

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE CREATION OF THE JOB CORPS CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CENTERS

The U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service has been an operator of involvement in operating Job Corps Civilian Conservation Centers for over 45 years, however much of the history of Job Corps' establishment, and the central role played by the Forest Service in creating and implementing the program, has been forgotten. Today, some question why land management agencies remain involved in operating the program. In fact, over the last decade most land management agencies that had operated Job Corps Civilian Conservation Centers since the program's creation have transitioned out of that role. The U.S. Forest Service is the sole operator of Job Corps Civilian Conservation Centers. What follows is a brief history of the U.S. Forest Service's involvement in Job Corps, including the story of how and why it became involved in the creation of the program, as well as how its involvement has contributed both to the Forest Service's mission.

THE LEGACY OF THE CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS

The legacy of the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCCs) is one that is widely accepted as one of the most important undertakings of the U.S. Forest Service. The vast majority of those involved with the program, whether participants or administrators in the land management agencies, attest to the remarkable success the program has had in empowering young Americans while investing in conservation work that preserved the value of our nation's natural resources. Since the 1940s Forest Service champions have repeatedly called for the recreation of the New Deal Civilian Conservation Corps program, mostly recently as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act.

Today's Job Corps emerged, in large part, from efforts to recreate the Civilian Conservation Corps. In 1959, **Minnesota Senator Hubert Humphrey** led a congressional campaign to permanently create a Civilian Conservation Corps program. The effort failed, but Humphrey continued to promote the program as a means to save "trees, land, and boys." The 1961 Kennedy Taskforce subsequently recommended a supplemental appropriation to the Forest Service for timber stand improvement, control of erosion, and development of recreation facilities on National Forests in distressed areas. One of the main aims of this recommendation, as with the Civilian Conservation Corps, was to create jobs to absorb unused young labor.

THE WAR ON POVERTY

In December 1963, following **President John F. Kennedy's** assassination, **President Lyndon B. Johnson** was being briefed by **Walter Heller**, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors, on the various issues that the Kennedy administration had been advancing. Heller noted that Kennedy had been intrigued by Michael Harrington's book *The Other America*, which was a study of poverty in America that was published in 1962. Kennedy had tasked his

administration with thinking of ways to address the issues raised by Harrington. President Johnson directed Heller to pull together the ideas that had surfaced to begin taking action.¹

Initially, the White House advisors turned to the relevant government agencies, including the Departments of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW), Labor, Commerce, etc. to solicit ideas for the President's poverty initiative. What they received was a rehash of previously surfaced initiatives that had not been implemented and which did not satisfy the White House. In turn, the Council of Economic Advisory proposed creating a special taskforce to craft the President's War on Poverty and the President asked **Sargent Shriver** to lead the effort. Shriver, an in-law of the late President Kennedy, had worked with his brother-in-law to create the Peace Corps. Though President Johnson had strained relations with the Kennedys he turned to Shriver, in large part because of the recommendation of **Bill Moyers**. Moyers had worked with Johnson on his presidential campaign and later served as Deputy Director of the Peace Corps under Shriver. President Johnson was also impressed with how Shriver had proven his ability to create new programs and get legislation through Congress with the Peace Corps, and knew the War on Poverty would require a similar effort.²

President Johnson officially designated Shriver as his poverty chief on February 1, 1964, and the President's Task Force in the War Against Poverty was formed. Shriver's immediate priority was to craft the Economic Opportunity Act and shepherd it through Congress. In early February of that year, a subgroup of that taskforce was given the mission of putting together a Job Corps program that would be a residential educational and vocational training program in part modeled on the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930s.

THE JOB CORPS PLANNING GROUP

Sargent Shriver immediately saw the Job Corps program as a critical part of the War on Poverty and took great interest in its development and implementation. Both President Johnson and Shriver knew that being able to quickly demonstrate results would be critical to the survival of the War on Poverty programs.³ Of the programs being considered, Shriver believed Job Corps could be implemented the quickest and would demonstrate results the fastest, in part based on the experience of the CCCs in the 1930s. He therefore saw it as extremely important to the political survival of the War on Poverty and chose to make it Title I of the Economic Opportunity Act.

A subset of the War Against Poverty task force was assigned the responsibility for conceptualizing Job Corps. This Job Corps Planning Group included representatives from all the government agencies that had a stake in the creation of the Job Corps, as well as educational and sociological experts selected by Sargent Shriver. The group was officially led by **Vernon Alden**, who was the President of Ohio University, though he was in reality a figurehead and was absent for much of the group's work.⁴ The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Forest

¹ Weeks, Christopher. Interview with Michael L. Gillette. December 10, 1980

² Ibid.

³ Ashmore, Susan Youngblood. *Carry It On: The War on Poverty and the Civil Rights Movement in Alabama*.

⁴ Weeks, Christopher. *Job Corps: Dollars and Dropouts*. Boston, Little, Brown. 1967.

Service, which had played a principal role in establishing and operating the CCCs of the 1930s, took a central role in the discussions that led to Job Corps' creation.

Prior to the formation of the Planning Group, the Forest Service had been involved in less formal conversations with the White House regarding the creation of the new antipoverty programs.

Deputy Chief Clare Hendee represented the Forest Service in these discussions, advocating for the creation of a new conservation program. The staff work to promote these ideas was conducted by **Clayton Weaver** who at the time led one of the sections under the Division for Administrative Management, then led by **Ed Schultz**. Clayton brought an enormous amount of experience and knowledge to the initial conversations regarding Job Corps because of his experience working on the Accelerated Public Works program earlier in the Kennedy administration. That program was similarly designed to put people to work, with the goal of helping depressed counties.

Ed Schultz and Clayton Weaver were both instrumental to the initial discussions with Shriver and his team to conceptualize Job Corps. However, when the Planning Group was formed it was determined that working on the development of Job Corps was too much for Ed and Clayton given their many other responsibilities and that the Forest Service would need to designate a dedicated full-time staff person to work with the planning group. Eventually Clayton would be promoted to Operations Chief in Region 1.

The Forest Service leadership chose **Jack Deinema** to represent the Department of Agriculture on the Job Corps Planning Group. Jack had been the Region 4 Personnel Officer in the spring of 1964 but was detailed to represent the Department of Agriculture in April 1964 in discussions regarding creating Job Corps Civilian Conservation Centers. He was selected for his leadership in the organization as a District Ranger and Forest Supervisor at the Challis National Forest, and for having headed up other projects of significance to the Department. In his new role, Jack reported directly to Deputy Chief Clare Hendee.

Jack enjoyed the strong support of Clare and **Forest Service Chief Ed Cliff**, who, remembering the enormous impact of the original CCC program, were solidly behind the campaign to create new conservation programs. Their efforts were also backed by **Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman** and **Assistant Secretary John Baker** who were committed to the overall goals of the effort to reintroduce conservation programs as part of the President's anti-poverty efforts. Secretary Freeman was close to **then-Vice President Humphrey** who had remained an advocate for creating a new CCC program, since his days in the Senate advocating for a Youth Conservation Corps. In fact, Vice President Humphrey would call upon Jack Deinema to brief him on the progress in Job Corps' development and regularly weighed in with Sargent Shriver regarding the need for conservation activities.

The planning group was very loosely organized by areas of expertise. **Chris Weeks**, who had worked closely with Sargent Shriver on the creation and implementation of the Peace Corps, served as the liaison to Shriver and the officials on the Task Force. **Pat Healy**, another associate of Sargent Shriver's, was detailed with responsibility over developing the Civilian Conservation Center portion of the program as well as community relations. **Dr. Wade Robinson** a professor at Harvard University was tasked with devising Job Corps educational programs and components

with assistance from **Lou Eigan** and **Dave Gottlieb**. **John Carley** was detailed from the Department of Defense to oversee the logistical support for the creation of the new camps with assistance from **Hunter Smith** and **Ralph Conroy**. **Dr. Jeanne Noble** was a professor at New York University and was tasked with developing the Women's Center programs with assistance from **Bonneta Washington**. **John Cheston** of the Department of Labor was given responsibility for issues of recruitment. **Wray Smith** was tasked with overall responsibility for the Urban Centers. Finally **Dwight Rettie** and **Jack Hoft** represented the Department of the Interior and its interests with regard to the Civilian Conservation Centers.

Since the work being conducted by the planning group lacked authorizing legislation and funding, the effort was enormously informal and chaotic. The nearly 80 person planning group worked out of office space in an old ex-hotel on M Street near Dupont Circle. Though most of the planning group staff were on loan from federal agencies or universities, many were simply volunteers or working based on a promise. Jack Deinema shared an office with the Department of the Interior representatives Dwight Rettie and Jack Hoft. Despite the chaotic situation, morale remained high, and the staff were eager to get the job done right. Everyone put in long days, working evenings and weekends. Given Shriver's desire for Job Corps to get up and running quickly in order to prove the War on Poverty a worthwhile effort, there was considerable pressure to get things done as expeditiously as possible.

CREATING THE JOB CORPS CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CENTERS

In part because of the pressure from prominent political leaders like Vice President Humphrey and Secretary Freeman, the plan for the Job Corps had always incorporated a conservation center component to be run by the Agriculture Department and Interior Department. However, the other members of the Job Corps planning group, many of whom were academics, were skeptical of the conservation model and whether it could be successful educationally.

Program Design

In discussing the design of the program, the academics and educators that dominated the working group favored an approach that was more skill-centered, emphasizing the specific vocational or job skills that were necessary to secure employment. It was assumed that entrance into employment would facilitate the social and emotional development of the enrollee. They did not see the value in conservation work and that rural centers would not find qualified educators to work with enrollees.

However, based on its experience with the CCCs, the USDA leadership believed that Job Corps enrollees would greatly benefit from learning good work ethics through meaningful conservation work under proper supervision. They felt that the enrollees could go out and get job skills any time, but what they lacked were basic employability skills, including social skills and emotional stability. This thesis emphasized a greater focus on basic education, motivational counseling, peer group interaction, and service.

Ensuring a balance between work and education was a top priority for the Forest Service and other conservation agencies. In order to balance his own extensive experience with conservation work, Jack Deinema requested that the Forest Service detail **Jack Large** from Region 4 to advise

him regarding integrating educational and work components of the program. Prior to joining the Forest Service, Jack Large had been a school teacher, and his expertise and ideas would prove critical to the design of the conservation centers' educational programs and the educational programs across Job Corps. In fact, it was Jack Large who introduced the union training programs to Job Corps, which today are present at most, if not all, centers.

Designing the Centers

One of the earliest conversations on the conservation center program was regarding how the Job Corps enrollees would be housed at the centers, and how much the centers would cost to construct. The vast majority of the conservation centers were going to have to be built from scratch because the old CCC camps were over 30 years old and those that were in usable condition were already being utilized as barracks by the Forest Service. Max Peterson, who was a Forest Service engineer detailed to the Division of Administrative Management, was asked to determine the cost of building the new conservation centers.

In large part because of the expediency with which the political leadership wanted the centers opened and housing students, and because some of the other land management agencies were concerned with what they would do with these new structures after Job Corps, the idea of simply housing students in trailers was initially embraced by Shriver's staff. A consultant suggested that the square footage of the trailers would allow for six students to be housed in each, based on trailer manufacturers claims that their trailer could sleep six. This, in effect, became an operating assumption. As a result, the initial cost estimates for Job Corps sites, without taking into consideration site costs, the cost of education and vocational classrooms, or even cafeterias, was around \$200,000 for a 100 student center. This estimate was shared with Members of Congress.

Max Peterson, however, had doubts as to whether it would be appropriate to actually squeeze the maximum capacity of students into these trailers. Though trailers could feasibly sleep six, he highly doubted that they could comfortably house six. He found a copy of the Army's Barracks Manual and informed the group that Army regulations determine appropriate living space based on cubic feet, not square feet, and that the working proposal to house six students per trailer would not meet the Geneva Conventions' standards for prisoners of war! Needless to say the taskforce immediately adjusted their assumptions regarding student housing.

Around this time Deputy Chief Clare Hendee was asked to testify on the costs of building the new Job Corps centers. Max was asked to prepare these estimates on behalf of the Forest Service. Yet, aside from the requirements to house and feed the students, there was little idea of what other structural requirements these centers would have, what would occur on the camps, and even how many students would be on each camp. Based on his own assumptions, Max Peterson proposed three types of camps to be constructed: 1) trailer camps; 2) semi-portable camps consisting of semi-industrial units that could be moved; and 3) permanent camps. His estimate of the cost of constructing a permanent camp was \$1 million. This would appear in the Congressional Record the next day, much to Max's surprise and much to the surprise of the task force officials who had previously told Congress the cost would be \$200,000. Ultimately, the camps would end up costing more than \$1 million to build.

The Forest Service tasked its Region 5 Architectural Section with developing design concepts for the conservation centers. The designs they would provide would eventually serve as the model for the majority of the conservation centers, both those operated by the Forest Service as well as the Department of the Interior centers.

Legislating the Conservation Mission

Despite the skepticism of other members of the planning group, Jack Deinema, with the clout and backing of Vice President Humphrey, was able to ensure that the conservation centers remained a part of the model being discussed. In the end it was resolved to employ both models, with the Civilian Conservation Centers favoring the work experience model and the Urban centers focusing on job skills. Nevertheless, although there was always an intention to operate conservation centers, the initial legislation that emerged from the planning group and the task force's discussions did not mention anything related to conservation.

The inclusion of language identifying work experience gathered through conservation work on public lands was the result of a deal made within the last 48 hours before the legislation was passed by the House of Representatives. In the last days prior to the Economic Opportunity Act being brought to the floor of the House of Representatives for a vote, it remained unclear whether the legislation actually had enough votes to pass. According to the tally of Sargent Shriver's legislative liaisons, the vote count stood at 196 for and 196 against.⁵ Much of the opposition to the bill stemmed from race related issues in the aftermath of the Civil Rights Act.⁶

However, in the House there was a substantial number of rural Members of Congress, predominantly Republican, who were very much interested in conservation issues, and a large number of these Members were on the fence regarding whether they would vote for the legislation. At this time Sargent Shriver was approached by a lobbyist of conservation causes named **Spencer Stewart**. Stewart committed that he could deliver most if not all of these Members of Congress if Shriver committed that a certain percentage of Job Corps enrollees be enrolled in Civilian Conservation Centers. After some discussion, it was settled that between 40 and 50 percent of the Job Corps enrollees would be assigned to conservation centers and language was written into the legislation to specify the conduct of conservation work. In the end, when the bill to the House floor for approval, Stewart delivered the votes he had promised.⁷

IMPLEMENTING THE JOB CORPS CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CENTERS

In late August of 1964 President Johnson signed the Economic Opportunity Act into law. The Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) was formally established with Shriver as its first Director. **Otis Singletary**, who had been the Chancellor of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, was named the Director of the Job Corps with Chris Weeks serving as his deputy. Pat Healy was given responsibility for the Conservation Centers. **Barney Old Coyote** replaced Dwight Rettie and Jack Hoft as the representative for the Department of the Interior. Now that the effort to create Job Corps had been formally authorized and appropriated money, the Forest

⁵ Weeks, Christopher. Interview with Michael L. Gillette. December 10, 1980

⁶ Ashmore, Susan Youngblood. *Carry It On: The War on Poverty and the Civil Rights Movement in Alabama*.

⁷ Weeks, Christopher. Interview with Michael L. Gillette. December 10, 1980

Service was able to create a Job Corps Division. Jack Deinema was named the Division's first Director with Jack Large serving as his deputy.

Given the strong push from the President and from Sargent Shriver to get Job Corps up and running as quickly as possible, there was little time between the conceptualization of the program and planning for its implementation. In fact, for the most part this occurred concurrently. When Forest Service staff sent white papers on the program's implementation to superiors in the Forest Service or over to OEO, they always had to assume it would be shared with the President or the Congress and appear in the papers the next day.

One of the earliest proposals raised in the Job Corps planning group was for the Department of Defense to operate the program. This was in large part due to political importance of implementing the program expediently, and the quickness with which the Department of Defense had built the original CCC camps and managed the logistics of implementing that program. However, the proposition of Department of Defense run youth camps was quickly determined to be unfeasible given the growing opposition to the Vietnam War and the draft.⁸ Ultimately the operation of the centers was split between private corporations, which would operate the larger centers, and the federal land management agencies that would oversee the conservation centers.

Selecting the Centers

The most immediate task was selecting center sites. Mr. Deinema, along with **future Forest Service Chief Max Peterson**, chose many of the locations for these first Forest Service centers based on recommendations for line staff. Site selection was based on political considerations, expected support by local communities, geographical location, and the availability of existing facilities that could be used. Areas with the greatest poverty and population centers were given priority with the result that most of the proposed centers were in the east and south.

The Departments of Interior and Agriculture sent over their preliminary proposal of center locations up the chain to Shriver. Shriver in turn shared the list with the President because he felt there were strong political implications to where the first Job Corps centers were to be located. One of the issues that had been controversial during the legislative battle to pass the Economic Opportunity Act was whether local officials or the Governors had any control with regards to where or whether Job Corps centers were established in their state, particularly the conservation centers which would be constructed on federal lands outside the jurisdiction of local officials.

The list was sent over to the White House simply to gauge a political response. OEO had not yet independently analyzed whether these sites were appropriate and how much it would cost to create centers in these communities. They also had not yet reached out to a single governor, mayor, congressman, or senator with regards the proposed sites in their states or districts. Despite all this, shortly after the list was sent to the White House the President held a press conference during which he read the list introducing them as the first Job Corps sites and announcing they would be open in three months.⁹

⁸ Weeks, Christopher. *Job Corps: Dollars and Dropouts*. Boston, Little, Brown. 1967.

⁹ Weeks, Christopher. Interview with Michael L. Gillette. December 10, 1980

The Departments of Agriculture and Interior were given the approval for their share of the initial Conservation Centers. In the end, only about half the centers proposed were constructed and put into operation. Altogether, the Forest Service would operate 29 centers while the five agencies at the Department of the Interior, the Fish & Wildlife Service, the Park Service, and the Bureau of Reclamation, Bureau of Land Management, Bureau of Indian Affairs, and Sport, Fish and Wildlife, would operate 26 centers.

First FS CCCs and Critical Staff		
<u>Forest Service Region</u>	<u>Center(s)</u>	<u>Center Director(s)</u>
Region 1 <i>RF:</i> Neal M. Rahm <i>ARF, Operations:</i> Clayton Weaver <i>Job Corps Program</i> – Vernard L. Erickson	Trapper Creek Dickinson Anaconda Cedar Flat Cottonwood Curlew	Robert W. Steiner Dale S. Thacker John M. Johnson Gerhart H. Nelson Robert R. Lusk Robert A. Smart
Region 2 <i>RF:</i> David S. Nordwell <i>ARF, Operations:</i> Howard C. Lee <i>Job Corps Program:</i> Kenneth A. Taber	Pegosa Springs Boxelder Pine Ridge	Jerald R. Martinez Henry R. Taylor Walter J. Fillmore
Region 3 <i>RF:</i> William D. Hurst <i>ARF, Operations:</i> Walter L. Graves <i>Job Corps Program:</i> Paul D. Wild	Alpine Heber Grants Mountaineer	Billy H. Shelby Duane G. Brean Talmdage L. Figart, Jr. William R. Snyder
Region 4 <i>RF:</i> Floyd Iverson <i>ARF, Operations:</i> Thomas H. Van Meter <i>Job Corps Program:</i> Richard W. Henthorne	Clear Creek	Charles J. Hendricks
Region 5 <i>RF:</i> Charles A. Connaughton <i>ARF, Operations:</i> Donald R. Ball <i>Job Corps Program:</i> Eugene R. Lepley	Fenner Canyon Los Pinos Sly Park Alder Springs Five Mile	Robert J. McDonald George Liddicoatt James H. Shiro Adolph R. Groncki Robert L. Royer
Region 6 <i>RF:</i> J. Herbert Stone <i>ARF, Operations:</i> Marvin L. Smith <i>Job Corps Program:</i> Jack E. Handy	Timber Lake Angell Wolf Creek Cispus	Norman E. Gould Robert G. Lewis Richard M. Pomeroy Zane G. Smith

First FS CCCs and Critical Staff (continued)		
<u>Forest Service Region</u>	<u>Center(s)</u>	<u>Center Director(s)</u>
Region 8 <i>RF: E. W. Schultz</i> <i>ARF, Operations: Arthur A. Grumble</i> <i>Job Corps Program: Clarence M. Evenson</i>	Hodgens Ouachita Cass Frenchburg Pine Knot Arrowood Schenck Jacobs Creek New Waverly Flatwoods	Stanford M. Adams Ralph H. Kunz Ronald J. Strauss Bernard J. Schruender A. Earl Haught Harvey Price Philip M. Clark Harold G. Armstrong William L. Sherrer Carl F. Hoover
Region 9 <i>RF: George S. James</i> <i>ARF, Operations: Velden A. Parker</i>	Golconda Branchville Vesuvius Hoxey Ojibway Lydick Lake Isabella Poplar Bluff Blue Jay Ripton Anthony Clam Lake Blackwell	L. Wayne Bell George M. Smith Roderic D. Herbrandson Charles G. Anderson John V. Lupis James L. Kimball Robert R. Tyrrell James S. Berlin Patrick J. Sheehan George S. Bowling Robert J. McCarthy Jack A. Weissling Roger B. Johnson

Building Local Support for Centers

The process of actually constructing and opening the centers was an enormous logistical challenge. Using the critical path method and project evaluation and review technique, Max Peterson charted out the critical steps that were necessary to get the centers up and running. While there was much work that could be done, much of it was first predicated on having the political support of the local community and Governors, which proved to be a slow process in many cases. Early in this process, Pat Healy, Barney Old Coyote, and Jack Deinema were sent on a national trip in a Interior Department turbo jet airplane to inspect proposed sites and meet with local townspeople to gauge their reaction to bringing Job Corps enrollees to their towns.

Each Center was to have 100 corpsmen from disadvantaged families representative of the nation's races. As there were very few minorities in the small towns close to the proposed centers, there were strong feelings about the introduction of minority students into the community. These racial fears were expressed at almost every local meeting, but almost always an older community leader would stand up, say he was a CCC graduate, and recommend that the community accept the center. In the end, only a handful of sites had to be scrubbed because of local opposition. The reputation and respect for the Forest Service's local Rangers and Forest Supervisors, as well as their advance ground work, was instrumental in gaining this strong public support.

FOREST SERVICE LEADERSHIP IN JOB CORPS

Chief Cliff and Deputy Chief Hendee committed the Forest Service's full resources to the Job Corps effort and it showed when they nominated the best in their ranks to be the first Center Directors. Fifty seven candidates for Center Director were interviewed by the Job Corps selection panel for the initial slate of centers that would open. The Forest Service and Department of the Interior proposed Center Directors from within their agencies but these selections had to receive approval by a panel in Washington and many were approved by Shriver himself. Ultimately 44 passed, 39 from the agencies and five from outside the agencies.

The program was hectic for the first year. Centers needed to be built, staff employed, curriculum established, students recruited, and all on a timeline to have 10,000 students on centers by the end of the year. The majority of the personnel at OEO came from the fields of education, business and politics. Few had any federal management experience. Consequently, they were constantly in turmoil and upheaval and had difficulty dealing with their governmental partners and the bureaucracy.

The dedication, management skills, and problem-solving skills of the Forest Service Center Directors as well as the Forest Service's national staff tasked to Job Corps, including Clare Hendee, Clayton Weaver, Jack Deinema, Max Peterson, and Jack Large quickly earned the plaudits and esteem of Shriver and the OEO leadership. Their input became recognized for its quality and dependability and helped shape not just the development of the conservation centers but the Job Corps program as a whole.

In part due to the excellent field support Forest Service Chief Ed Cliff and Deputy Chief Clare Hendee ensured the program would have from line staff, as well as because of the competence of the Forest Service Center Directors and their staff, the Forest Service had its half of the Conservation Center program up and running relatively quickly and relatively well. Meanwhile the Interior Department, with their five bureaus had a more difficult time. Recognizing the commitment and competence of the Forest Service staff in implementing the program, Sargent Shriver and Job Corps Director Otis Singletary requested that the Forest Service take a greater leadership role in the development of all the Job Corps Civilian Conservation Centers.

Assistant Secretary of Agriculture John Baker, Forest Service Chief Ed Cliff and Deputy Chief Clare Hendee, disgusted with the indecision and problems existing in OEO, encouraged their point person on Job Corps, Jack Deinema, to accept a transfer to OEO in order to correct the course of the program. Despite some trepidation, Jack Deinema officially transferred to OEO and accepted the position of Director of Conservation Centers in October 1965. In this capacity Jack oversaw not just the 29 Forest Service Job Corps Civilian Conservation Centers, but also the 26 other Job Corps Civilian Conservation Centers managed by the Department of the Interior. **Vern Hamre**, who had been the Forest Service's Inspector General, replaced Jack as the top Forest Service Job Corps official. Fortunately, the Department of the Interior was fully supportive of Jack's new position given the challenges they had been facing with OEO. Jack took with him to OEO both Bob Shrake and Barbara Yessel from the Forest Service and both were instrumental in gaining OEO staff support. Bob went on to become the Regional Director

for Job Corps' Denver Region and Barbara later became the Administrative Officer for the Weber Basin Center.

Otis Singletary continued to serve as the Job Corps Director with **David Squires**, who had been a businessman, serving as his deputy. However, the Job Corps office was divided among the three main programs: the Conservation Centers headed by Jack Deinema, the Urban Centers overseen by Wray Smith, and the Women's Centers run by Dr. Bonetta Washington. Pat Healy moved to Community Relations and Lou Eigan was put in charge of Education Programs. Each of these individuals were given great autonomy over their areas of responsibility and yet were able to collaborate and communicate well.

At the Forest Service, Vern Hamre would eventually be replaced by **Doug Leisz** as Job Corps Coordinator in the Division of Administrative Management. Verne would later go on to become the Regional Forester in Region 4. Jack Deinema eventually returned to the Forest Service from OEO, serving as the Regional Forester in Region 5, and later as Deputy Chief of Administration.

URBAN VS. CONSERVATION CENTERS

Though there had been a philosophical debate during the planning of Job Corps regarding the value of the conservation centers relative to the urban centers, in implementation the conservation center model clearly had its benefits. Urban Centers were designed as large residential vocational training schools focusing on job training with just enough basic education to fill in small deficiencies. These centers would typically house as many as 1,500 students. Their aim was to turn out young men ready to enter an entry-level job.

The Conservation Centers were designed to provide basic education and work experience for enrollees with the most severe educational gaps and those otherwise least ready for vocational training. Enrollees would work on basic education, such as reading and counting, and through the structure and discipline of the center receive a rounded living experience which would help them learn to get along in society. In addition, half or more of their time would be spent on conservation projects in which they would learn to use simple tools, operate motorized equipment, etc. Contrary to worries expressed during the planning phases, the centers did not have trouble recruiting local school teachers.

In implementation the larger centers were thought to have far better educational programs, but faced significant challenges controlling the students. In many of the large centers, it seemed as though the students ran the centers. From the beginning Job Corps was designed to take the young adult population that most thought of as the hardest to serve. Yet on these large centers, it was nearly impossible for the staff to effectively enforce discipline or organization upon a population of hundreds of young men with histories of disciplinary challenges and misbehavior.

The challenges with discipline were far less evident at the much smaller conservation centers. The smaller size of the centers made the student body easier to manage and denied students the anonymity that encouraged misbehavior on larger centers. In addition, the remote location of the centers limited the misbehavior of students and inappropriate interactions with the local community. Forest Service Center Directors, wary of the often skeptical local communities,

went out of their way to enforce strong disciplinary measures and to ensure their students were well behaved in the local community. The questions regarding the value of the conservation centers' vocational programs were gradually addressed with the increasing participation of national trade unions offering vocational programs on their centers.

However, the one area of criticism that persisted with the conservation centers was that students in urban areas would not want to travel to these rural communities and would refuse to stay. Indeed, one of the earliest programmatic challenges faced by the conservation centers were high dropout rates. Many of the Forest Service's own Center Directors saw the high dropout rates and attributed it to the homesickness of students who were far from home. As a result, the Forest Service began to push for students to be recruited from areas closer to their centers.

At this time, Max Peterson, still detailed to the Division of Administrative Management, commissioned an analysis of the conservation centers' dropout patterns. What he discovered was that the conventional wisdom had it completely wrong. It turned out that it was the students who lived closest to the centers that were dropping out at the highest rates. These students would go home for a weekend, and whether because of pressure from family, friends, or perhaps a girlfriend, would never return. This was the first data validation of a core component of the conservation model, namely that removing students from their home environments could prove beneficial to their education.

JOB CORPS' IMPACT ON THE FOREST SERVICE

Working in Job Corps developed into a fast-track for cultivating the next generation of Forest Service leadership. Based on recommendations from the field, Clare Hendee and Jack Deinema were given freedom to recruit from the top of the Forest Service ranks to choose the first Center Directors. The Forest Service leadership believed that working in Job Corps would expose emerging Forest Service leaders to new and unique challenges and help groom them for future leadership positions. In fact, each of the initial Job Corps Center Directors, including **Zane Smith, Chuck Hendricks, Jim Berlin, Norm Gould, Walt Fillmore, Bob Tyrrell, Dick Pomeroy, and Al Groncki** were promoted into senior positions as Forest Supervisors, Assistant Regional Foresters, and Regional Foresters. The careers of many of the Forest Service's subsequent leaders, including Forest Service Chiefs and Deputy Chiefs included stints working in Job Corps.

Today, the Job Corps Civilian Conservation Centers not only help cultivate and develop emerging leaders within the Forest Service, but also provide a pipeline of entry-level workers to serve as wildland firefighters, forestry technicians, or administrative staff. Each year, the Forest Service hires dozens of Job Corps graduates that have participated in forestry and conservation programs at Job Corps Civilian Conservation Centers. Through Job Corps the Forest Service is building a skilled and diverse workforce capable of advancing the agency's mission.

However, perhaps the most significant contribution Job Corps Civilian Conservation Centers have made to the Forest Service's mission over the last 45 years has been the meaningful conservation work of Job Corps enrollees in the nation's forests. Agriculture Secretary Freeman, Forest Service Chief Ed Cliff, and Deputy Chief Clare Hendee recognized how much the

Civilian Conservation Corps had done to advance the Forest Service's mission, and helped create Job Corps to carry on that work. They saw the program not as a side project, but as integral to the mission of the Forest Service: "Caring for the Land and Serving People." Their foresight has been born out in the hundreds of trails and ranger stations constructed by Job Corps enrollees, the tens of thousands of fires that Job Corps crews have responded to, and the millions of hours enrollees have spent on conservation activities in their forests.

CONCLUSION

Today's Job Corps Civilian Conservation Centers were designed early in the program by Forest Service leaders to be a direct heir to the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930s and to directly contribute to the agency's mission of promoting the conservation of the national forests. In the 45 years since the Forest Service's prominent involvement in creating the program, Job Corps has expanded the capacity of the Forest Service to conduct conservation activities, served as a training ground for future Forest Service leaders, and created a pipeline for a more diverse Forest Service workforce.

In their implementation of Job Corps, the Forest Service followed the successful template of the Civilian Conservation Corps ensuring the program incorporated a focus on work experience through conservation projects. Job Corps is commonly described as a program that is intended to serve the hardest to serve young Americans. This is the legacy of the Job Corps Civilian Conservation Centers which have always focused on both basic education and work experience for enrollees with the most severe educational gaps.

With the strong support of the current Forest Service leadership, the Job Corps Civilian Conservation Centers will continue to play a critical role in "Caring for the Land and Serving People."