects. The project combined training in forest and stream ecology, restoration skills, and business and entrepreneurial basics with practical field experience.

The 1994 Ecosystem Workforce Pilot Project demonstrated that dislocated timber workers, ecosystem restoration projects, family wage jobs and education/training can be successfully linked. It equipped forest workers with the skills and confidence needed to be leaders in the new forest stewardship industry.

C. 1995 Ecosystem Workforce Demonstration Projects

In 1995, six Ecosystem Workforce Demonstration Projects were developed to build on the Sweet Home experience. In Tillamook, Waldport, Sweet Home, Oakridge, Roseburg, and Medford, partners have built demonstration projects that fit their particular circumstances. A seventh related project in the Deschutes National Forest is also part of the evaluation process, as valuable lessons can be drawn from the project.\(^1\) The overall goals for the six projects are the following:

---

\(^1\) Deschutes, the only east side site, started in 1994 as a separate effort. Although it has been included here with the other demonstration projects umbrella, it continues to operate separate from the other sites and is not designed to build on forestry skills and re-deploy workers in ecosystem management work. The project is designed as summer employment for dislocated workers enrolled in community college retraining programs.
1) Short-term: Provide dislocated forest workers from rural communities with training, family wages and benefits and work experience on ecosystem management projects in several different regions of Oregon.

2) Long-term: Substantiate the hypothesis that a multi-skilled, motivated work force outperforms low-cost alternatives which have little regard for the quality or origin of the work force.

3) Expand upon the lessons and insights gained from the 1994 Ecosystem Workforce Pilot Project.

D. Objectives of 1995 Ecosystem Workforce Demonstration Projects

1) Determine the quality and quantity of likely job opportunities associated with ecosystem restoration work using a larger set of example sites than in 1994.

2) Determine needed innovation regarding: a) Contracting reforms, b) Industry structure, c) Institutional partnerships, d) Skill standards (Knowledge, Skills and Abilities), and e) Training design.

3) Demonstrate methods that federal land management agencies can use to design and package contracted projects, in order to create incentives for high quality work, using high-skilled, multi-skilled workers; to increase opportunities for sustained employment in forest-based communities; and to improve ecosystem restoration efforts.

4) Learn what mix of training formats, personnel, and content is appropriate to meet the diverse needs of worker participants as well as the likely market demand.

5) Expand the ecosystem management industry pool of skilled workers.

6) Package more and different types of projects, on both public and private lands, to extend restoration project scheduling to provide the longest possible working season.

III. Evaluation Purpose and Methodology

This report summarizes early lessons from current efforts to evaluate the seven 1995 Ecosystem Workforce Demonstration Projects, using data acquired in late July, August, and early September 1995. Goals for the evaluation process are:

1) Measure the ability of demonstration projects to meet the short and long term goals described in Section I above.

2) Evaluate the different demonstration project models to determine the strengths and weaknesses of each.

3) Collect and analyze information about the 1995 demonstration projects which will help determine the direction and models that are appropriate to use in 1996 workforce projects.

During late July, August, and early September, the evaluation team sought qualitative and quantitative information necessary to evaluate the demonstration projects by:
1) Interviewing the workers in small groups.
2) Interviewing some of the more involved participants, such as the project coordinators and supervisors.
3) Requesting that steering committee members fill out a questionnaire about their experiences with and opinions of the demonstration project.
4) Requesting that a contact person at each site facilitate collecting information about projects, workers, and site operations.

The final evaluation will draw upon additional steering committee questionnaires and reports on project costs, project work, training and worker trainees.

IV. The 1995 Demonstration Projects

Each of the seven 1995 demonstration projects was designed by local partners to address the specific circumstances of the local community. Differences with regard to agency outlook, economic situation, labor pool, watershed needs and land ownership affected how the site partnerships were arranged to coordinate the projects, how worker trainees were selected, what project work was selected, and how the training program operated. All of the new sites worked hard to get up and running by May at the latest. For the most part, the sites operate autonomously under the direction of a local steering committee. The partners, such as LERC, OSUES, and OEDD, who initially helped set up the sites, continued to provide technical assistance.

A. Coordination Framework

Each site required an employer to accept responsibility for employment and safety of the workers. Employer entities were public and private, for-profit and non-profit. In addition a local entity, sometimes the employer, was needed to take primary coordinating responsibility, and to enter into Participating Agreements with the Forest Service and BLM. These agreements authorized project work on federal land, and required local matching funds. The final report will highlight the opportunities and challenges posed by the agreements. The Roseburg project's Participating Agreement was the first to be signed in 1995, and served as a model for the others.

Steering committees were established at each site to guide planning and implementation. The steering committees had strong participation by local USDA Forest Service and USDI BLM partners. They made it all possible by gathering together projects for work experience. A local Job Training Partnership Administration (JTPA) service delivery agency participates at each site to help with recruitment, career development, personal equipment, and other supportive services, and with funding for training materials and instructors. Community college, economic development, and local contractor partners were involved on several steering committees.

At each site a program coordinator identified and scheduled work projects. A training coordinator scheduled formal field and classroom training, trying where possible to assure the training fit with scheduled project work. The
demonstration projects also have one or more project managers and/or field supervisors who direct and oversee the crews.

B. Worker Trainees

Local JTPA partners took the lead in recruiting worker trainees, with the help of agency, labor, community college and other steering committee members. The broad participation in recruitment helped reach many workers who had not previously sought out dislocated worker programs. Fifty-seven worker trainees participated in the six west-side projects, and twelve in the Deschutes Project. The average age was 38, with ages ranging from 21 to 61. Nine women and sixty men participated; five were Hispanics and two Native Americans. Of the forty-six workers for whom information was reported, nineteen were mill workers, seventeen were loggers, three agricultural workers, two federal land management agency workers, two forest technicians, and three other.

C. Training Delivery

Steering committees at each of the sites developed its own training delivery and methods for coordinating training and project work. Formal training occurred in the classroom and in the field. Much informal training and orientation was provided during project work activities. In most cases project scientists and engineers met with the crews to orient them to the job. Each of the demonstration sites received a list of all the topics to cover in the training along with a binder of materials for each worker trainee. Six training sessions were made available to six demonstration project sites by satellite downlink. Worker trainees from the Sweet Home project served as the studio audience.

At each of the sites, the training coordinator scheduled a combination of classroom and field training to cover the training topics and complement the downlink classes. Training coordinators had the very difficult task of scheduling training to complement field work when feasible. For 1995 no detailed curriculum was available for each of the topics. (A curriculum development team has been convened to prepare more thorough materials and training outlines for 1996.)

Training delivery varied widely among the projects. As little as five and as much as 20 days of training were delivered (beyond initial orientation and the satellite downlink sessions). At Tillamook and Medford, steering committees decided to provide the majority of formal training after the field season is over, rather than use the training sequence suggested by the 1994 Sweet Home Pilot Project experience. At Medford a new one-year certificate program at Rogue Community College has been developed to support workers completing the demonstration project work season.

Also at Medford the training coordinator provided interpreters and translated many of the training materials. Three Hispanic workers had very little facility in English. Reforestation workers are estimated to be 60% - 70% Hispanic. If the developing ecosystem management industry follows this trend, Rogue Community College's trail blazing work will be needed elsewhere to assure access to training opportunities.

2N=55; data from Waldport not yet available; ages for some other workers was not available.
D. Project Work

Each of the demonstration sites packaged a set of projects which varied depending on agency partners, contracting officers, land ownership, project availability, project proximity, scheduling, and funding. The total dollar value of the projects varied from $100,000 to just under $500,000 in Tillamook, where project work began early and will continue through the winter months. In general there was a good distribution across work categories, including work in upland, riparian and in-stream settings, road stabilization, vegetation management, sensitive species protection, inventory and watershed analysis.

V. Early Lessons from the 1995 Experience

This section highlights issues and general observations gathered from the steering committee questionnaires and from interviews with worker trainees. Interviews with the workers were conducted at all demonstration project sites. To date we have received responses to steering committee questionnaires from Medford, Oakridge, Tillamook and Waldport so conclusions may not be representative of the experiences of all the 1995 demonstration projects.

A. Steering Committee Observations

Steering committee questionnaires completed to date have provided useful comments, and describe the success of the 1995 demonstration projects in meeting long and short term workforce goals. The demonstration projects are providing worker trainees with the opportunity to learn a broad range of skills and gain experience in a variety of project work areas. Steering committee responses are in italics below.

We [steering committee] wanted to be sure that we hit 3 areas: riparian restoration, density management, and measurement and assessment. . . . if we weren't really getting something in a project, we'd build it into the education. [We] spent an education day on a BLM site learning how to do fish counts

The ecosystem management industry is evolving and constantly changing. The workers will need to keep up with the field and acquire new skills to remain competitive in the labor force. The training has thus far provided the workers with the opportunity to gain skills that have been identified as those that employers think the workers should have.

A one year certificate is being developed and will go to the board of education for acceptance, hopefully by July 1996. The short term training is a good first step. One or two year programs or degrees will be important in the future for the worker in raising incomes and being competitive over the long term in the employment market.

A "certificate of completion" . . . will illustrate to prospective employers that an individual has had some pertinent training and possesses the ability to see things through.
In this year's projects, agencies provided more of the work than did private industry. The agencies were generally pleased with the results and want to continue to participate. This is important in supporting the emerging ecosystem management industry, promoting its expansion into private industry and in creating and maintaining a skilled pool of workers to meet future agency and industry needs.

*We believe agencies need to write into project bids a need to have at least one trained ecosystem restoration individual on their crew.*

*Bureaucratic barriers were overcome, time frames shortened, flexibility explored, communication enhanced between USFS, BLM, CSC [JTPA].*

*I feel the demos are leading to long-term solutions to government contracting for resource/woods work. Short-term benefits . . . involve employment of some workers for a limited amount of time. I am hopeful that in the future agencies will be able to select quality contractors (reputable and possibly local) who pay workers well.*

The projects are viewed positively in the communities as local people have been involved and employed as a result of the projects.

*[The project] provided employment for dislocated timber workers and completed work in the community.*

*The focus of the demos has been to provide a variety of woods work and thereby increase the skills pool in the local area. I believe this has proven successful.*

B. Issues from Interviews with Worker Trainees.

The informal interviews with workers were conducted using a set of interview topics with possible questions associated with each of the topics. The workers' responses, rather than the topics, guided much of the interview with the assumption that this would produce a better understanding of their perceptions of the training. Each topic was covered during the course of the interview. Some issues that emerged from the interviews are listed below:

1. Job anxiety: Workers were anxious about their employability/expertise at the end of the training.

2. Safety anxiety: Workers at some sites were concerned about the lack of safety on the job.

3. Training vs. production: At some sites, the workers have perceived an emphasis on production rather than training.

4. Underestimating Workers: Some workers did not feel that the coordinators and supervisors gave them enough responsibility, or trust that they were working hard.
5. Information not retained: Much of classroom training was ineffective because the workers could not absorb or retain the information in the current format and style.

In the short term (the time period of the 1995 projects), the demonstration projects have accomplished their goals. Approximately 70 dislocated workers have worked at what the Oregon Employment Department considers a family wage with benefits, and gained training and work experience in a wide variety of ecosystem management activities. It is not yet clear whether worker expectations have been realized. Many of the workers came to the projects expecting to prepare themselves for a new career in the ecosystem management industry: some were determined to be contractors; some wanted to explore that possibility, some wanted to work for someone else in this industry. Foremost in the worker’s mind, is what the training will do to help not in the long-term, but in the "medium"-term. What will (s)he do when the training is over? The level of worker concern about future employment depended partly on career expectations, her/his skill level, financial stress, current alternative opportunities, and knowledge of the labor market.

VI. Recommendations

A. Attaining Worker Objectives,

At a minimum, the worker is interested in acquiring enough proficiency at a set of practical skills to get hired by an existing contractor. While some sites got off to a slow start, by the projects’ end, all the workers will have been introduced to a broad variety of skills. As many workers and coordinators have pointed out, the workers have been exposed to these skills, but additional training and experience will be needed to achieve proficiency.

1. Building new skills for longer term employment. The workers identified two areas for improvement in the training process that could lead to future job opportunities.

a. Skills focus: during the demonstration project work and training, they should acquire broad exposure to a wide range of knowledge, skills and abilities. Opportunities should be identified for supplemental, more in-depth training during the demonstration project, or as a next step.

b. Lengthen the Training Period or Re-hire: the workers should continue working on projects through the winter, or, they should be re-hired the following year along with a new group that they could help train.

Adopting one or both of these suggestions, or perhaps making some other change, would, at the very least, help the workers to get employment with contractors, while those that are interested continue to look into contracting.

2. Building skills for contracting. Some workers, especially those committed to becoming contractors, were disappointed in the lack of focus on the business aspects of contracting. At many of the sites, the class on contracting and
bidding came 2 or 3 months after the start of the training. The workers felt they were losing weeks of experience in bidding and understanding contracting because they did not have this information to apply to all the work projects all summer. At most sites, the training has not included time to practice drawing up contracts. Again, the workers have been exposed to contracting, but they expected to learn how to do it.

At most sites, management functions have been placed outside the scope of the workers' roles. Only a few workers are getting experience that will help them run a company in the future. At Medford, each worker becomes crew leader for one month. The other sites, such as Sweet Home, have not instituted a "straw boss" system to provide a similar level of confidence (and appreciation for the crew leader's job). A few workers have been given opportunities to do equipment and materials procurement. To fulfill their expectations of being a contractor or supervisor, they will need to acquire the following capabilities:

1. Be proficient at a diverse set of practical skills and know how to find experts in other skills when necessary.

2. Be able to get the contracts by understanding the business end of things, bidding, and networking with agency people.

3. Be able to successfully coordinate the projects by knowing how to estimate costs, how to manage a crew (including maintaining morale, resolving conflicts, and ensuring safety), how to budget, do taxes, etc.

3. **Crew involvement in management and coordination.** Analysis of worker trainee feedback and steering committee observations shows a connection between the level of crew involvement in management and coordination and the level of satisfaction with the demonstration project experience. Several factors seem to be important where crew satisfaction is high:

1. Crews have not worked for extensive periods of time on grueling, labor-intensive jobs.

2. Crews believe that their safety is of utmost importance to the coordinators.

3. Workers respect that each worker brings different skills to the training.

4. Workers rotate among crews.

5. Coordinators trust crew leaders to do most of the project coordination and conflict resolution.

6. Workers feel that they have a voice in directing their training.

Selection of and support for crew leaders is critical, because effective crew leaders can identify and resolve problems quickly. Sweet Home and Deschutes, both in their second year, recognize how critical the crew leaders are to the smooth operation of the training. Sweet Home interviewed very carefully for their two crew leaders while Deschutes selected three workers from 1994. Both sites provided extra training for the crew leaders in worker supervision and conflict resolution. The crew leaders are able to act as role models in patience and respect for others and as positive liaisons between coordinators and workers.
B. Building Forest Stewardship.

One of the goals of the demonstration projects is to lead to short-term or long-term models that emphasize a "high-skilled", "multi-skilled", and "high-wage" path to forest stewardship. The demonstration projects training is based on this vision of the forestry worker of the future. Thus, to the list of requirements for becoming a contractor we could add the following:

To be a steward or applied ecologist, the contractor needs to know the region, its ecology, its multiple resource uses, its history, the people in and around it, and how these all function together.

An understanding of the more abstract ecology and stewardship principles enables workers to make on-the-spot forestry decisions and enhance new forestry techniques. This will theoretically help them gain higher wages. But the workers' attention was often more focused on acquiring new technical (manual) skills, because, in the short term, they are interested in getting a job in today's market. It is not yet clear to workers that the "applied ecologist" has a reliable career path. The project experience was there. More help is needed to define stewardship in the field and to see how this can help make them more valuable employees.

C. Improving Worker Training.

Based on the steering committee questionnaires and responses from the worker interviews, several recommendations have been identified that could enhance the success of future demonstration projects in meeting both short term and long term objectives.

- Design competency objectives and in-field goals and organize training to ensure that trainees meet the objectives.
- Include crew member(s) on steering committees.
- Provide more opportunities for trainees to be crew leaders in order to gain leadership experience.
- Provide a mechanism for trainees to focus on a set of specific skills as well as on learning a broad range of skills.
- Offer more training on the business aspects of contracting and coordinating projects.
- Invite workers to a forum, or ask crew leaders to interview and send in written responses recorded from crew members in a survey similar to the one conducted this year for the preliminary evaluation.
- Develop job descriptions for a variety of job categories. The descriptions could show typical KSA requirements, employment opportunities, compensation and other job features.

Competency objectives would help the training coordinators improve what the worker learns both in the classroom and in the field. The coordinators could then determine what levels of competency their workers start with, how these relate to the scheduled project work, and refine training plans according to the workers' needs.
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Reply Refer to: FS 6300  
BLM (1510)(52)  

Date: May 20, 1996

FS - Letter  
BLM-Information Bulletin No. OR-96-239

Subject: Watershed Restoration/Jobs in the Woods

To: Contracting Officers

Attached is a copy of a memorandum dated April 5 which was sent to Forest Supervisors and Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Western District Managers that describes current efforts both Agencies have actively participated in managing watershed restoration and the Jobs-in-the-Woods (JITW) efforts. This information is provided to inform you of some specific procurement practices that both Forest Service (FS) and State BLM procurement staffs have mutually agreed to use for meeting the objectives of this year's JITW program. Items discussed in the memorandum include compensation of mobilization costs, bonding, use of agreement authorities, and necessity to provide timely payments.

Based on expanded authority provided by the Secretaries' fiscal year 1996 JITW waivers, the agencies have broad latitude in forming contracts to meet the program objectives of hiring displaced timber workers through the use of techniques such as including specific evaluation criteria in negotiated procurements or incentive contracts.

Also attached for your information is a copy of an interagency agreement (IA) that provides that either the BLM or FS may complete acquisitions for the other when advantageous to combine projects to improve the delivery and attainment of goals and objectives for both agencies. The Agencies have agreed to waive overhead charges for these joint projects. The agreement anticipates a balance in the award and administration of these projects between the Agencies.

We would like you to review and use this information to provide continuity in meeting JITW program objectives. Please contact us should you have questions regarding this information.

/s/ Robert Hansen  
ROBERT HANSEN  
Chief, Branch of Procurement Management  
Oregon State Office, BLM

/s/ M. W. Wolfe  
M. W. WOLFE  
Director, Procurement & Property Management  
Pacific NW Regional Office, FS
Attachments as stated

cc: R. Rheiner, BLM OR-937
    C. Sampson, BLM OR-950
    J. Federline, BLM WO-850
    N. Graybeal
    R. Ferraro
    R. Ochs, RO
    PPM Grp. Ldrs., RO
    Acting Director, Adm. Serv., R5-RO
United States  Forest  R-6  OR/ United States  Department of  Service  WA  Bureau of  Land  Department of Agriculture  Management  Interior

Reply Refer to: FS 2500/2600/6300  Date: April 5, 1996
BLM (1510)(938)

FS-Letter  BLM-Information Bulletin No. OR-96-

Subject: Watershed Restoration/Jobs in Woods

To: Forest Supervisors and BLM Western Oregon District Managers

Over the last 2 years in managing watershed restoration/Jobs in the Woods, we have collectively learned a lot about what we can and cannot do within existing authorities. It has become apparent that we have enormous abilities to manage and achieve the goals of this program. To assist you, we have completed the enclosed paper that outlines the legal basis, authorities, and tools available to support implementation. This paper is not meant to be all encompassing but rather focuses on some of the barriers identified by the field.

The Regional and State Offices are dedicated to work with the field to resolve barriers that may arise. We are confident that the tools outlined in this paper provide you the wherewithal to effectively manage your watershed restoration/Jobs in the Woods program. But we are also fully aware that new challenges will surface as you proceed ahead. Please communicate any additional barriers, procurement or otherwise to either Ron Ochs, FS (503 326-2647) or Bob Rheiner, BLM (503 950-6015).

/s/ Chuck Wassinger  /s/ Nancy Graybeal
ELAINE ZIELINSKI  ROBERT W. WILLIAMS
State Director  Acting Regional Forester

Enclosure
WATERSHED RESTORATION/JOBS IN THE WOODS
Legal Basis, Objectives, Authorities

April 1996

Legal Basis and Intent of Watershed Restoration/Jobs in the Woods:

Watershed Restoration/Jobs in the Woods is a multi-agency program (Forest Service, BLM, US Fish and Wildlife, and BIA) established within the 1994 Department of Interior Appropriation Bill to:

1. Restore the health of key watersheds within the area of the NW Forest Plan; and
2. Help communities, businesses, and the workforce affected by declining timber harvest to transition to new work opportunities associated with ecosystem management and restoration.

The program goals and objectives are guided by numerous actions, including:

2. Record of Decision for FEMAT
3. Memorandum of Understanding signed by all affected agencies; USDA, USDI, etc.
4. Interagency Restoration Strategy
5. Public Interest Waiver to the Competition in Contracting Act for acquisitions.

The solution and opportunities to respond to local economic needs and desires can not be prescribed at a Regional or State level but, must be defined to meet the specific needs and opportunities within each local area. The specific actions and strategies must therefore be custom designed to meet the localized issues and opportunities.

As such, Line Officers are expected to implement high priority restoration projects that maximize the defined needs and benefits of the local community(ies).
**Procurement Options and Authorities:**


**Perceived Issue:** Procurement authorities do not allow the targeting of workers or giving consideration for providing training.

**Resolution:** Utilizing negotiated authority, managers can and should utilize either evaluation criteria and or incentives to encourage contractors to meet identified management needs of the program. Since the granting authority to utilize this option is contained within the public interest waiver, it currently must be limited to those projects and programs covered/included in the waiver.

We will be pursuing other options to possibly expand this ability to other areas but this may require some additional authorizing legislation.

**Example of Criteria** - should be clearly linked to identified management needs.

- Plan and intent to hire displaced workers from the local area.
- Plan and ability to provide training and skill development
- Plan and intent to hire local workers to accomplish project goals

**Considerations:**

In utilizing this option it should be emphasized that the criteria can only be used as an evaluation criteria, not as a required deliverable; giving preference to those proposals that meet the defined conditions but not excluding proposals who do not address the criteria. The idea is to reward those contractors who have actively taken steps to enhance job opportunities in the affected areas, but not to exclude or penalize any contractor who has not.

Also, any management defined need must be legal and within the intent of the program. For example, appropriated funds (i.e. jobs in the woods) can not be used to procure training for external individuals. This does not exclude the use of some type of training criteria, just that it must be communicated and understood that funding must be acquired elsewhere to achieve this goal. We can and should use solicitations to promote and encourage our contractors to contact local Job Training Partnership Act providers for possible resources as well.

In using this option, it is important that accomplishment of these types of measures be monitored during contract performance to ensure that the contractor actually performs according to its plan.

2. Compensation of mobilization costs.

**Perceived Issue:** Businesses in affected communities and displaced workers often cannot bid due to the lack of start-up capital (tooling, fuel, bonding, supplies, etc).

**Resolution:** The focus of the jobs in the woods program is to create jobs not businesses. Management should make every attempt to utilize existing business infrastructures to achieve the desired end results.
However we can and should utilize payments to compensate contractors for mobilization costs early in the process when appropriate or needed. Having mobilization as a separate line item will help facilitate such a payment. This cost item can include numerous things and includes any reasonable costs associated with contractors moving in/out of a project.

3. Require bonding only in those cases where it is essential to protect Government interests.

Perceived Issue: Bonding requirements often make submitting a bid or an offer prohibitive for contractors, particularly for small businesses in adversely affected communities, and displaced workers.

Resolution: Require bonding only when essential to protect government's interest and where specifically required by Federal Acquisition Regulations.

Consideration: In the case of the jobs in the woods program, the government interest is twofold: 1. accomplish the needed watershed restoration work AND, 2. provide quality employment for displaced workers and affected communities. If the use of bonding prevents the agency from accomplishing these objectives, then the use of bonding would actually be counter to its purpose in that government interest would not be protected.

Since bonding requirements are an additional cost to contractors, we strongly recommend that bonds only be used when absolutely required to meet management needs and protect government's interest. Payment and performance bonds on construction contracts are only required for construction contracts exceeding $100,000. There is no requirement for bonding on service contracts for any dollar amount. For construction contracts between $25,000 and $100,000, contractors are required to furnish some form of payment protection. There should be no routine use of bonds to "weed out bad contractors" or to provide a "safety net" for the Government.

4. Timely Payments.

Perceived Issue: Excessive time required for contractors to receive payments

Resolution: The issue of payments can and must be managed locally to meet your specific needs. Generally this should/will involve the appropriate and prescribed time provisions within the act, however, agencies do have flexibility to respond to special needs and considerations (see below).

Consideration: All of our contracts are subject to the Prompt Payment Act and contain clauses which specify payment procedures and due dates. Interest penalties are due to contractors who are not paid on time. Under the Prompt Payment Act, payments are to be made within 14 days under construction contracts and within 30 days for service and supply contracts unless the contract contains different specific provisions.

It is imperative that responsive attention be provided to all jobs in the woods transactions to ensure payments are received and processed as quickly as possible. Specifically, to ensure contractors are paid in a timely manner and in accordance with the contract provisions, we must make sure that we receipt for services as they are accepted and that invoices are processed as quickly as possible. Also, remind contractors when and where they are to submit invoices to avoid potential delays. When a contractor encounters a problem in getting paid, contracting and fiscal personnel should work together to resolve the problem as expeditiously as possible.
However, in those situations that dictate payments be made in less than 30 days to ensure program success, contracting officers may, on a case-by-case basis, authorize payments to be expedited, as long as the justification for this decision is properly documented, explaining the business reasons for doing so. The jobs in the woods program is a unique program that requires different actions by management but that does not, in itself, justify a blanket use of this approach wherein it becomes the standard. Nor should the above provision be used to offset in-house administrative delays in processing these payments.

The financial management principles contained in the prompt payment act are a normal business procedure; i.e. paying bills when they are due, generally at the end of a given grace period. As such, our efforts to help create jobs and promote businesses should incorporate/not exclude this provision into our efforts.

5. Design and package projects to meet identified/defined management needs.

Perceived Issue: No authority to split purchases, to create the size of projects to meet management's defined needs.

Resolution: Authority does not exist, and will not exist to "split purchases" (defined as breaking apart projects to avoid procurement regulations). However, management has full authority and responsibility to design and package projects to meet their defined/identified management needs.

Consideration: While the responsibility of design and packaging rests with management, it is highly advised that procurement specialists be active partners in the planning and deliberations from the onset.

It is a team effort to meet management needs and contracting officers should be a part of the team. We urge you to obtain the input of contracting personnel during the planning process. Contracting Officers can offer valuable information on the many ways to shape a contract and the effects of one course of action as compared to another. The determination of whether to include a variety of projects under one contract or to handle separately is one that should be discussed with the view to do what makes the most sense and provides a benefit to the Government as well as a reasonable project for contractors.

6. Utilize conditional authorities to expand contracts across fiscal years

Perceived Issue: Uncertainty of funding limits the extent and duration of contracts which limits our ability to meet some of the social and economic objectives (e.g. increasing work duration, etc).

Resolution: To meet identified needs, management can and should consider, when appropriate, multi-year projects and funding using either conditional language (i.e. dependent upon availability of funds) or contract extension authorities (i.e. ability to renew contracts through the use of options).

Units should also consider the use of indefinite delivery, indefinite quantity contracts as well as options clauses. For more information on these techniques and authorities, please check with your local contracting officer.

7. Clearly define project goals, objectives and standards.

Perceived Issue: BLM/FS utilization of sealed bids (i.e. low bid) results in low quality, low cost work.
Resolution: Management has the responsibility to adequately define and ensure that the quality of work meets or exceeds management expectations.

Consideration: Quality work is not a function of the procurement process, but rather on the inclusion and accountability of performance standards that clearly reflect management needs and intentions. These standards must be adequately included and monitored in any procurement technique whether it be sealed bids or evaluated under a negotiated procurement technique.

Clear specifications or statements of work and contract administration are critical in reaping quality work under our contracts. Whether a contract is awarded as a result of sealed bidding or negotiated procedures, it is imperative that we have clearly defined what we want, that we deal with only responsible contractors, and that we administer the contract diligently to make sure work is done in accordance with the contract.

8. Acting as one government - linking procurement actions where/when appropriate

Perceived Issue: Inability for different government agencies to link projects into one contract.

Resolution: An Interagency Agreement, using the authorities contained in the Economy Act of June 30, 1932 (31 U.S.C. 1535), has been drafted by the State and Regional Offices that will provide all BLM/FS units within the area of the Forest Plan to link projects and award only one contract where and when appropriate to attain program goals. We estimate that this agreement will be in place by April 15, 1996.

9. Ability to use the same grant/agreement authorities among the FS and BLM

Perceived Issue: The FS and BLM are utilizing different authorities or interpretation of existing authorities within Grants/Agreements. BLM has been using authorities that provide increased abilities in that matching funds/contributing share is not required; which has been a need communicated by management. The Forest Service currently lacks this ability.

Resolution: This issue is being researched and resolution sought.

10. Utilize the right tool to get the job done

Perceived Issue: Management lacks the understanding of the procurement tools and authorities available to achieve their program objectives.

Resolution: If the proposed action by management makes sense and is authorized as a role/mission of the organization, we generally can find tools and authorities to support the effort. But it requires a team approach, resource people working upfront with administrative/support personnel; making them part of the solution not part of the problem.

If local managers are unable to find a workable solution, please elevate it immediately to the Regional/State Office for action.
INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT
BETWEEN
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
OREGON STATE OFFICE
AND
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, FOREST SERVICE
NORTHWEST REGIONAL OFFICE

BLM Agreement No. 1422H952-A96-0016
Forest Service Agreement No. 96-06-78-18

1.0 Background

This Interagency Agreement (IA) is entered into by and between the U.S.
Department of Interior (USDI), Bureau of Land Management (BLM), acting by and
through the State Director of Oregon/Washington and the U.S. Department of
Agriculture (USDA), Forest Service (FS), Northwest Regional Office, Region 6,
acting through the Regional Forester.

2.0 Authorities

This IA is made and entered into under the authority of the Economy Act of June
30, 1932, Section 601, as amended (31 U.S.C. 1535) and 48 CFR 17.503.

3.0 Purpose

This IA is for the purpose of improving the effectiveness and efficiency in
attaining the shared program goals within the watershed
restoration/Jobs-in-the-Woods program. This IA does not in anyway change or
relieve the BLM or the FS in the planning, implementation, monitoring, and
quality assurance of the resource management activities being implemented. Nor
does this IA provide the BLM or FS with the authority to award a project and/or
obligate funds without the full consent of the responsible designated BLM or FS
official.

4.0 Objective

Both the BLM and the FS are mandated to implement watershed restoration/JIW
programs. BLM and FS share a similar mission and objectives within the JIW
program. It is advantageous for both the BLM and FS to combine projects which
will improve the delivery and attainment of goals and objectives of both
agencies. Both the BLM and FS desire to establish an atmosphere of
cooperation, and to work collectively at providing the best results for the
natural resources and the affected communities involved in JIW projects.

The BLM and FS have offices and resource management functions in the same
geographic areas and in consideration of the above premises, both agencies
agree to the extent feasible under legal, fiscal, and other limitations
governing each Agency, to accomplish JIW projects.
5.0 Statement of Work

5.1. To combine BLM and FS watershed restoration/JIW projects when suitable and necessary to meet or improve on the attainment of the agencies mutually defined program goals.

5.2. Consolidate projects and acquisitions between BLM and FS only when it is in the best interest of the Government. Utilize either the BLM or FS to complete needed acquisitions, on a case by case basis. BLM District Managers and FS Forest Managers, in consultation with Procurement Managers, will determine which agency will accomplish individual acquisitions.

5.3. Specification standards utilized by BLM or the FS will meet requirements of both agencies.

5.4. The agency receiving the procurement service will transfer the required funding to carry out approved projects. Each agency will utilize a separate IA, or other mutually agreeable procurement document to transfer funding.

6.0 Payments

The procurement document utilized by each BLM District and each FS Forest will reference the BLM/FS IA numbers established in this agreement. Individual procurement actions/task orders, will utilize local office established procurement numbers and follow local billing procedures.

Nothing herein shall be considered as obligating either BLM or FS to expend funds, or involve the United States in any contract or other obligations for the future payment of money in excess of approved funding.

7.0 Availability of Funds

It is understood that if Congress does not make available appropriated funds to BLM or FS for JIW projects, both agencies will be released from any liability and potential future commitment under this IA.

8.0 Access to Records

Federal Agencies and the Comptroller General, through authorized representatives, shall have access to and the right to examine all books, papers, or documents related to this IA.

9.0 Termination

Either BLM or FS, in writing, may terminate the instrument in whole, or in part, at any time before the date of expiration. Neither BLM or FS shall incur any new obligations for the terminated portion of this IA after the effective date and shall cancel as many obligations as is possible. Full credit shall be allowed for each parties expenses and all noncancellable obligations properly incurred up to the effective date of termination.

10.0 Modifications
Modifications within the scope of the IA shall be made by mutual consent of the BLM and FS. A written modification to this IA shall be signed and dated by both parties prior to any changes being performed. Neither BLM or FS is obligated to fund any changes not properly approved in advance.

11.0 Congressional Involvement

Pursuant to Section 22, Title 41, United States Code, no member of, or Delegate to, Congress shall be admitted to any share or part of this IA, or any benefits that may arise therefrom.

12.0 Project Coordinators

The BLM and FS have designated primary points of contact in each organization for the resolution of technical related questions specific to this IA.

Mr. Ron Ochs, FS
333 SW 1st Avenue
P.O. Box 3623
Portland, OR 97208-3623
Telephone No. (503) 326-2647

Mr. Robert Rheiner, BLM
1515 SW 5th Avenue
P.O. Box 2965
Portland, OR 97208
Telephone No. (503) 952-6015

13.0 Signature

This IA is executed as of the last date shown below and expires no later than September 30, 1997, at which time it is subject to review, renewal or expiration.

U.S. Department of Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Oregon State Office

By: /s/ C. Wassinger for
Title: State Director
Date: 5/6/96

U.S. Department of Agriculture
Forest Service
Northwest Regional Office

By: /s/ Nancy Graybeal for
Title: Regional Forester
Date: 5/16/96

/s/ Roger Sharp
Contracting Officer, BLM
Date: 5/6/96

/s/ Leo M. Corona
Contracting Officer, FS
Date: 5/14/96
Reply Refer To: FS 2500/2600 BLM OR-938  Date: May 3, 1996

FS-Memorandum  BLM-Information Bulletin No. OR-96-

Subject:  Watershed Restoration/Jobs-in-the-Woods
FY '96 - FY '98 Program Direction

To:  BLM District Managers - Western Oregon, Forest Supervisors - CA, WA, OR

The last two years we have worked together to define the opportunities and design workable strategies for our watershed restoration/jobs in the woods program. We have learned an enormous amount; which can only be attributed to the commitment and dedication of the field employees, State Community Economic Revitalization Teams (OR/WA/CA), and our state and community partners. We very much appreciate these efforts.

It is now time to apply our two years of learning to better focus our efforts. As President Clinton said to the Forest Conference participants, the federal government must do a better job at improving the quality of jobs within natural resource management and help communities to transition to a new reality. This objective can be achieved by our continued search to changing the way we do business. The watershed restoration/jobs in the woods program, through FY 1998, provides us opportunities to accomplish the President’s and our vision. We must fully utilize this opportunity. As such, we expect each District/Forest who receives these targeted funds to thoroughly review your program in light of the following guidance and take needed actions to meet program objectives.

Our mutually defined objectives for the watershed restoration/jobs in the woods are to:

* Restore the health of watersheds by focusing activities on the long-term improvement of riparian and aquatic resource conditions in accordance with the Aquatic Conservation Strategy within the Northwest Forest Plan.

* Improve the social and economic conditions of timber dependent communities by creating longer duration, multi-skilled, family-wage jobs; with emphasis on providing employment for displaced timber workers.

* Promote a watershed based approach to restoration across ownerships.

* Improve partnerships with local communities.
We have done a good job with the ecosystem restoration aspects of the program. We ask you to do some additional thinking and take needed actions to help improve the delivery of the last three program objectives which focus on helping communities and workers.

One thing we learned is that this is not an issue of quality watershed restoration versus quality family wage jobs but that both can be achieved. If you have two projects with similar restoration benefits but with different social/economic possibilities, we expect the project with better social/economic possibilities be implemented. But for all projects we must seek opportunities to improve the quality of jobs involved by packaging projects to extend the duration of work, to improve the skills required, and integrate worker and business training.

Many tools are available to achieve this end. The contract waiver authority we received opens the door for the additional efforts we need to make this program and our efforts a success. The waiver gives us the authority to restrict competition to contractors within the region AND to creatively promote employment, work force development, and community-related opportunities. BUT, the waiver authority does not in itself assure family wage, long term, quality jobs. Only a change in the way we design and deliver projects, using the authorities inherent with the waiver, will lead us to these desired results.

One of the more recent authorities with the waiver is the ability to include evaluation criteria and incentives in procurement actions that incorporate your specific goals, whether it is hiring displaced workers, improving skills of local workers, or other job quality issues. In order to use this tool, units must have the projects identified and included under the public interest waiver.

The Demonstration crew designed projects in California and Oregon are also a tool to meet program objectives. It is useful when applied in the right circumstances. In communities where work force development, either retraining of dislocated timber workers or training to develop a skilled local work force, is not an issue, then a demonstration project may not be an effective approach. If your community views retraining and/or skill development as a top priority then demonstration crews can be effective. The specific strategy must be created locally to meet your local needs in concert with local partners.

Thru this letter we're asking you to take whatever advantage there is, for this years program as well as into FY '97 and FY '98, to place added emphasis into improving the quality of jobs. At a minimum, I ask you to implement actions to repackage your programs, linking projects, to increase the duration of work and variety of work experiences in specific contracting actions. Units are encouraged to collaborate and link projects with other partners to meet some of these objectives.
We and our State Community Economic Revitalization Team representatives are available to help you. Contact Ron Ochs, Jobs in the Woods Coordinator (R6), Bob Rheiner, BLM Economic Manager, Bruce Gaines, Jobs in the Woods Coordinator (R5), or Sonny O'Neal, Darrel Kenops, Van Manning, or Martha Ketelle, Washington, Oregon, and California CERT Representatives respectively, if you have questions or need further assistance.

We fully realize this direction impacts workload and asks us to really work differently. Yet, we still need to deliver on our and the President's commitment to our communities and affected workers. It requires our best thinking, full commitment and top notch teamwork.

Thank You for you and your folks efforts to date. It is now time to move this program to an increased level of effectiveness. We appreciate your personal attention and leadership and look forward to seeing quality results.

/s/ Elaine Zielinski
ELAINE ZIELINSKI
State Director, OR/WA
USDI Bureau of Land Management

/s/ James A. Lawrence
G. LYNN SPRAGUE
Regional Forester
Pacific Southwest Region
USDA Forest Service

/s/ Nancy Graybeal
ROBERT W. WILLIAMS
Acting Regional Forester
Pacific Northwest Region
USDA Forest Service

cc: Forest Rural Community Assistance Coordinators
Forest/District Contracting Officers.
BLM District Jobs in the Woods Coordinators
Bob Devlin, FS, RO, R-6
Charlie Krebs, FS, RO, R-6
Michael Wolfe, FS, RO, R-6
Ron Ochs, FS, RO, R-6
Bob Rheiner, BLM, State Office, OR/WA
Van Manning, BLM, Salem
Martha Ketelle, FS Eureka, CA
John Neisess, FS, RO, R-5
BLM CA
Reply to: 2500/2600/3600/6300  Date: March 28, 1995

Subject: "Jobs-in-the-Woods" Watershed Restoration

To: Forest Supervisors and Directors

I appreciate your personal involvement in moving us forward toward completing priority watershed assessments and in implementing "Jobs-in-the-Woods" (JITW) restoration projects. Considerable progress has already been achieved, and I want to thank you and your staffs for making so much happen so quickly. Keep up the great work!

I understand there has surfaced some confusion both within and outside of the Forest Service regarding our priorities and commitment related to the jobs-creation part of the President's Plan. Therefore, it is timely to restate my commitment to this important effort.

The revised Interagency Watershed Restoration Strategy (October 4, 1994), sent to you last fall, is still our guide.

In addition to articulating the need for watershed assessments and implementation of watershed restoration, the Strategy also outlines our responsibilities to those in distressed timber communities and to dislocated workers. It describes how we can assist with job-creation, retraining, and development of a quality work force for the future; specifically:

Watershed restoration offers the opportunity to deliver meaningful, family-wage jobs in the affected region. Restoration activities must therefore be designed and carried out in ways that advance the goal of increasing the capacity of the region's communities and workers to improve their economic and social well being. Recognizing this goal as a key part of watershed restoration ensures that short- and long-term economic benefits are compatible with environmental goals, affirming that "Jobs-in-the-Woods" are truly synonymous with watershed restoration.

I strongly support these tenets related to our community involvement and enlist your support of them as you move ahead with your restoration projects. If you have not done so recently, I urge you to reread the Strategy, focusing on the economic/family-wage implications that are woven throughout, and note how closely they are tied to everything we are hoping to accomplish with our restoration activities. Clearly, we need to involve cooperating agencies and communities in our thinking as we identify restoration projects. We need to work closely with these cooperators in developing the innovative ways needed to complete important restoration work, while also creating family-wage job opportunities.
To assist you in these efforts, I am asking Bob Devlin, Director of Natural Resources; Mike Wolfe, Director of Procurement and Property Management; and Charlie Krebs, Director of Cooperative Programs, to work together to assure that we successfully link watershed restoration and JITW/community assistance activities in the Region. I have designated Charlie Krebs as the "lead director" for this effort. It is my intent that these three directors work as a team to assure that you receive timely assistance and consistent advice regarding the matching up of restoration projects with priority community needs.

I have also asked Christine Walsh to be our Jobs-in-the-Woods Watershed Restoration Coordinator. She will serve as the Regional focal point for questions/concerns regarding these activities and for assuring that our responses are timely and consistent with the Interagency Watershed Restoration Strategy. Christine's familiarity with the President's Plan and our progress to date should prove to be a real asset in helping us redeem our Jobs-in-the-Woods responsibilities.

The specific duties of this position will continue to evolve over the next few months, but initially I envision that the role of the Jobs-in-the-Woods Watershed Restoration Coordinator will include:

1. Serving as a focal point for and facilitator of all Regional "Jobs-in-the-Woods" watershed restoration activities,

2. Recommending needed strategies, direction, and policy to the "Three Director Team" regarding JITW implementation and/or opportunities,

3. Representing the Region at key meetings related to the development and implementation of JITW, supporting field units as necessary,

4. Providing support and advice to Charlie Krebs, Sonny O'Neal, and Darrel Kenops as they represent the Forest Service on the Regional, Washington State, and Oregon State Community Economic Revitalization Teams (CERT's), respectively,

5. Serving as liaison with cooperating federal agency personnel and community leaders to assure better coordination and integration of efforts,


To assure the overall coordination of efforts, effectiveness of communications, and prompt problem resolution the members of the Watershed Restoration Core Team will report to the JITW Watershed Restoration Coordinator.
Linking watershed restoration with JITW/community assistance is not a small task, but you have made excellent progress. I am anticipating that more effective coordination from this office will make your job easier. This is a win-win for everyone.

/S/JOHN E. LOWE
JOHN E. LOWE
Regional Forester

cc:
Chief, WO
SPF, WO, Joan Comanor
CF, WO, Steve McDonald
RF, R-5, Lynn Sprague
RCERT, CoChair, Bob Rheiner
RCERT, CoChair, John Gilman
OFED, Tom Tuchmann
REO, Don Knowles
Appendix C
I. Vision: To demonstrate the linkages between a quality workforce, healthy communities and efficient and effective management for healthy forest ecosystems in the long term.

II. 1996 Action Plan; Objectives and actions for the 1996 program year

A. Quality Workforce:

1) Strengthen local Steering Committee capacity for:
   Quality training, recruitment and job development.
   Action:
   • Raise awareness of strategies among JTPA partners; strengthen working relationships with JTPA partners; JTPA strategies meeting, April 3. (Nancy, Charles)
   • Produce a guide for JTPA participation. (Nancy)
   • Monitor placement results. (Nancy)
   • Promote establishing local training coordinators at each site; strengthen ties with local coordinators. (Mike, Charles)
   Quality performance of project work.
   Action:
   • Independent Review Panel to visit sites mid-process to assess quality of work, training and program design (PRC; contractors; LMA Contracting Officers, scientists, resource managers; AMAs; RC&Ds; watershed councils). (Charles)
   • Report results and disseminate. (Charles)
   Effective over-all coordination and management.
   Action:
   • Convene Forum follow-up session in April or May, bringing together four partners from each SC, representing each of the four general functions. (Charles, Brett)

2) Document demand for high-skilled, multi-skilled ecosystem management workers.
   Action:
   • Develop qualitative and quantitative understanding of demand. (The picture should not reduce the issue to "enough-fed-funding vs not-enough". (Charles, Brett)

3) Further develop strategy and action plan to institutionalize skill standards and certification for quality workforce, quality jobs, quality outcomes.
   Action:
• Meet with AOL Pro Logger program representatives; assess, report, apply relevant lessons. (Charles, Mike, Bob W.)
• Further develop certification alternatives; apprenticeship and others. (Charles)

4) Strengthen labor involvement in demonstration projects, apprenticeship, advocacy for quality jobs.
Action:
• Follow up on training; identify additional local representatives. (Charles)

5) Increase contractor involvement.
Action:
• Maintain and build contact with contractors through Northwest Reforestation Contractors Association and steering committee contacts. (Charles, Nancy)
• Distribute list of licensed Oregon contractors to steering committees; facilitate identification of local contractors to work with SC’s on training design and monitoring, assessment of quality performance, development of quality standards. (Nancy)
• Recruit new contractors to for apprenticeship program. (Charles, Nancy)
• Formulate a variety of contractor/training pilot projects linked with EWP. (Bob W., Charles, Nancy)

B. Forest Management

1) Strengthen working relationship with Natural Resource Partnership.
Action:
• Presentation to NRP with EIT, May 1 (Bob W. Charles)
• Define ways involve Natural Resource Partnership in the Ecosystem Workforce Project; implement. (Bob W.)

2) Define and promote opportunities to focus project design and procurement to achieve EWP objectives.
Action:
• Assist federal land management agencies in clarifying procurement opportunities. (Bob R., Ron, Bob W.) DONE
• Monitor and assess results of clarification of procurement opportunities and develop plans for next steps (fall of 1996). (Ron, Charles, Bob W.)
• Use Sweet Home and Oakridge projects to demonstrate and document methods for bundling appropriate work in watershed based contracts. (Brad, Charles)
• Promote opportunities for local partnerships to participate in project selection and training.
3) Document the benefits of the demonstration projects and of other innovative models such as multi-task contracted work using trained workers or linked to training for workers, communities, land management agencies, private industrial land owners, contractors.

Action:
- Gather success stories from project scientists and managers; produce stand-alone summary; utilize in press and orientation materials. *(Brad, Charles, Bob R., Ron, Bob w.)*
- Urge steering committees (SCs) to 1) visit and brief local JTPA boards, Regional Strategies Boards, Regional Workforce Quality Committees, Province Teams/Advisory Councils; 2) invite county commissioners to visit work & training sites and talk with worker/trainees. *(Brett, Charles)*
- Assist steering committees in scheduling presentations to SCERT (one presentation for each west side meeting). *(Charles)*

4) Institutionalize skill standards and certification on the demand side (public and private land ownership).

Action:
- Develop short and long term strategy and action plan to 1) document the benefits of skill standards/certification, 2) create resource management and procurement practices alternatives for implementing skill standards.

5) Document the long term cost effectiveness of ecosystem management.

Action:
- Work with PRC to convene a working group to compile work already done that could meet the need. *(eg. Rich Fairbanks, Jerry Franklin, Ray Rasker, Headwaters, PRC)* Integrate demonstration project results where appropriate. Produce and disseminate summary statement; determine who should issue it. *(Brett, Charles, Cynthia)*

C. HealthyCommunities

1) Work through local Steering Committees to increase community involvement so as to build capacity for linking resource management and workforce strategies.

Action:
- Assist steering committees in developing and implementing plans to 1) increase community participation on the steering committees, 2) publicize the projects and demonstrate benefits to workers, contractors, agencies, communities, 3) mobilize constituencies and support for needed policy/administrative change and funding.

2) Document local supply demand for high-skilled, multi-skilled ecosystem management workers, and local industry structure.

Action:
• Develop local-driven methodologies for describing local labor markets, contractor capacity and industry structure. (1 to 3 county scale). (Charles, Brett)

3) Support and foster, where appropriate, community-based institutional capacity to pursue the long term workforce and industry goals of the project.
   • Identify 2 to 3 pilot areas to support.
   • Work with local steering committees to formulate local institutional strategies.

III. Defining the Importance of Quality Jobs

A quality workforce requires quality jobs. Our operational definition of "quality jobs":

   a) stable employment opportunity for workers in resource dependent communities;
   b) family wages and benefits;
   c) necessary infrastructure for entry level training and skill up-grading driven by a high-skill, multi-skill, work-based learning model;
   d) multi-task work design.

Our operational definition of "positive socio-economic impacts of the contracting process on resource dependent communities":

   a) quality jobs are supported and sustainable;
   b) entry and upgrade training infrastructure is nurtured;
   c) watershed-based planning is enhanced;
   d) there is flexibility to allow community-based labor market strategies;
   e) community involvement, with land management agencies is encouraged in the areas of resource management and socio-economic impact planning;
   f) high skills and high quality business capacity is able to thrive.

IV. Checklist for Demonstration Projects and Transitional Contracting Models

1) Sustained employment (minimum 5 months)
2) Wages $10.50 to $12/hr with benefits (Avg OR Demonstration Pjcts: $10.57 wage, $2.12 benefits. Note: wages/benefits in CA and WA demonstration projects averaged well above ours; the average wage & benefits for all JITW was also well above the OR demonstration projects.) We need to move 1996 avg above 1995 level.
3) Diverse work experience across relevant ecosystem management categories
4) Structured training following the curriculum plan of the Curriculum Development Team, at least in its essential components
5) Participation in Ecosystem Management Apprenticeship program
6) Participation of federal land management agencies with potential for work on private land
7) Employs dislocated workers or at-risk forest workers who are residents of work area
8) If contracted demonstration project, contractor cooperates with local steering committee
9) Coordination with local JTPA for recruitment, training support, job placement, needs-related support as eligibility allows
10) Over-all project planning and implementation is aimed at producing quality results and sound stewardship on the ground.
Ecosystem Workforce Training
THE THREE STEPS FOR SUCCESS

I. Run an efficient and effective training program this year.
   1. Check in regularly and directly with both Bjorn and Clay.
      • Find time with each separately
      • Establish overarching priorities with each and return to them in each meeting
   2. Check in regularly with project leaders to determine level of satisfaction or concern. Conduct follow-up survey of project managers to determine satisfaction with projects. Capture key quotes which could be used in subsequent promotional materials e.g. “I really appreciated the flexibility which this program gave me in conducting projects that would be hard to spec.”
   3. Publish regular report on progress and accomplishments for distribution to key allies and critical resource holders (State BLM, Regional USFS, Industry, Congressional people)
   4. Get the board out on field trips to experience the real human accomplishment that this program represents.
   5. Get press coverage at least twice on interesting projects.
   6. Do efficiency studies to determine productivity of crew and be able to document in real numbers the benefits and cost effectiveness of using these crews.

II. Prepare the Second Year Apprenticeship Training Model
   1. Develop a list of supportive contractors (not just all contractors) who would be interested in working with us in a pilot project
   2. Meet with a small group of these contractors (3-5) to design an apprenticeship program which would meet their needs and provide valuable training for first year graduates. Key elements include:
      • A bundled contract with a range of different tasks in one place and over several seasons.
      • An education plan which furthers the skills of the participants
      • An apprentice wage scale which provides on-the-job training to participants in exchange for a lower apprenticeship wage (generally 80% of full journeyman wage)
      • Possibility of wage augmentation through OJT (On the Job) funds provided by Job Council.
   3. Work with agencies to provide the necessary projects as part of their commitment to a high skill workforce. Possibility of including these projects as part of our Participating Agreement (we would then subcontract to the contractors) or put them up as a RFP or RFQ as per Sweet Home experiment.

III. Network with other Pilots
   1. Make sure some sort of gathering of steering committees from the various training pilots takes place this summer and is by and for the steering committees and not for the various bureaucrats.
   2. Maintain ongoing communication with key allies in other pilots.
   3. Find ways to advocate together so that the collective political influence of these pilots can keep the system moving in the right direction and not abandon this important experiment before its given an adequate chance to prove itself.
Welcome to the Ecosystem Workforce Project Demonstration Projects! This Guide was put together by the Ecosystem Workforce Project (EWP) staff at University of Oregon Labor Education and Research Center (LERC) in an effort to assist and support our partners in the JTPA.

Purpose

Purpose of this Guide is to document successful strategies discovered during 1995 demonstration projects and to provide a resource to aid new JTPA partners who join the project. Input came from Service Delivery Area (SDA) staff who worked on the demos in 1995. Their names and numbers appear in the Appendix of the guide and they are all willing to share their experiences with you.

General Notes

With the diversity of interests and backgrounds that partners bring to the project also comes a challenge to communicate clearly and completely. Each of us has our own motivation for participation in the project, and each partner group tends to “speak their own lingo”. With the fast pace and steep learning curve of each project, it is often difficult to make the time to orient new members and confirm understandings and motivations. There is no substitute for being well-informed, but that burden rests with us individually.

This Guide may raise as many questions as it tries to answer. It does not completely cover JTPA involvement in the EWP Demonstration Projects, let alone the myriad other partners’ involvement. One comfort is knowing that those of us involved in this project highly value our partnerships, and that this motivation encourages us to share what it takes to make the projects - and each of our partners - successful.

JTPA SDA involvement with the demonstration projects rests mainly with coordinating recruitment of worker trainees, facilitating their training, and assisting graduates with job placement. This Guide is a toolbox of both proven strategies and new ones that could be tested in 1996; it is divided into three sections: Recruitment, Training, and Job Placement.
Recruitment

Aim: To recruit qualified displaced timber workers who commit to attending training and performing the demonstration work, and who are interested in pursuing ecosystem management work in the future.

Recruitment Overview

1. Getting workers back into the woods: Many of our target trainees feel that "the woods are leaving them", more than that they are leaving the woods. For them, demonstration project work is an opportunity to go back into the work environment they like, appreciate, and know very well. The program is also attractive because it offers work as well as training, and a different - and therefore intriguing - way to work in the woods.

   These are often clients who JTPA has not served in the past (because they are not interested in programs that steer them away from the woods). If they opt out of the demo project or are not eligible for it, they can still consider other programs JTPA offers.

2. Describing this emerging ecosystem management industry: It is critical that applicants understand the opportunities and risks they take on by entering this program. We are seeing federal land management agencies slowly changing their deeply-rooted policies from narrow resource extraction strategies to broader watershed-based ecosystem management approaches. As this trend continues, graduates of the demo project trainings are well-positioned to take advantage of this new way of doing business. And as the trainees actually do this work, they see first-hand the need for and the scope of opportunity for that work.

   On the other hand, these agency changes take time and continued motivation within an industry which is not known for embracing innovation. The risk lies in the fact that a reliable pool of potential employers is yet to be developed. As such, an even greater burden of job development and job search rests with these trainees, as opposed to those enrolled in other JTPA programs.

   It is our responsibility to give potential trainees all of the information we have about the new industry and its potential for success and failure. They must consider their own situation and decide if the opportunities outweigh the risks.

3. Defining dislocated workers: JITW funding specifically defines who is and who is not eligible for training under these grants. As the demo projects grow from year to year, however, we may be approached by viable candidates who do not strictly meet this definition. Perhaps other types of dislocated workers could become eligible under a broader interpretation of the funding criteria, or there may be other funding sources (OJT money) or a fee-for-services option. Check with your partners at the state JTPA, who can help and support your efforts to serve community members in ways intended by the spirit of the JTPA program.
Here are some strategies that can help get us started:

1. **Check project lists as early as possible:** Both the USFS and the BLM issue project lists from fall to spring which show the projects that are going to be let out for bid and those that have been awarded. (You may have to get additional information directly from local contracting officers, since some of the early lists do not have much detail about the work.)

   - Ask local contracting officers to put your name on the mailing list to receive these lists. Some lists include the names and numbers of contractors who have been awarded projects - a way to get started networking!
   - Share these lists with applicants to show them the types of projects they could be working on.
   - Share the lists with the Steering Committee as they campaign to put together multi-task work.

2. **Become aware of the timber worker culture.** Although stereotyping is not appropriate, the shared experiences of timber workers result in some norms and lifestyles that can be common to folks who depend directly on the local woods for their livelihood. A little food for thought:

   - Talk to other SDA reps about the work ethic, independence, and learning styles that can characterize woods workers.
   - Ignore the temptation to acknowledge a gender, age or race bias. Ten out of 74 1995 trainees were female or Hispanic. Try to avoid making assumptions about who can or cannot do this type of work.
   - To learn more about the common norms and lifestyle of our target clients, talk to Corrine Gobeli, a consultant with OSU who interviewed Sweet Home project graduates about their experience ((541) 745-7736).

3. **Get the word out on the street:** Consider these strategies:

   - Look at your current list of job seekers for viable candidates.
   - Work with the Employer of Record or contractors to network through informal channels for long term dislocated workers.
   - Use cable TV, public service announcements, newspaper ads, and employment office postings.
   - *Word of mouth is often the best advertisement!* Ask graduates of this and other JTPA programs to encourage their friends and relatives to inquire about the program. Consider doing a mailing to successful graduates, telling them about the project, eligibility requirements, and deadlines.
   - Make your advertising bilingual.
   - Hold a town meeting or job fair that markets all of your programs.
   - Use bulletin boards at community services, meeting halls, stores, etc.
   - Talk to mills or logging operations that have downsized in recent years.
   - Check with union reps for names of unemployed members.
   - Network with other SDAs who may have qualified workers who are willing to travel or relocate temporarily.
Choosing the Right Trainees

Recruitment is already a complicated and lengthy process. But in addition to complying with the relevant laws and guidelines, consider the trade-offs between expediency and thoroughness that these suggestions offer:

1. **Give the applicants a realistic work expectation.** Some strategies are:
   - Hold a general information session with 1995 grads, Steering Committee members, and local employers, each presenting their own perspective.
   - Distribute summary articles or reports on 1995 demo project work.
   - Encourage applicants to network with 1995 grads for information.
   - Emphasize the level of responsibility that they must accept as a trainee in this program.
   - Put together a clear job description that allows for self-selection. Share with applicants the project lists which detail the types of work required.
   - Suggest some placement targets early on, such as completing the apprenticeship training, becoming an independent contractor, sub-contracting from several employers, etc.

2. **Firm up the evaluation criteria.** Get input from other JTPAs, 1995 grads, union reps, and employers on what qualifications trainees should or must have to be successful. Criteria that have been suggested for 1996 include:
   - Experience in and desire for working in the woods/outside
   - Local residence and a knowledge of local geography
   - Enthusiasm
   - Commitment to work hard and cooperate to accomplish the project work
   - Basic math and writing skills
   - Openness to new ideas (i.e., mill workers and loggers working together)
   - Openness to training/learning, both classroom and on-the-ground
   - Independent or entrepreneurial attitude which can provide motivation for developing post-program work opportunities
   - Comfort with or tolerance for uncertainty and ambiguity

3. **Involve other EWP partners in the interview/assessment steps.** Some possibilities are:
   - Use a panel-style interview with a few representatives from the Steering Committee, USFS/BLM staff, a crew chief, the Employer or Record and/or local contractors, grads, or the local union reps.
   - Hold an applicant review meeting where applications, testing results, and interviews are discussed by representatives of the EWP project. The panel could then make selection recommendations.
   - Consider working with other SDAs to develop a structured, performance-based screening and interview guide.
Training Coordination

**Aim:** To facilitate on-the-job, in-the-field, and classroom training for demonstration project participants, integrated where possible with the Joint Apprenticeship Training Council (JATC) requirements.

Although the JTPA does not have to take on the designated “Training Coordinator” role, it is often a good fit and is welcomed where it is possible. Even without that role assignment, JTPA has an organizational responsibility to monitor the training and is in a strong position to facilitate it.

**Training Overview**

1. **Funding issues:** Our participation is funded by JITW grants, but that money doesn’t always cover all of the costs incurred with demo project training. For instance, non-eligible participant training costs must be covered by other sources. In some cases, alternative funding within the JITW structure may be possible. Often it has been necessary to provide other support needed by trainees, such as clothing, tools, transportation, car repair/gas/insurance, fines, food, and housing (which can be covered under JTPA grants). Perhaps even using enhancement or on-the-job training funds to supplement training costs is possible.

2. **How do we provide the most effective quality training?** Technical specialists and business development people usually provide the ecosystem management and business training. These trainers may not be familiar with the diversity that a group of dislocated timber workers can provide. One of the greatest challenges these instructors will face is relating complicated material to learners who may not value an academic approach. These instructors may welcome your help in making the course content and format palatable - even enjoyable - for the trainees.

   Granted, SDA representatives may have little control over the delivery of the technical courses. But consider having a meeting (or at least a phone conversation) with the trainer before the training, to discuss the dynamics and demographics of the trainees, and their preferences for classroom and on-the-ground learning.

   Some instructors may not routinely include a feedback or evaluation survey at the end of the course. Since SDA has a role in ensuring the quality and effectiveness of these courses, perhaps you can offer to provide a questionnaire and to collect, review, and feedback the results.

3. **How will we be able to do all of this networking?** Yes, the demonstration project training success depends on good communication and creative marketing. But keep in mind that you have a wide network of partners, in your community, at the state level, and with the EWP staff in Eugene. And don’t forget about last year’s graduates, Steering Committee members, and 1995 demonstration project folks who may be willing to take on some of the communication and public relations work that keeps these projects moving ahead.
Scope of Training

Here are some suggestions for assisting trainees for whom the multi-task and multi-skill demo project work will be new and challenging.

1. Be sure to assess basic skills: Many of the workers best qualified for the demos (because of their in-the-woods experience) have not used all of the skills required for the demo work in past jobs. Some ideas about providing extra training are:

   - Offer short brush-up courses in math and writing using real work materials and situations for practice exercises (i.e., area and weight calculations, fish inventory forms, etc.) can be very helpful.
   - Don't neglect interpersonal skills! Confirm that the communication skills and teamwork training portions of the curriculum are delivered. This is also the place where trainee groups can set their own ground rules and expectations for working together.

2. Offer a competency-based course on personal budgeting. The income cycle for these workers will include significant highs and lows. Assistance in developing a full-year budget can make the difference in supporting a family year-round or only seasonally. The course should require a demonstration of competency and perhaps a check-in with the SDA.

3. Offer small business development training options up front. For those interested in starting their own businesses, getting training early in the project allows them to apply this training in a real project setting. GCAP is also piloting a Mentorship Program to assist emerging contractors, and GCAP representatives of that program can provide additional training for those interested.

4. Consider adding leadership training: Especially for crew leaders and for trainees who would like to pursue a contractor's license or supervisory roles, training in supervisory and coaching skills could be critical and much appreciated. Although it is not part of the current curriculum, it is possible to provide it as part of the business development component. Contact Mike Cloughesy for help planning this training.

5. Get training buy-in early. Meet with the employer, project work coordinator, and trainees at the start to discuss the training options. Use a calendar and the project description(s) to discuss what types of training are needed, when they will be needed, where they will be held, etc. Early commitment to training will set expectations for everyone and may reduce reluctance to attend or support the training later.

6. Keep the communication going: Check-in with the trainees every two weeks; with the employer once a month. Be sure to report progress to the Steering Committee each month.
Because JITW funding has very specific applications, knowing what other funding sources are available means we can assist clients with their plans for the future. Consider:

1. **Revolving loan funds:** Several opportunities exist for tapping into loans for grads who want to become contractors:

   - **Rural Economic and Community Development:** A 100K loan from the RECD is being used in Tillamook to help small contractors meet payroll while they wait for the federal agencies to pay for the work. It may also make loans for start-up costs for project graduates who want to start their own business. Get more information from Lou Minisce at the MTC in Tillamook.

2. **Other sources of funds:** Several state agencies can provide funding for projects that address community and rural economic development issues. Consider contacting these agencies for possibilities and requirements for loans or grants:

   - **Local Regional Strategies Boards**
     Contact Bob Warren at (503) 986-0092 to get the name of your local contact person.

   - **Oregon Rural Development Council and Community Economic Revitalization Team (CERT)**
     To find out who to contact on your local CERT and for information on Rural Development funds, call Bill Campbell at (503) 986-0069.

   - **Local Economic Development District Agencies (such as SOREDI and Cascade West).** Contact Bill Campbell for information at (503) 986-0069.
Monitoring and Evaluation Strategies

Once the project is up and running, JTPA is in a key position to watch the progress and keep other partners informed of successes and continuing challenges. Keep in mind:

1. **There's no substitute for being there.** Visits to the training and project work sites are extremely valuable.
   - Check with the crew supervisor for the best time to come, and ask the crew leader to let the crew know you're coming. Arriving at the lunch break and asking open-ended questions about the project is one way to get first-hand, mid-project evaluations from the trainees.
   - Bring along other interested partners from the community. Consider following up with a phone call to the crew leader and employer.

2. **Consider a family-based evaluation tool.** To get a broader perspective:
   - Set up a written survey targeted at learning how the project and training meets the family's needs.
   - Ask trainees to bring their spouses/partners to the regular meetings with their SDA rep.

3. **Monitor Training Effectiveness.** Some formal and informal strategies are:
   - Work with the training provider(s) to make up a questionnaire on the content, delivery, and usefulness of the entire training schedule (e.g., What was more helpful, least helpful, and why?).
   - Follow up with the employer to see how the training works when applied in the field.
   - With the trainer's permission, SDA reps could attend all or part of a training session, both in the classroom and on-the-ground, and give formal feedback to the trainer.
   - Use training evaluation forms after each session. Generic forms are available from Mike Cloughesy at the OSU Extension Office.
   - Encourage trainees and trainers to refer regularly to the competency standards included in most sections of the curriculum guide.

4. **Compile data across demonstration projects.** Work with other SDAs to gather employers' opinions about the successes and challenges of the training effectiveness.

5. **Keep in touch with the EWP Training Coordinator.** Mike Cloughesy, an OSU Extension Service instructor in Eugene and an EWP Core Team member (listed in the Appendix) is available to answer your questions, address concerns, and support your local training efforts.
Job Placement

Aim: To assist trainees in finding employment which is related to the training they received; hopefully work that carries them through the apprenticeship training program.

Placement Overview

1. **How does job placement differ for demo project trainees?** While employers for other programs are often established with a known track record, ecosystem management employers are still rare. This means that career development will probably take more time and energy than is required in other programs. At the same time, however, these trainees have a far-reaching support network. Steering Committee members can be key to assisting with job search. Previous demo project graduates who have become contractors may also provide employment opportunities. Specific strategies are addressed on the following pages.

2. **What is a successful placement?** Our successes have taken many forms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th># of Trainees</th>
<th>Placement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sweet Home 1994:</td>
<td>4 completed</td>
<td>4 placed in training-related work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweet Home 1995:</td>
<td>11 completed (another 1 dropped during the project)</td>
<td>5 are still working on the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 placed in training-related work (USFS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 still looking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rogue/Medford:</td>
<td>11 completed (1 other dropped out to take a job)</td>
<td>8 placed in training-related work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 have contracts pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 went on to enroll in college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakridge:</td>
<td>9 completed</td>
<td>2 placed in training-related work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 placed in non-training-related work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 is on a worker's comp claim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 are still looking for work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waldport:</td>
<td>10 completed</td>
<td>2 placed in training-related work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 just finished project work, now looking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 transferred to SDA in Corvallis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 moved out of the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tillamook:</td>
<td>12 completed</td>
<td>5 are pursuing contractor’s license</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 expect to work for these contractors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 just finished project work, now looking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 offered training-related employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umpqua:</td>
<td>4 completed (2 others dropped out, 1 was fired)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During the Project

Some tips for implementing job development strategies early in the project cycle:

1. **Network with EWP Partners.** Typically, our partners are active in the community and therefore in a position to link grads with potential employers.
   - Members of the Steering Committee will be a primary source of information and marketing for graduates. Encourage them to approach local area industrial land owners (large enough to have their own milling/production capacity) to promote the training and work experience, and perhaps even supply a list of graduates. This could be with a meeting, social event (a local festival or celebration), a work demonstration, by letter, or with a phone call.
   - Ask teams or pairs of trainees to make a short presentation and demonstration of their project work at any community opportunity (i.e., a JTPA press conference).
   - Invite employers and project graduates to be on the Steering Committee to help define the local labor market and to advocate for trainees.
   - Be in regular monthly contact with a USFS or BLM contracting officer and ask to be informed of the status of contracts. In the late winter or early spring, there is a list of contracts (called a “Contract Prospectus”) available which shows projects scheduled to be up for bid this season. Discussing this list with the contracting officer will give you a good idea about which projects to steer qualified graduates towards.
   - Plan a "Field Day" for local employers, private land owners, or other potential employers to visit the work site, meet the trainees, and see firsthand what they can do.

2. **Encourage graduates to network.** Near the half-way point of the project:
   - Develop a checklist or suggestion sheet for graduates on how to network with potential employers (as opposed to calling for interviews). Allow some time for one-on-one practice and feedback. This may seem like a “stiff” technique to some trainees, but it may simply be a more formalized version of what happens informally out in the community. “Whatever works” is a good rule of thumb, but organized networking skills can serve the trainee in a broader purpose later on in work life.
   - Ask crew leaders to check in with trainees at regular intervals to ensure that they are networking for post-project jobs (i.e., sending resumes, following up on job leads, etc.).

3. **Keep trainees on the job search track.**
   - Schedule a skills and interests assessment at the 25%, 50% and 75% of project completion mark. This would not only indicate if there is a match with the trainee and the work, but it also forces a discussion with the trainee about his or her post-project plans and commitment to searching for a job.
   - Consider offering a half-day paid release time for trainees to do structured networking (with appropriate accountability).
After the Project

Some strategies that project trainees can use are:

1. **Networking with the agencies:** Distribute the Contract Prospectus (described above) to grads to get them thinking about future projects they would be qualified to work on.

   - Encourage networking with local contracting officers. Trainees can ask to be put on the “Pre-bid Announcement” mailing list to be notified of upcoming contracts. At the same time, they can make sure that the contracting officer knows about the ecosystem management training.

   - Grads could drop off a resume with the contracting officer and ask for recommendations of contractors who might be interested in hiring them. (Be aware that information flows much more freely earlier in the process, before bids are awarded.)

2. **Networking with employers:** Distribute a list of local contractors who routinely do work in the woods (available from the USFS and BLM, the EWP, and GCAP).

   - Encourage graduates to contact the contractors to describe their training experience and to ask for work. Trainees would sound especially savvy if they are able to let the contractor know of upcoming contracts that the trainee has learned about from the local USFS or BLM contracting officer.

   - Grads should pay special attention to employers who are approved training agents for the JATC programs, since they should already be familiar with and value the demo project training. (A list of JATC employers is available from BOLI, EWP, or the JATC.)

   - Ask the Steering Committee to host a local forum for contractors and land owners to discuss local watershed needs and other ecosystem projects. Trainees can make a presentation to demonstrate the work they can do.

3. **Networking with other JTPAs:** When local opportunities seem scarce, SDA representatives can talk to other SDA offices in nearby communities to assess opportunities there.

   - Check with trainees as to the travel radius they would be willing to commute (or move?) to for continued employment. Then check with JTPAs or contractors in that area for opportunities.

   - A surplus in demand may be hard to imagine, but it is possible that the training gained on one demo project is more valuable to a contractor who has work coming up in another forest district. Other SDAs can get those project and contractor lists from their local USFS or BLM office.

4. **Bilingual considerations:** Having a Spanish interpreter available to assist with interviews - even informational interviews with potential employers - can go a long way to increase the chance of hiring an Hispanic trainee.
5. **Assistance materials:** Some of these already exist, others need to be developed:

- A sample JITW resume (available from the EWP team)
- A pocket-sized laminated certificate of completion (check with Tillamook MTC)
- A checklist or guide on "How to Network Effectively"
- A project support letter from BOLI Apprenticeship Consultant Fran Bates
- Recommendation Letters from the Employer of Record, trainers, etc.
- A contact list of the names, addresses, phone numbers, and titles/occupations of our demo project partners (employers, educators, state agencies, and state, federal, and land managers) for grads to follow up with. (SDAs can network together to compile this list.)
- An informal opportunity for 1995 grads to meet and speak to trainees

6. **Special assistance for those who want to become independent contractors:**
Aside from establishing a revolving loan fund (as is being piloted in Tillamook this year), there are other resources for those interested in starting their own contracting business:

- Small Business Development Centers at some community colleges offer small business counseling, information on grants, loans, and training for entrepreneurs.
- GCAP's Mentorship Program, a pilot in 1996, offers one-on-one assistance in meeting requirements, understanding agency procedures, and other start-up issues. Call Jim Beltran at (541) 548-5992 for more information.
- Bonding Assistance is available through the OEDD. For information, call Bill Campbell at (503) 986-0069.
- Revolving Loans are available through local Regional Strategies Boards. For your local representative, call Bill Campbell at (503) 986-0069.
- The USFS can set aside special contracts for demo project graduates under certain circumstances. This was done in Tillamook, and the Oakridge Forest Service partners are preparing contracts suitable for graduates seeking small contract work. See the SDA or a Steering Committee member in those areas for more information.

7. **Marketing the demo projects:**

- Make presentations at local community-based meetings, such as Regional Strategies Boards, County Commissioners, Regional Workforce Quality Committees, watershed councils, PIC and JTPA boards, Community College Boards, etc.
- Think Big! Make presentations or send updates to state-level boards or agencies that may (or should) be interested in the project.
- Approach the local newspaper and radio stations with quarterly updates on the progress and successes of the project.
Conclusion

We hope that this document has been helpful in suggesting some workable strategies for 1996. Please keep in mind that the EWP staff is available and eager to assist and support you in any way they can.

We also ask that you consider this Guide to be a working document, and that you add to it, edit it, and otherwise modify it as your experience dictates. Your input will be valuable information for us in the Spring of 1997 as we update the Guide to assist next year's JTPA partners.

If you have any questions or comments about this Guide, please contact Tom Brumm, Sue Nebrija or Nancy Arbogast (all listed in the Appendix).

Finally, thank you for your recommendations, advice, input, and hard work. Good luck with your demonstration projects for 1996 and please don't hesitate to call on your partners for assistance!
Appendix

Below is a list of some of the EWP partners involved in recruitment, training, and job placement. Feel free to call anyone who might be able to assist you.

**Ecosystem Workforce Project**
Charles Spencer, Cynthia Taylor, Nancy Arbogast
Labor Education and Research Center
1283 University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403-1283
(541) 346-2787

Bob Warren
OEDD
775 Summer Street NE
Salem, OR 97310
(503) 986-0092

Ron Ochs
USFS
333 SW 1st Ave.
Portland, OR 97204
(503) 326-2647

**TPA/SDA Partners**

**State Level:**
Tom Brumm, Sue Nebrija, Al Newnam
255 Capitol St. NE, Suite 399
Salem, OR 97310-1600
(503) 373-1995

Jeff Davis, Oregon Consortium
260 SW Ferry, Suite 102
Albany, OR 97321
(503) 928-3096

**Local SDAs:**
Susan Buell
Umpqua Training and Development
Box 1429
Roseburg, OR 97470
(541) 672-7761

Tanarae Greenman, Mel Wagoner
Community Services Consortium
41 W. Maple St.
Lebanon, OR 97355
(541) 451-1071

Marie Jones
Community Services Consortium
Box 928
Newport, OR 97365
(541) 265-8505

Lou Minisce
Management & Training Council
1902 Second Street
Tillamook, OR 97141
(503) 842-6675

Ray Olsen, Jill Wilson
The Jobs Council
673 Market St.
Medford, OR 97504
(541) 776-5100

Ellen Palmer
LCC Training & Development
4000 E. 30th Ave.
Eugene, OR 97405
(541) 726-2223

Val Pitchel, SWIPIC
78 Centennial Loop
Eugene, OR 97401
(541) 984-7278