In 1998 and 1999, more than 200 male workers at the United Defense plant in Fridley, Minnesota, were displaced from their jobs due to reduced demand for military hardware and to the company reallocating production work to corporate sites in other parts of the United States. This article summarizes a longitudinal case study of the displaced United Defense workers, focusing on their desire and options for new work and the factors influencing their decisions to work or retire. At the time of the downsizing announcement, workers anticipating job loss ranged in age from 42 to 68, although most workers were 50 to 60 years of age. Accordingly, this case study offers an opportunity to examine how older workers who have been made redundant are impacted by job loss in their retirement versus work decisions.

This research was funded in part through a New Initiatives grant from CURA that provided money for interviews, data collection, and data analysis. Three data collection periods spanning the years 2000–2002 provided background and employment adjustment information about more than 85% of the terminated United Defense production workers. This article will discuss the context for the termination of workers at United Defense, describe the methodology for the three data collection periods, present findings from the research, and discuss the policy implications of these findings with respect to older displaced workers.
United Defense: The Corporate-Union Background

United Defense L.P. was created by the 1994 merger of the defense divisions of FMC Corporation and Harsco Incorporated, two long-term defense contractors each with more than 50 years of defense production. United Defense designs, manufactures, and supports weapons delivery system products and services for the U.S. military and allied nations. The company employs more than 5,000 personnel, with production facilities at 10 sites in the United States as well as joint venture or coproduction activities in five other countries. United Defense and its forerunners have produced most of the available U.S. military ground combat vehicles, and most U.S. Navy surface vessels carry a United Defense gun or missile launching system, primary products at the company’s Fridley facility.

In June 1998, United Auto Workers (UAW) Local 683 was informed that 25 workers at the United Defense Fridley facility would be laid off by the end of the month. Then, during the 1998 contract negotiations, the bargaining unit and management teams were informed that new production work would be shifted from the Fridley facility to a newly available site in Louisville, Kentucky. According to union leaders, this transfer was to occur even though management had assured the local union at the time of site and separation. Compared to the Fridley facility in 1980, only 6% of the bargaining-unit workforce of 2,500 at Fridley were eligible to elect the separation program as part of the new contract.

The Separation Program. In July 1998, a contract that included a Special Separation Program was ratified by bargaining unit personnel. The contract made provisions for the reduction of nearly 350 of the 450 hourly positions at the United Defense facility in Fridley. In early August, the company provided hourly employees with written information about the separation program and an opportunity to attend an information session. All UAW-represented hourly employees at the Fridley plant were eligible to elect the separation option during the signup period, which ran from August 3 to September 19, 1998. Workers were informed that (1) all employees would have the option to volunteer for the separation program, with acceptance based on seniority; (2) employees would have to exercise their option during the election period, sign a release, and be laid off or retire based on business needs; and (3) the actual date of separation would be determined by the company based on business requirements but would be no later than December 31, 1999.

To encourage workers to volunteer for separation, the company offered three incentives that were otherwise unavailable if a worker were terminated without volunteering for separation during the signup period. First, retirement benefits would be calculated on a base of $42 per year, compared to the contractual agreement of $36 for workers terminated outside of the signup period. Second, a single lump-sum payment of $15,000 would be made available to each individual as cash, an annuity, or a roll-over. Third, all pension benefits would become portable. The 1998 contract also collapsed several job titles, thus eliminating some positions and creating further incentive for affected workers to “volunteer” for separation.

Minnesota Department of Economic Security Rapid Response survey data documented that the expected 350 soon-to-be-redundant workers averaged 52 years of age, with more than 29 years of seniority. Many were skilled workers—welders, machinists, or electricians—but one-third were general clerks without specific skills.

The Termination Process. By December 31, 1999, 224 United Defense workers had been terminated, leaving a workforce of less than 150 production workers. Because of improved business conditions, not all United Defense workers who signed up for the Special Separation Program were actually terminated. A total of 145 hourly workers were retained by the company, and according to union leaders, virtually all of these workers had signed for the separation. Compared to the bargaining-unit workforce of 2,500 at the Fridley facility in 1980, only 6% of the workforce remained after the 1998–1999 terminations.

Workers were terminated in staggered increments, so any “congestion effect”—caused by many displaced workers simultaneously entering the job market at the same time—was minimized. The congestion effect has been offered as one explanation for the long periods of joblessness experienced by some displaced workers; rarely are there sufficient available positions to absorb all displaced workers when large numbers enter the job market at the same time. Staggering the release of workers helps those who obtain new jobs quickly “speak for” others at their new place of employment and, through this informal process, helps other newly displaced workers find employment.

Study Methodology

Data for this study were collected during three separate data collection periods spanning three years. Of the 224 workers ultimately terminated by United Defense during the 1998–1999 downsizing, 9 had been on medical leave and were retired for medical reasons, leaving a net population for this study of 215 men. In addition, 8 hourly workers were offered salaried positions, reducing the study population further to 207. Although a transfer was not an option, 2 hourly workers opted to be laid off rather than accept the special separation, knowing that if work increased at United Defense, they could expect to be called back with all rights. These two laid-off workers were not included in the study population.

Cover photo: The United Defense plant in Fridley, Minnesota.
Participants in this study were asked at each data collection period what their employment status was, with the following options provided: retired, unemployed, working full time, working part time, and unable to work. At the T2 panel, 12 workers wrote in an additional category, describing themselves as “working retired.” Operationally, those 12 workers were considered employed, as were all who claimed simultaneous work and retirement in any data collection period.

The First Collection Period (T1). Initial data in the three-year panel study were collected in February 2000 via a questionnaire. A total of 85 men completed the mailed questionnaire, 17 participated by responding to the questions over the telephone, 6 participated in personal interviews, and another 10 were involved in small-group discussions with other terminated United Defense workers and completed the questionnaire at that time.

With the exception of the mailed questionnaire, each of the other data gathering procedures during the first data collection period provided both additional knowledge and interaction opportunities with terminated workers. For example, a participant in one of the small-group discussions said he was uncomfortable looking for work in small engine repair because he had completed only one year of a two-year program. One might assume he left the program to seek other work or that he found the program of little interest. The reality was that he enjoyed the training, but the technical school he attended terminated the program. Thus, his failure to complete the program was not of his doing. Qualitative data collection provides an opportunity to understand the rich and varied postdisplacement life of the men we worked with.

Of the 207 displaced workers in the study population, 117 completed the first questionnaire at the first data collection period (without any monetary compensation), for a completion rate of 56%.

The Second Collection Period (T2). The second panel period started in March 2001. Although it is typical to ask only initial respondents to continue to participate in a longitudinal study, we thought that some displaced workers who thus far had not been involved in the research might now participate. Many displaced workers are angry, confused, or negative close to the time of job loss, and we were hopeful that many men had now worked through those feelings. In addition, a large percentage of the terminated workers were involved in the research project and we thought that some nonparticipants would be familiar with our research through informal contact with those participants.

With two exceptions, all participants in the first wave were involved in the second panel, which was a mailed questionnaire. Questionnaire data were supplemented with select personal and telephone interviews. In addition to the 117 participants from the first panel, 30 new respondents joined the research project at the second panel, retroactively completing the first questionnaire as well. Of the 207 men in the study population terminated by United Defense from 1998 to 1999, 147 workers were now involved, for a completion rate of 71%. Respondents in the second panel were paid $10 for completing the second questionnaire. New participants were not paid for completing the first questionnaire.

The Third Collection Period (T3). The third questionnaire was initially mailed out in April 2002 to the 147 panel participants. In addition, a letter requesting involvement was mailed to the 60 individuals who were thus far not participating in the study. Another 30 respondents joined for the third panel, completing retrospectively the first two panels as well. All third panel participants were paid $15. New third panel participants were also paid $10 for completing the second questionnaire. We informed new participants that they were being compensated equally with those who were already participating in the project, but like those already involved, they would have to complete the first questionnaire without any compensation. New participant-respondents were instructed to answer each questionnaire for a given time period, and those time periods were provided in a cover memo and on each questionnaire. Ultimately, 177 participants were involved in the panel study for a completion rate of 86%.

In the invitation to participate in the third panel, all displaced workers in the 1998–1999 downsizing were asked to check a response page whether they were (1) physically unable to work; (2) self-employed, either part time or full time; (3) working (but not self-employed), either part time or full time; (4) unemployed; or (5) retired (i.e., not working for wages at all).

The “self-employed” category was inserted for the first time at this third panel.

Findings

Table 1 shows the employment-retirement status of workers at each of the three data collection periods. Of the 84 men who were employed at the initial data collection period, 26 respondents indicated that they started to look for work prior to their termination, with 15 of these men successful in their job search. At the time of termination, Minnesota had the lowest unemployment rate in the nation.

By the third data collection period, at least 15 workers in the sample had lost their position in post-9/11 reductions and the state unemployment rate was 4.3%, Minnesota’s highest rate in eight years. Dave Senf, writing in the April 2002 issue of Minnesota Employment Review, described the change in the Minnesota labor market:

In little more than a year, the job market has switched from a job seeker’s paradise to a nightmare. Employers who were lucky to receive one or two responses to a help-wanted ad two years ago are now flooded with several hundred resumes when a job opening is advertised. (p. 2)

Although 30 (17%) of the displaced workers retired immediately after job loss, 11 of these respondents stated that they had planned to retire about the time they were terminated from United Defense. Given the additional perks at the time of their dismissal, their displacement was probably not viewed negatively but rather as a plus. Those who retired comprised 17%, 25%, and 23% of the total respondents at each of the three data collection periods, respectively. A total of 4 men who were retired by the second or third panel had found work—either full time or part time—since they left United Defense, but 11 others retired from unemployment positions or because they had become unable to work.

Although work or retirement were plausible postdisplacement options at the first data collection period, some men found themselves unable to work, and this also was the case at each of the following panels. At the first data collection period, 17 men (10%) were in a training or education program, but none of the workers were in a training
Table 1. Employment-Retirement Status of United Defense Displaced Workers at the Three Data Collection Periods (T1, T2, T3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>T1 (February 2000)</th>
<th>T2* (March 2001)</th>
<th>T3† (April 2002)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>84†</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(47%)</td>
<td>(62%)</td>
<td>(62%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(17%)</td>
<td>(25%)</td>
<td>(23%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10%)</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>37§</td>
<td>18§</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(21%)</td>
<td>(10%)</td>
<td>(10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to work</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5%)</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
<td>(5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(100%)</td>
<td>(99%)</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Of the original 177 participants, one individual who participated in the initial questionnaire declined further participation; another failed to return the second and third questionnaires.
† At the third data collection period, several participants from previous collection periods were not included because of death (2), because they could not be located (8), or because of their failure to return the completed questionnaire (3).
§ Includes 30 men who were seeking work and 7 who were unemployed but not seeking work at that time.
† At the third data collection period, several participants from previous collection periods were not included because of death (2), because they could not be located (8), or because of their failure to return the completed questionnaire (3).

Terminated United Defense workers were able to access their retirement account to roll over their investment, take a cash payment, or remain invested in their retirement account. Because the stock market had done well over the years, workers’ retirement accounts at the time of termination were important components of their retirement income. By the time of the third data collection period, just two years later, those retirement accounts still invested in stocks were reduced significantly by the national economic downturn, as some workers told us. A 51-year-old worker who had been at the plant more than 30 years replied to a question on the T3 survey concerning whether there was ever a time when he regretted taking the Special Separation Program by stating, “I don’t know; I lost most of my pension in the market.” A 56-year-old worker with 32 years at the plant responded that he was retired, just watching his investments go down the tube. Another worker wrote:

The cash “buyout” payment in trade for [my] pension means that after 30 years with this company I have no pension coming to me and the $75,000 I received as a buyout is now worth about $45,000 in an investment account. Hopefully the stock market will recover to the point that this investment will return to at least what the original amount was, but the fact that hundreds of other employees, like myself, will never receive any pension money from [United Defense], I believe has had a profound effect on our future financial situation.

The number of working retirees—workers who receive pensions and continue to work either on a part-time or full-time basis—has increased dramatically during the past decade. Diane Herz, writing in the April 1995 Monthly Labor Review, offers some suggestions why that is the case, including declines in pension values and increased healthcare costs, as well as improved job opportunities and the fact that some work is simply more attractive than it once was. According to Christopher Ruhm, in an article that appeared in the October 1990 Journal of Labor Economics, one-quarter of household heads return to the labor force after a self-reported retirement, a phenomenon called reverse retirement. In addition, he notes that workers often use some combination of “bridge” employment or partial retirement in the “job-stopping” process. Given the above-average earnings of the long-term employees displaced by the United Defense downsizing, as well as the significant decline in the stock market and their retirement portfolios, we anticipated a significant number of instances of reverse retirement among those who had already retired. However, this was not borne out by our findings.

So, were displaced workers who wanted to find employment able to find work? Most workers terminated in this downsizing were older workers, and although not all workers identified their age as a negative employment attribute, 39 of 44 workers (89%) who stated on the initial questionnaire that they were treated differently by prospective employers than were other applicants indicated that being an older worker was a problem or that, in combination with other factors, it was an explanation for why they believed they were treated differently. Table 2 shows that 28% of the respondents at T1 did think they were treated differently than other applicants, whereas 33% said they were not treated differently, 19% were unsure, and 21% didn’t know because they were not applying for work. At T2, age continued to be perceived as a problem; 15 of the 18 unemployed respondents (83%) cited their age as a factor in why they had not found work.

Transferable Skills. Although there were many displaced United Defense workers who were skilled machinists, electricians, platers, welders, grinders, or experienced foundry workers, one-third of the workers were without transferable skills. Some of the workers without skills were knowledgeable about assembly and production processes or tool crib inventory procedures, but their above-average pay was related to their familiarity with United Defense operations and their longevity in a union shop. At the onset of this downsizing (September 1998), the seasonally adjusted Minneapolis metropolitan area unemployment rate was 2.4%. By the time of the third questionnaire (April 2002), when nearly 40 men had retired and 17 men were without work, the metro area seasonally adjusted unemployment rate had risen to 3.9%. At the most recent data collection period, 11 of the 17 men who were unemployed (65%) believed that work
became increasingly more difficult to obtain after September 11, 2001. As noted earlier, 15 of the displaced workers found they were out of work again as a result of 9/11 and another 5 workers found their workload increased because of other terminations at their place of work after that date.

**Reasons for Unemployment.** Some of the men who were unemployed at T1 were not looking for work—they were either treating their work release as a vacation, planning for their future, or working on household projects. Others, as noted earlier, were unable to work, and still others seemed to be simply “stressed out.” For those who were unable to work, injuries were certainly possible while employed at United Defense. The Fridley facility, a 132-acre government-owned site with more than 40 acres enclosed, had more than 440,000 square feet devoted to machining, foundry, metallurgical, assembly, testing, and quality control services. With the massive equipment used to create large defense products, work could be dangerous. At various times some respondents were injured. Some departments—like the foundry, plating, and machine repair departments—exposed workers to greater dangers. Hazards in these departments included the heat and possible mishaps during the casting process, a variety of chemicals and solvents used in plating production and machinery cleaning, and working with large parts moved by overhead cranes. In addition, long-term workers were exposed to trichloroethylene (TCE), a component of industrial solvents. The substance was found in the United Defense water supply wells, which were shut down in 1981. In addition, the northern area of the plant grounds is an EPA Superfund site due to drummed waste found in 1983.

Contaminants found include a number of volatile organic compounds that many of the displaced workers would have been exposed to as airborne gases.

**Dealing with Stress.** Stress was also a factor in taking “a breather” from seeking immediate employment after displacement from United Defense. For many workers, the past 10 years was a period of stress because workers were worried about whether they would continue to have a job or be terminated. At the T3 data collection, the following question was asked: “Some former United Defense workers have commented that they felt the continual threat of job loss at UD, and on a daily basis they didn’t know if that day would be their last day on the job for them. How about you, did you feel any threat to your position at United Defense over the years?” Respondents were asked to circle one of the following four options:

1. Yes, I was very aware, and worried about being “under the gun” at United Defense.
2. Yes, the threat of job loss was there, but it didn’t bother me.
3. There was only some company pressure at the time before contract talks, not any other time, and it surely didn’t bother me.
4. No, I don’t think that pressure existed at all, or if it did, I wasn’t aware of it.

There were 160 responses to this question, with 85 respondents (53%) indicating they were aware of the threat of job loss and being “under the gun.” Another 43 respondents (27%) said they were not bothered by the job loss threat. A total of 19 respondents (12%) checked the third response, which was limited company pressure at contract time and a threat that didn’t bother them.

Only 13 respondents (8%) checked the fourth option, which was a lack of any job loss pressure.

**Making Do with Less Money.** There were other reasons why these men did not look for or accept new work immediately after job loss. Many displaced workers expect their starting wage at a new job to be about what it was prior to job loss. This was true at United Defense. Most of the displaced United Defense workers were earning more than $20 per hour, about twice what most unskilled workers were earning in the Twin Cities metropolitan area. Thus, for the unskilled workers who were displaced, accepting almost any position would mean working for half of what they had earned at United Defense. New work would also mean a different work environment, which would be a difficult transition for men who had worked most of their adult life for one employer.

What about retirement as an option? Some workers had adequate resources to retire, in part because they had anticipated that they might be caught in a downsizing and had consciously been saving for years. For them, the $15,000 buyout for terminated workers was only an addition to their already existing savings. Because the men in this study were the survivors of four other downsizings since 1985, during which they saw 1,200 of their coworkers laid off, some men had been anticipating job loss and had cut back on their expenses. For those who were serious in their efforts to reduce their spending, some were able to generate a substantial savings account.

**Deciding to Retire.** In a few instances (3 respondents), former United Defense workers indicated that they retired because they were needed at home, largely to care for a spouse or other family member. Retirement was a demand for other men (2 respondents) because their own health prevented them from having full-time work. During the three-year study period, retirement became more desirable for others when their spouses retired. For a small number of men who had started their own business but decided that those efforts were no longer attractive (2 respondents, or 10% of the self-employed), retirement also became preferable.

Data analysis for the displaced United Defense workers during the three-year data collection period (Table 3) shows that most of the terminated
workers (95 respondents) were employed consistently throughout the entire data collection period. A total of 36 men were retired by the end of the three-year period, although 30 of these had retired immediately upon their work release from United Defense. A total of 17 men were unemployed at the end of our data collection, with 3 of the men unemployed throughout the entire period, the balance having lost employment since their downsizing from United Defense. At the time of the third data collection, 8 men were unable to work, including 2 who had been unable to work throughout the entire data collection period. Dependent upon their injury or health, it is possible that these men would formally retire. Only 6 men made a reverse retirement move during the three-year study period, but each age category had at least one reverse retirement worker.

As was noted earlier, age is a factor in selecting retirement. Table 3 shows a positive relationship between the age categories and retirement (cells of 14, 17, and 6 respectively, which are 36%, 20%, and 16% of their age categories). A larger number of retirements among the older workers may be due to any number of reasons, including their eligibility for Social Security retirement benefits, perceived discrimination, an unwillingness to work for lower wages, or a belief that they will have difficulty doing the work. Table 3 also supports the view that retirement prior to age 62 is becoming normative because 23 of the United Defense displaced workers were consistently retired at 60 years of age or younger.

Conclusions and Policy Implications
This article focuses on older displaced workers in the defense industry. Many of these men had worked at the same place of employment throughout their working career. Although older workers may face less pressure to become reemployed because of reduced family responsibilities, and thus less financial commitments, most of the men in this study wanted to continue to work. Although some men who had found work lost their position after 9/11, most men were able to find replacement work. Only three men were unemployed throughout the entire three-year data collection period. Retirement might have come earlier than expected for some men, in part because of perceived age discrimination but also because wages at new work sites were below their prior United Defense wages. Work opportunities were also declining during the data collection period as the unemployment rate increased. Some workers found themselves unable to work; others were stressed from the conditions of work at United Defense or had worried about the threat of job loss over a period of years. For these older displaced workers, an overwhelming share were able to follow through with their plans. Most of the men who wanted to work found work and those who wanted to retire were also able to do so. Most of the men who retired remained retired and did not engage in reverse retirement, even though many workers had seen the value of their retirement portfolios decline significantly.

Mergers, acquisitions, global competition, new technology, and subcontracting are likely to produce continuing contractions in the defense industry manufacturing sector. In addition, defense program cancellations, the vagaries of defense budgets, and mixed

### Table 3. Employment-Retirement Status of Displaced United Defense Workers throughout the Three Data Collection Periods (T1, T2, T3) by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Continuous Retirement from T1 to T3</th>
<th>Consistently Employed from T1 to T3</th>
<th>Reverse Retirement from T1 to T3</th>
<th>Unemployed at T3</th>
<th>Unable to Work at T3</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61–68</td>
<td>14 (36%)</td>
<td>21 (54%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>1 (2%)</td>
<td>2 (5%)</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55–60</td>
<td>17 (20%)</td>
<td>52 (61%)</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>10 (12%)</td>
<td>3 (4%)</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42–54</td>
<td>6 (16%)</td>
<td>21 (55%)</td>
<td>2 (5%)</td>
<td>6 (16%)</td>
<td>3 (8%)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>37 (23%)</td>
<td>94 (58%)</td>
<td>6 (4%)</td>
<td>17 (10%)</td>
<td>8 (5%)</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* T1 was February 2000, T2 was March 2001, and T3 was April 2002.

Roughly one-fourth of the former United Defense workers surveyed were continuously retired throughout the study period. Although retirement may have come earlier than expected for some of these men, most of the respondents who wanted to work found work and most who wanted to retire were able to do so.
success in obtaining new defense contracts may also lead to employee terminations. As displacement continues, older workers face the challenge of early retirement and longer gaps between termination and retirement eligibility. They may find new employment, but often at considerably reduced wages and benefits compared to their previous defense-related work. Separation agreements, such as the one negotiated by United Defense and UAW 683, may help workers transition into retirement, but workers need to be aware of their future options even when dislocation in not imminent. Defense contractors and workers might be more proactive if there are financial incentives for individual retirement planning once a worker reaches midcareer. Retraining options—including training in small business management—jointly financed by unions and employers could be part of early career planning as well.

In her book Redundancy and the Railwaysmen, Dorothy Wedderburn identifies four crucial elements in minimizing hardships for displaced workers: long-term planning, “the longest and most honest possible displacement notice,” close cooperation with government units, and an adequate compensation scheme. Although there was no long-term planning in the 1998–1999 United Defense downsizing, the other elements Wedderburn identifies were present, and workers were able to “prepare” for displacement based on their experience of observing previous labor force reductions at the plant. In addition, the company minimized reemployment problems for terminated employees by not terminating all workers at the same time, thereby avoiding a “congestion effect.”

Nonetheless, there are policies that could be implemented to assist workers who are scheduled to be terminated or have been recently terminated. For older workers (those age 45 and older), predisplacement sessions should be offered to help them consider and prepare for retirement. Retiree retraining counseling for older workers on the reality of being an older job seeker would also be beneficial. Additional assistance in the form of counseling or training for those who remain long-term unemployed should be provided. (Although in the United Defense downsizing there were only a few men who were long-term unemployed, the policy should still be practiced.) Finally, assistance should be provided to those who are second-time job losers shortly after termination from their initial displacement because these displaced workers have the disadvantage of bringing only limited new work experience to a prospective employer.
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2000 Population Change Maps Now Available

The state of Minnesota population change maps featured in the Summer 2003 issue of the CURA Reporter are now available from CURA as four-color wall maps. Based on 2000 U.S. Census data, the maps show percentage change and absolute change in population in the state from 1990 to 2000. The percentage change map shows data at the minor civil division level (which includes cities, townships, and unorganized territory), whereas the absolute change map shows growth and loss of population across the state.

The four-color poster-sized wall map versions (17 by 22 inches) of the population change maps were created through a joint effort of CURA, the Department of Administration (Minnesota State Demographic and Land Management Information Centers), and the Cartography Lab in the University of Minnesota’s Department of Geography. The maps are printed back-to-back and include major water features and selected major roads and highways.

Population distribution maps for the state of Minnesota and Twin Cities area, which were originally featured in the May 2001 issue of the CURA Reporter, are also available from CURA. Based on 2000 U.S. Census data, these 17-by-22-inch four-color wall maps are printed back-to-back and show the distribution of population within the state and the seven-county Twin Cities metropolitan area, as well as county and city names, major water features, and selected major roads and highways.

CURA will ship up to two folded copies of each wall map free of charge, and will ship an unlimited number of flat (unfolded) copies of either map for the cost of shipping and handling. To order, call (612) 625-1551 or send e-mail to cura@umn.edu. Please specify which maps you would like (population change or population distribution), whether you would like flat or folded copies, and the quantity you would like to order, and include your complete mailing address and phone number. Allow 3–6 weeks for delivery. To obtain free flat (unfolded) copies of either map, or for multiple folded copies, visit CURA during regular business hours (8–12 and 1–4:30, Monday through Friday) at the University of Minnesota, 330 HHH Center, 301—19th Avenue South, Minneapolis, MN 55455.

The population change and population distribution wall maps also can be ordered from Minnesota’s State Demographic Center at 651-296-2557 or Demography.Helpline@state.mn.us and from the Land Management Information Center at 651-296-1211 or LMIC.mail@state.mn.us.