

Appendix II

Methods

The methods described focus primarily on two major approaches utilized in the study: an institutional analysis that describes and analyzes how the institutional structures and relationships established by NEAI affect the implementation and community-level outcomes, and a community case study analysis to understand the effects of NEAI on workers and community well-being and capacity in the NEAI region.

Advisory Committee

At the onset of this study, an advisory committee was established to review and make recommendations concerning interviewees, study criteria, case study selection and research products, among other things. This committee consists of 15 members, most of whom have direct experience implementing NEAI through their participation on the Regional and State Community Economic Revitalization Teams, as part of an NEAI funding agency, and, for some, as both a funding agency representative and an Economic Revitalization Team participant. The committee includes representatives from state and federal agencies, tribes, universities, and rural communities. The committee worked loosely with the study team through in-person meetings, e-mail, document review and comment, interviews, and conference calls.

Institutional Analysis

The institutional analysis takes a retrospective look at the NEAI's institutional design. Data are derived from two principal sources: document review and stakeholder interviews. Previous research reports that evaluated aspects of the Initiative — or specific agency programs and projects — are examined, as were annual reports of participating entities. These reports contained lessons learned as well as perspectives on the Initiative's effectiveness. In addition, approximately 30 key federal, state, and local officials involved in the Initiative's design, or who were key agents in its implementation, were interviewed during the fall and winter of 2000-2001. Given the

constraints of time and available resources, not all individuals who played an important role could be interviewed. While a few in-person interviews were conducted when possible, most interviews were conducted by telephone. In consultation with a project advisory committee, individual interviewees were selected to ensure that the interview pool contained a cross-section of contacts from each organizational layer of the NEAI organizational structure (i.e., the national, regional, and state-level organizations established to facilitate the delivery of economic assistance), and to ensure that all three participating states—California, Oregon, and Washington—were represented. Four main open-ended questions provided the foundation for framing the interviews. They were purposefully designed to be broad in nature—as prompts to initiate discussion—allowing the interviewees latitude in “ranking” and bringing to the fore issues of utmost importance to them. The questions included:

1. What have been the biggest advantages/benefits of the NEAI's institutional design?
2. What have been the biggest disadvantages of the NEAI's institutional design?
3. How effective has the NEAI been in reaching the people it was supposed to affect? Has the overall institutional design facilitated or impeded this linkage? How? Is there anything that wasn't done that you would have liked to see accomplished?
4. What changes in institutional design should be recommended to anyone considering this as a model for similar future efforts to deal with communities and workers facing a transition from a resource-dependent economy?

Because several interviewees were promised anonymity, quoted material from the institutional interviews is not attributed to any particular individual.

As an organizing framework, NEAI institutional relationships are examined through the lens of the

policy design framework outlined by Schneider and Ingram (1997). In addition to recognizing the importance of the societal and issue context within which policies are framed, the policy design framework dissects policies into several core empirical elements:

goals or problems to be solved, agents, target populations, rules, tools, rationales, and assumptions... Goals or problems signify what is to be altered or attained as a result of policy. Target populations refer to the people, groups, and/or organizations whose behavior or capacity the policy is intended to change or effect... Agent(s) refers to the institutions that are part of the formal governance structure and are responsible for the development and delivery of policy.... Tools are those aspects of policy design intended to bring about the policy-relevant behavior of agents and targets... Rules specify the procedures for policy-relevant action and include definitions, qualifications, standards, and criteria. Rationales are the explanations and reasons given that justify, legitimate, and explain the policy. Assumptions are the implicit or explicit underlying premises that connect the elements...(Schneider and Ingram 1997, p. 82).

The institutional analysis examines the institutional challenge of the Initiative, and describes in more detail the policy problems the Initiative was designed to address. It also examines the target populations, the rationales and assumptions that shaped the scope and content of the economic assistance program, and the rules and tools used to guide implementation. Target populations, the analysis suggests, were two-fold. The direct and immediate populations that the Initiative was designed to assist were the forest sector workers, communities, and businesses whose lives and economies were affected by changes in the timber economy. However, the Initiative was also explicitly designed to change the behavior and capacities of the policy agents (or implementers) responsible for program administration.

Consequently, particular attention is devoted to the agents of policy design and the innovative organizational structure that was established to implement the Initiative and to deliver economic assistance to the Northwest. The various components of the structure at the national, regional, and state levels—the Multi-Agency Command (MAC), the Regional Economic Revitalization Team (RCERT), and the three state Economic Revitalization Teams (SCERTs)—are described, and the factors influencing the effectiveness of their operation are examined.

Community Case Studies

In addition to understanding the institutional relationships and structures of NEAI, the more detailed focus of this assessment is on the Initiative's effects on workers and communities. We felt it was critical to understand how NEAI played out in communities, and amidst the social and economic realities of people's daily lives. Too many studies focus on county or larger units of analysis because that is the unit for which there is the most comprehensive and current data (Kusel 2001). Indeed, some early Initiative success was identified using aggregate level statistics that had little relationship to what went on in many of the smaller rural communities (e.g., Raettig et al. 1998; Reyna et al. 1996). Often county-level or similar aggregate data are too broad to discuss outcomes and effects of projects, like those associated with the Initiative, that are designed to effect community conditions and individual workers. Additionally, projects may take a year or more to show effects. This study was built on the premise that only by focused learning in communities can individual project effects be isolated and NEAI as a program be understood.

Study Design

The community assessment uses a multiple case study design to analyze the impacts of the NEAI on community well-being and capacity. Referred to as multi-site research or collective case studies, this approach involves the joint study of a number of cases to understand a particular phenomenon, population or general condition (Herriott and Firestone 1983, Stake 2000). Yin (1993) defines a case

study as “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident (p.13).” A multiple case study approach was used to assure that a suite of diverse projects was included to address the complexity associated with the many projects, communities and their contextual settings that themselves affect outcomes. This study design consequently allows us to develop a richer and more clearly articulated theory of rural community and economic development than would have been possible using either random sample surveys or a single case study approach.

A total of 31 case studies, including 34 communities, were evaluated in this study. Most qualitative research indicates that 20 to 40 cases normally captures the majority of variation present, even in very complex situations. Due to the diversity of projects and programs, and variations in community histories and background contexts, we felt that 31 case study communities would effectively capture the range of variability among communities included in the Initiative. This number would also provide sufficient replication within the three states (California, Oregon, and Washington), among Native American communities, and among communities with varying levels of capacity. This design uses what Yin (1994) refers to as “replication logic” in contrast to “sampling logic,” which is used to represent an entire universe or pool. With replication logic, cases are selected so as to predict similar outcomes (literal replication) or varying outcomes for predictable reasons (theoretical replication) (Yin 1994).

Variables of Interest

Variables of interest for the NEAI assessment effects include socioeconomic condition and community capacity as static and dynamic components of community health, respectively. Socioeconomic condition is evaluated through interviews, focus group sessions, and an assessment of states and trends in socioeconomic measures. Socioeconomic measures used in this study include, among others, quantitative measures such as poverty, unemployment, population, income, education and training, and per-

cent of elementary school students eligible for free and reduced lunches. This latter measure is particularly useful because these data are collected annually by every school and are readily available. Socioeconomic measures at the community level are often difficult to obtain, especially for many of the smaller, unincorporated communities, hence our focus on qualitative assessment. Qualitative assessment also offers opportunities for making causal and associational project and outcome connections that quantitative data cannot, especially where such data are limited and baseline data are absent.

Community capacity is evaluated primarily through qualitative information obtained through interviews and focus groups and, secondarily, through diverse quantitative measures. Quantitative measures include but are not limited to measures of poverty and unemployment. Poverty itself is one aspect of community capacity because it suggests not only reduced opportunity for some residents but a failure of a community and society to respond to resident needs. Low education levels and limited skills and training opportunities reflect reduced human capital and the need for human capital improvement opportunities. Evaluating social capital involves assessing, among other things, how individuals and groups work together, creating and utilizing diverse forms of knowledge to improve local opportunities and community capability. It involves the ability of residents to collectively solve problems, advocate for themselves, and mobilize organizations and structures to actively respond to the conditions they face.

Unit of Analysis

Because the primary objective of this study is to understand the effects of the NEAI on community well-being and community capacity in communities and the region, our unit of analysis is the place-based community. “Community,” as defined here, refers to place-based shared identity (Gusfield 1975), and joins social relations and a bounded territory in a “setting for interaction” (Massey 1994:139). In general, we delineated communities by their political boundaries (i.e., incorporated cities and towns, unincorporated rural service areas, school districts). In some cases, however, clusters of communities are analyzed to-

gether when they share common administrative, economic, social, and/or geographic ties (e.g., Illinois Valley, Alsea-Lobster Valley). For example, we analyze the Illinois Valley in southwest Oregon, which includes one incorporated city (Cave Junction), several unincorporated hamlets (Takilma, O'Brien, Kerby, Selma, and Holland), and a large number of homesteads scattered throughout the Illinois River Basin. Inclusion of the entire valley (including the unincorporated communities and independent settlements) was logical in this case because most NEAI projects were administrated and prioritized through a valley-wide Community Response Team (the Illinois Valley Community Response Team). In other cases, when distinct governing bodies and administrative structures are embedded within a single political unit, the governing unit defines the "community." For example, the Skokomish Indian Reservation is located within the political boundaries of the city of Shelton, Washington. As a sovereign tribal nation, the governing body of the tribe is completely separate from the city, and the county, and funding channels for the NEAI are consequently distinct. Thus, in this case, we analyze the city of Shelton and the Skokomish Indian Tribe as separate communities.

In addition to using the community as the primary unit of analysis, displaced timber workers constituted a "sub-unit" of analysis embedded within each community. Our initial definition of "timber worker" was an individual employed in the direct harvesting of timber (i.e., loggers) or involved in the transportation and manufacturing of raw logs (e.g., log truck drivers and mill workers). As we began our casework, however, we soon realized that this definition needed to be expanded to include other types of workers. For example, federal and state forest procurement contracts (e.g., road construction, thinning, tree planting) were significantly reduced as a result of declines in timber harvesting, thus reducing jobs for forest contractors and many mobile forest workers. Many of those directly employed by federal land management agencies (i.e., U.S. Forest Service and BLM) also lost their jobs or were forced to relocate and secure work elsewhere as a result of reductions in harvesting on federal lands. In addition, for coastal communities, there was often significant

crossover between the timber and fisheries industries, with declines in salmon and groundfish harvests consequently affecting timber workers. Our interest in displaced workers thus expanded to include those employed in natural resource-related work with a primary focus on forest industries.

Selection of Case Study Communities

Selection of case study communities was based on a combination of predetermined criteria and "local knowledge" about communities provided by the advisory committee. To select case study communities based on predetermined criteria required that we first identify all communities that received assistance through the NEAI. The most comprehensive databases were maintained by each state agency that administered the SCERT (State Community Economic Revitalization Team) process. These agencies are the Oregon Economic and Community Development Department (OECDD), the Washington Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development (CTED), and the California Resources Agency (and more recently the California Department of Trade and Commerce). Each agency kept an electronic database of CERT-funded projects as well as hard copies of project application forms. Data on funded projects included the county and sometimes the community in which the project occurred, a CERT identification number, fiscal year, amount funded, applicant, project name, project category, and sometimes (but not always) the funding agency. Databases varied among the three states in terms of both the depth and breadth of information provided, as well as accuracy. For projects that had no community name, we reviewed the application form to learn which community(ies) the project affected. Using the data provided by each state, we compiled our own database of CERT-funded projects. Additional Initiative project data that had not been included in the state databases were added and the accuracy of our database was crosschecked with information from the federal funding agencies (e.g., Forest Service's Rural Community Assistance Program, USDA Rural Development, and the Economic Development Administration).

Appendix II: Methods

Once our database was established, we were able to sort funded projects by county and community. We developed additional selection criteria based on the information provided in the database. Our selection process is described as follows:

1. We selected the top 20 to 30 communities from each state that received significant projects and funding, or that were located in heavily funded counties. Because the focus of this study is on understanding the effects of NEAI projects and the program, we tried to select communities where NEAI activity was most concentrated.
2. We concentrated our selection on communities with populations under 20,000, with the majority under 10,000. This preference for smaller communities was based on our interest in understanding the NEAI impacts on rural communities. Also, most communities funded by NEAI had populations under 20,000, and we felt that NEAI effects would be more readily apparent in smaller communities.
3. We then gave preference to communities with a diversity of project categories to insure that we covered a suite of project types.
4. We also tried to select communities that participated in the CERT process for a minimum of three years.
5. We tried to insure that communities designated as “timber distressed”¹ by SCERT administrative agencies were included. We also looked at additional socioeconomic measures (poverty, unemployment, percent of elementary school children eligible for free and reduced lunch), to insure that we included communities that were most in need of funds.
6. We included a number of tribal communities to assure that the final pool of communities included the tribes because of their different status and because they would further diversify the case studies and lessons learned.

Using these selection criteria, we developed a “short list” of 60 potential case study communities. This list was then presented to the NEAI advisory committee, which made recommendations based on their experience and knowledge of communities and projects. The advisory committee’s recommendations were critical in determining cases that they thought we could learn the most from, and at times overrode

Table II.1 Case study communities

Oregon	Washington	California
Alsea	Hoquiam	Bridgeville / Dinsmore
Astoria	Colville	Happy Camp
Cascade Locks	Darrington	Hayfork
Cave Junction / Illinois Valley	Forks	Hoopa
Eagle Point / White City	Neah Bay	McCloud
Garibaldi	North Bonneville / Stevenson	Upper Lake
Klamath Falls	Omak	Weed
Mapleton	Packwood	
Myrtle Creek	Shelton	
Oakridge	Skokomish	
Port Orford		
Roseburg		
Sweet Home		
Warm Springs		

1. Timber distressed” communities were identified by Oregon Economic and Community Development Department in Oregon using index-based socioeconomic data. In Washington, a similar index was developed for timber-distressed counties, with highly distressed counties designated as Special Emphasis Areas.

the selection made from the criteria listed above. Selection of cases was thus purposive (versus random), and designed to promote the greatest learning. Stake (2000:447) notes that, “selection by sampling of attributes should not be the highest priority...Balance and variety are important; opportunity to learn is of primary importance.” Using the recommendations made by the advisory committee and further investigations into projects and communities, we selected a total of 31 case study communities: 14 in Oregon, 10 in Washington, and seven in California. One case in each state, Bridgeville-Dinsmore in California, Eagle Point-White City in Oregon, and North Bonneville-Stevenson in Washington covered two communities bringing the total number of communities included in the case studies to 34. Because NEAI funds were not equally distributed across the three states, we adjusted the number of cases to approximately represent the ratio of funding received by each of the states. For example, because Oregon received the bulk of Initiative dollars, we selected more cases in Oregon because more communities participated and there was a greater diversity of projects and contextual settings. See Table II.1 for case study communities included in the assessment.

Case Study Fieldwork

The first eight case-study communities provided an iterative research approach from which our methodology was finalized. Two researchers were assigned to a community, with one researcher “leading” the project. The other researcher assisted and observed, preparing to lead the next community. Having two researchers working together allowed us to develop consistency in field methods, and allowed for discussion and cross-referencing of field observations.

Prior to entering a community, one to two weeks were allocated to obtain background information on the community, review any written documentation on NEAI-funded projects, make contacts, and setup interviews. To obtain a basic understanding of NEAI-funded programs and projects in a community, we began by collecting all available CERT-funded applications that were available through each state’s CERT-administering agency.

These forms provided the bulk of documentation that existed for a given community and project but, in some instances, they were incomplete or missing. In these cases, funding agencies were contacted to obtain a copy of the project proposal and any available final or accomplishment reports.

In certain cases, projects and programs were not funded through the CERT process, and thus not included in the databases. Examples of these types of projects or programs included Jobs-in-the-Woods projects and contracts, and Title III Secretary’s Reserve funds or “timber grants” funded under the Department of Labor’s Job Training and Partnership Act. For these programs we contacted participating federal and state agencies directly to obtain project information.

Because of the incompleteness and ambiguities in the state databases, we established that all projects listed in the CERT databases would be included in our community case study assessments. Displaced timber worker retraining programs were included regardless of whether or not they appeared in the state CERT databases. For other non-listed projects and programs, we spoke with agency personnel and community residents to determine whether or not they should be included.

An initial list of contacts was created from CERT project applications. The NEAI advisory committee members familiar with projects were able to provide us with local contacts. Additional names were obtained through snowball sampling, in which those contacted were asked to recommend other relevant contacts. Perspectives of local agencies and government representatives were important in understanding institutional structure at the community level and how institutional intent played out on the ground. Additionally, perspectives of local residents familiar with NEAI were vital to our understanding of both project impacts and local context. As a result, we contacted those who had been directly connected with a particular NEAI-funded project or program, including those that had facilitated the funding process, and those that were recipients and/or beneficiaries of funds. We also contacted community leaders and informed local citizens, as well as people who contributed di-

verse community perspectives on projects. Because of our interest in understanding the effects of NEAI on displaced timber workers, we also made an effort to contact workers who had been laid off or lost their job within the past ten years. Locating these individuals was often problematic because of confidentiality issues within social service agencies and because many workers had already left the community.

Individuals were contacted by phone one to three weeks prior to the interview date. The phone conversation consisted of providing a brief description of the project, and then asking if the individual would be willing to participate in an interview or discussion group. Individuals were then asked if they could recommend others that would be useful to talk to.

Data Collection

Individual Interviews

Following the initial set-up period, we spent five to 10 days in the community conducting interviews. Individual interviews were semi-structured in that they were open-ended yet focused on a specific set of questions posed by the interviewer. Appendix A provides a list of the types of questions that were asked during interviews. Questions focused on NEAI-funded projects, the role of the interviewee in the project, project outcomes, and barriers to or characteristics of success. Interviews also included a discussion of the community, how it may or may not have changed over the course of the NEAI funding, and the relationship of the change to NEAI supported projects. Interviews were hand-written, tape recorded, or directly typed onto a laptop computer, and averaged one to two hours in length. The number of people interviewed per community ranged from 15 to over 30, depending upon the complexity and size of the community as well as the number of projects.

Additional Information-Gathering Methods

In addition to one-on-one interviews, other methods of information gathering were employed as a means of triangulation. Triangulation is defined as a “process of using multiple perceptions to clarify meaning and verify the repeatability of an observation or interpretation (Stake 2000:443).” Stake (2000) further states that “acknowledging that no ob-

servations or interpretations are perfectly repeatable, triangulation serves also to clarify meaning by identifying different ways the phenomenon is being seen (pp. 443-4).”

a. Group interviews: Group interviews took place in the form of (1) focus groups and (2) “feedback sessions.” Madriz (2000) defines focus groups as a “collectivistic rather than an individualistic research method that focuses on the multi-vocality of participants’ attitudes, experiences, and beliefs (p. 836).” Because social interaction is a key element of focus groups, the process of sharing ideas, opinions, and experiences facilitates the “social construction of meaning (Madriz 2000:841)” and the development of “shared stocks of knowledge (Holstein and Gubrium 1995:71).” For this assessment, focus groups ranged in size from three to 12 people, depending upon the focus group topic, information required, and our ability to recruit participants. Participants were selected because they were (1) familiar with the focus group topic (i.e., were involved in a particular NEAI-funded project or program); (2) were active in the community; and/or (3) increased the diversity of community perspectives on issues. Researchers determined focus-group composition, location, and times, often with help from key community contacts or local agencies (i.e., JTPA administering agencies). In several cases (e.g., Packwood and Darrington), youth focus sessions were held. Focus group interviews typically were two hours in duration, although some lasted three and more hours. Researchers followed an interview guide, keeping written notes as well as tape recording discussions. Questions focused on (1) the history of the community, particularly in the early 1990s; (2) opinions, effects, and outcomes of NEAI-funded projects; (3) key issues, assets, and challenges facing the community today; and (4) expectations about the future of the community.

Feedback sessions were follow-up discussions among people who had previously been interviewed. The objectives of the feedback sessions were to allow the researcher to present to the community what he/she had learned through interviews. Participants would then confirm observations, offering feedback

about the researcher's interpretations. In addition to serving as a means of validation, feedback sessions provided an opportunity for interviewees to participate more fully in the research process by receiving and commenting on our observations and preliminary syntheses of information. Feedback sessions were also useful in that they forced the researchers to summarize collected information while still in the community.

b. Observation: Field reconnaissance included general community tours and visits to project sites (e.g., industrial park sites, watershed restoration sites, infrastructure development sites, newly constructed facilities) to better-understand project impacts and results. We also attended community meetings, gatherings, and events (e.g., city council meetings, rotary club meetings, senior lunch programs) to listen and learn about local issues and concerns.

c. Review of Existing Documentation: We collected and reviewed any written documentation (e.g., project proposals, agency reports, memos, articles, community strategic plans) on projects and communities that was available from the community or funding agency.

d. Review of Historical Documents: We also collected historical information on case study communities to place the NEAI interventions within a broader temporal context. Historical information was obtained by visiting community historical societies, museums, and local libraries; and through interviews with old timers and local historians. Historical documents included articles from the local newspapers, and books and articles about the history of the community.

e. Secondary Statistics: Quantitative data were obtained from secondary sources, and included 1990 and 2000 Census Place data, school data obtained from the National Center for Education Statistics, and available state and local surveys. The quantitative data were used to supplement qualitative information and provide contextual understanding of socioeconomic conditions and trends in a community.

Data Analysis

Our framework for analysis is divided into two separate components. The first focuses on the effects of NEAI projects and programs on community well-being and community capacity, including understanding NEAI effects on displaced timber workers. We use the "capitals" approach to capacity mentioned above to inform and guide this portion of our analysis.

In addition to assessing changes in community capacity as a consequence of NEAI interventions, our study also examines the reasons for success and/or failure of NEAI-funded projects and programs. Specifically, we look at the obstacles and barriers of service delivery to communities, as well as the factors that led to project/program success. Using a grounded theory approach (Strauss 1997, Charmaz 2000), we focus on emergent patterns and themes surrounding the outcomes of interventions. Grounded theory uses empirical evidence to develop hypotheses and theories. In contrast to inductive theory, however, which is used exclusively to generate hypotheses, grounded theory combines induction, deduction, and verification through an iterative process of data collection and analysis (Strauss 1987). That is, grounded theorists "develop analytic interpretations of their data to focus further data collection, which they use in turn to inform and refine their developing theoretical analyses" (Charmaz 2000:509). Hypotheses generated from "on-the-ground" research thus are continually checked, tested, and verified through further information collection, reflection, and discussion.

Throughout the preparation and data collection phases of case study fieldwork, researchers kept notes of both interviewee responses and personal reflections. These notes were then sorted for use in the write-ups of case reports. Some researchers used computer-assisted techniques, including programs like NUD-IST and Ethnograph, to aid in coding, sorting, and integrating data. Others used hand coding and sorting methods.

We followed a standard outline for a case write-up (Appendix II-A). The outline was developed using an iterative process, based on information acquired during the first eight communities studied. Once drafts of case studies were completed,

Appendix II: Methods

researchers then circulated copies to interviewees for comment and feedback. This form of feedback provided a means to verify and correct factual information as well as to allow for greater participation among community members in the analytical process by discussing observations and interpretations.

Communication among the research team via e-mail, team meetings, monthly conference calls,

one-on-one discussions, and sharing of case reports and notes also provided a means of bringing together the collective knowledge and varied experiences of the team. These practices helped identify emerging patterns and themes. The team's shared reflections helped advance the iterative nature of the grounded theory approach, and enabled refinement of questions during the fieldwork.

Appendix II A

Interview Questions for NEAI Community Assessment

Introduction

How did you come to live in this community?
(If applicable) How did you get involved with NEAI?

Institutional

Could you begin by describing the process/relationship/programs (i.e. CERT, JTPA, etc.)?
Who could participate? Who did?
Did participation evolve/change over time? How?
How effective were projects?
How effective was the Initiative as a whole?

(FOR CERT)

How were projects prioritized?
Who was involved in that process? (Names/affiliations)
What criteria were used to prioritize projects?
What were some of the benefits to the CERT process?
What were the limitations?
Do you think the process made it easier to get federal aid?
What prevented/enabled the community to successfully receive funds?
How could the process/relationship/program be improved?

CERT Projects

Please describe the projects that came into this community.
Who developed these projects? Who sought funding?
Without NEAI, would these projects have been funded? If so, how and by what organization(s)?
What issues were the projects designed to address?
Who were these projects intended to serve?
Were these people served?
Of the projects you are familiar with, which would you consider successful? Why?
What contributed to these successes?
Which projects would you consider unsuccessful? Why?
What effect did the projects have on the community?
Did any of these projects lead to (1) other community projects? (2) other community activities? (3) additional community awareness?
What could have been done to better serve the community?
What issues did projects fail to address?
What kinds of jobs, if any, were created as a result of the Initiative?
How would you describe the quality of these jobs?

Community

Seven years ago, when the NEAI program was first initiated, what were key issues facing this community?
What were the strengths and assets in the community then?
What were the greatest challenges facing this community?
Who were the people most in need?
How did the projects address their needs?
What sorts of changes have you observed in the community since then? (including physical, attitudinal, demographic, degree of participation in community events/organizations, etc.)
What do you attribute these changes to?
How would you describe the community today?
What are the strengths and assets that you see today?
What are the greatest challenges facing the community today?
Who are most in need?

Capacity

How did projects impact the level of collaboration in the community?
What was the key event or catalyst that initiated change (if any) for the community?
What allowed the community to bring in projects?
Who were the key individuals involved?
Has there been an in- or out-migration of residents to or from the community?
Who has moved out?
Why did they leave?
Who has moved in?
Why have they come?
How have the projects impacted the ability of the community to address change?

Appendix II B

Draft Case Report Outline

(Community Name), (State),
(Case study conducted by
Researcher and Second, if applicable)

List of NEAI Projects

- Table listing community and county-level projects plus relevant state, regional, multi-state projects/ programs
- Chronologically ordered, but modified for multi-year projects
- Separation of community and county-level projects

Background Context

Brief History

- Historical context for understanding key issues
- Organized thematically or chronologically, but limited to relevant, critical events
- Could include secondary statistics, such as population, income, dominant economic sectors
- What is the history of the community as it relates to NEAI?

Key Issues

- Key issues facing the community in the early 1990s
- Also any relevant mill closures that took place in the 80s that have had long-term effects

NEAI Projects and Programs

(State) Community Economic Revitalization Team

Institutional Structure and Function

- Include key institutional players
- How projects were developed, prioritized, funded

Projects

- Projects funded through the CERT process
- Funding agency(ies) and amount
- Objectives and outcomes
- Why were the projects proposed?
- How did they fit within the larger picture?
- How did projects connect in time and space with other projects and events?

Jobs-in-the-Woods

- Institutional structure and function
- Projects funded under JITW
- Name(s) of funding agency(ies) and amount
- Objectives and outcomes
- Why were the projects proposed?
- How did they fit within the larger picture?
- How did projects connect in time and space with other projects and events?

Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA)

- Institutional Structure and Function
- Program

Effects of NEAI Projects on Community Well-Being

Socioeconomic Condition

- Quantitative and qualitative information on the impacts of NEAI on socioeconomic measures (e.g., poverty, unemployment, income, education and training)
- Recent statistics (e.g., 2000 census data—not yet available), school free lunch data, other recent statistics)

Community Capacity

- Effects of NEAI on “community capacity” (i.e., “the collective ability of residents in a community to respond to external and internal stresses, to create and take advantage of opportunities, and to meet local needs”)
- Effects on physical, financial, human, cultural, social “capital” (See “Capital for NEAI” file for further definition of community capacity)

Effects of NEAI on Workers

- Impacts of NEAI on displaced timber workers and their families

Patterns and Themes Associated With NEAI Interventions

- What were some of the obstacles/barriers to service delivery for communities?
- What factors led to project/program success?

Conclusions

References

Appendix

- List of Interviewees
- List of focus group participants

Appendix II C

Individuals Interviewed for the Institutional Assessment

Berblinger, Anne	Economic Development Administration, Department of Commerce; Oregon and California CERT, and RCERT
Berkholtz, Karin	Washington Rural Community Assistance Team, WA-CERT and RCERT
Brumm, Tom	Oregon Economic and Community Development, OR-CERT, RCERT
Campbell, Bill	Oregon Economic and Community Development, OR-CERT
Connaughton, Kent	Forest Service, Office of Forestry and Community Assistance, RCERT
Duff, Scott	USDA Rural Development, RCERT
Fawbush, Wayne	USDA Rural Development, MAC
Gilman, John	Small Business Administration, RCERT
Gloman, Nancy	US Fish and Wildlife Service, RCERT
Gorton, Terry	California Resources Agency, CA-CERT, RCERT
Herst, Eric	USDA Rural Development, RCERT
Judd, Dean	Rural Community Assistance Team, WA-CERT, RCERT
Jungwirth, Lynn	Watershed Research and Training Center
Kenops, Darrel	Forest Service, Willamette National Forest; ORCERT
Leinan, Dan	City of Forks, Washington
Lyons, Jim	USDA Under-Secretary of Agriculture for Natural Resources and the Environment
McBride, Mary	USDA Rural Development, WA-CERT
McGinty, Katie	White House, Chair, Council on Environmental Quality
Marshall, Steve	Forest Service, MAC
Mendoza, Juan	Willamette Valley Reforestation, Inc.
Motanic, Donald	Intertribal Timber Council, RCERT
Raettig, Terry	Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station
Rheiner, Bob	Bureau of Land Management, RCERT
Saranich, Ron	Forest Service State and Private Forestry, Region 6, MAC, RCERT
Scott, Bill	Oregon Economic and Community Development, OR-CERT, RCERT
Stauber, Karl	Deputy Under-Secretary for Rural Development, MAC
Stanley, Mark	California Resources Agency, Department of Forestry, RCERT, CA-CERT
Sullivan, Francie	County Supervisor, CA-CERT, RCERT
Tuchmann, Tom	Office of Forestry and Economic Assistance
Yu, Peter	White House, National Economic Council