Appendix S
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Processes</th>
<th>Fill in Date</th>
<th>DATES</th>
<th>TO</th>
<th>List Projects</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Reforestation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Mgt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Planting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Reconstruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* (Fencing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streambed Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Resto. Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCC Field (Ecosystem Restoration)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Admin.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signed ________________________________ Date __________________

Supervisor Signature __________________ Date __________________

Fencing: barbed wire & metal fencing
Survey: monitoring, assessment, and survey work
Reforestation: equipment (saw, backhoe), reforestation (planting), density management,
Outdoor Administration: for Crew Leaders/Work Leaders ONLY; administrative & meeting time
Mileage: for mileage to and from the Work Site from the center of Medford (USFS compound)
**Expense Reimbursement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>PA</th>
<th>Cat.</th>
<th>Mileage</th>
<th>Cost @ $/mile</th>
<th>Other Expenses/Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:**

Claimant ____________________ Date ________

Approved by ____________________ Date ________

**Total Reimbursement Requested:** ________
Appendix T
PURCHASE REQUISITION FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL AMOUNT REQUESTED $   

PERSON MAKING REQUEST ___________________________ Signed _______ Date _______

OK OF SUPERVISOR ___________________________ Signed _______ Date _______

DIRECTIONS: FILL IN, OBTAIN SIGNATURES, ATTACH TO INVOICE, RETURN TO LON

PURCHASE REQUISITION FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL AMOUNT REQUESTED $   

PERSON MAKING REQUEST ___________________________ Signed _______ Date _______

OK OF SUPERVISOR ___________________________ Signed _______ Date _______

DIRECTIONS: FILL IN, OBTAIN SIGNATURES, ATTACH TO INVOICE, RETURN TO LON
June 28, 1996

Dennis Martinez  
Mountain Grove Retreat Center  
785 Barton Road  
Glendale, OR 97442

Dear Dennis:

This letter puts in writing our request for your services as a Consultant during our training project collecting native grass seed for Medford BLM. As a Consultant we expect you will cover your own worker compensation, taxes, etc. and that you are responsible for your own liability insurance. Per our phone conversation this morning we would need your services up to two days per week for approximately two months during the native grass seed collection season. The collections would happen from one to four days per week with a need for you to be there at the beginning of each new collection area to insure our collectors know their species well and have been taught proper collection technique for each species as outlined in the attached BLM Description of Work. After the first few days you would only need to be with them for a couple of hours at the beginning of each collection area. Planned start work is this coming Wednesday, July 3 at 8:00 a.m. at the Medford BLM office.

Collection areas will initially start in the Butte Falls Resource Area and expand to other portions of the Medford District. I have asked that we concentrate in the Butte Falls and Glendale Resource Areas, but there is no guarantee of that although I believe most collections will take place there.

We agreed to a payment rate of $25.00 per hour for time you are working with the crew. We will pay $.29 per mile from your home (office) to the job site and back but not an hourly rate for travel time. You may submit your invoice with documented hours and mileage to our office monthly for payment. I estimate your time and mileage to be a maximum of $2,100. If it appears you will need to go beyond that amount we will renegotiate at that time.

As I mentioned earlier today I will get specific species information and collection locations from BLM early next week.

Please sign below that you have read this agreement and agree with the terms.

Sincerely,

[Signature]  
Glen Brady  
Project Leader, Ecosystem Workforce Training Project

---

Dennis Martinez

enclosure

---

Working for Sustainable Forests, Jobs and Communities
DESCRIPTION OF WORK:

Native grass seed will be collected on various sites across the district. A variety of native grass species are targeted for collection, such as Bromes, Festuca, Poa sp., Melica sp., Dactylis glomerata, and Deschampsia. A maximum of approximately 5 lbs of seed per species per site shall be collected. The BLM will locate some collection areas. Rogue Inst. may locate additional areas for collection with approval from the BLM representative. Grass seed matures at different times by species and elevation. Small blocks of time, possibly 1 to 3 days at a time over a 2 month period will be necessary to make adequate collections.

The Rogue Institute is required to have an individual knowledgeable of grass species on the site at the beginning of seed collection to train the crew and ensure quality control for the following:

1. Proper species identification.
2. Proper labeling of grass seed by species, location, elevation and site information.
3. Ensure purity of the grass seed collected so that different species are not mixed and excess foreign material is excluded.

The total amount of seed collected under this task order is approximately 160 lbs.
Appendix U
1. TYPE OF PAYMENT REQUESTED
   a. "x" one or both boxes
      ☐ ADVANCE ☐ REIMBURSEMENT
   b. "x" the appropriate box
      ☐ FINAL ☐ PARTIAL

2. BASIS OF REQUEST
   ☐ CASH
   ☐ ACCRUAL

3. FEDERAL SPONSORING AGENCY AND ORGANIZATIONAL ELEMENT TO WHICH THIS REPORT IS SUBMITTED
   U.S. Forest Service

4. FEDERAL GRANT OR OTHER IDENTIFYING NUMBER ASSIGNED BY FEDERAL AGENCY
   95-PA-22

5. PARTIAL PAYMENT REQUEST NUMBER FOR THIS REQUEST
   5

6. EMPLOYER IDENTIFICATION NUMBER:

7. RECIPIENTS ACCOUNT NUMBER OR IDENTIFYING NUMBER

8. PERIOD COVERED BY THIS REQUEST
   From (month, day, year) Reimbursement: 8-1-96
   To (month, day, year) 9-30-96

9. RECIPIENT ORGANIZATION:
   Name: Rogue Institute for Ecology & Economy
   Number and Street: 722 A St.
   City, State and ZIP Code: Ashland, OR 97520

10. PAYEE (Where check is to be sent if different than item 9)
    Name:
    Number and Street:
    City, State and ZIP Code:

11. COMPUTATION OF AMOUNT OF REIMBURSEMENTS/ADVANCES REQUESTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAMS/FUNCTIONS/ACTIVITIES</th>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Total program outlays to date (As of date) 9-30-96</td>
<td>$133,491.75</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$19,830.89</td>
<td>$153,322.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Less: Cumulative program income</td>
<td>- o -</td>
<td>- o -</td>
<td>- o -</td>
<td>- o -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;et program outlays (Line a minus Line b)</td>
<td>133,491.75</td>
<td>133,491.75</td>
<td>133,491.75</td>
<td>133,491.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Estimated net cash outlays for advance period</td>
<td>36,349.23</td>
<td>36,349.23</td>
<td>36,349.23</td>
<td>36,349.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Total (Sum of lines c &amp; d)</td>
<td>169,841.98</td>
<td>169,841.98</td>
<td>169,841.98</td>
<td>169,841.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Non-Federal share of amount on line e</td>
<td>- o -</td>
<td>- o -</td>
<td>- o -</td>
<td>- o -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Federal share of amount on line e</td>
<td>169,841.98</td>
<td>169,841.98</td>
<td>169,841.98</td>
<td>169,841.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Federal payment previously requested</td>
<td>162,630.39</td>
<td>162,630.39</td>
<td>162,630.39</td>
<td>162,630.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Federal share now requested (Line a minus line b)</td>
<td>- o -</td>
<td>- o -</td>
<td>- o -</td>
<td>- o -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Advances required by month, when requested by Federal grantor agency for use in making prescheduled advances</td>
<td>1st month</td>
<td>2nd month</td>
<td>3rd month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. ALTERNATE COMPUTATION FOR ADVANCES ONLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Estimated Federal cash outlays that will be made during period covered by the advance</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Less: Estimated balance of Federal cash on hand as of beginning of advance period</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Amount requested (Line a minus line b)</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. CERTIFICATION
   I certify that to the best of my knowledge and belief the data above are correct and that all outlays were made in accordance with the grant conditions or other agreement and that payment is due and has not been previously requested.

   SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED CERTIFYING OFFICIAL
   Brett Ken Cairns
   DATE REQUEST SUBMITTED: 10/8/96
   TYPED OR PRINTED NAME AND TITLE: Executive Director
   TELEPHONE AREA CODE, NUMBER, EXTENSION: 541-482-6031

   space for agency use
# INVOICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
<th>PREVIOUSLY ADVANCED</th>
<th>ACTUAL EXPENSE</th>
<th>RECONCILIATION</th>
<th>CURRENT REQUEST</th>
<th>THIS REQUEST W/ RECON</th>
<th>UNBILLED BALANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1101-L.A. Fish &amp; Hydro</td>
<td>$7,260.00</td>
<td>$7,228.24</td>
<td>$4,468.51</td>
<td>$2,759.73</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$31.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1103-Hancock Demo</td>
<td>$3,472.00</td>
<td>$3,304.33</td>
<td>$2,377.64</td>
<td>$926.69</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$167.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1104-L.A. Headwaters</td>
<td>$13,200.00</td>
<td>$13,566.92</td>
<td>$6,477.24</td>
<td>$7,089.68</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$(366.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1116-Applegate Fencing</td>
<td>$1,800.00</td>
<td>$884.37</td>
<td>$924.52</td>
<td>$(40.15)</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$915.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1117-Boundary Trail Drushing &amp; Repair</td>
<td>$2,065.00</td>
<td>$1,583.47</td>
<td>$1,583.47</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$2,065.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1124-Stoking Survey S.R.D.</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$667.01</td>
<td>$(667.01)</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1202-McDonald Basin</td>
<td>$21,120.00</td>
<td>$24,110.91</td>
<td>$18,349.20</td>
<td>$5,767.71</td>
<td>$8,800.00</td>
<td>$8,800.00</td>
<td>$(11,790.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1206-Bea Road</td>
<td>$2,640.00</td>
<td>$2,640.00</td>
<td>$2,640.00</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$(5,971.76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1207-Mt. Ashland</td>
<td>$13,200.00</td>
<td>$7,228.24</td>
<td>$5,396.93</td>
<td>$1,831.31</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$18.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1208-Bea Slides</td>
<td>$10,560.00</td>
<td>$10,541.44</td>
<td>$11,471.84</td>
<td>$(930.40)</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$(1,659.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1605-Gcbow</td>
<td>$2,640.00</td>
<td>$2,635.36</td>
<td>$1,344.25</td>
<td>$1,291.11</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2211-Waters Ck. Riparian Silt</td>
<td>$5,676.00</td>
<td>$7,545.03</td>
<td>$5,859.36</td>
<td>$1,085.67</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$(1,809.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2409-Grayback Ck. Riparian Thin</td>
<td>$39,379.00</td>
<td>$59,248.51</td>
<td>$58,423.01</td>
<td>$825.50</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$130.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2410-Grayback Ck. Intensive Placement</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
<td>$15,076.04</td>
<td>$10,107.55</td>
<td>$4,968.49</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$(76.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2418-Wildlife Prusa in Grayback</td>
<td>$8,621.00</td>
<td>$8,621.00</td>
<td>$5,401.90</td>
<td>$3,219.10</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$(602.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2422-P.O.G. Bough Harvest</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$245.32</td>
<td>$245.32</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>$156,633.00</td>
<td>$162,630.39</td>
<td>$133,091.75</td>
<td>$29,783.96</td>
<td>$8,800.00</td>
<td>$8,800.00</td>
<td>$(4,797.39)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| IN-KIND                        |        |                      |                |                |                |                      |                 |
| Salaries                       | $12,462.00 | $11,627.94            | $(1,627.94)    | $2,791.95      | $14,419.89      | $14,419.89          | $(1,957.89)     |
| Travel                         | $158.00  | $498.51               | $(498.51)      | $76.85         | $575.36         | $575.36             | $(377.36)       |
| Supplies                       | $396.00  | $21.65                | $(21.65)       | $ -            | $21.65          | $21.65              | $(374.35)       |
| Equipment Use                  | $1,154.00 | $3,813.99             | $(3,813.99)    | $ -            | $3,813.99       | $3,813.99           | $(2,059.99)     |
| **TOTAL IN-KIND**              | $14,810.00 | $15,962.09             | $(15,962.09)   | $2,868.80      | $18,830.89      | $18,830.89          | $(4,020.89)     |

**TOTAL INVOICE**

- $8,800.00

**TOTAL DUE**

- $8,800.00

- $7,296.00
- $785.41

**TOTAL DUE**

- $6,804.59
INVOICE

To: Bob Walker, BLM
Date: September 13, 1996

Invoice # BL-104

Projected: September 15 to October 15, 1996

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK ORDER</th>
<th>ITEM DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>CONTRACT ESTIMATED QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNITY</th>
<th>COMPLETED QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T005</td>
<td>Projected Expenses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Riparian Mark</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>25.34</td>
<td>$ 23,009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T002</td>
<td>Woodford Creek</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>25.34</td>
<td>$ 3,117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>123</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>$ 1,876</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cumulative Total $ 28,001

This Invoice $ 28,001

Please remit to Rogue Institute for Ecology and Economy. Thank you.
Appendix V
STATE OF OREGON
APPRENTICESHIP AND TRAINING COUNCIL

ECOSYSTEM MANAGEMENT JATC
MA# 1106

1. The occupation to be taught under these training standards is:

   Forest Technician
   Forestry Aide (Forestry)
   DOT#: 452.364-010
   LICENSE: None

MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS FOR APPLICANTS

2. The minimum qualifications for applicants are:

   a. To be eighteen (18) years old.

   NOTE: Preference will be given to Dislocated Timber workers certified by State of Federal agencies.

GEOGRAPHICAL AREA

3. These standards apply to the geographic area of:

   State of Oregon

HOURS OF EMPLOYMENT

4. Approximately 1500 hours of on-the-job training are required for completion of this training program.

WORK PROCESSES AND APPROXIMATE HOURS

5. The work processes to be learned and the approximate hours required for each are:

   a. Science and Ecosystem Restoration and Enhancement 1000 hrs
   b. Technical and Safety Knowledge related to the Forest 250 hrs
   c. Business Development and Management as related to Forest work 250 hrs

   TOTAL .... 1500 hrs

The Committee realizes that the completion of 1500 hours on-the-job training is the ideal, but recognizes that most trainees will not be able to fulfill the total amount of hours specified in each and every work process as set forth in the standards.
RELATED TRAINING

6. Approximately 200 hours of related training may be required each year unless determined otherwise by the appropriate apprenticeship committee. Related training may cover the following subjects:
   a. Watershed Processes and Ecology
   b. Forest Ecology
   c. Forest Management
   d. Wildlife Habitat Management
   e. Basic Fire Suppression and Safety
   f. Land and Stream Measurement
   g. Interpersonal Skills
   h. Business Technical Skills

WAGE SCHEDULE

7. The average wage for those journeymen employed by the participating employer in the occupation on (Updated ________________ ) is $________ per hour.

Trainees will be paid at 100% of the training wage throughout the program.

The average wage in this occupation will be updated by this committee at least annually and will be recorded in the minutes of the committee.

RATIO

8. The number of apprentices shall not exceed a ratio of 5 trainees to the first 1 journeyman in full employment on the job in order to assure adequate training and supervision. Additional trainees are authorized at the rate of 5 to 1 additional journeymen.

PROBATIONARY PERIOD

9. The probationary period shall be 80 hours. During such period, either party to the agreement may terminate the apprenticeship agreement upon written notice to the Apprenticeship Division of the Bureau of Labor and Industries.

AFTER THE PROBATIONARY PERIOD

10. The training agreement may be cancelled at the request of the apprentice or may be suspended, cancelled or terminated by the Committee for good cause, with due notice to the apprentice and a reasonable opportunity for correction and with written notice to the apprentice and to the Apprenticeship Division of the Bureau of Labor and Industries of the final action taken by the Committee.
ECOSYSTEM MANAGEMENT JATC
Forestry Aide

DUTIES OF AN APPRENTICE

11. The apprentice is required to sign an apprenticeship agreement and apply oneself both on the job and in the related training program and continually strive to become a skilled journeyman. The apprentice must not miss work or related training classes except for good cause. The apprentice must comply with the provisions of these standards and any applicable agreement.

MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS OF AN EMPLOYER

12. The minimum qualifications of an employer in apprenticeship facilities, training and working conditions are:

The employer must have and maintain at all times sufficient plant facilities, equipment and fully trained journeymen to train in the work processes and comply with the provisions of these standards. A valid certification by the appropriate apprenticeship committee that the employer is an appropriate training agency shall be prima facie proof of compliance with this section.

Working conditions of apprentices shall conform with all laws and regulations affecting their health, welfare and safety.

DUTIES OF AN EMPLOYER

13. The employer shall take all steps necessary to see that each apprentice works under and with competent journeymen in the occupation for which the apprentice is being trained and is assigned to working and learning tasks so that the apprentice masters the on-the-job training and related instruction.

The employer must comply with the provisions of these standards and any agreement applicable to the sponsor's program. The employer, on forms approved by the Council, must make regular reports to the appropriate apprenticeship committee.

NONDISCRIMINATION IN SELECTION AND EMPLOYMENT

14. The recruitment, selection, employment and training of apprentices during their apprenticeship shall be without discrimination because of race, color, religion, national origin or sex. The sponsor will take affirmative action to provide equal opportunity in apprenticeship and will operate the apprenticeship program as required under Title 29 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 30, and Equal Employment Regulation of the Oregon State Apprenticeship and Training Council.
ECOSYSTEM MANAGEMENT JATC
Forestry Aide

APPROVED BARGAINING AGREEMENT

15. If the apprentice job is covered by a collective bargaining agreement, the lawful provisions thereof shall supplement, or prevail over, these standards if there is a conflict between the bargaining agreement and standards. The employer or employer's association shall simultaneously furnish to the union, if any, which is the collective bargaining agent of the employees to be trained, a copy of its application for registration and of the apprenticeship program, etc.

PERIODIC REVIEW, EVALUATION AND MAINTENANCE OF PROGRESS RECORDS

16. It shall be the duty of the sponsor to review and evaluate the apprentice's progress in job performance and related instruction; and the maintenance of appropriate progress records. The basic evidence of such advancement shall be the record of the apprentice's progress on the job and during related instruction. If such progress is not satisfactory, the sponsor shall have the right to withhold their periodic wage advancements, suspend or revoke the Apprenticeship Agreement, or make such recommendations, it feels desirable. A recordkeeping system shall be established by the sponsor for such purposes.

CREDIT FOR PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE

17. Applicants accepted by the sponsor, who have creditable experience in the skilled occupation or in some other related capacity, may be granted advance standing as apprentices with commensurate wages for any progression steps so granted.

TRANSFER OF APPRENTICES AND CONTINUITY OF EMPLOYMENT

18. It shall be the obligation and responsibility of the sponsor to provide insofar as possible, continuous employment for all apprentices in its program. If unable to provide apprentices the diversity of experience necessary for all-around training and experience in the various processes of the occupation, as set forth in the apprenticeship agreement; or where the sponsor's business is of such character as not to provide reasonably continuous employment, the sponsor may arrange for transferring their training obligation to another employer under the same program with consent of the apprentice and apprenticeship committee or program sponsor. If, for any reason, a lay-off of an apprentice occurs, the apprenticeship agreement shall remain in effect, unless cancelled by the sponsor.

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLETION

19. Upon successful completion of apprenticeship, as set forth in these standards, and passing such examination as the sponsor may require, sponsor shall recommend that the registration agency issue a Certificate of Completion of apprenticeship.
MODIFICATIONS, CANCELLATION AND DeregISTRATION OF PROGRAM

20. These standards may be modified or changed, for the betterment of the apprenticeship system, by submitting proposed modification(s) or change(s), in writing to the registration agency for approval.

Cancellation and deregistration of the program may be accomplished voluntarily, by a written request from the sponsor to the registration agency, or by formal deregistration proceedings.

REGISTRATION AGENCY RECORD REQUIREMENTS

21. It shall be the responsibility of the sponsor to establish and maintain such apprenticeship records as may be required by the registration agency and other applicable laws.

APPRENTICESHIP AGREEMENT

22. Each apprentice (and, if under eighteen (18) years of age, the parent or guardian) shall sign an Apprenticeship Agreement with the sponsor, who shall then register such agreement with the registration agency before employment or attendance at related instruction classes. Following such registration, all signatory parties thereto shall receive copies. Specifically, or by reference, the apprenticeship agreement shall incorporate these standards of apprenticeship.

AUTHORIZED REGISTRAR

23. Name and address of authorized representative and agency identification of registration agency:

Bureau of Labor and Industries
Apprenticeship and Training Division
800 NE Oregon #32
Portland, Oregon 97232

1054E 5/30/96
SS

Francis C. Bates
Apprenticeship Consultant
Dislocated Workers Program
Program Development

Oregon
BUREAU OF LABOR AND INDUSTRIES
Apprenticeship and Training Division
800 NE Oregon St. #32
Portland, Oregon 97232
(503) 731-4072 Ext. 271
FAX (503) 731-4623
TDD (503) 731-4106
PERIODIC REVIEW

16. It shall be the sponsor's responsibility to monitor and maintain the progress of the apprentices and their supervisors shall provide periodic reports to the sponsor. If unsatisfactory performance is identified by the supervisor, the sponsor shall provide corrective action and submit a written report to the Training Coordinator. If a pattern of unsatisfactory performance is observed, the sponsor may be required to provide additional training or may be asked to take appropriate action to improve performance.

17. Applicants accepted into the program must meet the established standards for the occupation. The sponsor shall provide a detailed training plan, including goals, objectives, and methods of instruction. The plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Training Coordinator.

TRANSFERS

18. It shall be the responsibility of the sponsor to ensure that transfers are made in a timely manner and that the new employer is properly trained and receives a detailed training plan from the previous employer.

RELATED TRAINING

6. Approximately 200 hours of related training may be required as determined by the sponsor. Related training may cover the following subjects:

a. Watershed Processes and Ecology
b. Forest Ecology
c. Forest Management
d. Wildlife Habitat Management
e. Basic Fire Suppression and Safety
f. Land and Stream Measurement
g. Interpersonal Skills
h. Business Technical Skills

WAGE SCHEDULE

7. The average wage for those journeymen employed by the participating field office in the occupation on [insert date] is $ [insert wage].

Trainees will be paid at 100% of the training wage throughout the program.

The average wage in this occupation will be updated by the sponsor at least annually and will be recorded in the minutes of the next quarterly meeting.

RATIO

8. The number of apprentices shall not exceed a ratio of 5:1 of journeymen in full employment on the job in order to ensure adequate training and supervision. Additional trainees will be added at the rate of 5 to 1 additional journeymen.

PROBATIONARY PERIOD

9. The probationary period shall be 80 hours. During such time, both parties to the agreement may terminate the apprenticeship agreement, and such termination shall be by written notice to the Apprenticeship Division of the Bureau of Labor and Industries.

AFTER THE PROBATIONARY PERIOD

10. The training agreement may be cancelled at the request of either party or may be suspended, cancelled or terminated by the Committee. In such case, with due notice to the apprentice, the Committee will cause, with due notice to the apprentice, a reasonable time for action and with written notice to the apprentice and Apprenticeship Division of the Bureau of Labor and Industries, take action taken by the Committee.
Appendix W
ECOSYSTEM WORKFORCE TRAINING PROGRAM
To be filled out by Agency project coordinator for each project

SISQ    ROGUE RIVER    BLM    OTHER

PROJECT NAME

PROJECT LOCATION

PROJECT COORDINATOR

PHONE

PLANNED ACCOMPLISHMENT

ACTUAL ACCOMPLISHMENT

WERE EXPECTATIONS MET FOR THE FOLLOWING?

• PRODUCTION RATES

  SUGGESTIONS

• QUALITY OF WORK

  SUGGESTIONS

• WORKER SKILLS

  SUGGESTIONS

DID WE FACILITATE ACCOMPLISHMENT OF THIS JOB OR YOUR WORKLOAD?

OTHER COMMENTS & SUGGESTIONS

WOULD YOU HAVE US DO ANOTHER PROJECT?  YES    NO    MAYBE

IF NOT, WHY?

PLEASE LIST PROJECTS YOU WOULD BE WILLING TO MAKE AVAILABLE TO EWTP NEXT YEAR
DAILY DIARY

Name ___________________________________________ Date ___ / ___ /95

What did you do today? Include descriptions of tasks and production rates. ____________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________

What did you learn today? ____________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________

What can you do differently tomorrow to increase efficiency and further ecosystem based management? ____________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________

Questions and concerns. ____________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________
Appendix X
IDENTIFIED PROBLEMS

A) INITIAL HIRING POOL
The initial hiring pool for SFP employees included a high proportion of persons who had not demonstrated individual drive in employment/jobs, or who had "bombed out" in the traditional workplace market for a variety of reasons. As we attempted to work with these people and these reasons, it became clear that there were two poles: one we could work with, and the other we should have left alone.

Problem Behaviors to NOT HIRE: 1) no transportation/no drivers license/no insurance; 2) history of being fired for being a strongly disruptive influence; 3) drug & alcohol problem; 4) refuses responsibility for self & group 5) persecution complex/paranoid delusions

Problem Behaviors to HIRE: 1) sense of failure; 2) lack of training or education; 3) feeling overwhelmed by the enormity of the potential job;

B) DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIORS APPEARING DURING THE JOB
These were not obvious during the hiring process, as naturally people put on their best behaviors during interviews. Some of these behaviors were so destructive to the group that whenever they are discovered, firm and even extreme measures need be taken to prevent the negative dynamic from "taking over" the crew. Some of these are listed below, there may be others...

Disruptive Behaviors Needing Immediate Action: 1) personality conflicts actively "working"; 2) padded hours/added miles/any form of cheating or lying on the job; 3) putting the "blame" for any problem/recommendation/conflict/question onto others; 4) any of the initial hiring problems that appear later.

C) PRODUCTION NORMS
Reasonable production norms need to be set, monitored, and modified by the supervisor responsible for field work. They may be individual rates, or they may be applied to the general group, or both. When the trainee does not meet these norms, he must be faced with this reality immediately, and the problem found and corrected. The problem area may be: 1) the Institute 2) the norms 3) family/home problems 4) some negative crew dynamic 5) any of the above identified Problem Areas 6) health problems.

SUBSTANTIVE PROBLEMS

A) PERCEPTUAL SET AT THE INSTITUTE
Several "taken for granted" were part of the Institute's baggage as we went into the SFP training, all of them predicated upon good will/good intentions, and a motivation of the best for the trainee at all times. Subjectively: 1) the trainee always tells the real truth 2) it is kind to continue to help the dysfunctional trainee make it by extended deadlines/advances of money/more chances 3) gentle words/huge amounts of listening time are always to be expected 4) the trainee will respond positively to any of this & not take it as a sign of weakness 5) good people in private situations will make good employees 6) the trainee with an obvious ax to grind is given forum on par with the supervisor automatically to demonstrate equality 7) every trainee should be carried through the entire program 8) training will be able to provide enough information for responsible decision-making usually gained through experience across the board

B) BACK-UP WITH OPERATING PARTNERS
Agency, educational, and private enterprise connections are a two-edged sword; they have their own agendas within the mutual context of operations. Sometimes they are able to facilitate wonderfully for us, and other times these hidden agendas or priorities get substantially in our way. For example, in SFP we were not able to get feedback on the assessments we were doing due to lack of a program/downloading
generator for the computer. We were thus unable to correct and adjust problem areas in our assessments as we went, not knowing what needed adjusted!

PRACTICAL SOLUTIONS & SUGGESTIONS

A) INTERVIEW/HIRING PRACTICES

Several suggestions are immediately apparent to ensure that an entrepreneurial personality is what we’re getting 1) a much more detailed questionnaire at interview time, directed at the problem areas we experienced last year 2) a more formal interview process than we had with the SFP interviews, a point interview similar to getting into Canada-accumulated points earn higher ratings for employment 3) phoning a past employer for EVERY applicant to determine some of the more easily hidden problems 4) goals questions to determine what & IF the applicant plans with his/her life...

B) ON-GOING PROBLEMS

A sequential list of criteria needs to be met and passed by each trainee DURING the program; this precludes that there will be some, (approximately 15%) dropout rate. We should expect this and intentionally narrow down the list of trainees as we go. Suggested criteria and timeframes could be:

1) 1 week comes to work on time with no excuses 6 of 7 days
2) 2 weeks appears with intentionally assigned stuff 4 of 4 assignments
3) 5 weeks personality conflicts persisting zero tolerance
4) 5 weeks on falsification of any data one occurrence
5) 8 weeks takes crew responsibility, opportunity provided by supervisor 3 of 4
6) 8 weeks maintains production norms 2 occurrences only
7) 12 weeks assumes leadership within crew zero tolerance

This list would be better if it were “stacked” towards the beginning of the program heavily, expecting and counting on some failures to demonstrate to the crew the seriousness of the business; several criteria within the first two weeks which would need to be met would be better.

C) INSTITUTE MANAGEMENT PROCESS

Sufficient supervision of trainees in the field, virtually constant, needs to be maintained. In each of the programs we ran this year the trainees took intentional advantage of administrators having to do paperwork/administration and not be in the field. Great amounts of time were lost unintentionally because decisions were not made in a timely manner in the field by a supervisor empowered to make those decisions. In SFP huge blocks of time were spent in the office, on the phone, setting up acreage to be surveyed, time not available to be in the field. Middle level management is mandatory!

Trainees need to be recognized as trainees, and not treated as, nor expected to be, supervisors. There is an obvious and implicit difference in ability and “status”, as super visor, should mean upper or higher view...

It is demoralizing to administrative staff at the supervisory level to have to answer to the 3rd or 4th set of charges from identified persons having persecution fantasies, and then watch these persons be recommended for further professional connections. Nice words are not always what is needed for the growth of the trainee; people often need to be told to shit or get off the pot, (often they make the choice for positive movement), or just plain not supported by ANYONE in one more delusional illusion.

Trainees need:
1) maximum ONE advance on earned pay. Period. This is a “bene”.
2) deadlines carefully and intelligently set, and rigidly adhered to.
3) professional attitudes; too many, like 2 or 3, chances spoil the trainee...
4) consistency in “upper” management, just like, and for the same reasons, as parents.
5) treatment as equals as people, not as equals in experience.
6) examples made of correct choices; the benefits should be made obvious to all.
7) examples made of incorrect choices, with equally obvious results...
8) the experience of the joy of work well done that is meaningful, or why bother?
ROGUE INSTITUTE FOR ECOLOGY AND ECONOMY
NOTICE OF WORK-PERFORMANCE DEFICIENCIES

Date: >

To: >

This letter confirms our recent meeting of > , 19>, when we discussed your poor job performance. You were cautioned that your performance was not acceptable in the following respects:
>
Based on the above factors, you have been given an unsatisfactory performance rating. For you to enjoy a good status standing, you must improve your performance and, as we discussed, adopt the following action plan to improve your performance:
>
We trust that this notice is accepted as constructive and that we can look forward to improved performance on your part.

You are requested to make an appointment with your Job Council Case Manager to ensure that you have the proper behavioral tools and processes to make the improvements discussed above, and that you understand the necessity of doing so within this Program. A copy of this Deficiency Notice is being sent to their offices.

As you will note, an additional copy of this notice has been attached. Please sign that copy where indicated and return it to me promptly.

Sincerely,
>
Receipt acknowledged: >

Crew Supervisor, RIEE

NOTICE OF WORK-PERFORMANCE DEFICIENCIES - Form510
ROGUE INSTITUTE FOR ECOLOGY AND ECONOMY
FINAL DISMISSAL NOTICE

Date: >

To: >

You have been counseled and warned of deficiencies in your job performance (see notification dated >, a copy of which is attached).

Regretfully, the deficiencies do not seem to have been corrected. Immediate action, in conformity with the earlier notification mentioned above, must be taken by you to correct your performance deficiencies. I cannot stress too strongly that such action must be undertaken without delay. Failure to comply will result in your dismissal without additional notice.

A copy of this notice shall also be sent to your Case Manager at the Job Council. You are requested to immediately contact that person to formulate your correction of performance deficiencies.

I have attached a copy of this notice; please sign where indicated and return the copy to me promptly.

Sincerely,

Crew Supervisor, RIEE

Receipt acknowledged: > ________________

Employee

> FINAL DISMISSAL NOTICE - Form511
ECOSYSTEM WORKFORCE TRAINING PROGRAM

TRAINEE CHECKPOINT EVALUATION STANDARD FORM

TRAINEE

Crew Supervisor ______________________________ Evaluation Week ________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Commitment</td>
<td>Comes to work on time, no excuses</td>
<td>(8 of 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Transportation</td>
<td>Consistent, legal, functional</td>
<td>1 Warning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Follow Through</td>
<td>Brings material, completes work</td>
<td>(60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Initiative</td>
<td>Has Independent Study Topic</td>
<td>Pass-Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Accurate Records</td>
<td>Time, mileage, data, no falsification</td>
<td>1 Warning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Personality Conflict</td>
<td>Maintains professional relationships</td>
<td>1 Warning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Responsibility</td>
<td>Work Leader/Crew responsibility</td>
<td>(75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Production</td>
<td>Maintains defined norms</td>
<td>(Growth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Crew Dynamics</td>
<td>Regular contributions to crew</td>
<td>(Growth)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each category shall be used each week to evaluate every Trainee even though there are no “Program Requirements” for some categories until later weeks into the program. For example, the Crew Supervisor will evaluate for Production & Responsibility all of the weeks before #5 & #8 when these categories become PASS-FAIL. Every time a trainee does not meet the standards set in the Manual, (%), he or she will be referred to the Jobs Council Case Manager for counseling and process examination, and the Crew Supervisor will meet with the trainee using Form 501 to structure the meeting. Repeated failure to meet these standards will result in termination from the program. Once a criteria has been met with acceptable results/behavior, Crew Supervisors will continue to use this form for weekly evaluation unless directed otherwise by the Program Coordinator.
DAILY DIARY-DIAS DIARIO SHORT FORM

NOMBRE/NAME

DATES/FECHAS

PROJECT #

MONDAY: HOURS/HORAS ___% COMPLETE___

COMMENTS

____________________________________________________

FIELD ED.

TUESDAY: HOURS/HORAS ___% COMPLETE___

COMMENTS

____________________________________________________

FIELD ED.

WEDNESDAY: HOURS ___% COMPLETE___

COMENTARIOS:

____________________________________________________

FIELD ED.

THURSDAY: HOURS/HORAS ___% COMPLETE___

COMENTARIOS

____________________________________________________

FIELD ED.

ISSUES/PROBLEMAS

____________________________________________________

EQUIPEMENT USED/QUE SE SUO

COMMENTS:

____________________________________________________
CREW SUPERVISOR DAILY NOTES

DATE __________  PROJECT __________________________
CREW __________  # IN CREW __________________________

*MILES __________  *VEHICLE __________________________

*VIP/MGR ON SITE __________  * WEATHER __________

*CREW LEADER ON SITE __________________________
*CREW LEADER ADMIN. TIME __________________________
*CREW LEADER INTERFACE __________________________

*TYPE /HOURS OF WORK:  SAW __________  FENCE __________
                    EQUIP OP __________  SURVEY __________  FIRE __________
                    TREE PLANTING __________  VEG ASSESSMENT __________
                    STREAM ASSESS __________  WATER REST. ANA. __________

ENVIRONMENTAL RECONSTRUCTION __________________________

*AMOUNT COMPLETED __________  Units __________________________

*MATERIALS USED __________________________

*HANDOUTS TO CREW __________________________
*MANUAL REFERENCE __________________________

*ISSUES __________________________

*EVALUATION NOTES __________________________

*NOTES __________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Northwest Economic Adjustment Initiative
FY 1994 Ecosystem Workforce Pilot Program

Final Evaluation Report
December 7, 1994

Pilot Goals and Objectives

A. Program Goal
1. Demonstrate that dislocated timber workers, ecosystem restoration projects, family wage jobs and education/training can be successfully linked.

B. Program Objectives
1. Determine the quality and quantity of likely job opportunities associated with ecosystem restoration work.

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

3. Learn how to cooperatively design and package ecosystem projects to facilitate employment of dislocated timber workers, in a way that meets the multiple needs of timber workers, their communities and ecosystem restoration.

4. Learn what mix of training formats, personnel, and content is appropriate to the worker participants (based on their diverse needs) and the likely market demand.

Evaluation

We chose to evaluate the FY 1994 Ecosystem Workforce Pilot Program (Program) looking at the four main areas: the ecosystem restoration projects, the worker trainees, the education/training, and the Program as a model for linking ecosystem work with workforce and community development. In each section we’ve tried to share highlights of what we’ve learned, and make concrete suggestions for the future.

I. The Ecosystem Restoration Projects
Approximately $100,000 worth of projects were successfully completed. See appendix, Tables 1, 2, and 3 for details.

1) Were the projects designed in a way that was conducive for use in a Program? How could improvements have been made? What would be an appropriate design of project packages?
   a) Although most of the projects worked out ok, most needed to be manipulated to fit the work-based learning environment. This is because these projects were off-the-shelf projects. The Program’s experience in taking “off-the-shelf” projects and making them work on the ground (with worker input/expertise) would be invaluable to share with other regions. For example, many of the contracts let in most of the Provinces (including the Willamette
Province) are road stabilization or obliteration projects. They have been designed requiring large equipment with only a few support people. A different project design might be to set aside two of the smaller road stabilization projects for Project work, and design these projects to enable a rotation of the worker trainees through the support positions. This would provide the opportunity to accomplish the work and work-based learning.

b) The projects that worked the best were the ones where the project designers/managers stayed on the site for more than a project briefing. When this happened, they could help the worker trainees understand what they had envisioned and why it was important. It is clear that writing some "specs" for certain types of restoration projects will be challenging at best. This pointed out an important point:

Land management agencies (and especially the project designers/managers) need to become familiar with the KSAs of the workforce and the workforce needs to become more involved in the on-the-ground decision making to bring about a common vision of forest ecosystem restoration. Standards in the industry are being set with projects similar to the ones accomplished during this Program.

When project managers spent more time with the worker trainees on the project site, a relationship developed that shifted the perceptions and antagonisms that previously existed and increased the trust in both parties.

c) Project design suggestions for the future:

* Land management agency leaders/decision makers and upper level managers must re-evaluate their cynicism about the changes in forest management, become part of the vision of forest stewardship, and empower their area managers and subsequently the project designers/managers, to be creative and make ecosystem management work for the environment and the economy.

* Future project designs should focus on creative ways of linking projects into project packages, resulting in a stewardship approach to land management. For example, Program worker trainees and project managers alike suggested broadening the scope of projects include more thinning and pruning, overall forest health, inventory and monitoring, stocking, planting, fuels, and special forest products management. This also relates to the size of the projects, both for use in a Program and in forest stewardship contracts placed up for bid. One example would be with the road stabilization/obliteration projects. Set aside two of the smaller road stabilization projects for Program work, and design these projects to enable a rotation of the worker trainees through the support positions. This could be accomplished by scheduling another work project in a nearby area where the rotation of a few worker trainees onto the road project would not be disruptive. This would be helpful in the creation of the high-value, multi-skilled worker.

* Project designers should keep workforce/employment/community impact objectives as important design criteria and should not be designing the projects in a biological "vacuum". Projects could be designed by a team including scientists, engineers, and practitioners, and where the capacity exists, knowledgeable workers on the site. This is true for implementation as well (see I-1b above). This could begin in FY 1995 for project being designed for the FY 1996 field season.
* In FY 1995 and beyond, ecosystem projects on private land must also be incorporated into programs such as this one. As Dan Shults, an Oregon Dept. of Forestry (ODF) district manager so aptly states, "A great deal of habitat restoration work needs to be done on private industrial forest land. Several companies are doing some of that work now. More are interested and supportive..." This Program must be linked up in some type of cooperative, or at least, complementary way with the funding/projects available via the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service and, the Soil Conservation Service.

2) Were the projects completed and performed in such as way as to match (or enhance) industry standards?

a) In terms of project completion, the Program work has been evaluated using factors such as time, cost, and quality (see Table 2 in the appendix). One example of the comments received from agency "customers". "They did a great job! They did what I asked them to do, and they gave me a lot of flexibility. They saved us money. They have a good grasp of what we are trying to accomplish and learned very fast." (Eugene BLM)

b) In terms of industry standards, two things must be addressed. One is that we have an evolving forest industry; from one based on distinct segments (such as forest product extraction and reforestation) to an integrated, forest stewardship industry. The second is that we have an evolving forestry workforce; from one that had high skills/wages (forest products) and low skills/wages (reforestation) to a combined, highly- and multi-skilled forestry workforce. This Program provided the opportunity for the worker trainees to utilize their existing skill base and combine it with newly-developed skills (from the training) to accomplish the work and set future industry standards. As this relates to project design, most of the off-the-shelf projects were not designed in a way that demonstrated that the agencies recognize the need for a multi-skilled workforce. This Program helped illuminate this situation and some possible solutions.

3) How did the Program and its work projects compare to other FY 1994 contract jobs?

a) There is much that we are learning that the FY 1995 programs will be able to use. There remains, however, a need for on-going measurement of employment outcomes by the USDA-FS and BLM. This is arduous and we have run into several snags in doing this. There is currently no source of employment data or quality outcome measurements for Jobs-In-The-Woods contracts, making it impossible at this point to compare the Program with other, contracted projects. A special study has been undertaken to determine employment outcomes on FY 1994 USDA-FS and BLM projects which will allow comparison of employment outcomes. It will not be possible to accurately assess quality or customer satisfaction, thus we will be unable this year to develop a definitive cost/benefit analysis supporting or rejecting continued investment in training.

b) The projects (see appendix Table 1) gave worker trainees experience in most types of restoration work undertaken this year in Oregon, with the exception of road stabilization work. See section I-1c above for suggestions for the future related to this.
II. The Worker Trainees
Table 4 in the appendix provides details about the worker trainees. On July 5, 1994 10 worker trainees formally began the Program. Over the next 17 weeks only one worker trainee left the Program.

1) How did the recruitment of the workers compare to expectations, similar industry situation, etc.?
   a) There was a perception that workers would not want to enroll in this Program. However, recruitment went smoother than anticipated. At the same time we were recruiting, the Southern Willamette Private Industries Council (SWPIC) had approximately 60 applications on file from laid off wood products workers interested in receiving retraining services. Because of the short timeline for recruitment and scheduling interview time for an extensive assessment was not permitted. The availability of salary information, thorough description of the Program, and good communication between the recruiting partners and the agency partners resulted in a successful effort.
   
b) The perception also existed that this was a "stop gap" employment/training program, and as such, a deterrent to recruit workers. However, we were clear that we didn’t want to just hire anybody who "needed a job." We wanted to give worker trainees an opportunity to use/show their existing skills through participating in the work, and to develop new skills (self improvement) through training. Dan Shults, ODF, states "Ending up with nine out of the ten original worker trainees attests to excellent screening and recruitment, and an up-front commitment to take only the best candidates."
   
c) Suggestions for the future:
   * Start the recruitment process earlier. This will enable the recruitment partners to do more focused recruitment and have more time to assess workers’ KSAs. One suggestion is to have an orientation for dislocated workers who are interested in participating in the Program. They could visit with representatives from the land management agencies/entities, JTPA, and the Employment Department about the Program, and pre-screen themselves for JTPA eligibility and appropriateness for the Program.
   * Recruitment of worker trainees and work projects from a wide area resulted in somewhat of a logistics problem for some of the workers as well as their families. During the interview process, it will be important to be clear with the potential worker trainees that overnight travel may be a part of the Program.
   * During the Program orientation at the beginning of the Program (or during the "orientation session" suggested above), be clear about the importance of an affirmative, harassment-free workplace, and how this Program is a learning experience. Discuss group dynamics, appropriate behaviors, and the goal of co-learning and support among all workers trainees regardless of gender, age, size, learning style, etc.
   * The "hiring committee" must give the recruitment partners (JTPA, organized labor) documented feedback as to why a potential worker trainee was not chosen to participate.
2) Was there a fit between their previous experience/skills with the projects?

a) The worker trainees possessed strong skills but in a somewhat narrow "band" (single-skilled). Some had strengths in falling trees, others in light construction or tree planting. Over the course of the Program, all of the worker trainees became more clear on what their existing KSAs were and how those skills could then be enhanced to make themselves "multi-skilled", and as such, more competitive in doing this kind of work.

b) Some folks had the perception that these workers would be "just laborers." Dan Shults, ODF District Forester, states "I was pleasantly surprised at the quality and experience level of the workers. Having dealt with other projects like this in the past, I was, quite frankly, pessimistic. I was wrong. The workers were very interested, dedicated, highly skilled and committed to the Program and doing a good job." The depth and breadth of the worker trainees' existing experience, when combined with the training, validated that these workers will become crew supervisors, self-employed contractors, etc. In short, they will be leaders in their field. These individuals will know where they stand in relation to the rest of this evolving forestry workforce. In fact, the design of the work component of the Program included weekly rotations of workers into a "crew leader" position. This had its challenges and its successes. Suggestions for improvement related to this is listed below.

c) Suggestions for the future:

* Develop "single projects" into project packages. This will lead to a stewardship approach, better utilizing all previous experience and skills.

* In linking private land projects with a Program, the worker trainees would accomplish the work, and would make important contacts for gaining employment in the private sector for habitat restoration work.

* It's important to have a lead worker assigned to each 5 or 6 person work team. This person will be a consistent contact for the foreman of the Program. This lead worker could be one of the worker trainees with the most advanced skills and leadership abilities. In addition, each of the other worker trainees on the team could rotate the responsibility as "straw boss" under the lead worker. This "straw boss" could be responsible for working up the bid on the project prior to the work date, and then practice their leadership of the team for the duration of that project; all with the oversight/support of the lead worker. This design will help all involved to improve their leadership skills.

3) Was the workers' project work performance acceptable? Could it be enhance? By what?

a) As previously stated, customers have expressed that they really like the quality of work done. One way that the Program could have been more helpful to the worker trainees would have been for increased cross training between worker trainees. Often, in order to quickly complete the project, too much emphasis was placed on letting the people with the strongest skills complete the task (i.e. letting the ex-fallers fall all of the trees). It would have been beneficial to require the lesser-skilled fallers to learn from the more-skilled fallers; maintaining safety at all times.
4) Did the workers develop exit plans & career trajectories?
   a) This was a part of the education/training, but could always be stronger. The worker trainees completed initial, mid, and final self assessments, participated in a series of career planning activities, and received a resource kit with appropriate listings of agency contacts, existing contractors, continuing education and business development resources. To date, at least two worker trainees have contacted potential employers, one has started his own contracting business, and one has obtained work in a different occupation (the employer made reference to the Program as a reason for the hire).

   b) A suggestion for the future would be to complement the initial self assessments with some career planning at the beginning. Continue with the assessments and career planning mid-stream and then make it more extensive at the end. The JTPA service provider (SWPIC) could help worker trainees with an Individual Service Strategy that would map out a personal career path, making sure that the end goal would be an unsubsidized job at a family wage of at least $9.00 per hour.

5) Workers earned a "certificate of completion" from the training and actual work experience associated with this Program. What will this get them?
   a) We believe that the "certificate of completion" will be useful to the workers in demonstrating to themselves what their KSAs are, and to the potential employers (public and private land managers, contractors, etc.) in recognizing the KSAs of this person and how those KSAs match the task(s) for which they are contracting/hiring. To do this, each worker trainee received a copy of their framed certificate of completion with a description of the Program on the back side (see appendix Document 1).

   b) However, it should be noted that because there is currently no experience or familiarity with such certificates in the industry, it is unclear how valuable this will really be in the job search. Here's what three different agency managers had to say about this:

   * Rolf Anderson, District Ranger, Sweet Home Ranger District, states "These certificates validate that the worker trainees accepted the responsibility to participate in a program designed to help them help themselves. These are traits that are very attractive to potential employers."

   * Dan Shults, ODF District Forester, states "From the perspective of the Department of Forestry, the workers will be a valuable asset in the future for us because of the fire training and actual experience they received this past summer. They are a "known" quantity... We would strongly consider these workers."

   * Lee Lauritzen, BLM Area Manager in Eugene, states "Should we be considering hiring a worker, the "certificate" would be useful information to verify their qualifications. Also if they were bidding on contracts it would be useful for us when we were evaluating bidder qualifications and experience."

   c) The Program was used as a test site to develop a new ecosystem management specialist apprenticeship program under the Oregon Apprenticeship Division of BOLI. If the new apprenticeship program is successfully implemented in FY 1995, we will be able to formally
involve future participants. In addition, FY 1994 worker trainees may be eligible for
apprentice credit for work and training completed that year.

III. The Education/Training
There was classroom and field-based training of over 216 hours, focusing on the knowledge,
skills, and abilities needed to successfully complete ecosystem enhancement projects. See
appendix Document 2 for details.

1) Did the training match the skills needed for the project work?
a) Feedback from the ODF supervisors and from agency customers suggested a good fit. It
appears the general scope of the training was on target. ODF felt the training session up front
was critical for employee safety and fire preparedness: "To do less would not only be
imprudent, it could result in substantial liability for the employing entity."

b) The timing between the project work and the training topic has been complementary in
many cases. Whenever possible, this is optimum.

c) Suggestions for the future:
* Have the training on contract bidding earlier in the Program, so as to provide some
foundation for the "straw boss" to do this on-the-ground bidding training. This
experience in preparing and submitting a bid, and tracking actual costs relative to bid
price, would significantly increase the worker's confidence and skills.

* Worker trainees requested that there be more field-based training, versus classroom
training.

* More training needs to be provided on botany, species identification, and survey and
measurement, and this training needs to be connected to the project work of this type.

2) Did the training match needs of participants?
a) Overall, yes. Some of the worker trainees felt that the two weeks of training up front and 8
hours per week, was too much class-room time. Others felt that the theory and wide variety
of topics helped them "put it all together" and recognize where they had to focus their skill
building. Most commented that they appreciated such an innovative, high-quality training
(given our budget limitations; $0 available for trainers!). Dedication and collaboration towards
the goal of this Program, and the opportunity to extend information to folks who are
committed to this developing industry, were listed as critical by the educators who
accomplished this task.

b) Some of the worker trainees felt that the tools they received in personal development were
much more effective than the training based on project work. Most came into the Program
from a passive role in the workforce. This Program gave them the tools to leave as leaders in
the evolving workforce; knowing that they would affect change. Most of these folks would
have found some type of employment. Instead they took the risk to participate in this
Program because they were attracted to the education component. This was important to them
during this life transition.
3) Was the training appropriate regarding breadth, depth, trainer selection, and design?
   a) Given the July-November duration of the project, most topics were covered as a "strong overview", and as such, the breadth was good, and the depth, though good, could have been lacking what it could have been with a longer program. In FY 1995, decreasing depth on some topics and increasing depth on others would be appropriate.

   b) The trainer selection was very innovative, utilizing a wide variety of educators (over 50) from universities, industry, community colleges, unions, agencies, etc. Worker trainees completed evaluations of the educators after each class and the overall rating has been "good" to "excellent." It should be noted that their dedication to their fields and willingness to collaborate on such an innovative program were critical to the success of the Program. And since there was no funding available for compensation, these trainers provided their services as an in-kind match or in some cases, through special support via the OSU Natural Resources-Dependent Families and Communities Project. Although this arrangement worked well in FY 1994, with expanded efforts in FY 1995, funding will be required to support up to 25% of the education/training.

   c) It is clear that it was important to provide innovative educators that are experienced in working with this type of adult learner. Cookbook curriculum based on classic classroom training would have been ineffective with this type of learner. Education/training sessions must be interactive, with lots of opportunity for hands on and cooperative learning. Long stints in the classroom are not desirable or effective with these learners. Therefore, it’s important to have the appropriate type of educator, the most innovative curriculum, and the most interactive design to make this type of training work.

4) Did the training help the workers to become more competitive? (See section II-5 above.)
   a) Working closely with project managers, the worker trainees demonstrated the ability to adjust the scope of the project work mid-process when details were difficult to specify ahead of time. This increases their competitiveness as this is not usually the case with contractors.

   b) The private companies and agency land managers who have seen the training schedule have commented on how this training will make these workers more attractive and therefore competitive. For example, Dan Shults, ODF District Forester, stated "Under ODF’s new stream rules that govern private land logging, credit is given for stream restoration work. If needed work is correctly done, additional timber can be removed in the riparian area that would have been set aside to later fall into the stream and generate habitat. This is a new concept and some landowners are interested. People skilled in doing this work right are in short supply."

5) Did the training match the types of KSAs that are needed in this evolving forest industry?
   a) As stated in section I-2b, there are two things happening at the same time. One is that this is an evolving forest industry. Another is that the forestry workforce is also evolving: (developing new KSAs that enhance their existing skills). Those in the industry who participated in the training as trainers or have viewed the training schedule have commented on its appropriateness for both of these transitions.
b) The training was clearly appropriate to the project work selected. Some felt the intensive training was an important factor in raising worker trainees’ level of interest in, and commitment to, the work. "Worker trainees left the Program with not only the project work experience and the education/training, but with increased self esteem and broader view of the industry. This will, no doubt, travel through their network of friends and colleagues in their communities."

IV. The Program As A Model
See appendix Table 3 for details related to costs, partners, etc.

1) Did the Program lead to short-term or long-term models that emphasize a high-skill, high-wage path to forest stewardship?
   a) Those responsible for coordinating the work and those responsible for coordinating the training developed some links among project work and training, thus providing a better model of the stewardship approach. Ultimately, how this will play out in the near future (FY 1995) is that several areas in the "owl region" are planning demonstration projects similar to the Program.

b) As was stated in previous sections, customers (federal land management agencies) have expressed their satisfaction with the quality of work done. They have also commented that they have recognized the need to be able to interact with the workers in defining the scope of some of the projects. Private industrial and non-industrial land owners have also expressed and interest in the Program, with regard to the restoration work they are doing and their plans for the future. In FY 1995, at least one region planning on having a program such as this Program will be including private land managers on the Steering Committee and ultimately as part of the work projects. (Table 4 includes a list of members of the FY 1994 Steering Committee).

c) The depth and breadth of the worker’s existing experience, and the group’s cohesiveness, when combined with the training have been and will be important factors towards a high-skill, high-wage path to forest stewardship.

d) The idea of long term payoff from investment in the high-skill path appears to be paying off even in the short term. This is evidenced in the fact that at the wage and benefit costs of the Program, the worker trainees completed projects at or under the budgeted project costs.

e) Programs like this Program might prove to be important in reducing the risk of losing more high-skilled members of the forestry workforce from the region because of lack of income earning opportunities. The availability of diversification training to complement their existing skills is very appealing to many workers.

f) In the coming years it may well prove to be important to work with contractors as well as agency land managers in designing projects. Much could be done to encourage and facilitate forward-looking contractors, acting as advocates for innovative project packaging and procurement procedures, to lead the effort for quality work and sustained employment.
2) Did it lead to demonstrated increases in compensation and skill standards?
   a) At this point it is still too early to tell. Diffusion of the high-skill, high-wage approach throughout the industry will probably take a long time. There is interest from local researchers to include the Program as part of a project that will lend information about this topic. We will also be monitoring, at 3, 6, and 12 month intervals, the job status progress of the nine worker trainee graduates.

3) Did the documented Program costs and project costs prove feasible to implement other programs in 1995-96?
   a) Since most projects were completed at or below what they would have been if let as contracts, it appears so. See appendix Table 3.

   b) In FY 1994, funding for wages and benefits paid during the training component came from an emergency grant from the USDA-FS Old Growth Diversification and Rural Community Assistance funds. We greatly appreciate having access to those funds and understand that they will not be available for FY 1995. Table 3 in the appendix states the estimated cost of training per participant in FY 1994 (typically less than $6,000 per participant on most DOL discretionary grants). For FY 1995, we are in the process of researching the availability of funding from Dept. of Labor for the training component for FY 1995. A work group made up of members from the Workers & Families and Ecosystem Investment Team subcommittees are working to get funding for training wages and support, and some support for educators.

4) What were the relationships involved? Who was in and who needed to be?
   a) Federal agencies: USDA-FS, BLM, DOL-JTPA; State agencies: the Governor’s Resource and Policy office, OEDD, ODF, etc.; Labor/Worker: Western Council of Industrial Workers, International Woodworkers of America, LERC; and Education: OSU Extension, U of O LERC.

   b) In the future, others who could be appropriate might be Tribal Representatives, other federal agencies like USF&W, SCS, Corps of Engineers, & SWCD, state agencies like ODF&W and the Employment Dept., private industrial forest land owners, and possibly existing community workforce groups, etc. It would be advantageous to have all groups involved as early as possible, say as the work projects are being identified.

What barriers were overcome and to what long-term benefit?
   * Barrier: Perception by many that there is not enough work. Long-term benefit: Increased awareness of land managers and forestry workers of the potential work to be done, well beyond what would yield "stop gap" employment/training. Several times in this document we have comments from land managers as to how this perception has changed. This is also being evidenced in the FY 1995 Federal Appropriations. The focus in FY 1995 and beyond will be on how to design and implement projects (spend the money) efficiently and effectively, not on whether or not there will be money to do the work. As Bob Warren, Governor’s Resource and Policy Team, states "For me the most important barrier involves the perception of "no work in the woods and no value to increase skills for jobs in the forest". It relates to the "can’t get there from here" attitude of many people. My view and how we approached this Program, was that we have to get there from here and so the barrier has to be broken. Our Program
attempted to hit it from both ends: showing there is a need for quality workers, that they do quality work, and that skill enhancement is the key to it all. Higher skills + higher self esteem + improved work ethics + motivation + opportunity = quality forest management.

* **Barrier:** The perception that workers would not want to enroll in the project.

**Long-term benefit:** Increased awareness of the interest and skill level of the existing forestry workforce by agency and private land managers (and the workers themselves). And by moving beyond the perception of this being only "stop gap" employment/training to the understanding of the evolving forest stewardship industry.

* **Barrier:** In FY 1994, some JTPA SDAs could not participate/provide financial support for training since there was no "documented demand" for long term potential jobs in the forest industry. **Long-term benefit:** There are two; 1) It’s important to train "within an industry" when that industry is evolving for future stability and success (see section I-2b), and 2) The concept of "documented demand" is good, however, with a forest industry that is evolving, documenting need may require more rigorous effort and possibly new sources of data. The challenge will be to access new sources of credible employment forecast materials through reputable sources, including but not limited to the State Employment Dept.

* **Barrier:** Funding logistics were difficult. **Long-term benefit:** The memorandums of understanding that existed or were developed to make FY 1994 work will be helpful to other regions. For example, finding the necessary hiring authority and position for ODF to participate as the "employer of record." By hiring the worker trainees through the cooperative fire program under the authority of the 1991 "Parent Agreement" with the USDA-FS, ODF had to use unfilled positions from around the state.

* **Barrier:** Identifying sufficient work within a compact geographic area. **Long-term benefit:** Interagency cooperation and coordination provided much more flexibility in developing a pool of potential projects. And that the worker trainee teams moved back and forth between BLM and USDA-FS projects with relative ease.

5) **Were the overall objectives met?**

a) This Program demonstrated that dislocated timber workers, ecosystem restoration projects, family wage jobs and education/training can be successfully linked. In terms of the objectives:

#1: Determine the quality and quantity of likely job opportunities associated with ecosystem restoration work. Although we are working hard at it, this appears to require more time and overcoming of barriers. See sections I-3 and IV-4b above. However, it should be noted that this objective led to the discovery of problems in the reforestation industry and the need for a renovated, total forest "stewardship" industry as a whole.

#2: Determine needed innovation:

a. **Contracting reforms.** Contracting reforms have not been accomplished but the need has been better defined and understood. One barrier overcome was the
importance of targeting the notification/promotion of the contracts to the affected communities/workers.

b. Industry structure. Although there is still much work to be done in this evolving forest industry, it should be noted that many parties are starting to at least acknowledge that the industry is evolving and the future possibilities with it.

c. Institutional partnerships. Bob Warren, Governor's Resource and Policy Team, states it eloquently when he says "The relationships between various government agencies, both federal and state, are important and worth noting. Even more impressive is the potential for these government agencies for expanded partnerships with non-government players to accomplish land management objectives. This can have expanded importance as the agencies continue to deal with down sizing their own staffs and look for creative ways to cut costs and get the work done locally."

d. Skill standards (KSA). This Program helped to understand and set these standards, as well as cooperate with others (BOLI, Dept. of ED., etc.) that are actively working in this area.

e. Training design. See the training section above. However, given the amount of funding we had to work with, the training/education part of the Program went very well and is an excellent example of a "truly innovative" way to create a learning environment that meets the needs and desires of the workforce. The training schedule (appendix Document 2) and the curriculum used will be invaluable to other regions in FY 1995 and beyond.

#3: Learn how to cooperatively design and package ecosystem projects to facilitate employment of dislocated timber workers, in a way that meets the multiple needs of timber workers, their communities and ecosystem restoration. We were successful in getting a commitment from the Regional Interagency Executive Committee to design projects to provide jobs and training. We got a commitment from the land management agencies to connect projects with training opportunities. This project did more by doing than we ever could have done by saying. The key now is to get this commitment from the RIEC and agency heads down through the ranks of the agencies to the project designers, managers, and contracting officers.

#4: Learn what mix of training formats, personnel, and content is appropriate to the worker trainees (based on their diverse needs) and the likely market demand. See the Training, Project, and Worker sections above. In addition, the following changes are suggested:

* Start with 12 (vs. 10) worker trainees. This will allow for some normal attrition throughout the season and maintain a viable number of people to complete project work.

* Good leadership must be available for these Programs. In FY 1994, Ron Henthorne, ODF crew foreman, and Brad Leavitt, USDA-FS Program work manager/coordinator, provided excellent managerial and technical supervision and direction. Without people of this caliber committed to the Program, the success we experienced would not have been possible.
* Set goals that after the Program, a minimum of 75% of participants will be in an unsubsidized job at a family wage of at least $9.00 per hour.

6) Did the Program meet its short term objectives (linking dislocated workers to restoration projects at family wages in FY 94)?
   a) Yes!

7) What are the appropriate working relationships for project design and implementation?
   a) Project designers/managers should keep employment/community impact objectives as one of the important design criteria. See the Projects section above.
   b) There needs to be understanding and recognition, by agency decision makers through the project designers/managers of the capability (KSAs), of the available workforce.
   c) The resource specialists and engineers should not be designing the projects in a "vacuum". Projects should be designed by a team including scientists, engineers, and practitioners, and where the capacity exists, knowledgeable workers on the site. This is true for implementation as well. For example, it is clear that writing some "specs" for certain types of restoration projects will be challenging at best. We have learned a lot about how to optimally deal with this situation. Brad Leavitt's experience in taking "off-the-shelf" projects and making them work on the ground (with worker input/expertise) would be invaluable to share with other regions.

8) What were the impacts on communities as a result of the Program, compared to non-pilot experience?
   a) The biggest impact was most evident in the geographic area where the Program was headquartered, Sweet Home. Brad Leavitt, USDA-FS Sweet Home Ranger District, said that he had noticed that the perception of the local community had changed over time. This was most evident in the local newspaper, where the first article was skeptical and pessimistic, and later articles were positive and supportive. Brad states "After the Program had been going for a few weeks and the local paper ran another story about it, Sweet Home community members would approach me to talk about the Program. A few even wanted to "sign up" to be a part of it." He goes on to say "Local stores commented on how much they appreciated the Program's help to and reflection on their community."

9) As a result of the Program, did we report outcome data as required for state-wide restoration project assessment?
   a) It is still unclear at this time what USDA-FS or BLM outcome measurement is required. For FY 1994, each BLM and USDA-FS management unit reported work accomplished with the Program as part of their overall watershed restoration program accomplishments. We have provided, through our mid- and final-evaluation report, information and data that will be helpful to several audiences.
APPENDIX

Table 1: Types of ecosystem restoration projects selected and completed during the 1994 Ecosystem Workforce Pilot Program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Riparian Projects</th>
<th>In-stream Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* planting</td>
<td>* mapping and inventory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* silviculture</td>
<td>* structure design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* structure creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* structure tie-down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* large woody debris placement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native Seed / Noxious Weed Management Projects</th>
<th>Non-riparian (upland) Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* native seed collection</td>
<td>* plantation exams/monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* noxious weed removal</td>
<td>* monitoring of genetic evaluation plantations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* hand pruning of trees and brush removal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* timber sale pre-sale work (special forest products)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engineering Projects</th>
<th>Road Stabilization Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* trails</td>
<td>* seeding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* fence building</td>
<td>* placing of erosion mats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* step structures</td>
<td>* fertilizing and mulching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
President Clinton’s Northwest Economic Adjustment Initiative

1994 Ecosystem Workforce Pilot Program
July 5 - November 14, 1994, Sweet Home, OR

Program Goal: To demonstrate that dislocated timber workers, ecosystem restoration projects, family wage jobs and education/training can be successfully linked.

Program Steering Committee: Rolf Anderson, Brad Leavitt USDA-Forest Service; Lee Lauritzen USDA-Bureau of Land Management; Dan Schults, Bill Lafferty Oregon Dept. of Forestry; Val Standley, Mel Wagoner Job Training Partnership Administration; Verle Steele Western Council of Industrial Workers, Local 2791; Bob Warren Governor’s Federal Forest & Resource Policy Team; Charles Spencer U of O Labor Education Research Center; and Flaxen Conway OSU Extension Service.

Worker Participants: Ten (9 men, 1 woman) dislocated forest industry workers, all from impacted communities in Western Oregon (Lebanon, Sweet Home, Holley, Oakridge, Swissome, Springfield). Four were loggers, three were wood products mill workers, and three were seasonal land-management agency workers. The age range was from mid-twenties to mid-fifties. They received $10.32/hr plus medical benefits.

Project Work: There were over $100,000 worth of USDA-FS and BLM projects completed. The workers performed over 544 hours (32 hours/week) of project work in many types of ecosystem enhancement:
   - Fencing, Aquatic Habitat Improvement, Riparian Habitat Improvement, Recreation Site Improvement, Native Seed Collection, Noxious Weed Control, Manual Brush Release, Stream Mapping, Thinning, etc.

Education/Training: There was classroom and field-based training of over 216 hours, focusing on the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed to successfully complete ecosystem enhancement projects:
   - Biological and Precision Knowledge such as: Stream Ecology I & II, Forest Ecology I & II, Fire Behavior/Fighting/Management, Forest Management I, II, & III (rules & regulations, silviculture, wildlife), Measurement & Survey, Equipment Operation in Restoration Environments, etc.
   - Technical and Safety Knowledge such as: Driver Training, Health & Safety, Chainsaw Safety, Hazardous Materials Handling, etc.
   - Business Development and Management Knowledge such as: Business Planning, Taxes, Laws & Regulations, Worker Performance Enhancement, Contract Bidding & Management, etc.

For More Information: For more information regarding the Program, the workers, the project work, the education/training or the educators, contact Bob Warren (503-986-0092), Charles Spencer (503-346-2787), Flaxen Conway (503-737-1418), or any other member of the Project Steering Committee.
## ORIENTATION & TRAINING, Weeks 1 & 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Training Topic</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-5</td>
<td>Introductions</td>
<td>Flaxen Conway, OSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overview of NWEAI</td>
<td>Bob Warren, Governor's Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overview of EWP and training</td>
<td>Flaxen Conway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work projects</td>
<td>Flaxen Conway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employee Orientation</td>
<td>Brad Leavitt, USFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overview of regional forest economy and labor market; recent changes</td>
<td>ODF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Union Orientation/OPEU</td>
<td>Bill Street, IWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-6</td>
<td>Greetings and overview of Federal NWEAI effort</td>
<td>Tony Corcoran, OPEU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self assessment: knowledge, skills and ability</td>
<td>Tom Tuchmann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Why learn about ecosystems?</td>
<td>Flaxen Conway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is ecosystem management?</td>
<td>John Cissel, Blue River Ranger Dist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ecosystem management in Oregon and the Pilot area</td>
<td>Rolf Anderson, Sweet Home Ranger Dist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-7</td>
<td>Apprenticeship programs; overview</td>
<td>Fran Bates, BOLI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Driver Training Level A</td>
<td>Apprenticeship Div.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hazardous materials</td>
<td>ODF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>Driver Training Level B</td>
<td>ODF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11</td>
<td>Health and Safety:</td>
<td>Sweet Home Fire Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work practices/OSHA code</td>
<td>ODF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First aid &amp; CPR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>Introduction to fire management, controlled fire and suppression; Fire behavior (S190)</td>
<td>ODF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-13</td>
<td>Basic fire fighting (S130)</td>
<td>ODF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-14</td>
<td>Basic fire fighting (S130)</td>
<td>ODF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fire shelter use</td>
<td>ODF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-15</td>
<td>Chainsaw, clearing saw and hand tool use and safety</td>
<td>John Garland, OSU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## WEEKS 3 THROUGH 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Training Topic</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fri., 7-22</td>
<td>Forest ecology 1:</td>
<td>Steve Fitzgerald, OSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Forestry Extension Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thur., 7-28</td>
<td>Forest ecology 2:</td>
<td>Katy Kavanaugh, OSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McDonald Forest field-training</td>
<td>Continuing Ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Farrell, OSU Forestry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ECOSYSTEM WORKFORCE
PILOT 1994
PLANNED RESTORATION PROJECTS
DRAFT ESTIMATE AS OF 12/8/94

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT NUMBER</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>HOOT</th>
<th>PLANNED DATE</th>
<th>ACTUAL DATE</th>
<th>CREW DAYS</th>
<th>CREW RATE</th>
<th>CREW COST</th>
<th>ADDITIONAL DOLLARS</th>
<th>PLANNED COST</th>
<th>ACTUAL COST</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH01</td>
<td>WALTON FENCE</td>
<td>FENCE BUILDING</td>
<td>SH-FS</td>
<td>7/18/94</td>
<td>7/18/94</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$768.00</td>
<td>$5,382.00</td>
<td>$4,594.00</td>
<td>$4,504.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH02</td>
<td>NOXIOUS WEED</td>
<td>ERADICATION</td>
<td>SH-FS</td>
<td>7-18</td>
<td>7-18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$768.00</td>
<td>$3,830.00</td>
<td>$3,064.00</td>
<td>$2,625.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH03</td>
<td>MOOSE CREEK</td>
<td>REC SITE IMPV.</td>
<td>SH-FS</td>
<td>7-25</td>
<td>7-25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>$768.00</td>
<td>$3,064.00</td>
<td>$2,451.20</td>
<td>$2,458.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH04</td>
<td>NOXIOUS WEED</td>
<td>PULLING</td>
<td>SH-FS</td>
<td>7-27</td>
<td>7-27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$768.00</td>
<td>$768.00</td>
<td>$768.00</td>
<td>$676.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH05</td>
<td>NOXIOUS WEED</td>
<td>ERADICATION</td>
<td>SH-FS</td>
<td>7-27</td>
<td>7-27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$768.00</td>
<td>$768.00</td>
<td>$768.00</td>
<td>$676.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH06</td>
<td>MOOSE CREEK</td>
<td>SURV &amp; FELLING</td>
<td>SH-FS</td>
<td>8-8</td>
<td>8-8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>$768.00</td>
<td>$5,362.00</td>
<td>$4,979.00</td>
<td>$4,103.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH07</td>
<td>SILV. EXAM</td>
<td>SURVEY</td>
<td>SH-FS</td>
<td>8-19</td>
<td>8-19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>$508.00</td>
<td>$1,824.00</td>
<td>$1,520.00</td>
<td>$1,165.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH08</td>
<td>NATIVE SEED</td>
<td>COLLECTION</td>
<td>SH-FS</td>
<td>8-29</td>
<td>8-29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$308.00</td>
<td>$308.00</td>
<td>$308.00</td>
<td>$308.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH09</td>
<td>SODA FORK CK</td>
<td>MAPPING</td>
<td>SH-FS</td>
<td>9-13</td>
<td>9-13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>$616.00</td>
<td>$1,848.00</td>
<td>$1,694.00</td>
<td>$1,778.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH10</td>
<td>SODA FORK CK</td>
<td>TIE DOWN</td>
<td>SH-FS</td>
<td>9-15</td>
<td>9-15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$308.00</td>
<td>$308.00</td>
<td>$308.00</td>
<td>$308.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH11</td>
<td>POST POLE SALE</td>
<td>TRAVERSE</td>
<td>SH-FS</td>
<td>9-24</td>
<td>9-24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$508.00</td>
<td>$2,432.00</td>
<td>$1,624.00</td>
<td>$1,604.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH12</td>
<td>PLANT. EVAL</td>
<td>GENETIC MONL.</td>
<td>SH-FS</td>
<td>9-27</td>
<td>9-27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>$616.00</td>
<td>$2,464.00</td>
<td>$2,159.00</td>
<td>$1,955.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH13-14</td>
<td>RIPARIAN PLANT</td>
<td>PLANTING</td>
<td>SH-FS</td>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>$1,400.00</td>
<td>$12,600.00</td>
<td>$7,000.00</td>
<td>$7,189.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT01</td>
<td>IN STREAM</td>
<td>DESIGN &amp; TIE DNO</td>
<td>DT-FS</td>
<td>9-6</td>
<td>9-6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$770.00</td>
<td>$1,300.00</td>
<td>$29,020.00</td>
<td>$28,162.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT02</td>
<td>ROAD STABILIZATION</td>
<td>SEEDING</td>
<td>DT-FS</td>
<td>8-23</td>
<td>8-23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$816.00</td>
<td>$1,300.00</td>
<td>$8,092.00</td>
<td>$5,647.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU01</td>
<td>RIPARIAN SILV.</td>
<td>CONFER RELEASE</td>
<td>BLM</td>
<td>8-2</td>
<td>8-2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$768.00</td>
<td>$5,128.00</td>
<td>$5,362.00</td>
<td>$4,981.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU02</td>
<td>HAND PRUNING</td>
<td>STAND IMPROV</td>
<td>BLM</td>
<td>10-24</td>
<td>10-24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$924.00</td>
<td>$7,392.00</td>
<td>$6,488.00</td>
<td>$5,747.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA01</td>
<td>RIPARIAN IMPROV</td>
<td>DISP. REC SITE</td>
<td>BLM</td>
<td>8-2</td>
<td>8-2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$1,078.00</td>
<td>$10,760.00</td>
<td>$7,546.00</td>
<td>$8,071.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL DAYS 124 107.45

TOTALS $102,948.00 $87,288.20 $84,814.24
### Ecosystem Workforce Pilot in Sweet Home, FT94

**Table 3: Spreadsheest of total Program costs and funding sources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>USDA Forest Service (USFS)</th>
<th>BLM</th>
<th>Other Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Restoration Project $</td>
<td>Misc.</td>
<td>Old Grth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoration Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td>77,423</td>
<td>77610</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>劲, Labor &amp; Fringe</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>77,423</td>
<td>77610</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup. &amp; Equipt</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10,780</td>
<td>77610</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Admin.</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>77610</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td></td>
<td>44,100</td>
<td>44100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages/trng. time *</td>
<td>44,100</td>
<td>44,100</td>
<td>44100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trainer Cost</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment &amp; Support</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td>55,410</td>
<td>55410</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LERC</td>
<td>23,710</td>
<td>23,710</td>
<td>23710</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU Extension</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governors Forest Policy Staff</td>
<td>11,400</td>
<td>11,400</td>
<td>11400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCIW Local 2791</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene BLM</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWPIC &amp; CSC</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>6400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Program Administration</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>12000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweet Home RD Coordinator</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweet Home RD Administration</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linn Dist ODF Administration</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$210,314</strong></td>
<td><strong>77610</strong></td>
<td><strong>15700</strong></td>
<td><strong>25000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Wages & Benefits

Paid to Worker/Trainees: $138,423  51.6% of total cost;  70.0% of "local" costs (excluding technical assistance).

Total in-kind: $60,694

Total Appropriations: $199,220

* These column items were appropriations; all others were in-kind.
Table 4: Description of worker trainees and steering committee members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worker Trainee</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Previous Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Bemetz</td>
<td>680 Crowfoot Rd., Lebanon, OR</td>
<td>258-5895</td>
<td>Mill worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn Blakesley</td>
<td>24675 Springer Rd., Sw. Home, OR</td>
<td>367-6196</td>
<td>Seasonal LMA worker**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Davis</td>
<td>39851 Little Fall Creek, Fall Creek, OR</td>
<td>726-1521</td>
<td>Seasonal LMA worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne Graham</td>
<td>2796 S Main #26, Lebanon, OR</td>
<td>259-1431</td>
<td>Mill worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Jefferson</td>
<td>120 Sturdevant Rd., Lebanon, OR</td>
<td>259-3640</td>
<td>Logger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana Kirk</td>
<td>320 Wheeler St., Lebanon, OR</td>
<td>451-3531</td>
<td>Seasonal LMA worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Lindsey</td>
<td>93165 Indian Cr. Rd., Swisshome, OR</td>
<td>268-4261</td>
<td>Logger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Martin</td>
<td>41235 Baptist Church Dr., Lebanon, OR</td>
<td>258-3344</td>
<td>Mill worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Skordahl</td>
<td>48421 McFarland Rd., Oakridge, OR</td>
<td>782-4650</td>
<td>Logger</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Other assorted data: 8 men, 1 woman; all from "severely affected" timber-dependent communities; ages ranged from late 20s to early 50s.

** Season LMA workers were seasonal forestry (USDA-FS or BLM) workers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steering Committee Members</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rolf Anderson</td>
<td>Sw. Home Ranger District, Willamette National Forest</td>
<td>367-5168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flaxen Conway</td>
<td>OSU Extension Service</td>
<td>737-1418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Lafferty</td>
<td>Oregon Dept. of Forestry</td>
<td>367-6108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Lauritzen</td>
<td>Bureau of Land Management, Eugene</td>
<td>683-6988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Leavitt</td>
<td>Sw. Home Ranger District, Willamette National Forest</td>
<td>367-5168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Shults</td>
<td>Oregon Dept. of Forestry</td>
<td>726-2505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Spencer</td>
<td>U of O, Labor Education Research Center</td>
<td>346-2787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Val Standley</td>
<td>SWPIC (JTPA)</td>
<td>687-3800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verde Steele</td>
<td>LSW Local 2791</td>
<td>367-4571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mel Wagoner</td>
<td>CSC (JTPA)</td>
<td>451-1071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Warren</td>
<td>Governor's Resource Policy Team / OEDD</td>
<td>986-0092</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Training Topic</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mon., 8-1</td>
<td>Stream ecology 1:</td>
<td>Stan Gregory, OSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri., 8-5</td>
<td>Stream ecology 2:</td>
<td>Paul Adams, OSU Extension Watershed Specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thur., 8-11</td>
<td>Forest management 1&lt;br&gt;The Forest Practices Act</td>
<td>ODF&lt;br&gt;(at Elks Lodge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tues., 8-16</td>
<td>Forest management 2&lt;br&gt;Silviculture</td>
<td>Rick Fletcher, OSU Forestry Extension Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon., 8-22</td>
<td>Forest management 3&lt;br&gt;Wildlife&lt;br&gt;Restoration</td>
<td>Dan Edge, OSU Extension Wildlife Specialist&lt;br&gt;Derek Godwin, OSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 1</td>
<td>Equipment operation in restoration environments&lt;br&gt;Welcome &amp; Introduction to Marion Creek Restoration project&lt;br&gt;- Overview: habitat risks&lt;br&gt;- Project design considerations: how plant, design and equip. op. linked&lt;br&gt;- Agency equipment standards; maint. for minimal impact&lt;br&gt;Equipment impact risks in stream project environments; on-going restoration project.</td>
<td>Terry Jones; Marion Forks Hatchery Mgr.&lt;br&gt;Gary Galovich, ODF&amp;W&lt;br&gt;Wayne Somes; Sw Home RD&lt;br&gt;Dave Klug; Detroit RD&lt;br&gt;Mark Jurasevich; Willamette Forest&lt;br&gt;Dave Halemeier &amp; Mike Jordan; Detroit RD&lt;br&gt;Lou Davidson; Super Hoe owner &amp; operator&lt;br&gt;Ed Fields; Operator / Owner, Tilth Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon, 9-12</td>
<td>Survey, measurement, recording&lt;br&gt;- Overview / Introduction&lt;br&gt;- Forest and riparian survey &amp; measurement. (Sample doc)&lt;br&gt;- Stream survey &amp; measurement.</td>
<td>Brad Leavit; SHRD&lt;br&gt;Ken Loree; SHRD&lt;br&gt;Wayne Somes; SHRD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wed, 9-21</td>
<td>Business Development I&lt;br&gt;Basic business accounting &amp; Business planning&lt;br&gt;Employment &amp; high performance practices</td>
<td>Dennis Sargent &amp; Marty Schultz (LBCC)&lt;br&gt;Dennis Sandow; Special Training Programs, U of O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon, 9-26</td>
<td>Business Development II&lt;br&gt;Laws and regulations&lt;br&gt;Cost Share Programs for Non-industrial Forest Landowners; Industrial Fire Prevention&lt;br&gt;Mid-way self assessment and career planning</td>
<td>Gabriel Silva; BOLI&lt;br&gt;Bill Lafferty; Sweet Home ODF&lt;br&gt;Flaxen Conway; Charles Spencer; [LCC Training &amp; Development]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thur, 10-6</td>
<td>Business Development III&lt;br&gt;Contracting: bidding and contract management</td>
<td>Jack Desmond; NRCA&lt;br&gt;Jan Hirt &amp; Jim Beltram; GCAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Training Topic</td>
<td>Presenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri, 10-7</td>
<td>Career Development &amp; Job Search</td>
<td>Toby Finklestein &amp; John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lloyd: LCC Training &amp; Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon, 10-10</td>
<td>Business Development IV-a</td>
<td>Mike Barsotti; ODF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The changing forest industry; opportunities in ecosystem management; first hand experience: Panel / Q &amp; A</td>
<td>Steve Cooper; Second Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brenda Jungwirth; Terra-X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lee Lancaster; CESCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fri, 10-28</td>
<td>High Performance Work Systems</td>
<td>Dennis Sandow; Special Training Programs, U of O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Business Development IV-b</td>
<td>Peter Mastenbroek; Avery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The changing forest industry; opportunities in ecosystem management; first hand experience: Panel / Q &amp; A</td>
<td>Properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Burt Udell, Master Woodland Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thu, 11-3</td>
<td>Business Development IV-c</td>
<td>Charlie Dewberry; Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The changing forest industry; opportunities in ecosystem management; / Q &amp; A</td>
<td>Rivers Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final Skills Assessment, Program Evaluation &amp; Job Search</td>
<td>Flaxen Conway &amp; Charles Spencer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>