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Dedication

This book is dedicated to the tens of millions of users and friends of the National Park Service. The Service, now over one hundred years in existence, has a critical need to update and change its approach to the protection and use of the resources managed. Our parks can no longer be left to politicians who often view parks as party favors and to those in leadership positions controlled by political appointees. Our National Living Treasures and those who strive to protect them, need active support to maintain the integrity and values of the past for generations yet unborn.

The book is also dedicated, with great and sincere respect, to the current and past generations of park employees. You are now engaged in the protection and restoration of one of the great concepts from America’s past, the National Park System. Will future generations benefit from a system unimpaired or compromised? It is passed into your hands with hope and the belief that integrity and understanding will again guide our future due to your leadership and courage.
Preface

It's hard to imagine that there is someone, out there, who has never thought about writing a book, poem, song, sonnet or epitaph. I hadn't planned to, but being a lover of our National Parks, having sweated in the ranks for almost 35 years, my concerns and fears have risen. Concerns regarding what is now happening in and to the Service. The parks are our Living National Treasures, treasures that need help and support from within and from our communities and users.

This book begins with a recounting of the author's work in the National Park Service, and a sampling of the many resources and experiences managed within the system and the challenges presented to those working therein. It is an honest and true rendering of an average employee given unusual opportunities. A life dedicated to the importance of natural and cultural resources and significance of the changing values and mores of our society and the impact of change, both positive and negative, on the mission of our Service.
Having managed great American Parks like Glacier National Park and Big Bend National Park allowed me to work at an international level. Being the first Superintendent of Wolf Trap Farm Park for the Performing Arts in Vienna, Virginia and the first NPS Superintendent of Valley Forge National Historical Park challenged my management abilities. Forcing me to accept the importance that change brings to an agency.

This, combined with a total of thirteen field and central office positions, will provide the foundation for a discussion on the future of the National Park Service; current issues and proposed resolutions, including recommendations to fix the current budget crisis within the agency and the need for a major realignment of the agency to protect parks in the future.

Perhaps you will find my extreme embarrassment with one of our First Ladies or my past experience and understanding of walls and boundaries on the Rio Grande River in Texas, illustrative of the ups and downs that employees and managers in the National Park Service can have in just one career.

There will also be pages concerning the need for our Nation to replenish and restore the greatness of the National Park Service and its unique and treasured mission. It is one of the greatest ideas, a philosophy, ever put forward by the people of the United States. An idea that continues to spread around the world. However, in the
last thirty years it has been permitted to be politicized and politically corrected here in its home nation. In my opinion, we have come to the point of the National Park Service, its unique mission, being in some peril.

An agency unwilling to recognize and treat problems or speak about those problems openly and candidly is in trouble. An agency living in the accomplishments of its past, either unable or unwilling to engage or confront current issues is suffering. It’s bothersome to know that there are solutions to the problems, which will take time, yet will permit our national treasures to be carried into the future, unencumbered.

It is no longer possible for the National Park Service to correct major issues such as funding and resource deterioration. Attempts have been made, the only result, more park areas added to the system. It will take a national drive or initiative, as happened in 1955, when Director Connie Wirth successfully created Mission 66 with ten years of funds to restore the failing National Parks.

During the late 1940s and early 1950s, the Park Service came under increasing criticism for neglect of the park system. An essay by Bernard Devoto in Harper’s Magazine proposed that the national parks should be closed until they were funded appropriately. They were not closed but Mission 66 found life.
You will see many references to the Mission of the National Park Service in this work. There are now two mission statements, one from the Organic Act of 1916 and one from the year 2000.

The Organic Act of 1916. “The service thus established shall promote and regulate the use of the Federal areas known as national parks, monuments, and reservations hereinafter specified by such means and measures as conform to the fundamental purposes of the said parks, monuments, and reservations, which purpose is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.”

The Revised Mission Statement of 2000. “The National Park Service preserves unimpaired the natural and cultural resources and values of the national park system for the enjoyment, education, and inspiration of this and future generations. The Park Service cooperates with partners to extend the benefits of natural and cultural resource conservation and outdoor recreation throughout this country and the world.”

Both are relevant, but the Act of 1916 remains closest to my heart since we are failing to achieve portions of that act now, without further extending ourselves financially, to cooperate with partners. It's always been a
given that parks don’t end at the boundary, that managers, as part and parcel of their jobs, have a responsibility to work and cooperate with partners, but it’s nice to see that finally stated. For the present, the only caveat is that we need to get our house in order before spending funds in support of cooperation.
What follows is the collected experience of one Park Superintendent and one career. It is a recollection of the places and things done in that career. In so many ways what follows could be written by many long serving Superintendents of the Park Service. There would be differences because of the nature of the areas we worked in, but the ups, downs and highlights of those careers would be similar to mine. The frustrations inherent in our careers would be the same. Our respect and love for the National Park Service and its complex mission would also show through, often in personal and profoundly complex ways.

My career extended over three decades of change and increasingly difficult laws and requirements. The NPS of the 1960’s was very different from the 1990’s
and even more so in today's world of instant communication and a rush to judgement.

Now as then, I have concern for some of the trends emerging in the Service and in society. Trends being driven by politics, political correctness, failing public processes, politicians with life tenure and a seething anger finding voice everywhere. I hate seeing the work and vision of men and women striving to protect and fulfill the mission of the NPS, neglected and minimized. A mission copied around the world, being undone and somewhat bastardized within a hundred years of creation.

My service, ended in 1997, and there have been advances since then, some by court order, but more setbacks in areas critical to our mission. My being out of the traces for twenty years is not relevant to the issues being discussed here however. The things that concerned me in 1997 are still a concern, given half steps forward and leaps backward.

The complexity of the National Park Service mission can be conveyed by the number and types of areas that our managers must work with in their careers. You would be wrong if you think they are all managed in the same way. Same Mission, however.
National Parks 60
National Monuments 88
National Preserves 19
National Historical Parks 51
National Historic Sites 78
International Historic Site 1
National Battlefield Parks 4
National Military Parks 9
National Battlefields 11
National Battlefield Site 1
National Memorials 29
National Recreation Areas 18
National Seashores 10
National Lakeshores 4
National Rivers 60
National Reserves 2
National Parkways 4
National Trails 23
Others 11
Total 483

There are many key events that occurred during the time frame, 1965 to 1997 and my generation had an opportunity to experience them all along with the many stresses and changes that came with them. This is a sample.
January 1, 1970 Passage of The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). It is a United States environmental law that promotes the enhancement of the environment and established the President’s Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). The law was enacted on January 1, 1970. NEPA does not apply to the President, Congress, or the federal courts. It created a long and complex public process designed to assure that federally funded projects met a number of objectives in regard to environment, species, limitation of environmental damage and proof that the work would not harm the environment.

A policy designed to do good things, an important policy, which has since been used by small groups of advocates to block important or required plans and activities on all federal lands. It has created a mantra that science done by the government and scientists of standing working with the government are manipulators, liars and fabricators. It has also turned too much management of natural resources from those with the training and understanding to judges with little to no understanding of the issues being confronted and the impact of their decisions on an entire agency.

This is particularly true with the US Forest Service, an agency created to manage lands for wise use. Advocates curtailing forest management so as to assure no disturbance to the forest, have found and will continue to find
that forests left undisturbed and unmanaged have ways to correct problems naturally, a process called fire.

In 1977, President Jimmy Carter created a dozen national monuments, in Alaska. The controversy that ensued led to the passage of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA). Through this act, Congress affirmed the Executive Order, adding to it. The act set aside 47 million acres (190,000 km$^2$) for the National Park System and 54 million acres (220,000 m$^2$) to the National Wildlife Refuge System.


The people of Alaska, having no say in this process, were angered and very upset by the passage of this act.
It was the employees of the National Park Service, sent forth like innocent troopers without equipment, to create, expand and manage the lands taken from the State, curtailing uses such as hunting, road closures and other actions. Lives were put at risk in certain areas and even today, feelings still exist about the taking. The areas created are magnificent and the problem was not the creation, it was the expectation that rangers and managers sent out into the areas could make it work and yet have almost no training or help in the types of actions and activities required in this endeavor.

During the 1960s numerous legal challenges arose over the mission of the National Park Service. Using the court decisions, Congress supplemented and clarified the Organic Act of 1916 through the General Authorities Act of 1970. Additional challenges during the 1970s required that Congress again clarify the mission of the National Park Service. The 1979 amendment to the General Authorities Act of 1970 has become known as the “Redwood amendment”, as it also contained language expanding Redwood National Park. The key part of that act, as amended, is:

“Congress declares that the national park system, which began with establishment of Yellowstone National Park in 1872, has since grown to include superlative natural, historic, and recreation areas in every major region of the United States, its territories and island possessions; that
these areas, though distinct in character, are united through their inter-related purposes and resources into one national park system as cumulative expressions of a single national heritage; that, individually and collectively, these areas derive increased national dignity and recognition of their superlative environmental quality through their inclusion jointly with each other in one national park system preserved and managed for the benefit and inspiration of all the people of the United States; and that it is the purpose of this Act to include all such areas in the System and to clarify the authorities applicable to the system. Congress further reaffirms, declares and directs that the promotion and regulation of the various areas of the National Park system, as defined in section 1c of this title, shall be consistent with and founded in the purpose established by section 1 of this title (the Organic Act provisions), to the common benefit of all the people of the United States. The authorization of activities shall be construed and the protection, management, and administration of these areas shall be conducted in light of the high public value and integrity of the National Park System and shall not be exercised in derogation of the values and purposes for which these various areas have been established, except as may have been or shall be directly and specifically provided by Congress.”

— 16 USC 1a-1
Does the US Congress derogate the values and purposes for which these areas have been established by not providing the resources and funds to maintain and protect them? Yes, it does, but notice the last sentence in the Redwood Amendment.

Derogation of these resources shall not be exercised, “except as may have been or shall be directly and specifically provided by Congress.”

During these years, the President’s of the United States have added National Park units to the system, many of importance, their number being:

- President Reagan: 18 NPS units added
- President George H. W. Bush: 14 units
- President Clinton: 19 units
- President George W. Bush: 7 units
- President Obama: 18 units

New park units have been significantly increased during this time, new laws have been laid down on Agencies and publics and Congress have yet to meet their responsibilities protecting and preserving the areas they have set aside.

In a way this is like a huge dairy cow operation. The barns and milking stalls were built in 1966 through Mission 66 and things were fairly good. Then, the milk
was so good, the managers added another 250 producing dairy cows to the herd and told the workers that the barns and milking stalls were plenty.
It was the fall of 1961 when I walked on to the campus of Gettysburg College wearing my freshman GBURG Beany. Survival was my first instinct, with no thought as to that day in May of 1965 when I would walk into the world, a free spirit.

Well, I wasn’t going into pre-med, chemistry was Hi Ho AG, business seemed rather foreign and God knew that I still had two years of German left – what’s an adverb? I couldn’t sing or play an instrument and no fences nearby needed painting. Of course, there was soccer and I did read about the early Presidents, the Incas, Mayans and Aztecs - would that count?

My major became American History. The first year we were called Freshmen or Frosh for short but that is a term that has surely changed by now. Our identity was hard to miss in our orange beanies, signs around our necks, our proficiency in lighting things with matches
as required and how well we could sing our school song which begins, “As softly the evening shadows…”

Gettysburg College was affiliated with the Lutheran Church and was a school with a heavy emphasis on liberal arts, history, and language. A comprehensive curriculum was required during the first two years and it was tough. It had no relationship to today’s “Liberal Education” practiced in so many colleges and universities. We learned history from the prehistoric to the present, we read the great scholars of the world both before and after BC/AD. We studied language, read about religions and the great texts, had classes leading to our majors and stayed busy. In all subjects, the classes were non-partisan.

Somewhere in my first nineteen years I began to give a great deal of thought to public service and the importance of it in our lives. Given my early years, there was a need within me to belong, to be part of something and, equally important, to be liked. Never a Boy Scout but enjoying helping others as I could was important.

In late winter of my freshman year, the future opened its door and I tripped through it. Perhaps it was an item on the Student Union Building (SUB) bulletin board or an item in the press, but fortune smiled on me. It was an announcement from the US National Park Service about a new program called the Student Trainee Program.
It was a three year program designed for college students. Selectee would work three summer seasons in two National Park Service areas, training to become a full time Park Historian, Ranger or Naturalist. If successful, the candidate would then begin working full time after his Senior year. Person would not be required to take the Federal Service Entrance Exam (the FSEE was not an easy exam) upon entering service and retirement years would be counted as full years from your first summer forward. In effect my retirement years would begin to accrue as full years in June of 1962, if I stayed with the NPS. (A few years later I would take the Federal Service Entrance Exam and pass it, just to prove that I was legitimate.)

Well, what the hey. A salary for three summers with decent pay and maybe I would like it. What kind of job was a graduate in American History going to get also came to mind? Forms were sent forward to apply for the Student Trainee Historian position with a starting salary of just under $3,000 a year. Maybe it was because I was at Gettysburg College in a History Major, next to a world famous battlefield managed by the NPS, but however it happened I was accepted into the program. Now maybe I was the only applicant, but that’s too negative a thought even for me.

As soon as college was over in 1962, I returned home, packed and got my Greyhound Tickets. The
adventure of my lifetime would begin by stepping onto a Greyhound Bus in Northern New Jersey in June of 1962, heading for, of all places, St. Augustine, Florida. I would be working at the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument, a Spanish fortification built beginning in 1672 in a town established in 1565.

The ride south exposed me to one of our great national tragedies, that of Jim Crow and the Black Laws. Something that I had not experienced before and would never want to experience again. Moving south from DC it started small and grew more onerous the further south I went. Blacks to the back of the bus, Whites only restrooms and seats in restaurants. Rude treatment of black people witnessed, mixed marriages were dangerous and the Klan working to create chaos and hatred. It was a bus trip of discovery, never forgotten, always disturbing.

A day later I arrived in St. Augustine. It was a Sunday. The office for the Monument was on the second floor of the Post Office where I was greeted by the Superintendent, Bert Roberts on his day off. They had arranged an apartment for me in an historic home located at 93 King Street owned by a lovely 70 year old woman who would become a good friend over the next two years. My new uniform had been previously ordered and was on hand, an article of clothing that would be part of me for 35 years, in at least three versions. Of
course, there was also that fabulous Stetson Hat, the finest wind catcher capable of great speeds once freed.

The park itself was about 10 blocks away, an easy walk, down on the waterfront. The little upstairs apartment was all that I needed, a bathroom, small kitchen for cooking, a nice bed and space to relax in. I had it all, a job, a place to live, mosquitos, nice friendly folks and a small stable for the cockroaches that marauded during the night.

My career began the next day. As a Student Trainee my job was to learn as much as possible about the operation and use of the National Monument. My main job was giving tours to visitors and greeting visitors as they entered the park. We made sure that they paid their entrance fee to the cashier and patrolled the grounds and Castillo. In our spare time we studied the history of the Castillo, reviewed records, and considered operational matters. I was also required to work a few days a month at Fort Matanzas National Monument just south of St. Augustine.

My job at Matanzas was to provide relief on days off for the Ranger, taking boat tours to Rattlesnake Island and doing jobs as needed. The Castillo park staff was small, consisting of permanent staff and seasonal staff. There were usually about a dozen seasonals that worked during the summer, hired from area colleges and schools to work as guides and in maintenance.
Beginning at the bottom of a career, I was learning about the basics of operating and working in a National Park. Meeting the permanent personnel that worked in places like the Castillo and hearing about how the public and St. Augustine felt about the park and the visitors. The staff at the Castillo was wonderful. The atmosphere that was created by them was engaging and professional and my love for the National Park Service had begun.

By the end of August, I packed, got back on the Greyhound and went north to home. Back at school for the beginning of the year, I was already missing the beaches, the cookouts, the friends and the absence of sororities. The work experience, and training received was excellent, so I began to adjust classes as possible, eventually moving to a Sociology and Anthropology minor, a wider range of history courses and additives like public speaking.

It was interesting and instructive, having been indoctrinated in the English history of the colonies, to learn of St. Augustine's founding in 1565. Learning of the other successful colonies of the Spanish Empire in North America. I was experiencing just how exclusive history was about the English colonies and settlements as though nothing happened in the colonies before 1620 or south of Roanoke Island.

College advanced, work continued and attempts to break out any sorority member for a date with an
Independent again failed. I did say I was stubborn, didn’t I? Uh, and stupid as well. In June I again rode the Greyhound down to St. Augustine to my old apartment, this time with a uniform packed although the Stetson was rather cumbersome. There were some new employees having replaced others who had transferred but again good people and very professional. It was great having two homes, one a college the other a National Monument.

Prior to the NPS taking over the Castillo, it was managed by the US Army for decades. Those days always provided us with some good stories as told by the military to those who had toured in the 1920’s. There is a powder magazine in the northeast bastion of the Castillo, well protected from cannon fire by a low entry, well away from the bastion entrance. Tours were given by army personnel back then and they basically worked for tips, so the better the story, the better the tip. We would always hear from former tourists – “where is that old prison cell”, “where was the comandantes wife sealed up”, “did they really torture prisoners in there” are but a small sample of the mild ones.

Protecting National Parks, Monuments and Historic Sites is not a simple job and protecting them requires protection on more than three levels. Protection from outside physical change and interests, protecting them from poorly trained workers and staff and insu-
lating them from the changes going on in the cultures and societies that constantly change outside the boundary. We know that protection from political interests is most difficult and most challenging. Protection from poor staff and workers is simply a matter of training and development in numerous fields. Insulation from the changes and values that are continually changing in society and our culture can also be dealt with, when we finally accept the fact that vision and planning for the future, not of the resource but of our society, is a missing and critical element. The future is a proactive science not a reactive embarrassment.

The Castillo, in 1963 and 1964 experienced a concept which I was unfortunately able to witness, being a new concept for parks brought to us by political means coming as it did from the Pyramids, France and the White House. No, it was not a mummified Spanish soldier in a glass tomb with French decoupage.

If you have been to Giza lately, and my gosh, who hasn't, you might have opted for an evening performance of “Son et Lumiere” at the pyramids of Egypt. In English the spectacle is still known as a “Sound and Light” show developed in France decades ago. So how does a program from France and Egypt arrive in St. Augustine, Florida you might ask.

In 1958 the NPS Division of Interpretation became interested in “Sound and Light,” a dramatic medium
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used at several historic monuments in Europe including Versailles and the Chateau of Chambord. The Chief of the Interpretation Division received French sound and light entrepreneurs the following year and began planning for installations at Independence National Historical Park, Castillo de San Marcos National Monument, Fort McHenry National Monument, and San Juan National Historic Site. The Fort McHenry plans were shelved and those for San Juan deferred, but Independence and Castillo de San Marcos had shows ready for installation after the summer of 1962.

The Castillo program, produced and operated under concession contract by the Sound and Light Corporation of America, featured the voices of Douglas Fairbanks, Jr., and Ralph Bellamy and music by Bernard Green performed by members of the New York Philharmonic. The installation required 294 lights, 64 stereo speakers, more than 15 miles of cable, and seating for 750. Because of the need to minimize the visual impact of the installation during the daytime, much of the equipment had to be mounted before each performance and removed afterward. Adult viewers were charged $1.50 and children 75 cents. The program was judged reasonably successful from an interpretive standpoint, but its high operating cost and inconsistent patronage led to its demise by 1965.

The show is for the night time, after dark. As the show opens the audience, sitting in grandstands on top
of the Castillo, would be chilled with dramatic music coming alive from out of the night. This would be followed by a wonderful voice beginning the script based in past centuries. Colored lights would light up scenes as the script unfolded along with music and voices. I will say that the program brought out the goose bumps and was impactful in a way.

However, let's talk about the other impactful elements that came with the program. Construction and placement of the system would have a negative effect on the resource itself. A set of risers was installed on top of one entire bastion, the San Pablo, for seats. The Control Room was built inside one entire bastion, the San Pedro bastion, with wires coming in from throughout the historic structure, buried in the structure.

Speakers were placed in rooms, courtyards, on exterior trees, along the sea wall the other bastions and the Ravelin. Speakers were accompanied by light panels as well, most in view of daytime visitors. All powered by that 15 miles of buried cable installed in the historic fabric of the Castillo, top to bottom.

During the summer when it was active, I lived ten blocks away from the Castillo on King Street. The music and voices came into my apartment every evening carried by mild breezes off the ocean. The seating area for the show filled the entire surface area of a bastion. The program did not succeed for very long. I returned to the
Castillo in the fall of 1965 and it was no longer there, but the impact to the resource was still there. Decisions made that should never have been permitted and an example of how mistakes are made by many sources including our own people.

In 1963, my second season, I worked with a new Supervisory Historian who would remain a friend throughout our careers. His name is Hobie Cawood, a future National Park Superintendent. His supervision was filled with activities and needed changes along with the desire to support improved resource protection. Years later he would do a masterful job bringing the Bicentennial at Independence Hall to fruition and glory.

During my first two summer seasons as a Trainee, I worked with people who have never been forgotten. Helen Hess, cashier at the Park entrance, Chub and Will, two of the permanent guides, and Al Manucy, Spanish Colonial Historian and prime researcher for St. Augustine. Jim and Pat Anderson my away from family, family, Hilda and so many others. Welcoming, friendly and interesting I often thought of them as role models for me years later.

During those summers, my habit for lunch was to go into a storage room used by maintenance, kick back and rest the wearies. I would be joined by two people who I remember fondly and with great respect. Joe and Luigi were both veterans of World War II and
had served together in Europe and on the front. They were members of the Red Ball Express which was 75% African-American. The Red Ball was the war machines delivery system. It consisted of truck drivers who supplied the front lines and kept them going. We had many great hours together. Joe would later die while I worked at Castillo and I was sure to attend his funeral out of respect and admiration.

What impressed me with the National Park Service was the quality of the management personnel and workers. Needing to feel like I was wanted and belonged it was a sure-fire combination to make me want to belong. During this time many of the management personnel and permanent employees within the NPS, were veterans of World War II and Korea.

Their life experiences went far beyond schools, colleges and apprenticeships. They had management and world experience helpful in creating a positive and organized work place. They worked at all levels of the service from Washington on down to the parks. In later decades this naturally changed as permanent employees with various backgrounds and degrees joined the Service; personnel with great knowledge but many were not as familiar with the implications of management and large numbers of employees.

It should also be noted that getting a permanent job with the National Park Service has always been
like winning a lottery. The jobs were sought after by large numbers of college students and graduates at the national level and seasonal employees who have tried to work their way in via seasonal appointments. There were very few who entered with the program that I was on (Student Trainee) and the program was very short lived. There had to be more, but I was only aware of four Trainees on the east coast.

The first Director of the NPS, during my career, was Connie Wirth, whom I never had the pleasure of meeting due to my position and age. We did however hear stories at times.

Connie was hosting a Regional Superintendent's Conference at Smoky Mountains National Park with Superintendents from the Southeast Region. One of the Superintendents from a large park arrived at the conference, whose name shall not be mentioned. At his park they had recently stopped a vehicle for serious cause and confiscated the vehicle as a result. Well, he showed up at the Conference in a Gold Cadillac with all the trimmings and Park Superintendent with the Park name on the doors. Director Wirth was very direct in his handling of this. He had the car towed away and the hapless Superintendent had to find a way back to his park with a much better understanding of vehicle acquisition. This was told to me, possibly true, possibly not, but knowing
the Superintendent involved it made perfect sense to me years later.

To clarify, the National Park Service is organized with its central office in Washington, DC and, in 1963 had ten regional offices that managed parks in areas of the country. This has since been reduced to seven regions plus the Denver Service Center which is the central planning, design, and construction management office for the National Park Service and the US Park Police Office in Washington, DC with policing authority in DC.

My junior year at Gettysburg was as exciting and interesting as the rest. There was work, APO (Alpha Phi Omega) a service fraternity, which I was now President of and wrestling with getting a B+, any old B+. If only the cafeteria, where I worked during the school year, gave out grades my GPA would have been a solid 3+. As my professors would say, “C, you got a plus.”

Having successfully met the requirements of the Student Trainee program for the first two seasons, I was now transferred to another park for the 1964 season.

Another bus trip, this time to Yorktown, Virginia for my third and final summer as a Trainee having advanced a pay grade. Could this be the end of Spam? It was a little harder to get to Yorktown by bus, so I wound up in the Washington, DC Greyhound Station at 2:30 AM. Just waiting for my 5:00 AM connection
to Yorktown. If you have never experienced the DC bus station at 3:00 AM, you have lived.

My assignment is to the Colonial National Parkway with National Park areas at both ends and Williamsburg in the middle. I would be working in Yorktown, Jamestown and on the Colonial Parkway. My job would expose me to patrols on the Parkway, archaeology at Jamestown, administrative functions, collecting fees at the entrance to Jamestown and tours and programs at Yorktown. My living accommodation was in the Swan Tavern stable at Yorktown, where I had my own stall. The oats were first rate and I was brushed in the evening. I was definitely inn stalled. The stable is shared with an engineer from the Region working on structures at Yorktown. He has his own well-appointed stall and we share a kitchen and a bathroom.

Work here varies from day to day as to where I will be assigned or stationed. I work with a large number of other seasonal employees from various colleges or schools. Two of the seasonal rangers that I work with on road patrol at night are becoming attorneys through the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg. On other nights I made a little pocket change playing poker with administrative staff. The staff and seasonal personnel were a treat to work with given a more complex and larger resource. Headquarters for Colonial Parkway was at Yorktown which is why I was housed there.
The Parkway is 23 miles long and links the three major historic sites on the peninsula, Yorktown, Williamsburg and Jamestown. It runs through military posts and is treated to both college crowds and military personnel. Common problems were high speeds, reckless driving and lovers' lanes. Back in those days' ranger personnel dealing with law enforcement received little training. They were still expected to protect both the resource and the people. Here I was, sitting in the driver's seat of a fast patrol car, fully outfitted for the issues, patrolling the Parkway. Here I was, giving out a ticket for high speed going thru a construction zone to a woman from Missouri.

Here I was in the Chief Ranger's office hearing about the process for giving out a ticket to a car from another state or region and listening while he talked on the phone with the woman in Missouri to note that there would be no fine. I was learning about new processes.

Military personnel were always quite adept at high speeds on the Parkway, sometimes exceeding 100 miles an hour at night. A Ranger is chasing one of those cars at night when it suddenly turns off the parkway onto a road and speeds on. Ranger continues to follow. He suddenly hears a large caliber handgun going off behind his car, which brings him to a stop.

Naval ships coming into Norfolk at that time would off load munitions up the York River at the Yorktown
Naval Weapons Station. It was located just a few miles from the Yorktown Battlefield and abutted the Colonial Parkway.

The Ranger in question was in hot pursuit of a vehicle needing to be stopped and as a result failed to stop at the Marine Guard Post at the entrance to the Weapons Station. The Marine on Guard advised the Ranger he had not stopped and did get his attention. A ticket was never issued, and the Ranger met a lot of nice Marines as he was stopped just in front of the Marine Barracks.

After learning that there was a magistrate in Williamsburg who handled ticket appearances and fines for Colonial on Thursday, I took the opportunity to sit in on a few sessions with Rangers. The Magistrate and his friends always played poker on Wednesday night in his office/courtroom. The Rangers, mostly seasonal, who often appeared there, knew to get to the office at least a half hour before the hearings began. That way they could clear away the poker chips and material before arrival of offenders. It was a very symbiotic relationship that worked well.

My other stall mate and I would sometimes go to Williamsburg on an off day, not often as we had different schedules, but a few times. We enjoyed going to ballgames being played by area teams. The games were watched by parents or friends from both sides. We would sit on a grandstand while we learned which team
the grandstand was rooting for. Then we would root for the other team. It was done in fun and we got to meet some very nice folks. If we did that today we would be arrested, beaten or wearing various flavors of beer and soda. The times, they do change.

All in all, it was another great summer for learning and with people I really enjoyed. Soon however it would be a return trip to home and off for the Senior year.

I graduated with a BA in American History and a Sociology Minor in 1965. In a class of about 500 I settled in around the half way mark and felt good about it, all things considered. I believe my classification was Summa Cum Nada.

By graduation I knew two things. I would be going to Grand Canyon National Park for three months of training at the Horace Albright Training Center, becoming a full time employee of the National Park Service. The Center, named for the second Director of the National Park Service who was a force for bringing historic sites into the National Park Service.

Training would begin the first week of July. I also had to consider the implications of military service and Vietnam. Rather than be drafted I chose to enlist in the Marine Corps Officer Candidate Program and would be reporting to Quantico in the spring of 1966. During June I drove down to Washington, DC to be sworn in by the US Marine Corps.
This then was the final split in regard to living with my mother Mary and Uncle Johnny, who were then living in Lambertville, NJ. In June, Johnny bought me my first car, a new 1965 VW sedan for $1,500.00 which I promptly named Tumbleweed. What a beautiful car and wonderful gift to continue my career with.

Classes at the Albright Training Center would begin on July 5th, a Monday. Check in and arrival was the weekend of July 3 and 4. With that in mind, I was on my way from New Jersey in a neatly packed Tumbleweed. This would be the first of what, in my career, would be many crossings of America. I would be on the road for eight months until my call up to Quantico, in a VW packed with all my worldly possessions (clothes and paperwork). The same trip today would require a Waste Management truck and three trailers. One more thing in the world has changed.

Upon arrival at the Canyon I had just turned 22 years old, having never been on an airplane or been back to the home of my youth in Texas. I was anxiously awaiting a pay check. There was no credit card or savings account since it was cash and carry. When working for the government, jobs are often rated with a General Schedule (GS) grade based on your annual salary. Having begun my career as a GS-3 I came to the Grand Canyon as a GS-5.
I still remember that first trek across country and a problem that I had with the VW. I had passed through Albuquerque, NM and was moving along the Interstate when it began to rain a little. Time to turn on the wipers. The wipers did not work. It wasn’t raining hard, so I kept pulling the wiper button thinking that it just might be new. Several miles later, I finally got the wipers to work. I take credit on that day for slowing down numerous vehicles in the east bound lanes as they saw me flashing my lights, mile after mile.

Finally arriving in Flagstaff on a Saturday morning stopped at a store to pick up some pants and items that would be needed at the Canyon. Wow was America beautiful. Travelling west was all new to me. I had been down the east coast and over to New Orleans, but the west was really new to me. Just ahead was a really big wow, the Grand Canyon.

I checked in to the training center after deciding that I would not jump off the rim and fly. There were about 30 of us checking in, former seasonal and part time workers, but now all permanent employees. Those that graduated would go on to positions in the US for their first assignment. Our age range varied from 21 up to middle age. We were men and women, all Caucasian as I recall. Our housing was two to an apartment at the training center. We would live there until mid-September.
Our instructors included experienced NPS managers Frank Kowski, Howard Chapman, Tom Thomas, Dave Karraker, Don Jackson along with an excellent support staff. It was an amazing group of men and women that brought us into the service full time. These were people who you can never forget who gave so much of their time orienting us to an agency. An agency with one of the most unique, philosophical missions in our country. Several of the good folks attending that session have passed on over the years but there are still several of us, retired and still kicking up dust.

In our free time we hiked the Canyon, visited other parks and exercised our elbows and dance steps at the Canyon bars. A few of those attending were married and most had their wives with them. A few however found love and happiness right there in the classroom. The rest of us were single and enjoyed a busy summer at the Canyon.

The FBI taught us firearms and shooting as one example of the kind of training we received. Mountain rescue was also taught out at the rim of the Canyon. We practiced moving injured people up and down cliff faces and other difficult team rescues.

For some stupid reason I volunteered to be an injured party being lowered over a cliff in a wire litter. I was strapped in nicely and then the litter was carried to the cliff edge. When the litter was taken on belay the litter suddenly went erect and I was bound up in a basket
looking down at a drop of several hundred feet. I did not scream or faint, as I managed to hold my fear to a near heart attack. But it was educational.

Having a degree in American History, my immediate future would be in parks of an historical nature, of which there are many. The day of notification for our assignments came in September. It was like the scene on draft day with the National Football League. We would eventually be spread across the nation. Came the day and my assignment was going to be Salem Maritime National Historic Site in Salem, Massachusetts.

Then, within a few hours, Frank Kowski, Superintendent of the Training Center, got a call from Bert Roberts, the Superintendent of Castillo de San Marcos. Superintendent Roberts asked that I be sent to the Castillo instead. I hadn't even thought of that but was delighted to hear that I would be returning to my good friends at the Castillo, even though it was only going to be a few months before Quantico. Leaving Albright was another example of leaving college. A group of good friends that you might see again but then might not. All were being left behind with fond hopes and wishes for successful careers and making a difference.

In my career with the NPS I have worked with and become friends with literally thousands of people. Moving often as we do you develop acquaintances. You rarely develop the kind of friends that people have, liv-
ing in a community for decades or for their life. Some of our employees do it better than others. Most permanent employees at that time, other than in urban areas, lived in some form of NPS housing within the units that they worked or had to find other housing outside the park to purchase or rent for the duration of their assignment, often in less than six or seven years.

It was possible to live within a park and merely shop in the nearest community or have medical services and rarely meet community residents. The main exceptions were families going to church or spouses who worked outside in the community. Younger couples with children were somewhat more challenged, having to enroll their kids in local schools, who would develop local relations and then, in a few years, be relocated when their parents were transferred to another park.

Some parks, like Big Bend and Death Valley have their own grade schools for children, which are surprisingly well run. Students often find themselves going at distance to high school or grade school, while some parents, after their children go to grade school, move outside a park so that their kids can attend a local high school and avoid the long bus rides. Back in the 1950’s there was an excellent story with photos in Life Magazine about the school at Death Valley and the conditions experienced by the students and workers living in the desert. Photos that truly told a story.
Yes, things have improved today, as communities have come closer to some parks with schools nearby, but many parks still must contend with school locations and the education of park children. It still raises a question that most parents, offered a transfer, will ask or investigate before accepting a new position. It is and always has been a stress factor for couples with young children or pre-college students.

In leaving Albright and the Grand Canyon, our trainee group was very much like a good pad of butter, we were spread all over. We arranged and travelled from the east coast to Hawaii. The process of sending us on considered elements like previous park experience if any, married or single, with or without children and medical or other concerns. It was a well thought out and executed program and one of the many reasons that working in the NPS was such a pleasure.

Returning to the Castillo, I was housed in a beach cottage down by Fort Matanzas National Monument and would sub for the ranger in charge on his days off. The wee cottage was near Marineland, and a hundred yards from the beach, the magnificent beach, just behind the dunes. My main job was the Castillo, but I subbed at Fort Matanzas on days off. Supt. Roberts also sent me up to Fort Caroline National Memorial in Jacksonville to cover for the Superintendent who was on vacation.
My road having been determined at the Horace Albright Training Center, I set out to continue working in support of the Castillo. My title by this time was Park Historian, giving lectures and tours throughout the Castillo. I was also following work being done on the Cubo Line, an archaeological excavation of a protective embankment outside the fort. Vestiges of the “Son et Lumiere” were gone and most of the personnel, other than the Superintendent and Chief of Maintenance were the same.

Two of the unsung heroes of the Castillo were Historians Albert Manucy and Luis Arana. They worked for years researching and writing the history of the Castillo and Saint Augustine. Much is owed to them for their effort. Albert Manucy was one of the first on-site Historians of repute in the National Park Service. Born in St. Augustine, his master’s degree was received from the University of Florida in 1934. He began work with
the NPS first as a Work Progress Administration (WPA) worker and then full time. My time with him was short but obviously memorable. His awards and recognitions were extensive.

Luis, who I worked with frequently, came to the Castillo in 1955, transferring from El Morro National Historic Site in San Juan. He worked at the Castillo until 1993 having produced over 85 publications and articles on the Castillo and other Spanish sites. King Juan Carlos of Spain awarded him the Order of Isabel la Catolica in the grade of Commander in 1988.

The true significance of the Castillo, Fort Matanzas and Fort Caroline in America is the simple fact that our understanding of Spanish colonization in the United States is limited and little understood. This has changed since the 1960's through the presence of these resources and the fact that the internet is now an Encyclopedia Britannica a hundred times over.

When I was in school, Columbus discovered America, and the English settled America at Plymouth Rock, Jamestown and Fort Raleigh. Hopefully younger generations are being exposed to the true nature of colonization, discovery and the peoples who lived here for 15,000 years before our coming. They might be amused as to how the first “Americans” walked to the future America from Asia.
The following summary of the Castillo’s history, largely unknown in the United States, follows, quoted from Wikipedia, *The Free Encyclopedia*.

“The Castillo de San Marcos is the oldest masonry fort in the continental United States. Located on the western shore of Matanzas Bay in the city of St. Augustine, Florida, the fort was designed by the Spanish engineer Ignacio Daza. Construction began in 1672, 107 years after the city’s founding by Spanish Admiral and conquistador Pedro Menéndez de Avilés, when Florida was part of the Spanish Empire. The fort’s construction was ordered by Governor Francisco de la Guerra y de la Vega after the destructive raid by the English privateer Robert Searles in 1668. Work proceeded under the administration of Guerra’s successor, Manuel de Cendoya in 1671, and the first coquina stones were laid in 1672. The construction of the core of the current fortress was completed in 1695, though it would undergo many alterations and renovations over the centuries.

When Britain gained control of Florida in 1763 pursuant to the Treaty of Paris, St. Augustine became the capital of British East Florida, and the fort was renamed Fort St. Mark, until the Peace of Paris (1783) when Florida was transferred back to Spain and the fort’s original name restored. In 1819, Spain signed the Adams–Onís Treaty which ceded Florida to the United States in 1821; consequently, the fort was designated a United States Army base and renamed Fort Marion, in honor of American
Revolutionary War hero Francis Marion. The fort was declared a National Monument in 1924, and after 251 years of continuous military possession, was deactivated in 1933. The 20.48-acre (8.29 ha) site was subsequently turned over to the United States National Park Service. In 1942 the original name, Castillo de San Marcos, was restored by an Act of Congress.

Castillo de San Marcos was twice besieged: first by English colonial forces led by Carolina Colony Governor James Moore in 1702, and then by Georgia colonial Governor James Oglethorpe in 1740. Possession of the fort has changed six times, all peaceful, among four different governments: Spain, 1695–1763 and 1783–1821, Kingdom of Great Britain, 1763–1783, and the United States of America, since 1821 (during 1861–1865, it was under control of the Confederate States of America).

Under United States control the fort was used as a military prison to incarcerate members of Native American tribes starting with the Seminole—including the famous war chief, Osceola, in the Second Seminole War—and members of western tribes, including Geronimo’s band of Chiricahua Apache. The Native American art form known as Ledger Art had its origins at the fort during the imprisonment of members of the Plains tribes such as Howling Wolf of the southern Cheyenne.
Ownership of the Castillo was transferred to the National Park Service in 1933, and it has been a popular tourist destination since then.”

The fort was also used as a military prison during the American Revolutionary War. Among those imprisoned was Christopher Gadsden, the Lieutenant governor of South Carolina. He was also a delegate to the Continental Congress and a brigadier general in the Continental Army during the war. He was released after 11 months.

The Castillo was never taken by force perhaps since it was constructed of coquina blocks quarried from local sites. Coquina is a limestone material formed almost entirely of sorted and cemented fossil debris, most commonly coarse shells and shell fragments. It has several outstanding qualities but its most significant is the fact that when struck by a cannonball it does not crack or break, it absorbs. The ball hits the wall, creates a hole slightly larger than the cannon ball and stops within a few inches. Perhaps one of our first shock absorbers.

For me, Florida in the early 1960’s was a delight, except for the segregation and treatment of minorities, mostly blacks. It was my first non-New Jersey driver’s license and registration, the first of many to come. (I have a master’s degree in US Driver’s License Exams.) Saint Augustine was the place for my coldest day of all time, and that includes days that were well below zero in
other locations. The uniform of the day was long sleeve with jacket and I was in the sally port most of the day welcoming visitors as they entered. Yes, it was 33 degrees and 100 percent humidity. I spent the day losing weight from shaking so much from that bone chilling cold. Has Florida ever had a case of frost-bite?

People in Florida had a little more direct method for working out problems, as I learned. One of our older guides often frequented the Chimes Restaurant across the street from the Castillo, by our parking lot. His wife worked in the Castillo in the gift shop. Seems that one of the waitresses at the Chimes and our guide often visited while he was there having coffee. Well, one day his wife walked across the street to the Chimes and went over to where they were sitting. She pulled out a gun and explained in great detail how things were going to go from there on out, and so they did.

Superintendent Roberts would be transferred to another office in December and things would change somewhat. Regardless, I was already sworn into the Marine Corps. I was preparing to enter the 40th Officer Candidate Course at Quantico, Virginia in the spring of 1966. My immediate family had fought in every war and engagement in America since 1720 and I believed that my DNA was not about to let me wait around to be drafted.
The National Park Service was agreeable to my departure for military service and more importantly reinstatement when and if I came back. Thinking ahead, I began a routine of working out and running for distance on the beach sands.

It was a bright and cheery morning at Fort Matanzas, as I got up in the beach house to go to work. The beach house was nice, it had a sink. I was brushing my teeth and bent over the sink but instead of my back stopping my bending over, it just said nuff is enuff. I caught myself using my hands on the rim and did not hit my head on the sink, by a small measure. It should also be pointed out that there was some pain involved with this as well.

I spent the next few days on my back until it was possible to have a little relief and start moving around again. I was advised to make an appointment with doctors at the Jacksonville Naval Air Station to check on things and did so.

I had the exam and before I left the Navy Doctor came out to talk with me. My health was good, but my back had a congenital curve down at the coccyx and my enlistment with the Marine Corps was over. I would receive an Honorable Discharge as my back would not permit me to go forward. My self-question as to what I would do at the end of enlistment was taken away. It was frankly a disappointment as I wanted to serve my
country. In a weird but good way, I was looking forward to the training and experience of the Corps.

My drive back to St. Augustine was not a happy one and I still remember that first night back at my apartment. I haven’t been that drunk since and the meal of spaghetti was no help. The road in front of me had taken a turn and now I was committed to a road that was less taken. It wasn’t an ending, it was a true beginning.

The new Superintendent at the Castillo, replacing Bert Roberts, had a more classical and rigid style of management which I never really adjusted to. In the late summer, hurricane season, we were on alert for an incoming hurricane while I was working at Fort Matanzas, managed by the Castillo. It was a good storm with plenty of high wind, rain and moderate damage. I worked 24 hours that day on patrol, being sure that things and people were safe. Being sure that our boat and dock were secured, campers gone from Rattlesnake Island and no one out on the beaches or in trouble on the road. By the next morning things were settling down, but phones were out. Wanting to alert the Castillo to the situation at Fort Matanzas I drove to the office in St. Augustine and reported to the Superintendent. My thanks, a chewing out because I was wearing boots and therefore out of uniform. Well, maybe I had joined the Marines.

In my spare time I went up to Craig Airfield in Jacksonville and began taking flying lessons. I was able
to get in several solo flights while at the Castillo, but that stopped when I transferred out of the Castillo. Kind of exciting being up in the air with all those Naval aircraft from Mayport Naval Air Station, located down the road. We might have been flying at different altitudes, but my neck never stopped bothering me from continually looking up for company. The Cessna 180 would not have been much competition for those Mach 1 aircraft. I wish I had stayed with the lessons, but my next assignment was in a different region and I had less time.

There will be many transfers in my career because for rangers, interpreters, supervisors, maintenance personnel, key administrative personnel and managers the road to advancement is through the door. The advantage given by this process is the experience gained from working in different types and sizes of National Park units as well as in varied communities. Personnel hired into the Park Service from other agencies and groups, especially in key positions, are most often at a loss of words and loss of place. Our policies and our mission are nuanced in many ways, always with protection of the resource in mind and it takes time to understand and appreciate how those values are applied in a local ecosystem.

It is unfortunate that the Service had but now has no real way to track and record experience levels for Managers and Supervisors. So much experience that could be of great value is just never used, because it isn’t
known, appreciated or maintained in a manner for use in personnel selections.

In a sense, my apprenticeship was just about over. I was now entering my fifth year in the Park Service, having worked in several programmatic areas and become basically familiar with processes and some of the skills needed to work with visitors of all ages and levels with or without attitude.
From 1960 to sometime after 1980, transfers were handled by the Washington Office. They would work park vacancies and if you met the requirements you would be placed on a list for the receiving park to review and select from. There was a GS-7 announcement for a Supervisory Historian at Booker T. Washington National Monument in Franklin County, Virginia. It was a small area, but the beauty of a small area is the simple fact that it has to produce most of the same plans, reports and documents as the large parks. With a smaller staff there was an opportunity for a larger experience in the operation of a park. Fred Wingeier was the Superintendent there and I was selected to fill the job beginning in the late fall of 1966.

Tumbleweed, my VW, and I headed north in 1966, first living in Rocky Mount, Virginia. It proved easier to live in Vinton, Virginia a suburb of Roanoke. Fred lived in Roanoke and we often commuted to the Monument.
together. We would be in a park car driving over the twenty or so miles to Booker T. Washington at a set time every morning as was the routine. Fred, for all the time he was at the Park waved to every car he drove past for years. For so long that every car we drove past waved to us and smiled without even thinking about it.

Fred had been a Park Ranger in the Great Smokies, a GS-9 I believe. At some point, while at that assignment in 1961, he somehow managed to get cross-wise with the Director, Connie Wirth. This shows us another way in which a transfer could happen. He was transferred to Booker T. Washington as Superintendent, another GS-9 at that time. He would remain there until his death from cancer in 1967. He was a good man, enjoyable to work with and working at it all the time. What had happened between he and the Director I never knew or wanted to know. I just know that he never let that intrude upon his work or his feeling for the NPS.


“Washington was from the last generation of black American leaders born into slavery and became the leading voice of the former slaves and their descendants. They were newly oppressed in the South by disenfranchisement and the Jim Crow discriminatory laws enacted in the post-Reconstruction Southern states in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.
Washington was a key proponent of African-American businesses and one of the founders of the National Negro Business League. His base was the Tuskegee Institute, a historically black college in Alabama that he formed. As lynchings in the South reached a peak in 1895, Washington gave a speech, known as the “Atlanta Compromise”, which brought him national fame. He called for black progress through education and entrepreneurship, rather than trying to challenge directly the Jim Crow segregation and the disenfranchisement of black voters in the South.

Washington mobilized a nationwide coalition of middle-class blacks, church leaders, and white philanthropists and politicians, with a long-term goal of building the community’s economic strength and pride by a focus on self-help and schooling. But, secretly, he also supported court challenges to segregation and restrictions on voter registration, passing on funds to the NAACP for this purpose. Black militants in the North, led by W. E. B. Du Bois, at first supported the Atlanta Compromise but after 1909, they set up the NAACP to work for political change.”

In the early 20th Century he was labeled an Uncle Tom by later generations of African Americans and remains so today. They much preferred the more activist approaches of W.E.B. Du Bois. Booker was a leader of his people in the 19th century, a speaker, founder of Tuskegee Institute in Alabama, a writer and educator. Tuskegee Institute was founded by Booker T. Washington
in 1881 under a charter from the Alabama legislature for the purpose of training teachers in Alabama. Tuskegee's program provided students with both academic and vocational training.

He always felt that with education and work blacks could be anything they wanted to be in America. He espoused working together with whites, not in anger but together and is known for his Atlanta Speech of 1895. There he spoke to a huge crowd about his views and the commitments of both black and white leaders to a compromise in working together.

He viewed the reconstruction a failure following the Civil War as it was about giving things and positions to former slaves but not providing them with education and a foundation for growth. Paraphrasing a portion of his speech he noted that blacks and whites could be as fingers on the hand, but that those fingers when making up the fist could do wonderful things. As a former slave his views were that slaves most needed education and that with time would find their place in a unified society. His was a long term vision that could not meet the expectations of people who had been held back for so long.

Read his book, "Up From Slavery" and see a man committed to bringing races together, knowing that it could not be accomplished overnight. President Teddy
Roosevelt was an admirer of his works and a supporter, among many others of the time.

My time at Booker T. Washington was largely spent in writing and developing a new Interpretive Prospectus for the park. This plan detailed how we interpreted and showed the life of Booker T. in exhibits, trails, film, tours and publications. Pete Shedd, the interpretive specialist from the Richmond Office, which was the Southeast Regional Office, assisted with this. We began to use the concept of "tissue paper" museum items for tours and exhibits. Meaning that instead of using a museum item for exhibit in certain situations or for handling by visitors during tours, an exact replica would be used. One that could be broken or lost without consequence.

We also focused on the use of exhibits that could bring the site to life, conveying the hardship faced by slaves at that time as noted by Booker T Washington in his writings. It is not easy to interpret slavery and its outcomes, but it is a most significant element in our history. Slavery is not a Walt Disney production, it has to be interpreted in a way that may offend some blacks and many whites but must be understood by others for what it was and how it still afflicts our Country today.

Working at Booker T. Washington was a challenge in many ways, the Park being in Franklin County, Virginia which was still a center of segregation and opposition to blacks. A mile north of the Monument
there was a large steel cross that had been erected years back. It was still used for cross burnings and gatherings of KKK members from the local area. Black staff from the Park that lived with their families locally, were still subjected to vandalism and ugly behavior by people who lived locally. We tried working with the FBI, but it was never effective, not for want of trying.

It was never a complete story in those years, but we did receive visitors and interpreted the site as best we could. I recently looked up Franklin County to see what they were doing for tourism and change. Most communities want and market any National Monument, Park, Memorial, Battlefield or etc. as an attraction for visitation and tourism. I was greatly disappointed to view the County and local websites and still see no reference, mention or map location portrayed for Booker T. Washington National Monument. Could not believe it.

He was a great man during the decades after slavery, working in the south, helping his people to adjust and make progress. Franklin County should be proud of his birth, regardless the circumstance, for the man and leader that he became. As with all my assignments, people are owed for their support, assistance and the experience they provided. Fred Wingeier and Louise Aydlett, Administrative Officer/Secretary worked well and truly with the site and did a great job working in somewhat
hostile territory, along with Sidney and John on the Maintenance crew.

My feeling about experiences like this is that they are disappearing as opportunities for incoming employees. With budget woes, more of the upfront work in visitor centers and elsewhere is being done by volunteers. Some of this is due to grade creep over the decades and some of it is just not appreciating the values represented by small areas. I would be amazed if there was any park with a GS-9 Superintendent today, and probably far fewer GS-11 Superintendents as well. These were the areas that taught Superintendents their jobs and were stepping stones for careers. Their loss important.

A good park manager should have learned their trade at the front door and career ladders and training programs should provide for that. Within the past year we have had, according to the news reports, a manager who destroyed portions of a mound culture site building a trail through the site. Where was the training that provided this well meaning person with the knowledge for managing a site such as this?

Even so, working at Booker T. Washington provided me with a chance to meet and work with other more advanced interpretive specialists that worked in the Roanoke office of the Blue Ridge Parkway. It was a wonderful opportunity and extremely helpful to me.
Of course, during my work at Booker T. Washington I was able to meet my first wife, Mildred Dearing, and her wonderful family living in Stewartsville, Virginia. We dated for some time and would marry shortly before my transfer to Cape Hatteras National Seashore as a GS-9 District Supervisor. It wasn’t always easy to meet someone wanting to become a gypsy and we lived many years together in many different places.

Before leaving Booker T. Washington, for whom I have the greatest respect and admiration, a few of his quotes.

“If you want to lift yourself up, lift up someone else.”

“Success is to be measured not so much by the position that one has reached in life as by the obstacles which he has overcome.”

“Few things can help an individual more than to place responsibility on him, and to let him know that you trust him.”

Something for each and everyone of us, regardless of origin or race.
When the newly married couple arrived at Cape Hatteras in the winter of 1968, we were treated to new Mission 66 housing for employees at Headquarters in Manteo, North Carolina. A nice three bedroom home located back by the sound. When we arrived, we were also treated to an unexpected shivaree at our house on the night of our arrival. Food, drink and celebration with old and new friends. After it was all over, we found a pair of geese decoys in our bathtub.

Mission ’66 was a ten year program, conceived by Director Connie Wirth in 1955 supported by the Congress and President Eisenhower. Its purpose was to reinvigorate and replenish the infrastructure and interpretive programs of the National Park Service in time for its 50th year Celebration, in 1966. Resources that were in poor repair and desperately in need of help due to restrictions imposed on funds during WW II. One of its many accomplishments was the construction of housing at several NPS parks to replace old cabins and worn out facilities in some cases and new housing areas in others.
Of course, as you will find out, the Park Service of today needs another Mission 66 program in the worst way. How about Mission 30? I don't think the parks can wait until Mission 2066.

On arrival, Cape Hatteras had four districts; a south district on Ocracoke Island, a district at Cape Hatteras and a district at Bodie Island. The fourth district consisted of the Headquarters complex, Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and Wright Brothers National Memorial at Kitty Hawk. Fort Raleigh is also home to the Fort Raleigh Waterside Theater, a 3,500 seat outdoor theater playing “The Lost Colony” every summer since 1937. The Theater is operated and managed by the non-profit Roanoke Island Historical Association. I was to be the District Supervisor for this fourth district as it required an historian.

Two major training centers were active at the time, Horace Albright at the Grand Canyon in Arizona and Steven Mather at Harper’s Ferry, West Virginia. Steven Mather was the first Director of the National Park Service and one of the driving forces for its success and creation. Both centers trained in various fields. Albright was strong in orientation and park ranger programs for employees. Mather was more focused on interpretation and interpretive services. Harpers Ferry was also the Design Center for Media, Exhibit and Interpretive media for the National Park Service.
During the first year at Cape Hatteras I had an opportunity to go to Mather Training Center for a session on Interpretive Writing. During that week I met and worked with another excellent staff of professionals who I enjoyed meeting and returned to Cape Hatteras committed to keeping things running in the good way that I had found them.

There was a new program being put together at this time by the Washington Office of the NPS. It would have three elements, all revolving around environment and educational efforts both in schools and parks. Curricula for schools was developed under the National Environmental Education Development program (NEED), National Environmental Study Areas created in parks (NESA) and changes in management of all parks based on sound environmental principles. It was to be announced in a broad cross section of Parks by a team of personnel all from the Mather Training Center. It must have been the summer of 1968 when Hatteras received a call.

Mather Training Center wanted me to join the team that was going to be doing the work, later lovingly called “The Flying Circus.” It was an assignment that would last about six to eight weeks. Cape Hatteras could have said no given that time commitment but chose instead to approve my participation. I hoped I wasn’t already wearing thin.
During that assignment we put material together and practiced presentations to be made to the workforce. Director Hartzog mandated that employees at the selected parks were to attend. The daylong session was to include personnel from all the various departments, including management. As you might imagine, it was an “Oh Joy” moment for most parks in a very busy time of the year. The country was split up into five segments and each of us in the program received a list of about 15 random Park Units in one of those segments. It was designed as an introduction to the programs and was not meant to visit all of the parks at that time. My parks were spread out from Washington, DC, to the Southeast, the Mississippi River and the Canadian border. It was an invigorating time allowing me to meet many park personnel and Superintendents. It was an important program in my view which I tried to convey in the presentations. However, my presentations were more like those of an encyclopedia salesman rather than a used car salesman. They could have been better. The program was put together by Superintendent Ray Nelson, Mather Training Center along with Rob Milne and Steve Lewis, two of the instructors.

The presenters gathered afterward to compare notes and compile a report for the Director’s Office and then it was back home to Cape Hatteras. In the meantime, a new Office of Environmental Education was being put
together in the Washington Office. Director Hartzog brought Wayne Miller into the program from outside the service because he often reached outside the NPS for certain skill sets. My work experience at Cape Hatteras, a lovely park, was soon to be cut short as I was requested to join the Office of Mr. Miller. It was early in 1969 and the next two years would be strange as I was not really accustomed to life as a ping pong ball. But I was learning.

As short as my stay was, there was an opportunity to work with three types of parks in one location; National Seashore, National Historic Site and National Memorial all different but all with the same Mission. Having a larger staff, it was also possible to see the different approaches and attitudes among the staff based on a number of factors.

Cape Hatteras was very classy and thanked me for my short visit. I felt very bad about it as it was an excellent park with fine personnel and a few very good friends. The two geese decoys stayed behind to nest.
Moving to Washington was a new and exciting experience in terms of finding a place to live, learning how to get downtown without a car and how to never smile or say something while on a bus. It certainly wasn’t St. Augustine, Roanoke or Manteo.

I arrived in Washington for work as a GS–11 Environmental Specialist in early 1969. It was a small office on the 11th floor of the 801 Building, up the street from the Department of Interior. Wayne Miller, the Chief, had managers for the three programs plus a few others in the office. There was a manger for NEED, for NESA and for park environmental programs. My first day at the office in the 801 Building I got off the elevator on the wrong floor, the ninth and not the eleventh. I was met by a wall and two closed doors at the ends of a 50 foot hallway. Yes, my first day and I had already found the Secret Service’s office.
One of the first tasks was in helping put the first budget together for the Director, as a new office. It was a flip chart special. My inner self took hold briefly as I entered the figures for the totals. Wayne, JR Whitehouse and I, went over to the Director’s office to discuss the budget, which we presented. All went according to plan until the Director noticed the final figure for the budget which was something like $2,350,807 only it was $2,350,807.10. I don’t know if Wayne or JR appreciated it, but the Director had a light moment.

While on Director Hartzog we need to spend a little time visiting with him. Over the years I had opportunity to meet with all the Directors that followed Conrad Wirth. In my estimation, and the feelings of a vast number of NPS personnel from that time, Director Hartzog has been our best Director since Horace Albright and Steven Mather. He served from 1964 until 1972. He was an attorney with the necessary skill sets to drive and lead an agency like ours. I believe that Robert Utley, NPS Historian, said it best. His Forward to an Oral Interview with Director Hartzog in 2006 is attached in the Appendix.

Others that passed through the Office were Bob Nunn, Boyd Evison, Jean Matthews and Bill Bullard. The curriculum for introduction and teaching in elementary schools using the NEED program, was worked up by an educational consultant from California. Programs
for fifth to seventh grade classes on the environment. I still remember one class from DC used the program and took a field trip out to Prince William Forest Park in Virginia. The children were given an opportunity to consider some items and could disperse to areas that they were comfortable in to reflect. True to experience, several chose urban settings on pavement, concrete and manhole covers. No large moral to the story other than my feelings about the limited opportunities and experiences available to children in the inner cities and how difficult it was for them.

The NEED and NESA programs were well handled out of the Washington Office. Changing the approach of managers in the field was more challenging. We could present it in papers and memos but results from that method were neither good nor plentiful. Near the end of 1969 the decision was made to shift my position and funds to a field unit to try and implement changes. Before I knew it, I was on my way to Cedar City, Utah. I would work in the Southern Utah Group Office, managed by Karl Gilbert, as a GS-11 Environmental Specialist. I don’t recall who made the decision, perhaps Regional Director Kowski in the Southwest Region. Along with my salary, funds were provided to start up or create a few environmental programs while there to ascertain any changes or results from those actions in the field and acceptance in the field for the program.
The office was staffed by senior specialists in all the fields; maintenance, law enforcement, interpretation, resource management and administration. Hogwarts had been disturbed by the arrival of an uninvited presence, a young muggle.
Southern Utah Group Office

The concept behind the Group Office was to have key personnel in administration, interpretation, law enforcement, maintenance and resource management in one central office. They would then be available for consultation and assistance for several parks, not just one. The Southern Utah Group was made up of Cedar Breaks, Bryce Canyon, Zion, Pipe Spring and Capital Reef. Not that this was too much for one person, they added the following to my list, Glen Canyon, Grand Canyon and the Horace Albright Training Center. Perhaps the song lead-in “On the road again” characterizes my stay with the Group Office.

Working with staff and the Superintendents of those parks was a pleasure for me, perhaps not as much so for them. Ideas were there, concepts were there but funds were not. My program had a small amount of funding which was used at several of those units. Not enough to prove that environmental projects could be easily implemented without funding help. Yes, there was advice on some things that could make a change, but
parks with limited funds find new programs to be somewhat of a four letter word.

I did take on one large project, working with the Chief of Maintenance in the Group Office. Back when Zion National Park was forming, NPS personnel had visited the town of St. George, Utah. They apparently promised that, someday, there would be a road into the Kolob Canyon area of Zion from the main road, now Interstate 15.

More than three decades pass, and the promise is kept. The road is a disaster. It is planned and built on soils and material that could not hold a road nor keep slopes from failing. Maintenance cost was high and closures frequent. It was also an intrusion into an area of the park best left isolated.

The road exists and the approach we used was to try and find a new process or material for the road. Material that would work to improve the road and prevent further damage. Despite our effort and to no surprise, nature won another round. The road is still there today.

Yes, it overlooks a beautiful canyon and is a wonderful, often unsupervised opening into Zion, no disagreement. Does it assist St. George with tourism dollars? Probably not, given the overall development and nature of Southern Utah and St. George. Is it costly to maintain? Given the traffic received it remains a costly
item for Zion. There were surely higher priorities for road and trail funds in Zion during our work there.

Out comes my naivety affect backpack, to document the history and effect of a situation like this. Sometimes I put my foot in my mouth and sometimes I put my foot into somebody else’s mouth. I wrote a report on the Kolob Canyons situation, based it on the facts and submitted it as an example of decisions being carried out no longer needed or necessary. The road was built three decades after the road was promised and the region had changed. Analysis of the material that the road was being built on surely identified it as a serious problem.

The location and construction of the road exposed the park to large maintenance costs as well as an unattended entrance into the back of Zion. The report was designed to make certain offices aware of the way in which we sometimes created environmental problems.

Finished, I sent the report in to the Southwest Region and to engineering offices in Denver. Like an Ivory Billed Woodpecker in the Sierra Madre, the report was rumored to exist but never seen again.

Bob Hyder, Superintendent at Bryce Canyon National Park also produced a very fine program for environmental education with the limited funds available. There were also small successes at Glen Canyon and with programs at Horace Albright Training Center.
By now it was becoming obvious. Funds were not there to implement programs in the parks, regardless of the desire to do so. My position was not going to be able to meet its intended goals and there were surely Superintendents who had no desire or time for someone talking about changes in their programs.

The Regional Director, Frank Kowski, was aware of this and then came the call. Would I be interested in going back to Washington, DC to interview for position of Superintendent? It was a new and somewhat controversial area just coming on line called Wolf Trap Farm Park for the Performing Arts.

There would be other interviewees as performing arts of this magnitude was somewhat new to the National Park Service. Many would not be happy or comfortable with an area like this being added to the Service. This might be a fun and challenging position and I could enter the management ranks. As it turned out there were only two people willing to interview for the position. Management ranks were being opened to, of all people, park historians.

Russell Dickenson and Jack Fish were the regional managers of the National Capital Region, location of Wolf Trap. Both of whom I greatly respected and enjoyed working with. So, flight to Washington, interviews with key personnel, flight back home and a later phone call offering me the GS-12 Superintendent position at Wolf Trap. It was the fall of 1970.
My advancement as a Superintendent at this level and at my age was not because of my skill, it was just the luck of being in some right places at the right or wrong time. Park personnel, who worked years to advance, would not have been happy to hear about the young fart being given an opportunity like this. No argument from me. But given the chance my job was to try and make the most of it, good or bad, but not ugly. Most would not have wanted the job given it was an unusual park to begin with and not in keeping with the past values. It was a risk position from the outset, but what an experience.
Today, the name of the Park is Wolf Trap National Park for the Performing Arts but when I arrived on November 15, 1970 it was as you see in the heading.

In colonial times it was called Wolf Trap. Later it would be the home of Jouett and Catherine Filene Shouse where they raised finely bred boxer dogs and thoroughbred horses. Jouett was a conservative democrat from Kansas. He served in the Congress from Kansas and was a powerful presence in the politics of the 1930’s and 40’s. He was Chair of the Executive Committee of the Democratic National Committee in 1929. A little later he was on the cover of the November 10, 1930 issue of Time Magazine.

Mrs. Shouse was of equal stature and importance in the 1930’s, 1940’s and post war endeavors of the Marshall Plan. Her father was A. Lincoln Filene owner of the Filene Department Store in Boston. From the 1950’s on, for most of her life, she would work, support
and promote the performing arts. She was appointed by President Eisenhower to the first board of what would become the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts in Washington, DC.

It was 1964, as the Kennedy Center was progressing, when Mrs. Shouse apparently had a disagreement with the location of the Kennedy Center. This also involved Roger L. Stevens on the Kennedy Center Board. It was enough of a disagreement that she left the Kennedy Center Board. She then proceeded to work with the Congress and other agencies to create another performing arts center in Northern Virginia, in a suburban location.

In 1966, Wolf Trap Farm Park for the Performing Arts was established. It was to be located on 100 acres of land donated by her from the Wolf Trap Farm property. It was to be operated by the Department of the Interior and managed by the Wolf Trap Foundation, which she then created. The area was created as a park by the Department of Interior and was initially assigned to the Superintendent of George Washington Memorial Parkway, sometime around 1968, for safekeeping while under construction.

On our way heading back east from Utah, we drove through Knoxville, Tennessee. It was in mid-afternoon doing a pleasant 70 miles an hour when up behind us comes a car, flashing its lights with an occasional horn
blast. We were on the interstate, in the middle of town, with just enough room that I could pull over onto the shoulder before hitting a concrete wall.

Recall that we had just left Utah where we had a wonderful time living in a Mormon community and becoming familiar with the Mormon Religion. Our car had a Utah license plate. A man gets out of his car and comes running up to my window. With his rear end hanging over the white line and cars blowing past us he asks with a big smile, “Are you Mormons?” He returned to his car somewhat saddened but still alive. We got back on the road and thankfully left in one piece.

And so, we arrived in Washington. Where I learned that I wasn’t on the subway, I was on the rail. To say that the position was surrounded by political forces and personages would have been an inadequate description, I was no longer a young muggle, I was a sub-muggle. At 27, the best thing going for me was the pity and help offered by key personnel in the regional office.

The scene upon arrival was mixed. The theater was to open to the public with its first major production the first of July 1971, seven months away. The Filene Center, the theater, was under construction and still had quite a way to go. The Center itself, the construction, was under the direction and control of the NPS Service Center in Washington, where engineers, architects and
skilled specialists worked. The man in charge of the construction site for the NPS was Joe Godfrey.

The newly created Wolf Trap Foundation was putting its first season of major productions together dealing with issues like ticket sales, box offices and agents. The park was still assigned to the Superintendent of the George Washington Memorial Parkway and there was no budget established for Wolf Trap yet. My office was a shared office at the National Capital Region (NCR) headquarters downtown. The park was in Vienna, Virginia and I was the only NPS park person on site other than Joe Godfrey.

Everyone was in charge and no one was in charge. Persons in the Washington Office, the Region, the Service Center, the Foundation, Congress, the President, the Interior Department and, of course, Mrs. Shouse all had the ability to insert themselves. If I had an idea for making the park better and thought out loud about it, woe unto me if I happened to think about it in the company of Mrs. Shouse. If she liked it, the next person for her to talk about it with started at the Secretary’s Office and went up. It was literally a mine field for communications and only one person to be standing on it. It did quiet down a little after the first season. To be fair, the Regional Director, as my supervisor, also held a spot on the mine over from me, as he reaped the benefit of all those calls about, “What the hell is Lusk doing now!”
To summarize, there were seven months until we opened, and the center was still months away from completion. There was no budget, no office, no personnel, no equipment, no furniture, no community outreach, no vehicles assigned and a large construction site with plans and proposals being reviewed and implemented by the Service Center without guidance from the park in a few key areas. We were not a park, we were a construction site, and no one was working on the elements needed to create the park which contained the Filene Center.

Shortly after my arrival three persons were assigned to my staff that had been assigned to another office, hired to oversee technical issues with the performing arts center. They were all from the performing arts field with little experience and no understanding of park operations, or how to create a park. Gerald Holmes was a GS-15 from England who was to be the General Manager. Hilmar Salee was a GS-14 who was to be the House Manager and Ralph Hoffman, a GS-13 who was to be Stage Manager for the theater and would put the union stage crew together. Ours was an unusual working relationship helped by the fact that we were working for the same goal but in different disciplines.

The Wolf Trap Foundation had also been created by this time with Executive Director Joseph Leavitt in place. His charge was just as complex, and we often met
going around in tight little circles. Contract with and commit the top performers and companies to the first season of Wolf Trap, a new performing arts center, never before in the market for performers. See to the construction, staffing and outfitting of box offices along with all the marketing, and details of running a center with up to 7,000 seats. His Board, overseen by Mrs. Shouse and a cadre of important and highly positioned persons from Washington was, I am sure, a challenge to his profession. A challenge he easily dealt with, in my opinion.

Not in any particular order, my first priorities were many. Our job was to operate the theater, when finished, provide all the park support services such as utilities, maintenance, police, accessibility, parking facilities, volunteers and ushers, road access and signage. This included being open seven days a week, year round, to interpret the center, its operation and use, plan for the future park around the Center and deal with public contact and information.

Wolf Trap needed to be formally declared an independent Park Service unit so that our budget could be created. We needed to establish relations with the Service Center and become involved in their planning and construction activities. With great help from the region, we had to create and establish our budget in the middle of a fiscal year. With a budget we could begin setting up the operation. I had to immediately find an Administrative
Officer, a park ranger, a clerk, maintenance personnel, equipment and vehicles and arrange for US Park Police to be on site.

An on-site office had to be set up and we would need a large volunteer operation for ushering during shows. The Wolf Trap Foundation Board had been set up and needed to be contacted and last and most importantly, establish a working relationship with Mrs. Shouse. We worked together but apart. Her experience and great love were in one place and that was the center and the success of the theater. My work was totally geared to the operation of the site, care of the theater, access to the park, parking, safety and happy patrons. If the theater sat within a poorly managed site it would have consequences that no one wanted.

Working out of NCR, down in East Potomac Park, I was fortunate to receive a large amount of sympathy and help for the seven month miracle. I stole two trainees from their training program and made one an Administrative Officer and the other a Chief Ranger/Interpreter/Workaholic all around assistant.

The Associate Regional Director for Administration at NCR created a budget for the park out of whole cloth and made it work. The Personnel Division assisted in recruiting and quickly finding staff to support the park. On some jobs, the George Washington Memorial Parkway would assign a few staff for temporary help. It’s
not hard to say just how creative and imaginative the folks were in Region, helping me set up the park.

Regional Director Dickenson and Deputy Director Fish were there to lend support when push came to shove on issues and the US Park Police, as always, were great troopers and people. Joe Godfrey will always be remembered for his support and backing on so many things involved with the construction of the center. Mrs. Shouse loved Joe Godfrey because he was creating her Center. It was rising up from the ground, requiring many unique and interesting features not normally found in NPS construction projects and progress was always visible.

By late January we were beginning to feel like a wee park, but things were starting to come together a little more quickly. Our offices were now on site in the Wolf Trap Farm House. Maintenance was beginning to take hold in the barn, we had on-site patrols and a few vehicles for use. I had met with the Wolf Trap Foundation Board along with the Regional Director and was pleased to meet them. The board included the Deputy Secretary of Defense’s wife, the wife of the Secretary of the Interior, and a cross section of Washington’s A List. When the Regional Director introduced me as Superintendent several were glad to meet the person in charge of Maintenance, which I saw no reason to correct. Not being much help was the fact that I was young.
The Filene Center was a beautiful Oregon red cedar wood structure standing over a hundred feet tall within the house so that various sets could be hung over the stage. Under the free standing roof which flowed down to the informal seating areas were 3,500 seats on two levels. Outside on the wonderful slope another 3,500 seats were available sitting on the grass with great views of the stage. I know that a quarter million people enjoyed their wine and cheese, sitting on and using the grass during that first season of over 70 major performances. Within the seated levels there was another quarter million people who clapped and cheered all summer.

Mrs. Shouse was great to work with and we were generally in agreement on most things. She never fully understood the role that I played at Wolf Trap because her interest was with the performances, theater and Foundation. Joe Godfrey was building it, Joe Leavitt was producing it, Gerald, Hilmar and Ralph were in charge of technical issues within the House so what was Lusk doing? She was more comfortable working with people of the theater and with performers and patrons. They spoke the same language. Regardless, it was a life experience for me being able to work with her and to observe the workings of political power in DC.

It was beneficial to have Gerald, Hilmar and Ralph on the staff so that when technical issues in the theater came up, as they usually did, they could assist and keep
things moving. Just installing the sound system, with the designer from Europe, was a long and tedious process demanding perfection and experience.

Sometime during that spring, I received a call from Secretary of Transportation Volpe's office and was invited to the FAA tower at National Airport. Not sure why, I proceeded there and was escorted up to the heart of the tower. They took me over to one of the radar screens and asked "would you please indicate where Wolf Trap is, your concern for aircraft noise and where planes should be restricted?" Which I did. A quiet or no-fly zone for aircraft was established.

Working for the National Park Service at Wolf Trap was never easy in those days. New staff were simply not used to the intricacies of a performing arts center and the multiple organizations that worked there with different responsibilities. Mrs. Shouse wasn't the only person at Wolf Trap who was unsure of the role of the NPS, other than funding the project.

March arrived, and we were making good progress toward meeting the July 1st opening. Construction was moving along, and the performance schedule of top drawer entertainment was coming together. It was March 13th, about 2:40 a.m., that I received a phone call at home in Vienna, Virginia from the Park Police. The Filene Center was on fire.
A half hour later I was on site, seeing a fair amount of damage being done to the cedar wings and interior weight bearing ceiling structure of large laminated King and Queen Beams. I called Director Hartzog at home at about 3:20 a.m. because this was going to be a national story and to inform Secretary Rogers C. B. Morton along with others. The Park Police had notified the Regional Director and most of those called were on site quickly. I still remember the call to the Director and how quickly he was aware of the implications and needs. He helped a lot on that day with the media and other interests. We shared a stiff scotch that afternoon which I considered to be an honor, and greatly needed on my part.

It was not a pleasant experience for anyone. The construction site was under the control of the Service Center as it had not been released to the park yet. It was also later noted that the structure was a fire safety issue since it was a tower of wood and would never have been permitted by the County.

Several fire companies responded to the fire and wound up having to lay a hose line from a somewhat nearby housing development to feed water to the fire. Hydrants at the construction site were not yet serviceable. Some have said that the hydrants were hooked up that day, but that simply is not true. They had been installed but they were not yet hooked up. Fire compa-
nies would have gone to hydrants right away and been able to draw water if hooked up.

Cause of the fire, as far as I know, was never really determined. My belief is still that it was arson as Mrs. Shouse was known to have people strongly opposed to her personally and politically. A muffler pipe was found at the base of one of the wood wings and welding had been done earlier in the day. That’s as close as any determination was made as to the cause.

Mrs. Shouse arrived at the scene a little before 6:00 a.m. and I made sure that there was a physician on site just in case. It was mid-March and the theater had suffered damage to red cedar roof beams and wings that would be hard to manufacture and ship from Oregon. She walked up, and we began to talk about things, my concern being for her health. I inquired as to her thinking and concern about the opening. She replied, “Gil, there’s no problem, we will still be able to open in July.” An indomitable spirit. If I had only had a flask.

King beams are about 6’ thick laminated red cedar beams and Queen beams are more like 3’ thick laminated red cedar beams. The Cedar was from Oregon. We all pushed and pulled to get the job done. Congress, NPS Service Center, National Park Service, contractors, manufacturers and rail lines worked together and got it done. It was a truly amazing accomplishment and only something Mrs. Shouse could have achieved.
I still have great feelings for those workers who made it happen against great odds. A special fund raising event was held at Constitution Hall on May 10 to help with expenses for the rebuild which was a full house. Pierre Bouley led the NY Philharmonic Orchestra at the fundraiser. Sadly, the Filene Center would be totally destroyed by fire in early April of 1982 and again rebuilt, hopefully with better fire protection systems and, hopefully, County approval.

The end of June and things from an arts perspective were really coming together with great performers lined up for over seventy days of performances. There were still a few issues. Inside the House it was chaos as the opening approached, with all the issues that were yet to be decided or overcome. Sound, light, scenes, connections, systems all had to be tested and resolved in June.

Final cleaning, placement of control systems in the theater and lawn areas were still being refined. Staff never having worked there were being brought on for the box office and ticket operations. Stage hands were being rounded up for the theater under the able hand of Stage Manager Ralph Hoffman.

The park volunteer coordinator, with 400 volunteers ready and able to serve as ushers for the theater, had to schedule the nights, shows and times for all the performances. Finally, and not least, the grass for 3,500 people had to be green and kept green all summer.
Only question remaining, and no problem at all, was “WHERE ARE THEY GOING TO PARK?” There was simply no time to plan and find more funds for large parking areas.

Joe Leavitt came up to the office in mid-afternoon, June 30, because there was a problem in the theater that needed to be resolved. We went down, and the problem became very clear almost immediately. The National Symphony was rehearsing on the stage for the opening on July 1st. In front of the stage American Seating was installing the last 20 rows of seats. I explained to Joe that those seats had to be in place for the opening “tomorrow” and that it might be quieter later after the chairs were installed, but chairs came first.

I felt bad about having to do that, but there was little choice given the day and time and no compromise that we talked about could be done, other than rehearse later. I am sure that the orchestra was not happy and felt that the installers should leave and come back in the middle of the night.

In the theater our maintenance staff was still learning the ins and outs of working with union stage hands. “Yes, there are a few light bulbs that need to be replaced, but that is the job of the stage hands union. Please don’t change them.” Out in the rest of the park I was working with the US Park Police trying to figure out where we were going to park the cars for an audience of almost
7,000 people. Even if the audience arrived four to a car that was still some 1,750 cars for our one parking lot. Frankly, I don’t even remember where we put all those vehicles, but the Filene Center opened and a drive-in theater was avoided.

It had taken persistence and some rudeness by several of us to get phones installed at the park and in the many box offices and other sites. A week or so before our grand opening on July 1st, a call came in from downstairs. “Uh, the Secret Service is here to discuss arrangements for the First Lady’s appearance at the opening.” I should have called them to get our phones installed. Never saw so many phones placed in so many areas in all my life. People could answer from trees and rocks when they were ringing.

The night came, the First Lady, Pat Nixon arrived by helicopter accompanied by the wife of a South American President and her Colonel escort. In the warm up, I was professionally coached by the Secret Service. “OK, you’ll meet the chopper and greet the First Lady and her guests and then walk them out the bridge to the second floor. Here is the box that they will be coming to. It is critical that the First Lady sit in THIS SEAT ONLY and the wife of the other President sits there. She doesn’t speak English, but the Colonel does and will see to her proper seating.”

Piece of cake. It was fruit cake and still resides in my stomach even today. The house was full, the lawn below
was full, people cheering to welcome the First Lady, Mrs. Shouse's personal guest. Everything was fine. Met and greeted, walked them out to the balcony seating and the box. Before I could blink the Spanish President's, wife sat in the First Lady's seat. I looked the Colonel in the eye and he gave me one of those "oh well" looks.

Now to my undying embarrassment I had to relocate the Spanish President's wife and move the First Lady over, who is still standing. Have you ever noticed how small box seating areas are? Speaking of eyes, if the First Lady had had a bat I would have been fodder on the floor below. I hope the Secret Service enjoyed themselves watching all this. To the crowd I am sure that I was simply a confused usher. Was I too busy to learn a few Spanish words? Yes, but I still should have found the time.

For opening night, our volunteer coordinator, having a list of several hundred people willing to volunteer as ushers for the show, had no trouble getting a full contingent for that first night. The nice benefit of course was that while ushering they could also view the performances on stage.

Parking was not finished for the opening and remained a major concern on my part. Have a great show, feel wonderful about things at the Center and then try to find your car and get it freed from blocking traffic. We just didn't want that kind of interaction which is why I gave parking a lot of personal attention.
The Park Police and one of our Park Technicians always handled parking in a great way but it took time to figure some things out and have it working as smoothly as the grounds would permit. Laugh if you will, but at night I became a parking attendant in disguise.

We parked a lot of cars on the grass hill by the barn and quickly learned that parking the cars facing downhill was a good thing, with dew in the late evening. The Foundation and our Stage Manager, Ralph Hoffman, would see to the quality of the performances and the ushers would get them seated. The park, the park was focused on parking and getting the people to and from the theater. Paul, our Park Technician, started calling the hill by the barn, Gil’s Hill, because most evenings I was standing out there observing, with my fingers crossed. The Park Police and Paul did a fantastic job all summer and it will be noted that there were no complaints raised about the parking or traffic snarls. Our audiences returned and always cooperated with our personnel.

The New York City Ballet was one of the first major performance groups at Wolf Trap. Their semi-truck with sets and equipment arrived at Wolf Trap the morning before the first performance. Ralph Hoffman, Stage Manager, came up the hill to the office, indicating that there was a problem. As soon as the drivers and hands got out of the semi at the loading dock they asked, “Where are your Teamster members for unloading.”
The truck would not be unloaded unless there were teamsters, which we did not have. Stage hands union yes, but not teamsters. We had to get the truck unloaded, no choice, so I asked Ralph to go down and get it done and get it done however he could without causing a union problem. Just don’t tell me how he got it done. He got it done, I never heard how it was done and we had no further problem with the Teamster Union. That’s how great Ralph was.

The inaugural performances at Wolf Trap featured Van Cliburn, the New York City Opera with Norman Treigle, as well as performances by the National Symphony Orchestra, Choral Arts Society of Washington, United States Marine Band and the Madison Madrigal Singers.

Beverly Sills, the acclaimed coloratura soprano in live opera performances and recordings, was a good and strong friend of Mrs. Shouse. A performer at Wolf Trap and a supporter of the Center. A summer of names and performers but for me, Beverly Sills was the most pleasant and most interested in the park and its possibilities. She was a pleasure to visit with and talk to.

Then there were the “Carpenters”, arriving on the afternoon of their performance with equipment and material, at National Airport. Phone call to Joe Leavitt and then to me. They arrived from Canada. Care to guess what the problem was? National Airport received national traffic but had no customs operation to han-
dle international flights, which should have gone to Dulles. Another call to the Secretary of Transportation by Mrs. Shouse so that they could unload at National and get out to Wolf Trap without delay. They arrived and performed.

Speaking of Dulles, Wolf Trap, the historic property, was split into two sections by the Dulles Access Road coming in from Tyson Corners and the Interstate. It was a limited access road and is now a toll road. The Filene Center is on the north side of the Dulles Access Road and could benefit from on and off ramps to Trap Road and the entrance to Wolf Trap.

The road, as constructed, was to be without exits at any point but that would change. An exit for Wolf Trap was added to the Access Road and in the beginning was only allowed to be open for show times at the Center. It took a lot of burden off the Lee Highway and traffic flowing through the housing area at the entrance to Wolf Trap on the north side. The process to achieve that opening involved about four conferences, ten phone calls, three or four minor upwellings and someone who ultimately said, "Just get it done".

The first season, all things considered, was a smashing success for the Foundation, the Park and especially Mrs. Shouse. It would continue to be and still is. With the fall came evaluation of how things had gone, changes that needed to be made and finishing up some projects,
like parking. We would also begin discussions and plans for Cottages and other facilities on the Farm. These were intended to encourage performers in residence and in support of school programs and other activities. It was a busy fall season and the Foundation would begin planning for their next season in 1972.

During that time, I met with Region to recommend that Gerald and Hilmar be reassigned to another location or let go. The Center was now complete, and their functions were being handled by the Foundation. I recommended that Gerald's contract not be renewed, and Hilmar, an employee of the NPS, be relocated. This was done. Ralph Hoffman was a major force for both the Park and the Foundation and we had no intention of losing his services.

At the time it was common practice by the NPS to send in a small team to evaluate how a park was operating and being managed. Since we were a new unit and had been under a tremendous amount of stress and strain, I expected that we would receive an evaluation with advice as to how we could improve and better meet the needs. After Christmas it was becoming apparent, for whatever reason, there was going to be no evaluation.

Since no one would talk to me about it I had to assume that I was not performing the job that the service wanted done. At the same time my wife's father was having serious heart issues in Roanoke, Virginia. We decided
to either leave the National Park Service or perhaps there was some job open in that part of Virginia that I could be transferred to. Being a GS-12 there weren't that many opportunities, but the service managed to create a space for me on the Blue Ridge Parkway. The Roanoke office had an Interpretive Supervisor for the Virginia section of the Parkway.

Unfortunately, the space was created by moving the person in that position to the North Carolina section. I really wasn't made aware of this until almost on site. My last day at Wolf Trap was April 16th. After thinking about it for years I really believe that the Region did not want to do an evaluation given the political situation and connections evident at Wolf Trap, thereby opening doorways into other areas. Quien sabe!

I also have always felt that the NPS was reluctant to enter into the entertainment business to the degree being proposed by the Kennedy Center and Wolf Trap. The type of park site created and the political pressures that could be applied to the system were of concern. The lack of personnel experienced in park management or operations of a park like Wolf Trap would make the jobs there hard to fill.

It was a very tough assignment for park personnel at Wolf Trap, but I am sure that over the intervening years it has become much more of a plum. The park, in getting started up, received great support from the
Service Center and the Regional Office regardless of any feelings about becoming involved with performing arts centers. The Wolf Trap Foundation remains a key to the success and the park itself is an integral part of the National Capital Region.

In many ways Wolf Trap was my master's degree in complex political and social situations. There were many lessons and there was a lot of behind the scenes work to keep things on an even keel. An Administrative History would be written in 1983 concerning the time at Wolf Trap, during the opening and first years. It was written by an historian as it should have been. The Preface of the Administrative History indicated that it was not a history as his views were "biased" which I never fully understood.

The world of Wolf Trap and the Park Service in the area had more than its share of people who knew how to do it better or had opinions about the park being a National Park. Listening to those folks would bring a biased view of the work at Wolf Trap or at any park for that matter. The history paints a picture of my time there as naïve and an example of a new Superintendent who was out of his depth. I won't argue with either of his assessments but am glad to note that the opening was successful given all the turmoil going on.

During the time at Wolf Trap there were several hearings on the Hill pertaining to the park, its need for emer-
gency funding and the fire. I would usually be there with the Director or Regional Director but one I remember most was the last one in 1972. I was there with Director Hartzog in a House Committee hearing on Wolf Trap funding. Chair of the meeting was Congressman Roy A. Taylor from North Carolina a friend and supporter of the Director. As the meeting went on it became apparent that something was bothering the Director and Congressman Taylor picked up on it very quickly. He adjourned the meeting and asked the Director to come back with him and visit. I did not know the reason but soon found out, what I believed to be a key to the true situation.

Director Hartzog was being removed from office by President Nixon. As best I could find out it was an issue that had happened earlier at Gulf Shores National Seashore on the Florida Gulf. Bebe Rebozo, a close friend of Nixon, had wanted to dock his boat at a certain place. The Superintendent had denied permission because of the site's natural sensitivities. Rebozo called the Director who supported the Superintendent. Incensed, Rebozo called the President and Director Hartzog, one of our very best Directors, was soon gone. There was a little more to it than that, but this was part of it.

You may recall my earlier mention of a Utah License Plate but maybe I should call it my Utah Incensed Plate. Some years after Wolf Trap had been in operation, Mrs Shouse was interviewed by a major paper about the park
and its early history. One of her comments, noted in the Administrative History, was that the National Park Service had brought in a first Superintendent who had no love for performing arts. Perhaps designed to affect the success of the park in some way. Based on what? “She knew it right away, because when he got here he had a Utah license plate”.

How I wish I had had the time in that first season to show my love for the performing arts, unfortunately, my first love had to be the park operation and the thousands of people coming to every show, seventy times in a little over two months. When I did take in part of a show it was usually from back stage.

Ralph Hoffman and I enjoyed one show in particular, from back stage. The Preservation Hall Jazz Band from New Orleans was a fantastic group. It played at the Filene Center on more than one occasion over the years. In the early 70's it often featured great jazz artists such as Percy Humphrey (trumpet) and Willie Humphrey (clarinet) Frank Demond (trombone), James Prevost (bass), James “Sing” Miller (piano), Cie Frazier (drums), Jim Robinson (trombone), Narvin Kimball (banjo), and Allan Jaffe (tuba). We would be just off stage and every once in a while, one of the artists would come over, get a brown bag and take a little refreshment before returning to the stage. A great evening with a wonderfully laid back group of great artists.
Blue Ridge Parkway – Virginia Unit

It was a pleasure to finally be back in a normal park environment, my first since Cape Hatteras, where I could concentrate on being a Supervisory Interpreter GS–12. Providing help and direction for seasonal interpretive staff at the Peaks of Otter, Mabry Mill and along the Parkway roadsides in southwest Virginia. Trying to implement environmental management concepts where possible and bringing the park out to neighboring communities. I gave tours and programs as well, especially at the Peaks of Otter. To arrive in late April and early May was special as trees and flowers burst into bloom all along the Parkway and in developed areas like the Peaks of Otter and Mabry Mill.

The main town on the Parkway in Virginia is Roanoke where our office was located and in North Carolina it’s Ashville where the Headquarters was located. The Blue Ridge Parkway runs from the end of Skyline Drive in Shenandoah National Park in Virginia to the Great Smoky Mountains National Park in North Carolina. A distance of 469 miles of slow mountain and
ridge top driving through scenic country of outstanding quality. The Virginia Unit is 217 miles long and worth every mile.

During the early 1970’s Park Rangers and uniformed staff travelling off the Parkway in places like Floyd County, Virginia were not really welcomed, a fact that has hopefully changed by now. In putting the Parkway together, back in the 1930’s, a strip of land had to be acquired that ran across the mountain tops dividing them into east and west sides of the road.

People living in those locations in Floyd County Virginia and elsewhere were not interested in outsiders driving through their country. Their lands were divided and condemned for purchase and part of the parkway. Then there was the imposition of federal park rules and regulations. Families there were tight together and the dislike of Park personnel had been passed down almost two generations in the early 70’s.

The idea for the Parkway to some degree came from President Franklin Roosevelt when he helped dedicate the Skyline Parkway in Shenandoah National Park in 1933. In November of 1933 then Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes, began planning and building the Blue Ridge Parkway using a variety of sources including the Civilian Conservation Corps. The Parkway except for about 7.7 miles around Grandfather Mountain in North
Carolina, was finally completed in 1966. It took another twenty one years to complete those last 7.7 miles.

We began talking about Living History in the Booker T. Washington Interpretive Prospectus along with tissue paper artifacts. This form of interpretation would later be used and refined in many locations and as to when and where it began, I have no idea. Historic Mabry Mill in Floyd County had an operating Blacksmith and a lovely water milling facility to grind sorghum cane, make molasses and other flours.

We had local residents who made most of these products for much of their lives, dressed in period dress, demonstrating the crafts of the Appalachian Mountains at Mabry Mill. It would also have had, historically, a still for moonshine. Moonshine was part of the community and economy, one reason that the locals really disliked the coming of the Parkway through their communities. (I had a moonshine still as well, but naturally kept its location a secret, for local use only.) For any revenooers reading this, the still is just a little humor. Honest.

We lived in Government housing in Vinton, Virginia right at the Parkway and about four miles from where my wife’s family lived. Her father gradually recovered his health to a degree and to be there while that was happening was a real gift to us, and always appreciated. It was during this period that we brought my mother and Uncle Johnny down to live in Stewartsville. It was
close to my wife's parents so that we would have the combined family in one place when we moved on.

When I first arrived at the Parkway I found that I was somewhat persona non grata for having replaced a well-liked interpreter who was relocated to North Carolina. Regardless, it was important for my wife to be close to her father at that time and I was sorry for the disturbance to the individual but glad to be near her father. He gradually recovered and, my wife's presence no longer being needed, we transferred on to another position. Of course, since her father had not died, my coming there was unnecessary and should never have happened, as least in the opinion of a very few people.

The seasonal employees on the Parkway were an exceptional group, offering unique programs for the visitors in plant identification and use for food, as done two hundred years ago. My interest in working with publics near the Parkway led me to start a tour into Bedford County from the Peaks of Otter. Visitors car pooled as we visited dairy farms and other agricultural locations in the valley. It helped develop relations in Bedford County for the Parkway and the visitors enjoyed the opportunity to participate.

Implementing environmental programs at the park level was not easy but interpretive programs were one way to expand visitor understanding beyond what a plant was, back to its use in colonial times and its impor-
tance today. It also offered interpreters with programmatic elements that were somewhat new and interesting. In the early 1970's good seasonal employees still had a chance to become permanent employees, because of their experience.

It was still difficult, but there were possibilities. Reduced budgets and other programs have had an impact on hiring making it even more difficult to get a job which is one reason that the National Park Service has, in general, exceptional employees with exceptional abilities.

One of the difficulties in working within an organization that is a large family, as I found out, was that new members in a local family, coming in uninvited, were not always welcomed as on the Blue Ridge Parkway. We made many friends there but there were also a few others that remained distant and difficult to deal with.

A little over two years after arriving we would again be on the road. This time to the GS-12 Superintendent position at Appomattox Court House National Historical Park in Appomattox, Virginia. Having spent four years at Gettysburg College it was nice to experience where the Civil War came to an end in a well preserved site of the period.
April 9th, 1865 the armies of Lee and Grant finally gathered, not for war but to create a surrender returning the land to peace. It's fair to say that the mood on both sides was somber. My family fought on both sides of the Civil War, with losses to each and one had been at Appomattox. My work at Appomattox centered on working up a new Master Plan and Interpretive Prospectus for the area with the public. Having done this kind of work before, at Booker T. Washington made it an enjoyable exercise. Once, while in the Office of Environmental Education, there was an opportunity to participate on a study team evaluating the Eisenhower Farm in Gettysburg for management when the farm came to the National Park Service from Mrs. Eisenhower. The farm is in a beautiful location and was ideal as a future candidate for environmental interpretation.

Of course, the famous property at Appomattox is the Wilmer McLean Home where the surrender was
signed and agreed to. Sometimes events in history amaze me such as when a person is so lucky as to win two national lotteries in their lifetime. Wilmer McLean was not lucky, but he was involved in a rare double event in the Civil War. Wilmer’s family home near Manassas, Virginia was involved in the first battle of Bull Run in 1861 at the start of the Civil War. Not wishing to be further involved in the war he then packed up his family and moved to of all places, Appomattox, Virginia where the war would end in his parlor.

Years later in about 1891, the McLean house was measured and documented so the house could be dismantled. It was to be taken to the 1893 World’s Columbian Exposition and rebuilt. It was packaged for transport and then the owner ran out of funds. The house sat in crates and piles for fifty years, on the site.

The National Historical Park was created in 1940 and reconstruction of the house began in 1941. A long delay in the process during World War II saw the home finally rebuilt and rededicated in April of 1950 with a crowd of 20,000 there to witness the event.

You might say that the McLean House is the original home and it is. You might also say that the home is a reconstruction, rebuilt with great care from the earlier plans and original materials.

Appomattox, the park, was well involved in Living History, with interpreters dressed in period costume of
the villagers, talking about the events of the day on April 9th. This was done in first person which required study of the event and the period in which it occurred. By first person I mean that they talked to visitors as if they were actual villagers from the period. They were very good interpreters and did an excellent job. We would often entertain foreign visitors, as we lived in an historic home on the property, the Bocock-Isbell Home. One interesting group of visitors came from Japan, led by the Head Gardener of the Imperial Palace in Tokyo who invited us to visit him. In the next year, 1975, we did just that.

My wife and I and friends from College decided to visit another close friend from college and his wife, stationed at Yokohama for the US Army. We boarded a JAL airplane in New York for the roughly fourteen hour trip in basically a 707 with two rows of seats on each side of the aisle. It was generally said that when in Japan you should phrase your question carefully as they think it impolite to answer a question with the word NO. An example immediately came to mind as we were taxing out to take off. An announcement was made that we were returning to the gate and would be delayed briefly while a passenger not on route to Tokyo could get off. The flight was now going to be sixteen hours.

After a stop in Anchorage for medical documents we were off once again. Somewhere over the Pacific in the next couple of hours I would begin to feel uneasy. I was
having the first signs of what would eventually develop into a case of anxiety. Even so, we had a wonderful private tour of the Imperial Palace grounds in Tokyo with the Head Gardner, seeing the fantastic Bonsai Center housing the Palace Bonsai and other facilities. While in Japan we also visited a few artisans called Living National Treasures which I could obviously see from their work. Then too, we visited several national park sites as well, for comparisons.

The phrase Living National Treasures, title to this book, was gleaned from Japan, except that use here is for parks as opposed to people. Our National Park Service areas are, with few exceptions, examples of living treasures and that includes historic and archaeological sites, kept alive by the factual presentation and understanding of their past. These sites are alive and will remain alive so long as their importance, interpretation and physical structures remain intact, true to the history and culture of their time. Allowing history to be used for other purposes, as is beginning to happen today, is to encumber the past and the resource, a violation of the trust placed with us by the vision of those that created our agency.

What I mean by “used for other purposes” is the current trend to take history and make it politically correct and subject it to today’s beliefs and mores. Some of the founders of this nation are now being viewed simply as slave owners, unworthy of their place in history.
Some, who call themselves historians now allege that the American Revolution was not about religion, freedom or taxation, it was about the fear that England would prohibit slavery in the Colonies as it had in England.

The National Park Service is not the only guardian of our nation's history, but it is a significant force. As such it has a critical obligation to prevent advocates and forces from demanding that portions of the history we protect be rewritten and reinterpreted to create political messages for today. Towns and Universities are already engaged in this travesty, pulling down monuments, vandalizing historic sites and banning various celebrations and events that have moved this country forward for over two hundred years. It seems that an America, once proud of its past, is now becoming engaged in apologizing and attacking that past. This is the last thing that the National Park Service should be allowing to happen on its many historic and archaeological sites.

Not too long after our return from Japan, I was asked to come into the Washington Office to help select people for lists of qualified candidates for open or vacant positions. About a week into that stay my first full on panic attack occurred. Feigning food poison my wife came up and flew home with me. Panic attacks did not occur again, although the ghost was always present in my mind. For the next twenty-five years I would live with anxiety under certain conditions. Learning how to manage myself and
what to either avoid or live through was of necessity and not always successful. A few times if feeling undue pressure, a trip or meeting would be cancelled or reassigned to someone else, but this was very infrequent.

There would be thousands of speeches, meetings and trips across the nation over the next twenty-five years, often putting me on the edge of experiencing anxiety and considerable discomfort. Flights, which I often changed to trips by car or train and certain other activities like giving speeches were difficult. I sought medical and psychiatric help during that time, but no solution could be found. Medications were available, but I did not like taking them and only did so on certain flights that had to be taken. The thing that helped me most was the love of the job, the people that I worked with and my desire to do better.

As luck would have it, when I retired in 1997 in Tucson I found a psychiatrist who specialized in pharmaceutical treatments. It was determined that my problem was low serotonin levels in the brain and I was given two medications to supplant my serotonin. I have lived without anxiety since 1997 and have taken on tasks and trips that I would never have dreamed of before. I often wonder how parts of my career might have been changed had I found the cure in the late 1970's.

Even so, it was 1975 and I had a career to see too and things to do. The four assignments that were to end my
career in 1997 were major ones with no room for problems. Sometimes I also wonder if my spine had not been curved what might have happened in the Marine Corps had my anxiety begun at the wrong time. Thankfully that never had a chance to happen.

As we were getting down to the end of the assignment in Appomattox, I met a History Professor from Lynchburg College. In talking we decided that Appomattox was missing something, so we set out to create the Appomattox Historical Society. It was well received by the residents of Appomattox and within the year it was established, up and running.

There are other examples of groups and organizations where a roll was played as a catalyst, helping to found or establish community and park values. The point is neither about what I did or did not do; it is to have done something helpful for the benefit of a community and an important resource. The need for park management to always be reaching out to communities and neighboring residents is a critical function. More than anything else it requires time and planning on the part of the Superintendent, not money, as this is part of his or her job.

Doing these things and working in the park requires extra hours. Much of my career after 1969 was spent working more than eight hours a day. Not at all unusual for Superintendents, Regional Directors and other man-
agers. For me with a wife and no children the task was somewhat easier than someone with children and a family. The pressure to overdo comes naturally and in some cases has a dramatic affect on the family or the wife.

There are numerous stories in many parks of those pressures and the results that came about because of them. Divorces, separated families, affairs and other problems, while not common, did and still do occur. Few, if any, resources existed to help personnel with such problems and the stress of long days spent away from home. Remember that many large National Parks are not downtown. Park housing areas can be isolated with few recreational or other amenities and an ability to self-entertain is another key requirement for families living there. It can be a lonely life for spouses, male and female and Superintendents and their spouses are never away from public exposure in their communities.

Act out in a restaurant and it will be talked about in the community, drink too much at a function and people will talk. Too many Superintendents, either uncar ing or unknowing, suffered the results of being less than perfect in public. It was not an easy job then or now and mistakes will continue to be made simply as part of being a normal person.

Many who have made mistakes in their personal lives can move on and away, but in a family organization like the National Park Service, there is no allowance for
moving on or away. Some facts, but especially rumors become part of your luggage and must be carried with you. More than a few careers have been damaged or called into question with no allowance for circumstance or fact. We are still a family and a good one, and as with all families we tend to have some problems in our 30 and 40 year careers.

One thing that I never saw was a planned vision for the present and future of a park management team and a park. Superintendents, having had little training but a lot of experience (hopefully) are not cast from one mold. Each is different which can and does create an on-going tension in the park and the community. One Superintendent can be outward looking, managing by delegation of authority. He or she is then followed by a Superintendent that wants to run the park, not spend time with outside interests.

Superintendents are often in place for four or five years meaning that the park and surrounding communities never know how things are going to go or whether programs of the last Superintendent will be continued. This rubber band exercise, back and forth, can and does lead to resource impacts and confusion with those populations surrounding a park. There is no opportunity in this kind of approach for long term plans and long term accomplishments.

Incoming Superintendents should be briefed on the programs and efforts of the last manager and a deter-
mination made that the incoming person can move the program forward, not end it or re-create it. Last time I looked there were no programs in place to do this and assure the longevity of programs inside and outside parks. It is a critical need. Parks are neither rubber bands nor are they just brief stops for advancing a person's career.

During my years at Appomattox we were able to put together a General Management Plan and Interpretive Prospectus as well as work with other Civil War Parks in regard to their histories and associations with Appomattox. As at most locations Superintendents generally joined a Lion's Club or Rotary at nearby towns. For many that was considered collaboration and community relations work. Which was fine, so long as it wasn't the only community work done. It really wasn't until years later that working with a community and local citizens began to mean more than just the Lion's or Rotary clubs.

At the time we also made arrangements with George Washington's Birthplace National Monument in Virginia to obtain a few of their Morgan horses for the park. The Monument at that time maintained an excellent purebred stock of Morgan horses as part of the Colonial scene. The horses became part of our living exhibits at the park.

Then in August of 1976, Chester Brooks, Regional Director in Philadelphia, called to offer me another "unique opportunity". Valley Forge State Park was being
given to the National Park Service, with legislation signed on July 4, 1976. It was, in most ways, going to be a repeat of my experience at Wolf Trap Farm Park for the Performing Arts. Well, in for a penny, in for a pound.
On July 4, 1975, President Gerald R. Ford signed into law a bill that had been introduced by Senator Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania, permitting the American flag to be flown at Valley Forge twenty-four hours a day providing it was illuminated. The park was one of only eight historic sites in the nation to attain that distinction.

On July 4, 1976, President Ford went to Valley Forge State Park in Pennsylvania. There he would sign a Bill that would change the name and management of the State Park into a National Park Service area, Valley Forge National Historical Park. This was an action supported by the people of Pennsylvania, the State of Pennsylvania and the Valley Forge State Park Commission. In August, Chet Brooks, Regional Director of the Mid-Atlantic Region called and asked me to become Superintendent of the park. He asked me to bring the park into the NPS as I had experience with bringing new areas on line and the work involved doing this. It would be a huge challenge and I was delighted to say yes and to thank him for his confidence.
What follows is not the legislation itself, but rather a copy of a memorandum to President Ford in preparation for his signing of the Bill at Valley Forge on July 4, 1976 with details of the Bill that pertain to our later discussion.

“Attached for your consideration is H.R. 5621, sponsored by Representative Schulze and sixteen others. The enrolled bill authorizes the establishment of the Valley Forge National Historical Park on approximately 2,500 acres, provides necessary authorities for land acquisition and operation and maintenance of the park, and authorizes appropriations to carry out these activities.

A detailed discussion of the provisions of the enrolled bill is provided in OMB’s enrolled bill report at Tab A. OMB, Max Friedersdorf, Counsel’s Office (Lazarus) and I recommend approval of the enrolled bill.

RECOMMENDATION
That you sign H.R. 5621 at Tab B.

MEMORANDUM FOR
THE PRESIDENT

Subject: Enrolled Bill H.R. 5621

Establish Valley Forge National Historical Park, Pennsylvania
Sponsors—Rep. Schulze (R)
Pennsylvania and 16 others.

Last Day for Action July 7, 1976—Wednesday

Purpose

Authorizes the establishment of the Valley Forge National Historical Park on approximately 2,500 acres of land, provides necessary authorities for land acquisition and operation and maintenance of the park, and authorizes appropriations to carry out these activities.

Agency Recommendations

Office of Management and Budget Approval

Department of the Interior Approval

Discussion Since 1893, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has maintained, improved, and operated a State park commemorating the decisive winter encampment of Washington's Continental Army during the winter of 1777-1778. In recent years, extensive development of the area around the Valley Forge Park including the Pennsylvania Turnpike and ever growing suburban residential construction has threatened the integrity of the park. According to the Interior Committee reports, development
pressure has increased to the point where the State is not able to cope with them adequately, particularly in the need for protective land acquisition.

More specifically, the House Interior Committee’s report stated:

"The establishment of Valley Forge as a national historical park thus has the dual purpose of securing a larger land base for the park and of placing the area under the continuing protection and management of the National Park Service. The Congress, in this instance, will be building on the accomplishments of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to date, and is acting to guarantee that Valley Forge will continue to inspire Americans for long after the Bicentennial year."

The major provisions of H.R. 5621 would:

authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish the Valley Forge National Historical Park after determining that an adequate land area exists for this purpose and subject to other conditions; authorizes acquisition of the necessary land by purchase, exchange or otherwise except that the State park area could be acquired only by donation after October 1, 1976; prohibit establishment
of National Historical Park until the Secretary of the Interior has received adequate assurance concerning the availability and obligation of the $10 million in State funds which have been appropriated for new park improvements; authorize appropriations in the amount of $8,622,000 for land acquisition and $500,000 for additional improvements; and authorize the Secretary of the Interior, after consulting with the Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, to develop and transmit to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States Congress a final master plan for the development of the park consistent with the objectives of this Act, indicating:

(1) the facilities needed to accommodate the health, safety, and interpretive needs of the visiting public;

(2) the location and estimated cost of all facilities;

and (3) the projected need for any additional facilities within the park. There is attached for your consideration a proposed signing statement which Interior has informally submitted.”
"STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

July 4, 1976

It is with great pleasure that I am today signing legislation to include Valley Forge in the National Park System.

It was not only the fate of a fledging nation that hung in the balance as General Washington's army encamped at Valley Forge in 1777. Valley Forge also symbolizes an idea which was also at stake - the idea that government should truly represent all of its citizens and protect them in the exercise of their civil liberties.

It is difficult on a warm day as today to comprehend the courage that our army needed to survive the hardships of that winter. Nothing is as demoralizing as the combination of extreme cold and hunger. Had General Washington's soldiers and support not been equal to the privations they had to bear, the American Revolution would likely have failed, and the American idea of freedom would have been stillborn.

Valley Forge became a part of the Pennsylvania park system in 1893. The site as it exists today is a direct result of the Commonwealth's foresighted efforts to preserve this important part of our Nation's heritage. Most recently
the Commonwealth has extended its efforts on behalf of Valley Forge with a contribution of $10 million for a development program. On behalf of all Americans, I want to express our gratitude for Pennsylvania’s foresight and generosity in preserving Valley Forge.

The paths of history are littered with visions that failed because their proponents were not people of action and endurance. However, our forebearers were people of action and endurance, and their vision has prevailed. The winter at Valley Forge displayed the conviction that the Declaration of Independence, whose anniversary we celebrate today, was worth overcoming tremendous hardships. Valley Forge represents one of the bravest moments in our Nation’s history. It is also a powerful symbol of American vision and fortitude. I take great pleasure on this, the Nation’s two-hundredth birthday, in dedicating Valley Forge as a National Historic Park.”

Mid-Atlantic Regional Director Chester Brooks announced my appointment in Philadelphia and area media on September 23, 1976, just a little over two months from the July 4th Celebration and President Ford’s official signing. As noted, in Chapter Eight of Harlan Unrau’s excellent Administrative History of
Valley Forge (1984), the announcement helped set the stage for my arrival in late September.

"It may be some months before we assume operational control of the park.... but we can smooth the transition from State to Federal Management by naming our Superintendent now and bringing him to the area early. When he arrives at Valley Forge.... Gil Lusk will work with State Park superintendent Horace Wilcox, members of the park commission, and community leaders to develop a National Park Service program for operating one of the most venerated places in American history."

If you look at my paperwork, I transferred to Valley Forge March 31, 1977. But, that's not true. March 31 was the date that Valley Forge was officially authorized as a National Historical Park. It would not be officially established until November 24, 1982 when all the conditions agreed to by the State had been met. I could not transfer to a State Park when I moved to the Valley Forge area in September of 1976, so I was carried on the Region's roles for a few months. My position as Superintendent was a GS-13.

The early arrival was imperative as the Bicentennial was approaching, meaning that the park not only had to be reorganized, it also had to be energized for the creation and celebration of the 200th Anniversary of Valley Forge in 1977 and 1978.
When we drove into Valley Forge in September of 1976, the Park was a State Park under the mantle of the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission with a Park Superintendent and a Valley Forge Park Commission. There were about fifty employees, many of the historic homes or properties were rented out to employees and in the center of the Park was a 200,000 square foot former asbestos plant, a lovely church and the home of the Valley Forge Historical Society.

In the agreement to create the National Historical Park there were four items to be done before the park was officially established. The Park would be established once the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission had committed to the building of a new Visitor Center and certain other improvements to historic properties and other sites.

There would be a major research project by the NPS on the history of Valley Forge and the events of and around the encampment. This would also include a major archaeological study of the encampment sites and fields. In effect a major new study of its history.

The boundary of the Park would be expanded by the purchase of several properties in and around the park as detailed in the legislation. The Keene Plant, that little 200,000 square foot asbestos plant, had been purchased by the Trust for Public Lands and was going to be acquired by the Park. (yeah).
Finally, there was a set of plans that had to be completed as required by law, in meetings with the general public. A Park General Management Plan, an Environmental assessment, an Interpretive Prospectus, a Resources Management Plan and a plan for any needed land acquisition. Once all four of the required actions were completed and approved the park would be officially established.

Basically, there were a few differences of opinion between the Park Commission and the Commission in Harrisburg, but the Park Commission and neighbors were very supportive of Nationalization. The Chair of the Park Commission, Annamaria Malloy, was a strong supporter of the transition, very helpful in getting things done and well connected in Pennsylvania Politics.

Annamaria was instrumental in moving the legislation forward in Pennsylvania and Washington, was a great help to me and others as we learned about the physical resource and organizations around the park. She was like Mrs. Shouse at Wolf Trap but on a more personal and knowledgeable level of what a National Park was. It also helped that my car was licensed in Virginia and not Utah.

The first month, October, required close support and help from the Mid-Atlantic Region in Administration, Budget, Personnel, Maintenance, Historic Resources...
and Lands. As at Wolf Trap, as the Lone Ranger, I had no personnel, no office, no tools, no vehicles, no budget and a to do list the size of the Magna Carta.

It's important to note that the State Park Staff and State Superintendent Willcox were always helpful and supportive during those months as we moved into the park. It was a time of stress for them as well, but they did everything they could to make the change a success.

During the first two months the focus was bringing on board key staff. Region and Washington were going to have to announce and put lists of eligible persons together as soon as possible. Key staff at that point would consist of four GS-12's. A Chief of Maintenance, Chief Ranger, Chief Interpreter, and Administrative Officer. Included were a GS-7 Superintendent's Secretary and a Park Research Historian. There were personnel from the Regional Division of Planning and Resource Preservation who would be working on the history and begin to put a plan together for its completion. This took two months but was not the only thing being done.

Key personnel were interviewed, and references checked beginning in late November and December from lists of applicants. The Division Chiefs and Secretary were selected from registers in December and we began to huddle as a full team in January (Valley Forge, it had to be winter). The park offices were still occupied by
State Park Staff and would be until March, so we set up a temporary office in the old Keene Manufacturing Office (the old asbestos factory) at one end of the huge plant. We now owned the property as it had been purchased and then sold to the National Park Service by the Trust for Public Lands.

Please note that the original plant had been used for asbestos but over the past couple of decades it had been using non-asbestos materials, so the walls, ceilings, floors and space were covered in a silicate material. We had limited power and a few old desks to work from and ample snow mostly outside except for the icy stalactites hanging from above.

The new Division Chiefs, Secretary and Historian were asked to report for duty on January 17, 1977 for a one month planning and operational review period, as they arranged to relocate families to the park and get set up.

We worked as a team with the first order of business, after visiting all areas of the park, to agree on work lists for each Division, so they could start putting things in some order. Each Division Chief had a substantial list of To Do's and our one Secretary was able to support the work load, bless her heart.

The second order of business for each of the Chiefs was to visit the areas that they would be working in and begin to understand what tools and equipment would be
needed to work with in April, both from the State and new ones. They could then begin scheduling interviews in March of existing employees working in what would be their Division and start planning for recruitment of other NPS personnel and seasonal employees.

There were about fifty State people to be interviewed and we also had a 200 Year Celebration coming up in less than ten months. We had to be able to totally run an operating park in three months, April, without excuse.

The names of those first personnel on the scene who brought Valley Forge into life as a National Park and worked so long and hard to achieve it, under the worst of circumstances are known to few today, but they should be remembered in the early history of Valley Forge National Historical Park, not forgotten.

My secretary and all around helping hand was Barbara Fox, who was returning to her home in Phoenixville from Fort Detrick, Maryland.

Chief of Maintenance was Paul H. Clark, who had been Facility Manager at Morristown-Edison, NJ.

Chief of Interpretation was William Gene Cox, who had been Chief of Interpretation at Cumberland Gap National Historical Park, Kentucky.

Chief Ranger was Thomas Jack Fewless, who had been a District Ranger at Glacier National Park, Montana.
Administrative Officer was George Yardic, who had been Administrative Officer at Lassen Volcanic National Park, California.

Park Research Historian was Charles E. Funnell, who had been Research Historian in the Mid-Atlantic Regional Office.

I will never be able to say enough about their skill, dedication and leadership during those critical first months and years.

The agreement with the State allowed for us to interview all their employees and select only those qualified. The State Park employees had already been asked to submit applications for work in the new park, if they so desired, and about forty did apply. Among their other duties the Division Chiefs were tasked with interviewing those forty to determine who would be hired.

A panel of four interviewed the applicants based on the Division in which they would work. Each panel consisted of three consistent interviewers and one other. The one other being the Division Chief of the affected division. Other members were the Park Administrative Officer, Regional EEO Officer and a personnel officer from Region.

The Division Chiefs had full authority to hire after the interviews. By mid-March twenty-five of the interviewees were in process of being hired and brought into the various divisions, at the grade and pay-scale for the
position that they had been hired for. This would now be the core unit to lead us into the Bicentennial of Valley Forge and its new beginning.

The Regional Division of Planning and Resource Preservation was also busy, putting together two research teams; one to research and write a detailed history of the site and one to prepare for park wide archaeological studies. I still remember getting a call one morning in 1977 in our Keene office hovel, as we benefitted from a true winter Valley Forge experience.

The call was from our Research Historian, Charles Funnell who was coming to join us from the Regional Office. Charles was a young man of exceptional quality and he was asking if it would be ok if he worked in the library up in the State Park offices. He was aware of the history of the Keene plant and was concerned about the possibility of asbestos contact. He was just married and there was no problem in having him work up in the Park Library, which was a good location for him. This story has stayed with me because a few weeks later he went in to have a rather simple operation and died as a result. Such irony and such a loss.

My job was filled with To Do’s as well, during the time before establishing the park in April. Many trips down the Schuylkill Highway, (lovingly called the Surekill Highway by its drivers) to the Regional Office in Philadelphia for work on budget, recruitment and
history as well as meeting with the Associate Regional Directors I would be working with.

The park is located in two counties, Montgomery and Chester, and four Townships, Schuylkill, Tredyffrin, Upper Marion and West Norriton. There were two main groups involved with Valley Forge; the Valley Forge Park Commission and the Valley Forge Historical Society. The group that was the key to establishment was the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, a State agency located in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

Before turnover of the park the State, by legislation, was required to expend $10,000,000 already budgeted to build a new Visitor Center and parking lots. They would also refurbish and restore historic and important homes in the park used by officers like Washington, Knox and Von Steuben to name a few. This required several trips to Harrisburg to consult on the plans, along with meetings of numerous groups around Valley Forge.

By late February and early March, we were beginning to put out press releases explaining how we would be managing long standing public activities in the park. This included recreational use, road access and other non-historical uses. We also announced that we would have a large Park Volunteer Program and began to set that up.
There was an Ogden Foods Concessions Contract with the State to operate a facility in the park which had to be worked with and eventually reissued under the National Park Service. We were also creating a Valley Forge Park Interpretive Association whose purpose was to sell and provide books, publications and other items to the public. The profits would pay salary for the management of the Association and for finding and publishing works important to the park.

Then there was the land acquisition program in the legislation consisting of some 31 parcels totaling 200 acres. The communities and neighborhoods around the park had been strong supporters of the legislation creating Valley Forge National Historical Park. You have read the legislation laying out the land acquisition program and fund along with a time frame for moving forward.

After the first of the year, 1977, I began to work on contacting all the various property owners identified for acquisition starting with a very nice family who just happened to be 1953 graduates of Gettysburg College. We began talking about the land acquisition program… “What land acquisition program?” was the first response.

It wasn’t the last response that was received like this. All the owners were clear in their support of the legislation, but all indicated that they had not been contacted or made aware of any land acquisition, much less theirs.
Since owner responses all indicated the same thing, it altered my approach to the owners. We were able to acquire a couple of parcels from sellers willing to relocate. For the rest it was a matter of negotiating over time or other factors. Oh, how I still remember those blank stares when meeting the owners. Oh, how I remember my blank stares as I felt their blank stares.

We were able to move ahead, while retaining good relations with most of the owners. It could have been a lot more complicated than it was and certainly a lot less complicated than it was. By early 1979 the Park Service had assumed ownership of 24 of the 30 properties and was awaiting a federal court ruling on the purchase price of six others. These acquisitions included properties at the western edge of the park along State Route 23, Orchard Lane, Yellow Springs Road, on top of Mount Misery, the Port Kennedy area near State Route 363, and the southeastern corner along Thomas Road. Of course, there was the Keene property previously bought in 1976.

Two of the three legislative requirements were underway, but one remained; a Comprehensive General Management Plan. This would not be completed until 1981. This was due to the press of the bicentennial celebrations, reorganization of the park and the historical and archaeological research still going on. Another complication dealt with the Keene Plant and construction
of the new Visitor Center. But other plans had to be finished as well to meet NPS and legal requirements.

There were several, most requiring thorough detail and public process. There was a “Statement for Management”, a “Resources Management Plan” an “Interpretive Prospectus” and an “Environmental Assessment” to name but four. All of these plans would document such things as how we would manage the resource, planned recreational uses and locations, treatment and concern for the resources of the park. Resources defined as natural, historical and archaeological. This work went on before, during and after our bicentennial and was finally completed in 1982.

Feelings between the Valley Forge State Park Commission and the Valley Forge Historical Society during the first couple of years were somewhat tender. We were able to improve our relationship with the Historical Society and the Commission role gradually faded. One of the main exhibits in the new Visitor Center was Washington’s original Marquee tent, borrowed from the Historical Society. It was a beautiful exhibit in a highly conditioned enclosure for protection of the material.

Here we need to again mention Mrs. Annamaria Malloy, former Chair of the Park Commission and strong leader / advocate in transferring the park to the National Park Service. Early on she heard about the George C.
The Neumann Collection of American Revolution weapons and artifacts which was on the market for just under $650,000. The 1,500 item Neumann Collection comprised four parts: firearms, edged weapons, military accoutrements, and accessories.

Annamarie and I began talking about a donation of the collection with the Sun Oil Company on the Main Line. It was an exceptional collection and would be so well suited for a Valley Forge collection. We were making excellent progress, so I made an appointment with the officer at Sun Oil we had been dealing with, to discuss details and agreements. I invited our new Regional Director to the meeting because of the potential donation, which had been supported in the Region.

There were five of us in the meeting including Mrs. Malloy and after introductions, I briefly spoke to bring everyone up to speed as to where we were and why we were meeting. This was immediately followed by my being dressed down by the Regional Director for speaking out of turn. He was in charge of the meeting. The edge was on the meeting and I feared the donation had just gone up in verbiage.

The Sun Officer was in a state of disbelief as everyone else was. The meeting was rather stilted after that, but we got through a basic discussion. As the meeting ended the Sun Officer pulled me aside and basically said something like, "what the hell was that about." We had
a follow up discussion, and, despite this last meeting, we received a donation for the George C. Neumann Collection.

The amount that we were working on was the full $640,000 but the meeting with the Regional Director seemed to influence that. We received $350,000 from Sun Corp and Region had to find the remaining $290,000 which they did. The Regional Director proudly announced his acquisition of the Sun Corp donation and the Neumann Collection.

Was it an important donation? Assembled by George C. Neumann, it is still, I believe, the largest publicly owned collection of original Revolutionary War artifacts known in the world. It helps tell an important story of the Revolution and the people and equipment used in their fight for freedom.

What was needed also included equipment to operate the site of that fight for freedom. The four Division Chiefs worked and sweated like the Four Horsemen of Notre Dame. There wasn’t a division that didn’t need restructuring, retooling and revisioning. We had many good employees come over to us, but it was important for them to understand our policies, principles and programs. The Chiefs made Valley Forge over in a matter of about twelve months to their great and undying credit, and to the benefit of the Centennial Celebration.
One of the early needs was to clean the older homes used for employee housing by the State, move some people out and some people in. The problem came from the fact that the homes were provided to employees of the State Park without rent or compensation in exchange for maintaining them. There was no problem with that in so far as a policy by the State Park, but there was a problem. The homes were never inspected nor were they well maintained. The Chief of Maintenance gave me the news that most of the buildings would need a lot of work to be used for housing and some were filthy and health hazards. One home's back room had dog scat several inches deep over most of the floor, as one small example.

The bicentennial is its own story and fully occupied a large percentage of our employee's time for over two years beginning in 1977 going on through 1978. Plans, celebrations, openings, major bicentennial events and increased visitation were continual. There were new interpretive features and programs, on-going construction and maintenance of features, grounds and facilities. Fortunately, we had help from neighbors and organizations participating in the events. This included soldiers in period dress, citizens and hosts. Then too there were the Chambers of Commerce, historical societies and many other groups.
During those years we had guests and visitors including Governors, Mayors, the Secretary and Assistant Secretary of Interior, a Cardinal, Foreign Ambassadors, Military Personnel, Congressmen, Senators, media and a cross section of America. Visitors came from Europe, Asia, North and South America, Australia and Africa. There were many tuxedos, and we were pretty sure that a couple of those tuxedos might have been residents of Antarctica.

On Monday, December 19, 1977 Washington’s Troops, in period dress, 350 strong, led by the Valley Forge Military Academy Band, followed by thousands of people, marched into Valley Forge from Gulph Mills. This was the beginning of the six month encampment. Main address at the Memorial Arch was given by Interior Secretary Cecil Andrus.

In early May of 1978, we celebrated the announcement of the French Alliance with Washington in 1778. It was a key factor in the outcome of the Revolution and the French Ambassador gave the keynote speech during the celebration.

Cardinal John Joseph Krol, from Philadelphia, also blessed and spoke at one of the many events in Valley Forge in 1978.

Given my earlier experiences at Wolf Trap I had developed a management approach that was based on getting things done. Doing things that someone said
couldn't be done or taking calculated risks as necessary. Asking to do something a little unusual in these times would often result in being told “no, you can't do that,” or “that can't be done.” Sometimes management is like a bottle of ketchup, you have to turn it upside down and slap the bottom to get it working. That's how the French Ambassador came to be speaker for the French Alliance. We contacted the French Ambassador directly and invited him to the celebration.

The fact that the French Ambassador, Francois Lefebvre de Laboulaye, was present and spoke during the French Alliance Celebration only bothered the State Department and Assistant Secretary of Interior. It was an excellent speech.

Three elements involving the history were going on in this timeframe. Historical structures were being restored using funds from the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission. These included Washington's Headquarters, the Knox Quarters and Von Steuben's Quarters as well as others. The archaeological plans were being executed with work around the Parade Ground and two historians were busy writing an extensive history of Valley Forge.

When it was all said and done, the archaeological work was not as successful as we had hoped. Certainly, it verified and found relevant material. Unfortunately, Valley Forge was the home away from home for
Jamborees by the Boy Scouts of America, who camped throughout the park. Much evidence of camping was found by the archaeologists, mostly from the Boy Scout Jamborees.

Charles Funnell, Regional Historian, John Bond, Regional Historian and Sydney Bradford, Associate Director for Planning and Resource Preservation designed the Valley Forge Historical Research Project for Valley Forge. The lead researchers were Jacqueline Thibaut and Wayne K. Bodle. They began the project in August of 1977 and would bring it to conclusion in May of 1980, their team having conducted research in England, France and the United States in over two hundred archives. The work produced consists of several volumes and is a work of tremendous historical accomplishment and value. At the time the works were considered one of the "most concentrated and intensive research projects undertaken by the National Park Service."

I don't know how many sets of this bound set are out there but am sure it is not many. The Park will have a set and they are well worth reading if you are interested in Valley Forge. As with any product done by field professionals there will always be other professionals who tut tut over something in a study or research project and the Valley Forge Project is no exception. Thibaut and Bodle and their team are wor-
our living national treasures

thy of the term exception but in a slightly different usage, as the work was exception-al.

By about 1980 Gene Cox transferred and was replaced by John Tyler, another exceptional Chief of Interpretation. His focus was to continue with the progress made to date, work more closely with the Valley Forge Historical Society and form a Friends of Valley Forge Park. This was in addition to working with the non-profit Valley Forge Park Interpretive Association. Today, they remain important partners in the activities of Valley Forge and interpretation of an amazing story. The Friends now work under a new name which reflects an important event in the history of the American Revolution, The Valley Forge Park Alliance.

In the early years I met a former Commission and Historical Society member, John Reed who lived in King of Prussia. John was an avid collector of original George Washington documents, signed by him and others. We met on occasion and viewed his magnificent collection and discussed their future as he was still active as a collector. I asked John Tyler to work with John and to be sure that he was involved in the Park, which he did. I was no longer working at the Park when John Reed passed but I believe that he willed the collection to the Park. I can only hope that the Park dealt with the collection in a respectful and significant way. It was a collection worthy of great respect and reverence.
By 1977, so much had been done, yet there were two major projects remaining; A General Management Plan with Environmental Assessment and the Keene Factory. I’ll leave Keene to last as it is still creating repercussions in the Park.

In 1978 a Planning team arrived from our Denver Service Center to begin gathering information for the plan and to hold public meetings. A General Management Plan (GMP) is produced in the public sphere and details how resources in the park will be managed. This includes management of the historical scene, needed protections from neighboring lands, and relationships with surrounding interests, groups and communities.

It also includes plans regarding buildings, trails, roads and other similar needs. Restorations or removal of non-historic features, trails to be kept, improved or added and permitted uses of the park. It is put together with a team of people who are familiar with plans such as this and have sensitivity to the underlying value of the historic resources. A team that holds public meetings to gather input and to hear public concerns and desires.

Having been part of and seen teams like this work in other areas I was somewhat knowledgeable of strengths and weaknesses in the way that such programs were put together. At Valley Forge, we were the new kids
our credibility and reputation was on the line, especially in public meetings. The planning team had a Chief and consisted mostly of specialists that lived in Denver. In this case it was important that the Superintendent be a part of that team to represent the values and needs of the park and answer questions about policy in a straight forward way.

I worked in close coordination with the team on a number of fronts as we were dealing with a large number of publics. This was no longer a State Park, one that was familiar to the communities around the park. Our plans and comments, answers to questions, all had to be in keeping with the policies, regulations and procedures of the National Park Service in Historical Parks. It was also important that someone be at the public meetings who could answer a question about a use of the park with no equivocation such as maybe or we can check.

We met in several sessions with staff and our working partners to come up with an outline for the plan. Were there still vulnerable areas that might need more protection or possible acquisition? What other needs were there for the park and how and where we would conduct public meetings. We then scheduled twenty-two public meetings all outside of Valley Forge, which the team and I would attend.

The meetings were with State and Local officials, the general public and organized groups. The park being
in four townships, two counties and one State, some 86 local, county, and state agencies and public interest groups attended these meetings. The purpose of these consultations was to listen to comments and thoughts of park users, neighbors, local governments, planning commissions, schools, and local recreational and historical groups. In addition, to identify problems, opportunities, and issues to be addressed in the assessment of alternatives of the general management plan.

Valley Forge is a major transportation hub for cars commuting to jobs in King of Prussia and Philadelphia. It is home to a number of recreational uses from flying model airplanes to runners, bikers, picnickers, river users and canoeists, along with kite flyers, fishermen and other small things on wheels. By this time, we had been able to close the train station behind Washington's Headquarters to train service and commuters.

Public meetings would continue on through 1978 and 1979, in excess of forty more attended by hundreds of people. When it's all said and done the planning team returns to Denver and the Superintendent stays in the park to deal with all the comments made in public meetings and hearings. He or She better be able to deal with honest disagreements from the meetings but, if meetings went well, should not have to deal with statements made in error or incorrectly. We do not lie or misstate at public meetings. Hard concepts such as policy, regulation
and what can be done in certain kinds of resources need to be dealt with. "Yes, airplanes can be flown in the park, but not on the main battlefield. We will designate a site for your club across the river." An issue that should have been within the authority of the Superintendent, out of respect for the main resource, but was later reversed in the region for "other" reasons.

The plan, called a General Management Plan would be in draft form by 1980 for review and presentation to the public and include many of the concerns, ideas and thoughts gleaned from the numerous public meetings across the region. Three alternatives were proposed in the draft with road usage and location one of the main differences. By the end of 1980 the plan was ready to be submitted to the Regional Director for review and signature. He would make some changes that altered decisions and agreements reached with the public, and it would finally be formalized in 1982.

Several areas were being considered for acquisition and those interests had to be met with as well as shown to the public and reasons given. We were putting together a submittal for an additional acquisition program beginning in 1978, as we understood the points and places of greatest long term concern for the park. It was then that the attorney for Peter Camile, owner of Fatlands across the Schuylkill River, contacted the park about our ownership interests. Peter was a force in
Philadelphia politics and had been for years, particularly with Mayor Frank Rizzo. In some ways I think Peter was one of Mayor Rizzo's problem solvers. I mention this because once I started meeting with Peter, rumors began that were baseless.

I enjoyed my meetings with Peter and we tended to see his side of the river in the same way. Fatlands, the plantation home was a marvel and had historical meaning and significance, but it was not a building suitable for Valley Forge. However, the other acreage of Fatlands would be of interest in bringing in more encampment area and protecting Valley Forge from visible and elevated development in the future.

Using his interest as a fulcrum we met with the Regional Office and agreed to put together an acquisition plan for the park for submittal in the 1979 Congressional Omnibus Bill. This expedited the land acquisition plan before completion of the General Management Plan, but for good reason.

What follows is from the "Administrative History of Valley Forge" by Harlan D. Unrue. I cannot say it any better than Harlan.

"During the next five months, Superintendent Lusk and his staff met with local property owners, township planning commissions, congressmen, and state legislators in their efforts to compile a land acquisition package for the park. On March 23, 1979, Lusk submitted
the land acquisition package to the Regional Director. The package proposed acquisition of fourteen properties totaling 626 acres—496 acres by fee acquisition (60 acres in Chester County and 436 in Montgomery County) and 130 acres by scenic easements (20 acres in Chester County and 110 acres in Montgomery County) to assure present zoning and usage of property.

Lusk noted that:

"all land owners who would be involved by sale of their property to the National Park Service have been contacted and are formally disposed to such sale. It is important that we move quickly on this package as these owners will sell to developers and other interested parties should we fail to act. Three of the tracts are on the market at this time, but the owners would prefer selling to the National Park Service and have agreed to hold up sale for a reasonable time pending our decision."

The package included maps, photographs, justifications, descriptions, and details of increased operating costs. In conclusion, Lusk observed:

"This property represents the complete needs of the park and details only those areas which would have significant impact on the park. It also provides the park with adequate recreational buffer land to accommodate increasing traffic in the years ahead and to provide for recreational uses now impacting the prime historic zone. Use figures at Valley Forge
for 1978 indicate in excess of 11,000,000 visits. This breaks down, roughly, to 1,000,000 historic visitors, 4,000,000 recreational users, and 6,000,000 commuters and drive throughs. These figures further support our need for protection of the resource and additional recreational land.”

“Because of the offer of Fatlands to the park, this lands package has come out of sequence with our present General Management Plan schedule. It should be noted however that this package was discussed with the planning team and received their support. It has also been supported by the Montgomery County Planning Commission and the Lower Providence Township Planning Board as well as Schuylkill and Tredyffrin Township personnel, the Chester County Planning Commission and almost all neighbors contacted by the park.”

Numerous Congressional meetings were held on this plan and it was reported out by several committees favorably. It also received strong and critical support from Senator Heinz, Congressmen Coughlin, Schultz and Sebelius.

On October 1, 1980, notice was published in the Federal Register that the boundary of the park had been revised pursuant to Public Law 96-287. The revisions included lands depicted on the boundary map numbered 646/VF-91,001, dated June 1979, and prepared
by the Land Acquisition Division of the Mid-Atlantic Regional Office.

During this process, as it was nearing completion, I was directed to be at a meeting with NPS Deputy Director Ira Hutchison before attending the Senate committee's Subcommittee on Parks, Recreation, and Renewable Resources in Washington, D.C. on March 12, 1980 to testify on the land acquisition package.

It was a good feeling as I made my way to Washington, we were about to be on the road to a major win for Valley Forge. Our Washington Office had indicated earlier that it was in favor as well, so things were good. I arrived at the appropriate hour of 9:00 AM to allow us time to get to the hearing at 10:00 AM.

There were five in the room, including the Deputy Director, myself and Legislative Affairs personnel. We were going to go over the testimony. As we get to the issue, Deputy Director Hutchison looks at me and tells me that I am going to testify and that I will be testifying against the bill.

Well, that took me a second or two to say that I would not be testifying against the bill. This was repeated a few times and no progress was being made.

Our Legislative Affairs Director stepped in at that point to clarify that I did not have to testify, and that Hutchison could testify against the bill but to make sure that I was not called. Discussion over. We drove up to
the Hill and I sat at the table with DD Hutchison and listened and watched while he testified against the Bill. To be perfectly fair, it was the Secretary's Office that had required the Director's Office to testify against the Bill and Ira was just in an unfortunate position. I did however receive a number of puzzled looks from the Senators. As noted earlier, PL 96-287 was passed and published on October 1, 1980.

In the selection of areas for acquisition there were also a few areas that were ruled out of the plan. A major development planned for the south side of the Pennsylvania Turnpike, Chesterbrook, was already underway. It would have impacts on an area of the park but was screened by the Turnpike and was not considered. Purchase price would have been extremely high if the property was to be acquired. Having met with the developer, Richard Fox, on several occasions, I was content with the recommendation made and the fact that it would not be problematic for the park.

Chesterbrook was one of several issues that created favorable support for a National Park. For several years, prior to the legislation creating the park, strong opposition had been mounted by the public and advocates for the park due to population increases and the impacts of major development on Valley Forge. It was seriously evaluated and not included in the legislation for the park. Our view was the same as that of
the earlier evaluations thus not included in our later package.

Also, not included in the acquisition were other areas considered of less significance and unnecessary for the Park. They were the Valley Forge Manor, Camiel Lane/Vaux Lane/Chapel View and Valentine and lastly Pawlings Road across from Mill Grove Road and Audubon Wildlife Sanctuary.

Of all the properties identified for fee acquisition or easement purchase, the most controversial was at Betzwood, across the river near the park and is now called Valley Forge Crossing. This is a community of mobile homes, housing over a hundred families. The then owner kept advising the residents that the mobile home park was being acquired and they would be evicted.

It took three meetings with the homeowners to overcome that fear and clear the way for an easement to be acquired. The main concern for the mobile home park was not the park itself. It was the fact that the real estate it sat on would become an ideal site for future high rise or negative development.

With approval of the land acquisition program, the park was able to go forward with an adequate land base for present and future needs, as needed by management. It would also be accomplished before another major wave of high density development came into the area.
While the Service, in the years 1978-1980, was adding structures to the park via acquisition, it was also demolishing eighteen non-historic structures in the park. These were structures having serious structural issues, and unsafe buildings, but none that were significant or related to the history of the Park.

But the biggest job, the one that still haunts staff at Valley Forge today, was the Keene Manufacturing Facility in the heart of the park. The property was acquired from the Keene Corporation through the effort of the Trust for Public Lands. It was then purchased for $1,000,000 by the National Park Service. As they say in real estate, it’s location, location, location. It was acquired on October 12, 1976 and I would later think of it as my welcome to Valley Forge gift. I preferred the two geese in the bathtub.

The site was about 46 acres holding a 200,000 square foot concrete structure originally used for the manufacture of asbestos materials. It was fronted by a large wet quarry about 90 feet deep, filled about two-thirds with water from underground natural sources. There was a dry quarry and numerous waste piles the size of basketball courts and about as tall as a small basketball player. On one end of the structure was an old office building (our 1976-77 office sweet) two stories tall.
By March of 1978, testing by private firms, the Environmental Protection Agency, Occupational Safety and Health Administration and several state and local agencies had confirmed that the site was contaminated with asbestos, under all the plant surfaces and in several of the waste piles. Some type of non-asbestos material had been used in later years up to about 1970 and it would overlay and mix in with the waste piles also containing asbestos. With the testing and results the determination was to demolish the structure and recover the grounds as quickly as possible.

On May 16th in a meeting with regional and park staff I made it clear that the demolition and removal had to be accomplished by the end of the Fiscal Year as there was a $200,000 fund for its demolition that would expire at the end of the year. From May until September there was a flurry of meetings about the demolition and its timing in Washington, Philadelphia and Valley Forge. They included minor word exchanges of advanced language synonyms, differing opinions, decisions made and then unmade and a small amount of upset.

There were several issues but the hardest and biggest was that the History Division in Region wanted to preserve a part of the complex for artifact storage. One of the structures had a little history, our winter office. I was not very politic in this period as the last thing that we were going to see was a former asbestos plant con-
verted to artifact storage. The plant had decades of exposure to asbestos, sitting on land over which asbestos was placed or continually transported.

The feeling that the building could be sealed and restored to a safe condition was just not feasible as it was always going to be known as an asbestos factory. Placing employees into that situation would have resulted in a failure to attract employees and law suits from those that worked therein. If the factory had produced just about anything else the idea would have been a great one, but not with the known dangers of asbestos and the difficulty to remove it. We had several meetings over this but ultimately the decision was made in Region that total demolition should proceed.

By August it had been determined that an Environmental Impact Statement was not required for the demolition and the Pennsylvania State Historic Preservation Officer determined that the site did not meet the qualification for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places. The light was now flashing green, so we proceeded, with region, to put a contract together for the work and to get it out on the street for bid. In early October the Region issued and awarded the contract to Shelly's of Delaware, Inc. for demolition.

As we entered pre-demolition meetings with the contractor, on-site, we found out that this was the larg-
est demolition job taken on by the company. They were not familiar with hauling dangerous materials and they would have to obtain trucks and equipment given the size and sturdiness of the structures. Our supervision of the contract was going to be a full time job. They would also have to protect their workers with specialized gear and be alert to air flow changes when disturbing the structure and grounds.

Demolition was slow, but it went forward. A part of the plant consisting of concrete, brick and stone was used to fill the one dry quarry and to partially lay in a base in the wet quarry. The rest of the construction material had to be hauled out of the area to a site for hazardous materials, which required special handling and protection while on route. The wet quarry was certified as a suitable place for portions of the waste piles by Federal and State agencies that oversaw the removal. It was approved given the fact that the material would be in a wet environment and when the quarry was topped off the entire site would be buried in twelve feet of top soil.

Work on the site continued into 1982 and continues today. It may take a generation or two for visitors to once again visit the site without concern, but I would certainly hope not. Present management needs to understand that the removals and demolition were done
to the highest standards of measurement and safety in those years.

There was no short cutting, no place not measured for contamination, no moonlight specials or other procedures used. Per the measurements of the day using the equipment of the day, the site was cleaned. Rain and time can change the nature of ground, as can more sophisticated equipment. We did our best as I know they are doing now.

The years at Valley Forge were instructional, stressful and fun. Changes have been made over the years, generally to the good, as change is ever present around our National Park areas. The harvest of over abundant deer was a correct and well made decision, it requires no further justification. The influx of recreational users was predicted and known. Hopefully their distribution and placement are going well.

There are so many other interesting stories involved with the transition of Valley Forge, but we have other places to go. The Staff at Valley Forge during the years before establishment of the park (1982) were a grand group of people from all walks and aspects of life. I still feel emotional when I remember those people and all that was accomplished. Several have moved on to higher pastures, but I know that there are others out there who still remember our years on the Parade Ground, hopefully with joy and pride.
In the end, it was about 2015, after working up the Lusk family history, using DNA and other methods, that I understood why I might have been selected, mystically, for the Superintendent of Valley Forge. A GGGG Uncle, First Lieutenant William Lusk, Wayne’s First Pennsylvania Brigade, Parkers Seventh Regiment spent the winter at Valley Forge, camped but about 400 yards from where we lived while working at Valley Forge.

It’s important to remember that Valley Forge underwent the change that it did because things were rapidly changing around the State Park. People grew concerned and took leadership in assuring that a new steward could come forward better resourced to protect and preserve the area and history. It is a fine example of issues facing the National Park Service today, remembering only this one line from President Ford: *The paths of history are littered with visions that failed because their proponents were not people of action and endurance.*

We can never forget that the National Park Service is a vision.

By the end of 1981 my tasks at Valley Forge were basically complete and the park was ready for new thought and leadership. An interesting park and situation came up needing a new Superintendent, Big Bend National Park in Texas. Question was, would the Regional Director in Santa Fe consider selecting
a non-traditional person for the job. Glad to say that Regional Director Robert Kerr had no problem in making a decision. Big Bend was my next assignment.
At the time, Superintendents of natural and large western parks were almost always former park rangers from law enforcement or resources management, other Superintendents moving up in the west, those with other regional connections and usually of the male persuasion and light in color. Well, I was an American History major, a Park Historian for several years and on the east coast. Surprisingly enough I was selected for the position and was delighted to be moving west. In the west, more than one or two must have wondered “who let this camel into our tent?” In the recent past, post 1995 things have changed partially due to court orders regarding female and minority development and placement along with retirements leaving a number of key vacancies. The chance to bring forward females and minorities into key and upper level management positions, a good thing for them and the Service.
Big Bend was of interest to me for several reasons. It was in Texas and it was on the Mexican Border. It had a new area coming on board, it was supposed to be an International Peace Park and it was an exciting resource. It also had Russ Berry, who was the Assistant Superintendent there, with a solid reputation. Not to be forgotten, my family had been living in Texas since before the Alamo.

Big Bend National Park is scenic, its historic, its peopled past goes back a long way and it's a long way from the grocery store. The park is located about 110 miles from Alpine Texas and 125 miles to Fort Stockton. That's where the grocery stores, doctors and all the "if you need it stores" were located. The Park has many reputations, one being about incoming new personnel assigned to the park, the school at the park, or US Customs and Border Patrol personnel. (Yes, some parks have grade schools for park personnel, just one other consideration for movement in the NPS by families with children.) New personnel at the park do one of two things like clockwork, they turn around and leave after about a month or they want to live there for the rest of their lives.

The Big Bend that I will be discussing is Big Bend before the tragedy of 9/11. That created an entirely new situation on the border. So, I will only be referencing my
time there which began in March of 1982 and ended in March of 1986.

If you happen to go to Big Bend, and you should, you will be amazed to see the country and know that over 500 occupation sites from prehistoric times are there. To know that Comanche Indians commuted through Big Bend hundreds of years ago to capture horses and slaves in Mexico and that the southernmost Comanche medicine wheel in the United States is protected in Big Bend. You can recall the events in the US Military’s quest for Pancho Villa after 1910 and General Pershing’s efforts. It’s also fun to know that in 1899 a small town across the Rio Grande in Mexico, called Boquillas (Bo-key-ias), Mexico with a current population under 50, had over 2,000 residents. It was mining time and country.

In the park you will see relict forests, pink cliffs, thousand foot canyons, a small restaurant and a fine motel in the Chisos Basin. Have no fear because there is a gas station, a post office, a school, several campgrounds, historic structures, paleontological sites, and hundreds of miles of trails. There is a river called the Rio Grande which is also called the Rio Bravo in Mexico and of course a Park Headquarters and housing area at Panther Junction as well as at other locations.

The Rio Grande, from El Paso to just west of Presidio, Texas may have miles of dry river bed at times of the year but, fortunately for Big Bend, the Rio Conchos
River of Mexico flows into the Rio Grande, west of Big Bend and fully re-waters the river until Lake Amisted east of Big Bend. The Rio Grande is some 1,900 miles long and the second longest river in the Continental United States running from Colorado to the Gulf of Mexico. Will Rogers once described the Rio Grande as “the only river I know of that is in need of irrigating”. But in Spanish times, around 1500 the river was named “El Rio Bravo del Norte” or “The Fierce River of the North”. This certainly reflects the changing character of the river today. This brief introduction regarding one of the finest National Parks in the Continental U. S. is why I felt so privileged to live and work in it.

The position of Superintendent at Big Bend was a GM-14 (General Management) which was nice to have but not the reason for going there. The first order of business, upon arriving in West Texas on our way to the park, was to visit the Fort Stockton and Alpine Chambers of Commerce. It was my first opportunity to get a read on the situation in Big Bend and its standing in the community.

More important was information on the designated Rio Grande Wild and Scenic River which was undergoing planning at the time to become an operating Park. The Park and Southwest Region had a planner working on the situation and he was housed in an office in
Alpine. So, I stopped to visit with him as well. Then we shopped, loaded up some ice chests and headed south.

There are three roads into Big Bend in the United States. All of them hold fascinations and keep your attention as you travel down the long road to Big Bend. One road comes south from Marathon, another from Alpine and a third from Marfa, through Presidio and along the river.

Over the years we always enjoyed seeing a Brown SST in our rear view mirror as we drove. The Brown SST was a UPS truck making its rounds in Big Bend country. The visage was never in our rear view mirror for long. The driver of that SST was a man who had a sense of humor and was always supportive of our residents. His daily route started in Alpine, Texas and ended some 400 miles later back in Alpine having travelled to Marfa, Presidio, Lajitas, Study Butte, Big Bend and Marathon. His daily route. His vehicle always reminded me of a Super Sonic Transport, he could make it fly.

Once on site and settled in to our home at Panther Junction the most important piece of business was catching up with the Rio Grande Wild and Scenic River. It was moving forward and when I asked how much the park knew about what was happening with the planner it turned out the park was not really in the loop and that needed to change. The planner was meeting with ranchers, the Sierra Club and other groups. I may not
have spent my life in Texas, but I did know the culture of those groups and little warning bells were going off in my mind.

The legislation creating the Rio Grande Wild and Scenic River (RGWSR) called for actively managing the river for an additional 128 miles from the park boundary, almost to Amistad Lake in Del Rio. It’s important to understand that the international boundary between the US and Mexico is the middle of the Rio Grande River and is overseen by a Federal Agency called the International Boundary and Water Commission in El Paso, Texas. It administers the treaties between Mexico and the United States regarding the border. The Rio Grande W&S&SR is not a river, it’s a half river of the United States.

Mexico was neither involved in any of the planning for the W&S&SR nor, to my knowledge, the legislation creating it. The north side of the river was active ranch land controlled by ranchers who would not “gladly” give up access to the river and its source of water. In visiting with ranchers and then conservation/environmental groups in San Antonio another big problem emerged. Our planner was apparently trying to keep everyone happy.

The ranchers would not be affected by the W&S&SR and cattle operations would not be affected on the private lands that bordered the 128 miles on the north side. The conservation and environmental groups were being
led to believe that their concerns for protection of the river from cattle and ranchers would be taken care of. On the Mexican side quien sabe. Solomon, I was not.

There are no impediments on the river within the designated corridor, there are camp sites, mostly on the Mexican side, hot springs, mostly on the Mexican side, a road access for take outs on the US side and 128 miles of river for commercial and public river runners to use in all the river’s majestic beauty.

Just leave it alone, call it what it is, a W&SR and let it manage itself along with a few park river patrols a year. The river is totally isolated and many miles from roads or homes with no danger of commercial or other kind of development for decades to come. The river is an invaluable asset to both Mexico and the United States and until Mexico and the United States can plan the W&SR together, just leave it alone.

I called the Regional Director, explained that our best strategy was to leave it alone, relocate the planner and get out from under the hard feelings and impossible situations that would be generated for managing a half river. We needed no land acquisition or invasive management. Now, for those of you who are counting, yes, we manage a half river in Big Bend but the related land mass with that half river is what we are really managing with full access and use of the river thanks to Mexico.
The Regional Director agreed although the planning staff in Region was not happy with that decision. I only needed one agreement. The planner was relocated and the office in Alpine was closed. I was not well liked by the Sierra Club but that would not be a rare condition over the coming years.

The second item of business was the fact that we were on the Mexican border and the park needed two things. We needed a strategy for developing close relationships with Mexico and the small villages just over the border. We also needed a strategy to move forward the ideals of the International Rotary Club for an International Peace Park.

In 1932, International Rotary attempted to set up two International Peace Parks; one would be called Waterton-Glacier International Peace Park on the Canadian Border and one would be established at Big Bend. Problem was there was no park across the border in Mexico so that was left on the to do list. I knew that meetings between Mexico and the National Park Service had been held over the intervening years but without any success. Why no success and how could we kick the can down the road?

It was critical to create and implement a strategy for our neighbors to the south. The main relationship with the villages to the south for years had basically dealt with law enforcement. For years it was the collection of
a plant called Candelaria, growing along the Rio Grande in the park. Candelaria wax is created from the plant and was a way for the villagers to make money by harvesting the plant illegally in the park.

In the days of Pancho Villa the border in the park was patrolled by the US Cavalry to stop bandits from crossing the border and they had a small encampment in the park. Candelaria by the 1980’s had been largely replaced with cattle from Mexico crossing the border. We had a Department of Agriculture employee in the park to enforce this issue. (The cattle that trespassed into the park were actually “US Citizens”, owned as they were by wealthy Texas ranchers, but herded in Mexico because of cheap labor and expenses).

In case you haven’t got the picture yet, I love Mexico and I love and admire the Mexican People. The strategy developed was based on the following policies which were implemented:

1. The staff received on-site training in the Spanish language from Sul Ross State University in Alpine, Texas. Basic phrases and words.
2. The Ranger Division assigned rangers to be Ambassadors to the three villages across the river. They were to visit them on a regular basis, check on health or medical needs and become a good neighbor. The three villages
were Boquillas (Bo-key-ias), San Vicente (Ba-cent-ay) and Santa Elena.

3. In October of 1981 we established the International Good Neighbor Day Fiesta at Rio Grande Village for the Park staff, visitors and residents of the villages in Mexico. Residents of the villages were allowed entry into the Fiesta without fanfare. It would continue to function until the world brought that to a conclusion in 2001.

4. Our US Citizen Cattle, when found in the park were rounded up, taken to Presidio, Texas and impounded. Should someone from one of the villages find their way to Presidio, they could pay a fine, reclaim the animals and take them back to their vacation home in Mexico. This process would be phased out. The cattle would be rounded up and returned to Mexico from the park with fines.

5. Park Rangers would no longer seek to interdict drug smugglers passing through the park. The groups would be spotted, and information passed immediately to US Customs for interdiction as they crossed out of the park. Park Rangers carry hand guns and may have a shotgun or rifle in their vehicle. Drug smugglers carry automatic weapons and a sophisticated
set of armaments. Our personnel were neither trained nor equipped to handle this situation.

6. In the early 1980's there were two kinds of folks trying to enter the US at Big Bend. There were braceros walking to work in Midland-Odessa and returning home on holidays. Very few Mexican citizens tried to enter the US for residence because of the location of Big Bend. Then there were those trying to enter the United States illegally to become residents. These were often large groups of East Germans, Poles, Czechs and other countries behind the iron curtain. They were able to get visas to visit Mexico and then try to arrange for wheeled transport from Big Bend. The focus was not changed for these groups.

7. Visitors were always welcomed to Boquillas, being right on the river side across from Rio Grande Village. The park would be notified if there was a visit from Federales coming to the village. At those times we would bring all US Citizens in Boquillas back to Big Bend. The Frontera of Mexico is big, wide and deep along most of the border in the states of Coahuila (qua-wheel-ah) and Chihuahua, Mexico. There was no local law enforcement stationed along most of this border other than infre-
quent visits by Federales. When the Federales did come they tended to remind villagers that it would be better for them to not commit serious crimes with the Federales having to return.

8. After a short time, we began holding auctions at Panther Junction in support of our employee recreation fund. Items of many kinds came from our employees and neighbors along with donations of services and special trips by concessioners and employees. These auctions were open to everyone.

9. The Big Bend Natural History Association was encouraged to increase sale of items in Spanish and English.

10. The hiring of new personnel wasn’t based solely on speaking Spanish, it was based on their experience and skill sets. If two people were close together for selection, if one spoke Spanish that would be a positive, not a pre-select.

11. The overriding policy was to treat our neighbors with respect and dignity, to help when we could while understanding that we were still obligated to enforce our policies and the law.

Employees, almost to a person, accepted and appreciated the changes being made in Park policy and the
emphasis on being a neighbor to Mexico and not just an enforcer. Our first Park Fiesta held in 1981 resumed a tradition of annual “Good Neighbor Days” started by a former Park Superintendent, Ross Maxwell many years before. A man who also loved Mexico.

In my five years at Big Bend I can only recall about three events where a difficult situation occurred that involved residents of Mexico in the park and all were safely resolved.

One that I recall involved the Department of Agriculture employee whose job was to patrol the park for cattle that had crossed from Mexico. The problem occurred frankly because he failed to understand one of the stronger elements of Mexican culture. He patrolled on horseback and one day came upon two young boys from San Vicente, Mexico on horseback in the park, probably looking for cattle. He stopped them and as punishment took their horses and made the boys walk back to the village.

Not long after one of the two boys came back to the park and fired a round at the employee, missing. It was unfortunate and preventable, and the youth would be punished. The employee should have known that you can’t embarrass two young males from a village, having them return to the village on foot, without expecting something in return.
Not long after that we changed the manner in which cattle were treated and the Department of Agriculture relocated their employee.

While these and other minor changes were on-going, I began to research the history of relations with Mexico concerning the International Peace Park. There had been meetings, but nothing ever came of those meetings, why?

As I read minutes of the earlier meetings it became clear as to why nothing had gone forward. The meetings were all in the United States and the whole approach seemed to be that we would “help” them set things up. Some of the dialogue in the minutes also showed a tendency to be less than diplomatic and, unfortunately, a little off-putting, by our representatives.

If we were going to succeed with protected areas across the border, we would have to do a much better job at all levels. Of first importance was the diplomacy through our Ambassadors to the villages and concern for the local Mexican people. Of the greatest importance was to establish a major relationship with the agencies and leadership of Coahuila and Chihuahua, which would require not days but years of consistent and expanding relationships.

We hadn’t had the courtesy to discuss the Wild and Scenic River with Mexico and the involved states, part of the reason that we did not go forward at this time. In
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recruiting a vacant District Ranger position our Chief Ranger, Jim Liles, made an excellent hire. He brought in a Ranger with fluent Spanish and years of experience working in Chili and Argentina for the Peace Corps. Jim Bellamy would become part of the “on to Mexico” team, of great importance for years to come. 1981 was a foundation year and 1982 would become the first year of outward reach and diplomacy.

Our work in Mexico was extensive and full bore at times from 1982 on. There were no contacts with the State Department, the Secretary of Interior or the Director. We didn’t ask permission, we did. Had we asked, we would have been told to stand down, without doubt. I was never confronted by the State Department but know that there was real unhappiness about our trips to and activities in Mexico. We knew that we had to take Big Bend to Mexico and that meant going there, not by staff but by the Superintendent, a dummy who couldn’t speak Spanish. We had to make the first overtures.

Our first trip to Mexico, Jim Bellamy and I with our spouses, made a trip to the State Capitals of Coahuila (qua-wheel-ah) which is Saltillo, and Chihuahua, which is Chihuahua City. I mentioned spouses because that too was part of the trip, having family along and our confidence in Mexico. The trip was about a week in length and very successful. We drove to Mexico using one of our park fleet vehicles as we usually did and cleared the
trip with our GSA (General Services Administration) motor pool in El Paso.

After arriving in Saltillo we spent the next day going to the Office of the Governor of Coahuila, José de las Fuentes Rodríguez. If I had called in advance to make an appointment it would bring on several issues, so we made no advance arrangements. We arrived in mid-morning at his office, introduced ourselves to his Secretary and explained who we were and why we hoped to meet with the Governor. The reception was friendly and polite. We were shown into the Governor’s anteroom where folks waited to meet with the Governor, who had agreed to meet with us if he could work us into his existing schedule.

Jim and I sat in the anti-room until mid-late afternoon along with others waiting with us, wondering what two gringos were up to. About three pm an aide came out and regretted that the Governor’s schedule would not permit time for our visit. It was a successful day. The Governor knew that representatives from Big Bend National Park in the United States had been there to visit and we had done it with respect and patience. We were physically there.

We returned to the Camino Real where we were staying and found a phone message from the director of the federal agency in charge of forests and resources in Coahuila, Guillermo Mattus, who invited us to his
home for the evening. My belief is that the Governor’s Office called Guillermo and asked that he meet with us. He picked us up and we had a delightful evening visiting, discussing our goals and meeting his family. Arrangements were made to continue our relationship. In addition he told us about a Professor acquaintance of his at the Universidad Autónoma Agraria Antonio Narro in Saltillo, Julio Carrera, who would be an excellent contact and was very interested in our approach. The leadership team in Mexico was now forming.

We then travelled on to Chihuahua City, Chihuahua where we had the same plan. We went to the Governor’s Office, introduced ourselves and explained the reason for our visit. Governor Oscar Ornelas met with us for over an hour, thanked us for the visit and would help open doors down the road in Chihuahua. We then returned to Big Bend, feeling pretty good.

A good foundation had been laid and like a garden, would need to be tended to and worked with on an equal basis between nations. Follow up was continual from Jim Bellamy, Ramon Olivas, another of our park team and a District Interpreter and others at Big Bend. Over the next few years we would be meeting about joint training programs with Julio and Guillermo and other relevant ideas. Some in Mexico and some in the States. There would be other meetings along the way, generally through the Courtesy of Guillermo and Professor
Carrera. Two of those meetings would be highly significant for the future. Jim and Ramon were vital to the success of our work with Mexico and would remain vital for many years after I left along with resource specialist, Vidal Davila.

You may recall that there was earlier mention of a need for Park Superintendents to work issues forward and not go off in various directions, thus achieving little or nothing. During my tenure, a foundation was laid for the future protected areas, but it would require the cooperative and continuing work of three more Superintendents to achieve success. Had any one of them chosen to say, “That’s a waste of time” the entire house of cards would have fallen. Many parks have been able to create some great things because of a Superintendent or park team, to only see them ignored and abandoned by the next Superintendent. There are processes to prevent this.

Other areas of work during the years at Big Bend involved a major concession operation at Chisos Basin with a restaurant and motel operations. The Basin also had a horse concessionaire and there were also several permits with river operators for running the river from Lajitas, Texas and other put ins. We were also working on several required documents including, Statement for Management, Interpretive Prospectus, General Management Plan, Resource Management Plan and
possible expansion of the park on ground to the north of the park.

We also began to computerize the operation using surplus Data General equipment obtained from another agency along with training our staff in use of computers. A far call from today's systems but a beginning.

There were normal meetings with State representatives in Austin, the State Historic Preservation Office and Texas Parks and Wildlife to name a few. We were at this time keeping watch over 257 miles of the Rio Grande River. Big Bend with 129 miles and the Wild and scenic River with 128 miles. The border of Mexico with the United States is 1,954 miles so we were tending to roughly 13.4% of the border with Mexico.

Now, don't get me wrong, we worked closely with the Border Patrol out of Marfa, Texas and the U.S. Customs Service, but it was our personnel doing most of the day to day work along and on the river. There was no Customs station in the Park and one Border Patrol officer. They were always on call, flew over the border regularly and were only a radio call away. We had excellent relations with those agencies but that all changed due to tragic events. Things have significantly changed and tightened up since those days.

There are basically three forms of enforcement available to parks created in establishing legislation. There is proprietary jurisdiction which means that law enforce-
ment in the park unit is the right of local law enforcement outside the park unit. There is concurrent jurisdiction meaning that park rangers as well as local law enforcement agencies have authority within the park. Finally, there is exclusive jurisdiction which is often found in older parks. Exclusive jurisdiction means that park rangers and federal agencies are the sole enforcement authority except for murders, which must be investigated by the FBI. Chief Rangers have the responsibility to keep up with law enforcement regardless of jurisdiction and with neighboring law enforcement agencies and appropriate Federal agencies. Big Bend has exclusive jurisdiction within the park, but other federal agencies have authority on the international boundary as well.

So, how does a wall fit within all this at the border? What will happen, as of this writing, is yet to be determined but it seems that there is a fear that the wall will cut off Big Bend from Mexico, ruin the ecology and create chaos. Let's apply some common sense to the situation of the wall along the Rio Grande River from El Paso to the Gulf.

Chaos and rumor is cheap in these times, so let's forget about those. Remember that the Rio Grande is a critical resource for both nations, water for agriculture, cattle and communities. There is no possible method for a wall to be built along the Rio Grande in Big Bend and along the river. The international boundary is in the
middle of the river and is well established by law. So where is a wall going to go?

Will America build a wall on the south bank of the river and close off access to water along 400 miles of Texas, giving away half of the river? Will Mexico agree to building a wall on their side, taking water away from agriculture, cattle, towns, villages and people? How about they build a wall in the middle of the river? Border security along much of the Rio Grande is going to have to be done with towers, technology and people.

We all have our opinion about the wall but let's open the dialogue about lands in Big Bend and elsewhere and start making it clear that the use of technology is the important need along the river, not a wall. In other places there will be impacts of a wall that need to be dealt with such as at Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument in Arizona, which has a landed boundary with Mexico and serious complications for the Tohono O'Odham Nation and native species.

Now, with all that said, let me say that if there is any indication that a wall will be built along the Rio Grande River, fur needs to fly. The destruction of an ecoregion, its underlying species and the destruction of a prime National Park, a designated Wild and Scenic River and the work of more than ten years to create the underlying foundation for an International Peace Park and over a million acres of protected lands in Coahuila
and Chihuahua, Mexico, is beyond belief. No river in a desert can be blocked off nor given away to another nation. There are ways to enforce immigration along a river border without building walls and destroying the lives of people and species. Big Bend and the National Park Service need to begin, now, to lay in their foundation for why that wall is not going to be built and how protection can be applied using technology and other methods.

If the wall is built, Big Bend becomes a modified zoo in violation of all existing legislation. It also creates the scenario that National Parks are not protected and can be violated needlessly. This also applies to Organ Pipe Cactus. Are we watching and waiting or are we preparing for a fight as important as the Hetch Hetchy dam in Yosemite?

To the north of Big Bend was the Rosillos (Ro-see-yos) Ranch owned by the Pitcock brothers from the Midland-Odessa area and then beyond them the Santiago Mountains with the Love Ranch. In between was a wide area that we looked at for addition to the park to give our entrance road some protection to the west and also add some interesting acreage to the park. As you can see from today's maps that acquisition did occur at a later time. During this same time the Texas State Park and Wildlife Commission was engaged in
the acquisition and startup of the Big Bend Ranch State Park near Lajitas, Texas.

If you take the time to look at a State Map of Texas with a little overlap into Mexico, you will see an amazing bio-region slowly coming together. Its value in another twenty years will be well beyond that of today for many reasons. The Maderas del Carmen Flora and Fauna Protected Area and Parque Nacional Canon de Santa Elena in Mexico, Big Bend National Park, Big Bend Ranch State Park and the Black Gap Wildlife Management Area in Texas. Imagine the opportunities and cooperative values that exist and will exist even more closely in the future. It will draw interest and visitation from all over the world as one of the best examples of a partially protected bio-region.

The Pitcock Brothers, owners of the Rosillos Ranch, had an interesting history. Their father, it must have been in the 20's, owned an extremely large ranch south of Midland-Odessa and sold it. It would later become one of the largest and richest oil fields in West Texas. That by itself would make anyone about half crazy, but the Pitcock family kept moving on and, in the process, created one of the most successful oil field equipment suppliers in Texas and Louisiana. They were good neighbors.

In an attempt to bring West Texas tourism together to provide better information and support for the
region I worked on setting up a regional tourism group which was called the Big Bend Area Travel Association (BBATA). It had representatives on it from the Big Bend area, Lajitas, Alpine, Fort Davis, Fort Stockton, Marathon and a few guest ranches. Goal was to work together in producing regional media and contacts. It was still at work in 1986 but not sure how long it continued. Sometimes local communities in Texas have feelings about their neighbors, which are generated, in my unsophisticated analysis, from something called serious High School Football.

Walter Mischer, known as the Kingmaker in Houston, Texas was a prominent realtor, investor, banker, rancher and builder who came to love the area of Lajitas in the early 1980's. He would remake Lajitas into a rural resort and bring in visitors and owners from many places. Walter was an interesting and enjoyable person to work with while engaged in the work at Lajitas.

We met with him on occasion to learn his latest ideas and moves to be sure that the affect on Big Bend was negligible. A small town developed in Mexico, also called Lajitas, just to support his development and activities. The town of Lajitas, Texas was also home to several river running companies, who took float and canoe trips down the Rio Grande through Santa Elena Canyon in Big Bend and sometimes through Mariscal Canyon as well and beyond.
Big Bend also had an impressive reputation in West Texas. If a steer was killed 200 miles from the park, it was a mountain lion from Big Bend that did the deed. Protection of all species was always a matter of discussion at Rotary or Community meetings. It was an issue that has never died or gone away, but hopefully it is wilting.

We did have a couple of unfortunate attacks by mountain lions in Big Bend. One was an attack of a small boy on one of the trails in the Chisos Mountains. He suffered serious injuries but survived. As soon as we knew what had happened, we immediately called in a couple of well-known trackers, so we could find the animal, for rabies testing. A few days later the lion was found in the park and killed. The lion was starving, and his pads were bleeding and raw.

It was a lion that someone had taken out of the wild as a kitten, raised and then, because of size and other issues, brought it to the park and released it. It was a cruel thing to do for both the lion and especially the little boy. It would be nice to say that such dumping of a lion was unique or rare, but it wasn't as rare as you might think.

The park is a hiker's paradise and one can hike for miles across the desert in any direction on or off a trail. I hiked many miles in Big Bend while there and always found an area or place that was special. Once, while hiking on a cliff ledge in the Pink Cliffs area of the Sierra
del Caballo Muerto I found that I was stepping over a little snake. It was a Mojave Rattlesnake about ten inches long beautifully decked out in pink skin. It was a perfect camouflage for the Pink Cliffs, developed over how many years? I hope its kids are still doing well.

The park could also have other surprising events. Not long after arriving, three military aircraft flew over the park at low elevations creating quite a loud affect and disturbance. Hard to tell the altitude of aircraft but it seemed as though they were well under 500 feet. A onetime event that reoccurred a few more times. Conducting a little investigation, we found that the aircraft were coming from Laughlin Air Force Base in Del Rio, Texas, where pilots were trained.

Contact was made with the base noting our displeasure with the practice and the elevation of aircraft over the Park. I was not aware of any regulation or policy that opened park airspace for fast jets flying at low altitudes. Not too long after that I received a letter from a Major at the base who advised me that it was policy for the planes to fly over parks and forests as it was open space and safer for the planes to fly over. In effect, the planes were flying over the park intentionally. Too have such a letter in hand was a gift. After forwarding to the right locations along with our request to stop the flights over the park, the flights were rerouted and stayed well north of the park and the policy was changed.
But the Air Force almost got me back. We were driving south of Marathon on our way back to the park after shopping in Fort Stockton. It's a nice road and easy to drive. I was coming up on the brow of a hill, blocking my forward view, and just as I reached the top a black and large military aircraft came by about 100 yards to the west doing less than mach one at about 200 feet. I almost took a scenic drive in the desert. Well, they were out of the park.

It was also a wonderful place for the Audubon Society and birders with over 450 bird species within its boundaries, more than any other national park and more than all but a few states. A birders paradise and sometimes a small problem in management. One of the great canyons of the Big Bend and Rio Grande river is Santa Elena Canyon, with thousand foot sheer walls and a river running through it. There was a trail and an overlook at one end of the canyon, in the park, oh maybe 80 yards, located just above the river.

Those sheer walls were the home nesting sites for a few Peregrine Falcons every year, nests way up the walls near the top. At the time the Peregrine was on the list of Threatened and Endangered species and under the watchful eye of the US Fish and Wildfire Service, a very fine agency. The day comes that the Fish and Wildlife Service advises me that the trail into the entrance of the Santa Elena Canyon would have to be closed. The birds
could not be disturbed during nesting, even though they were about 800 feet above the river and upstream.

I took exception to that order and saw no real reason to close the trail because of its location. I called the Regional Director, explained the situation to him and my reasoning. His verdict was that we should obey the order and close the trail which we did. Why did I object to the order? Every year, while the Peregrine were nesting, they were being observed from above their nests by the Fish and Wildlife Service, and, when eggs were on the nest, rappelling down the cliffs to visit the nests and young birds. The few visitors way down at the base could not compare in terms of disturbance to the nests themselves.

Snakes, birds, lions, javelina but what about fish? Big Bend is home to the *Gambusia gaigei* C. L. Hubbs, 1929 (Big Bend gambusia).

The Big Bend gambusia is a rare species of fish in the family Poeciliidae. It is endemic to the Big Bend region of the Rio Grande of the United States and Mexico. The only known remaining population is in a protected pond in Big Bend National Park.

If you plan to run the Rio Grande at some point, a little hint. The more common members of the Gambusia family reside in hot springs and pools loved for late night relaxation while on the river, especially in Mexico. Not long after entering the pool you will find that it is inhab-
ited by Gambusia as they munch on moles and dark spots on your body. Sharp little teeth but oh that water is so good. The fish is often called Mosquito Fish because if introduced into stagnant or quiet water they eat the mosquito larva. These are small fish, hardly noticeable until that magic moment when mole meets teeth.

There was often a need to run the river with special guests or for observation of issues along the way. On one occasion the Assistant Superintendent and I along with two rangers were doing a canoe trip down through Boquillas Canyon and beyond to check on a couple of things. It had been raining and the Rio was running fast and high. Just after getting through Boquillas Canyon, I saw one of the neatest things.

I was in the rear canoe, about 30 yards back from the lead canoe, paddling away. A ranger was in the rear position in the canoe in front of us. As I was watching, he put his paddle in the water and was immediately flipped out of the canoe, head over heels and four feet in the air, two of those feet being his. We had to call the canoe in front because the flip out had been so smooth that Russ in front wasn’t even aware that he no longer had someone in the back of the canoe. I think we could say that Russ was surprised to be alone in the canoe. The ranger was fine and now had a heck of a story to one day tell his grandchildren. The only thing we could think of was the paddle had lodged between something in the
river, got stuck and he stayed with the paddle. Wish that had been on tape.

Building on numerous meetings with Mexican officials we finally arranged a trip with Guillermo and his staff to the Maderas del Carmen Mountains relict forest in Mexico. Guillermo and his staff drove down to Boquillas, from Santa Rosa de Muzquiz, Mexico to pick us up for an overnight camping trip into the relict forest of the Maderas del Carmen. The first few hours were spent driving along a little used dirt road at the base of the Maderas Del Carmens on what is now called Highway 53. Our beginning elevation was just under 2,000 feet at Boquillas.

After a couple of hours we turned off Highway 53 onto another dirt road going east up into the Maderas del Carmen mountains. It would take another couple of hours to drive up into the del Carmens given condition of the road. By late afternoon we had arrived at a small camp in the del Carmens where wood cutters and their families lived. We were now close to 8,000 feet in elevation. We ate a sheep and drank our fill that night where we camped. No, it wasn’t water.

At this point the area we were in, some 45,000 acres, was owned by a family in Torreon, Mexico and wood was being harvested by them under the direction of Guillermo’s Federal agency. The next morning, we loaded up and spent the day touring the mountain top
talking about preservation and park potentials. At the rim of the del Carmen's we were at an elevation of about 8,800 feet, some 6,800 feet above the desert below with fantastic views of the desert, mountains to the west, Big Bend and its mountains. As we drove through the forest it was lush with vegetation and trees, water sources and numerous bird species, bears, lions and so on. It was the size, complexity and health of the resource which was staggering and only about 60 miles south of Big Bend.

When we returned to Boquillas the next day I invited our Mexican friends up to the house in Panther Junction for a social evening. Staff was invited, and we had a great evening visiting and getting to know one another a little more, talking about things like training, protection of the del Carmen's and how our staffs might work together more closely. It wasn't about why we couldn't, it was talk about why and how we could. I had a supply of bar beverages at the start of the evening and at the end there was no bar left. Guillermo and I shared a bottle of Mescal at the end, but I don't recall who got the worm, however being the host, it was probably me.

The staff of Big Bend from 1981 to 1986 built a foundation for future work and cooperation with Mexico in support of working together with Mexico and achieving protected areas across the border from Big Bend in Mexico. The next Superintendent could have easily paid no attention to the foundation and put the park
back to 1980, but the magic was working. Through the eras of Jim Carrico (1986-1990), Rob Arnberger (1990-1994), Jose Cisneros (1994-1999), and Frank Deckert (appointed in 2000), each superintendent would recognize the value of sustaining interest in better working relationships between the two countries. They would be supported by the Regional Office in pursuing those interests. This was the team that got it done.

As noted in the Big Bend Administrative History, by Michael Welsh, 2002:

"the year 1994 marked the turning point for Mexico's commitment to the decades-old dream of a bi-national park. On November 7 of that year, Mexican president Carlos Salinas de Gortari announced establishment of the two protected areas across the Rio Grande: the Maderas del Carmen in Coahuila, and the Canon de Santa Elena in Chihuahua. The former consisted of 514,701 acres (208,381 hectares), while the latter comprised 684,706 acres (277,209 hectares). In extending the status of protection over this 1.1 million-acre area, the Mexican government gave the NPS and Interior department the opportunity to develop strategies for collaboration in matters of resource management, scholarly research, and eco-tourism development. Julio Carrera, a longtime natural resource official for
the state of Coahuila became director of the Maderas del Carmen region, while Pablo Domínguez assumed direction of Chihuahua’s portion.

Jim Bellany, Ramon Olivas, Vidal Olivas and others would continue the work of joint training sessions, communication, meetings and events for years and others after them. Now created, we can only hope that the protected areas and Big Bend have found ways to build eco-tourism and travel from the United States to the protected areas.

The last brick in the foundation occurred in 1985 in Laredo, Texas and Nuevo Laredo, Mexico. Beginning the year before, I had the good fortune to meet Maria Arujo, a Specialist with the Texas Parks & Wildlife Department in Austin, Texas. We had similar interests and visions for the future of relations with Mexico and began thinking about a plan to bring things together. Thus, was created the first “Border States Conference on Parks, Recreation and Wildlife”. The five states would be Texas, Tamaulipas, Nuevo Leon, Coahuilla and Chihuahua. Big Bend and the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department would plan and put on the conference and make it happen.

We invited Universities, Colleges and professionals from the five state area and put an agenda together combining studies and presentations from Mexico and
Texas. After several days of meetings, we would celebrate with a large dinner in Nuevo Laredo with the Director of the National Park Service, Bill Mott, as speaker. The five governors of the states would also be invited to attend their own meeting during that time. It was a lot of work but worth every moment as Maria and I can attest.

Sometime before the conference, we scheduled a meeting in Monterrey, Mexico with our Mexican counterparts to be sure that all the details were worked out and the multi-day agenda planned. I will now, with great trepidation, tell you of the most embarrassing event to occur while travelling in Mexico. As usual, Jim Bellamy, myself and a couple of others took a Suburban from Big Bend and headed to Monterrey.

On our way down, in Mexico, we came to a small town with the main road forking off to the right and the road into town forking left. We were interested in seeing the town, so we went left, sure that we could reconnect with the main road on the other side of town. In a couple of miles, we saw a sign pointing back to the main road, so we took it. In a short distance we came upon a rather large stream flowing by with a one lane concrete road going across and a sidewalk and rail above the water for walking, with the water flowing over the road.

It was about 100 yards across and the water was shallow, running a few inches deep. We sat and waited, watched a few cars come across with no problem and
then, rather than turning around we chose to drive on across. To the right as we drove, there were a lot of people on the sidewalk, fishing and enjoying the day. To the left there was a drop off about a foot and a half deep, defining the weir. Jim was driving, and I was on the passenger side.

We drove out and about 40 feet on it was evident that the Suburban was sliding to the left and the drop-off. To prevent being wrecked, Jim had to pick up the speed to offset the flow. For about 95 yards we offered those on the sidewalk a free shower that morning and I was glad that my Spanish was quite limited. It was terrible, but we had no choice once we started. I can still see those people with their mouths open looking at the oncoming wave. It was not funny, and it was avoidable had we just turned around.

We made it to Monterrey, had a good meeting and arrangements looked sound. The State of Nuevo Leon was now on board with the conference. Maria Arujo and I were the Co-Organizers of the Conference and by November of 1985 we were finally ready. Invites out, guests coming, participants coming from all five states, State Governors informed, and a Gala Dinner in Nuevo Laredo planned. We were prepared for well over a hundred people, had speakers invited and identified, meeting place confirmed, and translation service set up for bi-lingual audience. Most importantly, scientists, park
personnel, researchers from colleges and universities, professors and agency personnel came to the first conference indicating that there was indeed need for such a meeting.

On the first morning I was meeting folks and grabbing some coffee and Maria was hard to see, she was moving so fast. About a half hour before the start, I received a phone call from US Customs at the Laredo border crossing. There was a group of twenty Mexican scientists at the crossing all without papers on the way to the meeting. I explained the meeting and asked that the group be allowed to cross and come to the meeting as it was very important. They were allowed to cross and came to the meeting. Can't tell you what a symbolic and hopeful event that was.

Bill Mott, NPS Director, arrived a few days later as he was the main speaker at the Dinner in Mexico. He had an opportunity to sit in, meet a governor or two from Mexico and had a fine time. William Penn Mott was Director of the NPS from 1985 to 1989. California Governor Ronald Reagan named Mott as the Director of the California Park Service in 1967, where he remained until 1985, when President Reagan named him to head the U.S. National Park Service. In the 1970's Mott had been considered for the Director but was not chosen.

When finally appointed, Director Mott was 76 years old, enthusiastic and with energy to spare. His
ideas and concepts were good ones, not all suited for the NPS, but many were. Over the next four years I would watch as some leaders of the NPS would consider him amusing and be unsupportive of many of his attempts to move the organization forward in certain areas.

During this period, on into the 90's, three directors were hired from outside the NPS and all, in my estimation were badly treated by several in key leadership positions. They seemed to feel it was their job to protect the National Park Service by refuting these Director's, saying yes sir in meetings and then going out and doing what they could to derail the programs they had agreed to.

At one point they became the NPS Leadership Council which was far from reality. It was really the NPS Defense Council, as they considered their knowledge of the Service to be superior to any outsider. I witnessed too much of this in my later years as someone who attended a few Leadership Council meetings.

In a later phone call from Director Mott, following the Laredo meetings, he joked with me about the fact that the day after the gala dinner, as he was flying from Laredo to another round of meetings and speeches, he came down with a common ailment after eating in Mexico.

Here is what I will always remember about the meetings in Laredo as I talked with participant's after
the meetings, as did Maria. The scientists and professors from the US Colleges and Universities along with agency personnel were struck with how much, how well and how advanced the participants from Mexico were in their programs and research. They simply had not experienced this kind of meeting before in the United States.

The scientists and agency personnel from Mexico were delighted to meet fellow researchers in their field and many, contacts were made. But above all, the many from Mexico who had come to present papers on their research were amazed that they had been allowed to leave Mexico to present their papers, without approval of the Government.

This Conference and its meetings would last for twenty years due to the support and continued leadership of Maria Arujo and others. The last Conference that I knew about, was held in 2005 in Tucson, Arizona.

It was in late 1985 and the first part of 1986 that my wife and I would separate and divorce. All my fault. Relationships are hard to explain, even close ones. I was in the magic 40+ years, a sometimes common threshold for marriages to falter. It was a combination of elements. In September of 1985 my wife and I sat down, and I asked for a divorce. We had no children and she had strong ties to the family in Virginia. We had land holdings there and a nice home which would go to her along with other assets. She became a very well known realtor
in Roanoke, having obtained her license in Pennsylvania, with her drive and ambition. We still touch base at times.

Our separation occurred after the first of the year. Once separated I met with the Regional Director and explained that I would like to date one of the staff, our Administrative Officer. A no-no in most worlds and especially in our world and family. Had the Regional Director come down on me and denied my request there would have been no relationship or dating. While not liking it, he warned me about the affects this would have on my career, which I was aware of, but did not deny me the ability to date, which he could have.

Back in the park I spoke with the management team, explained the situation and assured them that neither bias nor favoritism would be extended or permitted. With that in place the Administrative Officer and I began dating. As expected, there would be consequences for the action.

Within a matter of a month or two, a vacancy for the Glacier National Park Superintendent position came out and I applied for the position. This was an interesting process, as my reputation was now in tatters because I was dating someone in the park and because of the salacious rumors that were spread about me. This was expected and understood by me.

Turns out that when Director Mott saw my name on the list, he appointed me to the position, which I would
hold for eight years. The Regional Director in Denver and Deputy Director of the NPS fought my appoint-
ment to the position but Director Mott held firm. I had not expected any such support from the Director but his experience at the Texas Conference won out, to my surprise. Until my retirement in 1997, it would be the Director's from outside the Service that supported me and encouraged me on. If not for them my ending years would have been much different.

Even more surprising, on March 8, 1986, the Secretary of the Interior, Donald Paul Hodel, presented me with The Department's Meritorious Service Award, second highest award presented by the Interior Department to one of its employees, for my efforts at Big Bend and Valley Forge. My work at Waterton-Glacier International Peace Park as a GM-15 would begin on March 30, 1986. My reputation and I travelled north to another border experience and the divorce was finalized in April. My greeting in the Region that didn't want me was neither open minded nor friendly which was not all that unexpected.
It was a wonderous time to think of being given the opportunity to manage two of the finest backcountry parks in the Continental United States, Big Bend and Glacier. I quickly taught myself the Canadian language, with all due respect to my friends in Canada, and began speaking it on the way from Big Bend to Glacier. As I would gas up at a station I would say, “really is a nice day, eh.”

On the way north, the news was about a pack of wolves that was naturally reestablishing itself in Glacier. I knew that I would fit right in. There was a long article in a Colorado paper about the natural return of wolves to Glacier which I found interesting. It was describing the capture and tagging of some of the wolves by the Science Staff in Glacier, and several of them had been given names by a researcher. I now knew that one of my first visits at Glacier would be with the Science Staff.

Making my way through Kalispell, Montana I stopped and visited with the Chamber and a few others
as is my habit. Lovely town, great people, so many opportunities. Once settled into the old Superintendent's residence at Glacier it was time to begin familiarization and meetings with the staff. My meeting with the Science Staff included a topic about the naming of animals in a research project.

The paper that I had read and the interview with one of the Scientists, named the wolves with names like Susan, George, Fred etc. I advised them that naming wolves with scientific labels like xzy-932 was perfectly fine. If, for some reason in the future, I had to authorize the taking of a wolf for some reason, I really did not want to see a news article about the Superintendent having authorized the brutal killing of George, the wolf. Sure, seems like a small thing but that did not make it any less important and it applied to bears, moose, lions and humming birds. Of course, I did provide and allow for employees to name their children as necessary.

Perhaps a few words about Glacier would be beneficial here, even if you have been to Glacier. Glacier was established as a National Park in 1910 and the world's first International Peace Park in 1932. George Bird Grinnell, an early explorer, was one of the principal forces behind the park's creation in 1910. Growth and support for the Park largely came from the Great Northern Railway in the period before 1930.
The Great Northern Railroad built the wonderful lodges and places needed to support visitors and all except one lodge on St. Mary’s Lake, at Sun Point, and the Sperry Chalet still exist. The lodge at Sun Point was lost in World War II due to lack of funds to keep it up and sad to report that the Sperry Chalet was destroyed by fire in 2017. The Chalet will be rebuilt, but the historic atmosphere of the Chalet is now lost.

Located in the northwest corner of Montana, Glacier National Park is over a million acres in size, with over 175 named mountains, 762 lakes, 563 streams, over 200 named waterfalls, 25 named glaciers (the names of the glaciers still exist but many of the glaciers have succumbed to nature), and over 745 miles of maintained hiking trails. The park receives over 2.3 million visitors a year, basically between June, when the Going to the Sun Road is open, and mid-September, when snow begins to fall. Who’s to say, with climate change, how this pattern might change in coming decades?

Usually there are over 600 Grizzly Bears and about 800 Black Bears that live in or near the park. Even so, the park is filled with a full complement of species common to the park from long ago. Around every corner is a surprise, some more exciting than others. Living with the Grizzly, ursa major, in Glacier is more about knowledge than anything else.
A good interpreter is one of the best ways to learn. Grizzly bears are like rattlesnakes (but not copperheads) in that they are happy living their own lives and will in almost all circumstances work to avoid those little things called people. Avoiding a park hike because of rattlesnakes at Big Bend or Grizzly Bears at Glacier is a wasted experience and unnecessary. Just think of the experience and wonder at the things you have missed in so doing. Glacier is also known for its Mountain Sheep and Mountain Goats, its wolves and bald eagles, its.... so many things.

The big annual event at Glacier is the opening of the Going to the Sun Road, a road from the 1930's going from the west side of Glacier, over Logan Pass in the mountains, and then to the east, or to the Sun. Winter snows pile up on the Going to the Sun Road sometimes to depths of over a hundred feet. Starting in April park crews begin to survey the large drifts so that snow removal can begin. On one side of the road are cliff faces and on the other side of the road is a drop of up to a thousand feet.

The road itself is narrow, has stone walls on part of the drop side and was built in the 1930s. The surveys are critical as when the big machines begin to remove the snow there has to be assurance that the machine and the operator, when they get to the bottom, land on the road and not in the air. It's an awesome process and the crews
that do the work are well experienced. It usually takes until mid to late June to get the road open.

It is a safe road, because drivers' actually drive safely, and it is an adventure. Every summer a call or two would come into the Chief Ranger's office from Logan Pass, regarding farmers from the flatlands of the Dakotas or Iowa. Having driven up the road ok, driving down the road, no way! "Could someone come up and drive them down?" That mountain road was not a flat field where they had spent their lives and we were always glad to oblige.

The hotels, chalets and lodge are operated by a major concessionaire and the process for serving the public is complex, hard and challenging. The structures are closed for the winter, generally by late September and are not reopened until June. Structures that are huge, historic and right at one hundred years old. The interior architecture of the hotels is fabulous and varied and rooms are generally what you would have found in 1924. They have not been modernized or remodeled due to the nature of their historic lineage.

To staff these operations requires a complex process of hiring young people from around the States, often college students, professional chefs and cooks, managers and assistants who mostly arrive in June and leave in October or earlier. The many hundreds of employees must be fed, housed and work unusual shifts and times.
In their off time, they have Glacier at their back door and all the excitement that comes from that. The facilities are almost all historic and require treatment and maintenance as such, which means you don’t run down to the hardware store for plywood and glue.

Of course, the same thing could be said about the Park’s seasonal employees who serve the 2.3 million visitors to the park during that three month window. They live in varied circumstances and locations and much is asked of them every year.

The historic and natural scenes in Glacier are world class, as understood by photographers in the late 19th and early 20th Centuries. It continues today and will, hopefully, for centuries to come.

Glacier has appeared in many films such as Alfred Hitchcock’s “North by Northwest” in 1959 and others. Some folks would ask how films would gain permission to film in the parks and it was easy to share my experience based on both TV and Movies. Your first information about an incoming film production comes from one of your Senators, calling to ask why you are refusing to approve filming for movie XYZ and the abrupt turn-down received by the film company, of which Disney Productions is one example.

Disney wanted to film “White Fang” in Glacier in 1991. After explaining to the Senator that we knew nothing about the film and had no contact with them,
we now knew that a film request from Disney was coming and they knew the Senator. Approval depends on circumstances of the movie, not on the phone calls from Senators and others. With “White Fang” there were problems and we turned down the film. Several dogs would be used in the filming in a park that had wolves naturally reestablishing themselves. Small chance of it happening, but not wishing to have any major problems we turned the film down on the possibility of parvovirus being introduced. Threatened and endangered species require extra caution and erring on the side of caution.

The view that I brought to Glacier in so far as management was concerned would not be popular with the old hands and not in keeping with a Superintendent’s behavior, but it was what it was. Parks like Glacier require special long term care and consideration for vision and change. The historic role of Superintendents is to live and work in the park, be ever present and aware of events in the park making sure that things are being properly taken care of. This is an oversimplified and somewhat crass description, but this was management at the time.

Glacier is not being preserved unencumbered for future generations if it sits in an isolated position. That could be done and was done for decades because most big parks were isolated and outside impacts were few and small. During my time at Glacier things were changing
as “civilization” was getting closer and impacts nearer and greater.

When a park has a GM-14 Assistant Superintendent, that makes a team. The Assistant Superintendent is not there to be trained, he or she is an accomplished manager experienced and able to deal with the internal workings of the park with help from the Superintendent only as needed. So, where is the Superintendent? He or she is working largely outside the park with communities, neighbors, government officials, Federal agencies and State agencies always seeking to know what is and what will be happening on the borders and resources just outside the park and beyond. Working on compromise and consensus on issues that may impact or change the condition of the park.

The Superintendent of a major park should not have to apologize for bringing up a concern or issue to a town council, governor, congressman, newspaper editor or industry. They should expect that he or she will show up and they get used to the idea that the park is not interested in growing but it is interested in several other issues affecting species and conditions. The fact is that the rezoning of a tract five miles down the road may have bearing, and the park should at least be knowledgeable.

This was not a popular way of managing with the staff at Glacier or with the residents of NW Montana as it was made to seem like the Superintendent didn’t care
about the park and was spending time doing useless or unnecessary things.

I worked closely with the Flathead National Forest and the Lewis and Clark National Forest, building cooperative relations, sharing concepts and discussing on-going issues. It wasn’t about the Forest now being able to influence management of Glacier because I was out there working with them on appropriate items, but to many that was the old issue of distrust and protection from “tree cutters” and “road builders”.

The Interagency Grizzly Bear Committee in Montana had members from State and Federal agencies and Native American tribes. The meetings were ideal openings to surface discussion on other things, not just grizzly bears and to make friends with many of the groups surrounding the park. Friends, by the way is not a term for always agreeing, it also means that there are ample opportunities to disagree in a respectful way and go in a different direction.

Then there was the Governor’s Flathead Basin Commission which basically oversaw some 10,000,000 acres of NW Montana, including Flathead Lake, on water issues and concerns. Serving on and as Chair of the FBC for a couple of years was important for understanding and dealing with the world of Glacier. Fortunately, I see that the current Chair of the FBC continues the line of Glacier management involvement.
Events of interest during my eight years at Glacier were many and varied. There were high notes and low notes but in general the high far outweighed the low. Having been an Historian and not being appointed or supported by the Regional Director, who made that clear to all regional staff, were two strikes before I got to the plate and affected positive regional support over the years.

In going to Glacier, it was clear that concession operations and the concession contract were in trouble due to previous negotiations that had occurred when the last concessionaire was being removed. In a hurry to get a new concessionaire, there were assurances given the new company that made up a bill of goods in order to get a signature. It was not an easy transaction as the company was inspecting properties in the middle of winter, snow up to their hips, having to work on estimates and what they could see.

When the concessionaire found that their ability to turn a profit from the contract, given the large historic structures, was not as expected, it was left to the park to negotiate with the concessionaire. Our job was to keep prices down, to negotiate and demand proper up keep of the historic structures, reasonable prices for services and lodging and excellent food and entertainment. We were given a contract which had been dealt with in a hurried and unrealistic way and then were held to a standard
to renegotiate prices and conditions that would lead to further problems and shortfalls. Problems and shortfalls like the loss of historic fabric and materials.

As you might imagine, I was given the reputation of being in bed with the concessionaire. In fact, I was never in bed with the concessionaire but did want the historic buildings kept in good condition and for visitors to be accommodated with good service, food and experiences provided by a reasonable contract. It was a constant struggle filled with many hours of negotiations and weeks of inspections by staff to assure quality in all the facilities covered by the contract.

There had been a new program put out to parks the year before, dealing with maintenance programs, personnel and budgeting. Apparently two of the Division Chiefs at Glacier had not, in some way, pleased the Region. The Regional Director wanted me to basically remove those two persons when I got there. I explained that when I got to Glacier, I would see what was going on as I would have interest in how the Divisions were working. I would not be able to make any decisions until I had time to meet them. The Chiefs in question did resign but not for a few years as their work was very good.

The first summer season and my first experience at Glacier, given my arrival in March, and there was much to be pleased with and excited about. There were also
some things that would need work and might take some time. We had an excellent seasonal crew at work providing very good programs and the permanent staff were right up there in their work, across all the divisions.

That first year was learning about the park and at least getting acquainted with some of the organizations and groups out in the community and other agencies. Also seeing how the Division Chiefs and Assistant Superintendent worked with one another and identifying issues that needed to be resolved. When you manage based on the Assistant Superintendent handling most internal management of the Park there needs to be a good fit regarding management style and confidence level. A person willing to discuss and then apply as appropriate the philosophies and concerns of the Superintendent or explain any problems that would occur.

Those two positions must be working in tandem on agreed tactics and strategies, not always easy to do. Confidence is required to be able to advise the Superintendent candidly and on point when there is a problem that the Superintendent is not picking up on or is moving in a direction that is not helpful. Call it a marriage if you like. When the Assistant and the Superintendent disagree on a subject it must be brought forward and discussed, bringing it to a resolution and agreeable process. Some Division Chiefs have been
known to want such an issue left alone so that it festers and affects the relationship of the two.

Speaking of marriage, I married Catherine Rutherford in October of 1986 in the Superintendent's Home at Glacier. It was a small ceremony in a lovely setting. She had risen through the Administrative Officer's series, like her father, who had also served in the National Park Service. Her arrival from Big Bend was a welcome event for me.

At the time, Glacier had two historic back country chalets, under concession contract, Granite Park Chalet and Sperry Chalet, used for overnight stays by hikers in the backcountry. Extremely popular and well managed, there were always concerns about human waste and water which required some extra touches.

In the year that before leaving Glacier I decided to do something about the conditions at Sperry Chalet. During the summer the Chalet would collect human waste in tanks and then at the end of the season, they would release the waste over a cliff into a meadow area below the Chalet. It should have been corrected at an earlier date, but the solution would not be simple and other issues were a little ahead of this one.

As to why the issue needed to be corrected? Human waste in great concentrations attracted two kinds of bears, the grizzly and the black bear, to a central point just off a major trail system that would be used until
snowed in. Not a safe or good condition. When they closed in 1993 staff and region had until the summer of 1994 to either fix the problem or close the Chalet until it was fixed. Another unpopular decision but a necessary one. I left before the next summer and can only hope that a solution was worked out. We would never have accepted that condition on a property next to the park, so why accept it inside the park? Actions not acceptable to the goose should also be unacceptable to the gander. There are times when employees and others feel it is appropriate to do things that we do not permit our visitors to do in the park.

Another characteristic that I had as a manager was to leave the last park I worked in alone. It had a new Superintendent and the last thing that person needed was sniping and talking from the last Superintendent in public. Once gone, I was gone, unless specifically asked for information. Superintendents love their parks and that is positive, but once transferred, ex-Superintendents continue to do great work assisting the new Superintendent by staying out of the way and not trying to still be a force, especially by publicly questioning decisions by the new Superintendent.

On an inspection trip to Granite Park Chalet, to meet the staff and see a new composting restroom facility, we were on horseback and on the way back to the Going to the Sun road. I had the pleasure of seeing
either how well trained or just how tired my horse was. The trail was narrow near the bottom and surrounded by vegetation as we stopped for a minute. I was about the third horse back and the Chief of Maintenance was in front of me. As I sat there, I noticed movement off to the left which turned out to be a black bear and one cub, about 20 feet away. I gently mentioned to the Chief that it might be nice if he pulled up a little bit further. That turned out to be unnecessary as the cub went under my horse closely followed by the mother. I then woke up my horse and proceeded along. So many unique little stories from working in a park like Glacier.

One of the attractions about working in the National Park Service, especially for younger people, is the allure of being able to work in the back country, ride horses, ski, hike and enjoy the park and its visitors and wild residents. This is true, but they need to determine, going in, as to how long they will want to do that or are they interested in supervising and managing? Employees in certain fields of maintenance and rangers and resource managers up to about GS-11 can still experience some of those opportunities, but the higher you climb, the more the doors swing shut and the desks don't beckon, they demand. Greatest jobs in the world but know what you want to accomplish and what you will be willing to do. In many parks we had professional seasonal employees filling jobs requiring experience and knowledge and
they loved the work and the park. As funds have been reduced and positions eliminated, professional seasonals have been one of our losses, although there are still more than a few hanging on.

Having said that, there are ways that managers can still enjoy their resource while doing a lot of good things. At Waterton-Glacier we called it the Superintendents’ Hike. In the summertime Bernie Lief, Superintendent of Waterton Lakes National Park in Canada, and I hosted our annual Superintendents Hike. Each of us invited ten persons to participate on the hike, both male and female, which was usually three or four days in the backcountry of Glacier. Our invites went to a mix of professions and backgrounds so as to have discussions and debates over environmental and other issues while on the hike and camped. Kind of a travelling seminar.

It would not be uncommon to have on a group from Glacier, manager of an industrial operation such as a major timber company, a couple of political members from Montana, the Sierra Club or another organization like it, a media person, a state or federal agency member, civic groups, Chambers of Commerce or business members. Bernie would put together the same mix of people on his side and we would spend three or four wonderful days and nights hiking on the trails, meeting one another, talking about issues and embracing the commonality of the group. We spent the evenings on
intense discussions about the environment, economic importance of protected and exploited lands, examples of industry and environment that successfully worked together and how lands in the west could best serve future generations.

Camping by the lake and at the site of the bear attack in the book, “Night of the Grizzlies” was educational for some, relieving some of their anxiety for hiking and camping in bear country. Of course, we were always supported by one or two Rangers from both parks who also participated in our discussions. Seven wonderful trips over seven years, with healthy conversation, give and take and a few minds changed about some issues.

Starting in 1987 it became clear that there was a massive opportunity in Wyoming, Montana and Alberta for a unique world resource and I would spend seven years and hundreds of hours speaking and writing about it to groups all over Montana and in Canada. You have to understand that in Montana, a Park Superintendent is not always loved when dealing with publics outside of the park. I knew going in that there was no way the idea would be accepted, but my hope was that some non-federal bureaucrat(s) would pick up the idea and eventually take it on. Kind of like the intention of this book.

I called the concept, the Crown of the Continent Ecosystem. It is a fact, there is a chain of mountain ranges between Yellowstone National Park and Jasper
National Park in Canada that are largely either public lands or conserved lands in some fashion. What if an International Ecosystem could be formally established going from Yellowstone to Jasper allowing for man and nature to travel the mountains in the future without fear or worry. There would be no change in the ownership of the lands nor management policies, but it would receive an additional layer of protection from designation as a unified ecosystem and pathway of many species. One of the first internationally designated Bio or Eco-Regions.

There is only one interstate in Montana and one major highway in Alberta that would cross the ecosystem and that could be dealt with by design. The concept was put out there through speeches and written material but was not viewed well because it was rumored a Federal Bureaucrat was seeking to take away lands for hunting and timber harvesting and make it all a National Park. Even my good friends in the Sierra Club were opposed to the concept. Jack Stanford, head of the Flathead Lake Biological Station, part of the University of Montana, and many others were supportive of the general concept and contributed ideas to the concept.

It was near the end of my tour at Glacier and I was giving a speech to the Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society at Waterton Lakes National Park in Canada. I presented the Crown of the Continent Ecosystem to the group. A member of that group lit up like Vesuvius
to the idea and proceeded over the intervening years to create the Yellowstone to the Yukon concept, a 2,000 mile stretch of largely undisturbed mountain ecosystem. The idea is well represented on the internet and is now known as the Y to Y concept.

It is well represented in Canada and becoming more so in the United States. It is a vision for the future and I believe will become a reality. Now that a bureaucrat is not talking about the concept it has taken off and even the Sierra Club now likes it. I really like how the mover and shaker in Canada expanded the idea from Jasper to the Yukon. Y to Y is a much more intriguing name that Crown of the Continent which is more associated with Glacier National Park.

There were occasions when special trips were set up for individuals or groups but not many. One such occasion was a three day horse back trip across Glacier from the Canadian Border to the Many Glacier Hotel. This was at the time when Montana was considering a Wilderness Bill for the State. There were about 2.3 million acres of land that had been tentatively identified for a wilderness designation – a designation which would provide special protections for the land in terms of timber management, mining and other uses. Literally, land left in a wilderness condition.

The debate between industry, environment, user groups, agencies and non-profits up to this point had
been hard and plentiful. Out of it all came a compromise approach to designate more than fifty percent of the designated lands as wilderness, leaving the remainder of the designated area as non-wilderness, but still under agency management. Conditions for passage of a bill to achieve this hard-fought compromise rested on the head of a wet pin.

Coming to the park for the trip were Ted Turner and Jane Fonda with Ted being in a position to possibly help provide support for passage of the bill, especially since they were living in Montana at that time. It was a beautiful time of the year as we gathered near the Canadian customs station on the road to Waterton. We would ride to the Belly River Ranger Station for our first night, camp at the sight of the Night of the Grizzlies the second night and then the final day into Many Glacier Hotel.

During the trip I learned that Jane Fonda had a considerable knowledge of plants and that Ted Turner was aware of the Wilderness Bill in Montana, which he did not support and was going to lobby against. There was ample time for discussion along the way. Turner wanted it all, the Wilderness that is. On several occasions I pointed out the hard fought road to get to an agreement on the compromise which would assure the future of wilderness areas in Montana in total area larger than Glacier.
The major issue was the fact that there was one chance to assure a sizable area of wilderness in the state and this bill was it. If it was defeated, it would be years, perhaps decades, before the Wilderness Bill in Montana was resolved, with all the benefits of designation now lost. His mind was fixed, he could get it all. Well, the Bill failed, and I have to imagine that he had a role in that defeat, large or small. I don’t have to image the fact however that another Wilderness Bill or Bills is going forward in the Congress in 2018 a quarter century later. Was it a victory or a defeat as it now moves forward again with very different shapes and sizes?

The south side of Glacier National Park is buffered by the Middle Fork of the Flathead River, Montana Highway 2 and a major rail line that once supported the Great Northern Railroad. It was the Burlington Northern in the 1980’s before a merger creating the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad. In the late 1980’s we began having grizzly bear and black bear problems because of the rail line. This line runs downhill from Marias Pass to the park entrance at West Glacier and is a steep and dangerous section for heavily laden freight cars and trains.

Quoting from Railroad Ecology by John S. Waller, Chapter 11, “Commerce and Conservation in the Crown of the Continent”:

“The railroad operated without much environmental controversy through most
of the twentieth century. However, a problem arose during the late 1980s and early 1990s.

Between 1985 and 1989, at least 134 cars of corn derailed along a 15-mile section of track west of Marias Pass. Each car carried approximately 3500 bushels of corn, so the total amount spilled was 469,000 bushels or nearly 12,000 metric tons. In its haste to repair the tracks and to dispose of the spilled grain, BN buried it along its right-of-way. As the buried grain began to decompose, it fermented, producing a strong odor that drew black and grizzly bears into the site from many kilometers away...As a result, between 1985 and 1990, at least 9 grizzly bears were hit by trains and killed. Grizzly bears are listed as a threatened species under the US. Endangered Species Act; hence, their deaths during operation of the railroad amounted to an illegal taking under that act”

Over the years we had improved our working relationship with the National Forests and worked cooperatively on some things, such as this problem. In the late 1980’s the Flathead National Forest Supervisor and I decided to take the issue of the kills to the headquarters of Burlington Northern in Fort Worth Texas, their headquarters at the time. We explained our concerns
and possible consequences, in coming to a possible solution of the problem. How could we keep the grain cars from derailing? Given the nature of the corridor could we come up with a community group to help with the issue? What training did the engineers on those grain trains receive about the concerns? How could we work to make Burlington Northern a respected partner in this critical corridor?

Having worked with Environmental Study Areas before, in Utah, I suggested creating a Burlington Northern Environmental Study Area (BNESA), a special operational district for the railroad. The three of us had an excellent meeting and the Burlington Northern Railroad executive became a receptive partner. Burlington Northern agreed to help in so many ways, not just with trains but also in the 15 mile corridor itself. The section was earmarked as a special district along with requirements for reduced speed, training and proper cleanups in the future. The number of killed bears would begin to drop in numbers so that in one five year period only 4 bears were killed.

We formed an advisory group for the BNESA made up of local residents within the zone, NPS, USFS, Montana State Fish and Game, Burlington Northern and others. It is still active today under a new name, going back in history, the “Great Northern Environmental Stewardship Area” (GNESA) The Forest, the Park and
Burlington Northern created a strong early example of a public/private partnership. In addition, Burlington Northern offered to donate their train stations at West Glacier and East Glacier if there were good uses. In 2008, GNESA was recognized by the US Department of the Interior as an exemplary example of collaborative conservation.

Upon return to the Park and in a few weeks, the Glacier Natural History Association became the most logical and best user of the West Glacier train station, a part of the historic scene. As a non-profit helping to support parks through the sale of appropriate books and other materials the new sales center was wonderful and still continues.

The East Glacier Train Station was a little harder and never matured in my time at the park. My goal was to ask the Blackfeet, if they would agree, to use this station and convert it to a museum of their people and history. It would still have been used for train passengers using the station in the summer. We offered to help if wanted but were unable to get any interest from the Blackfeet. If things have changed, the station is still there, in case the Blackfeet are interested.

Yellowstone is on fire. The Park will be destroyed. West Yellowstone is unprotected. Call in the National Guard. What wasn’t said about the Yellowstone fires in
1988, most of it critical of the process and the failure to gain control over night.

Later that same summer, Glacier is on fire. What a year to have a good fire at work but fire frenzy all over. Glacier had a tremendous chance to burn long and hard. It is filled with dead trees killed by bark beetle infestations, still standing and hurting new growth. The fire would burn up and stop at tree line and do some great good.

The fire had started on the Forest side of the North Fork of the Flathead River and then spread across the river into the park. We had an excellent fire team from the Coronado National Forest in Arizona and we had a situation that was out of control in the media. The Governor called offering the National Guard, which we declined. Senators and Congressmen called to warn about another out of control fire. Our option to have a controlled burn was just not possible, so we had to actively deal with the fire, which consumed about 33,000 acres and one human life. It was called the Red Bench Fire.

My decisions were not all that popular, and I can understand why, but part of my concern, rightly or wrongly, had to do with national fire policy. The only possible real damage by the fire was to a few small structures up by the lakes and the historic homes on the west bank of Lake Mc Donald, structures used by Charles
Russell and others in the early history of the park, all under either life tenancies with the park or held in fee by owners with restrictions regarding the sale.

To prevent the spread of fire to Lake McDonald, considering unknown and changeable weather conditions, would need something a little more than just water. I authorized the construction of a fire line to protect along the south shoulder of the fire, not to be larger than one bulldozer width, preferably smaller, and to have the line walked in, not just driven randomly, which was done. It has since become a research project to determine recovery modes in fire lines. It wasn't a viable fire line, but it was a signal to the Lake McDonald area that we would protect the south flank of the fire.

After the fire there was a great deal of damage to the burned areas in terms of downed trees across roads and in developed areas. Rather than sending in park crews expending time and money we could use for other recovery items, I chose to work with nearby companies that harvested timber. They were asked to clear only the roads and sites we specified, and they could take the removed and burned trees with them. They did a nice job and got a little boost for their workers as well. More than one of the workers probably later bragged at a bar in Columbia Falls that they had once cut trees in Glacier National Park.

I have always loved the media when it concerns environmental issues and stories. In most cases the
Superintendent or Forest Supervisor is cast in the black hat and mustache with a cheap cigarillo hanging from his or her lips. There were the usual interviews, news stories and media coverage of the Glacier fire, especially as it related to the Yellowstone fires. Yellowstone and Glacier destroyed in fires. In one interview I made an honest statement that I would regret as it was quoted in the papers for mass affect. Early in the fire, what I said was that the fires in Glacier would be different than in Yellowstone because the fires would burn out in the mountains and we could use a different fire strategy.

The paper comes out and basically says, “Glacier Superintendent says that fire in Glacier will be better managed than in Yellowstone”, actually a little more pointedly than that. The implication was that fire in Yellowstone was not being managed well and we would do a better job. I had to build a fire line across my hips to keep from going up in flames. Bob Barbee, Superintendent of Yellowstone, was probably holding off outraged employees about that butt hole in Glacier. Regardless, I called Bob and explained but never was sure if he believed me or the media. Given his experience with the media, I am sure that he understood.

As another example of tree removal in Glacier we had a very unusual storm in the fall of I believe 1989. Weather was warm, short sleeve weather. Winter had not set in yet and things were very unseasonal. Then there
came that one night, short sleeves going in and parkas coming out. Blizzard conditions in NW Montana after midnight, heavy snow and hard wind. Park headquarters at West Glacier and employee housing area were now without power, lines down, a fair amount of damage.

That night the housing area had over 500 trees blown over due to the soft and wet pre-midnight soil conditions. It took days to recover the area and remove all the downed trees by park maintenance crews.

Fire, snow and bears. We had ranger personnel that were responsible for bear patrols in the backcountry to note locations and possible conflict with visitors among other things. This one ranger was on patrol up on scree slopes above timber observing areas down lower. As he was going along, he happened to look up and see a female grizzly with one cub walking along on the ridge line above him. Seems like the grizzlies had a ranger patrol going on. He slowed his walking and kept his head down but his eyes up, looking for a safe place should one become necessary. Rangers on this kind of patrol are equipped with radios and a .45 caliber hand gun, among other things, should one become necessary for self or visitor protection. He notices a small space coming up, a small depression in the scree that he might be able to use. Well, we all know how kids are.

The cub, not a yearling, sees the ranger, is curious and starts downhill, slowly, a little faster, a little more
speed going downhill. The ranger gets in the depression which will aid in protecting his lower body and gets his .45 out and under his body because mom has now seen junior going downhill. Now there are two bears barrel- ing down the slope and if the ranger had a rosary, there wouldn't have been time. Cub and mom both arrive by ranger and then it happens. Mom reaches over and swats the cub on his little back side and sends him downhill and she just keeps going. I was never told how long it took for the ranger to get back up.

In the summer when the park is full of people, we still have relatively few encounters between people and bears. Having college and young folk working for the lodges and hotels our staff would always work hard to hold sessions with the new employees. It was important to acquaint them with the park, how to use the back country safely and what to be on the look out for. The number one thing strongly stressed, do not jog or run on the trails.

Almost every year we would have a concession employee that ran.... into a bear on the trail. Bears do not appreciate the concept of SURPRISE. Usually just scratches and a hole or two but not life threatening. Female grizzly bears have a very hard life in Glacier, finding food and protecting their cubs from male grizzlies, who will kill cubs. This is why many incidents of bear attacks in Glacier come from female bears, protect-
ing cubs, in a noisy area, not hearing the approach of a visitor. First reaction is going to be, not kill, but nullify the threat and get away. It was not unusual for rangers to see grizzly bears on heavily trafficked trails move off into the brush when approached by hikers and then return to the trail when the hikers had gone by.

As I retained the authority to kill problem animals in the park there were good and bad days for grizzlies and for people. I retained that authority so that no employee would be nailed by media for killing something and then having to defend their actions or bemaligned. One morning up past Granite Park Chalet, the body of a male visitor was found that had been partly eaten. It turned out to be a mother grizzly and her cub. There was no choice in that situation other than to order them put down. This was a bad day for both species.

Why? If we had allowed them to go on, every future encounter in the park would be blamed on this mother and cub and our positive management of bears would be failing. Once a human has been identified as a food source, action needs to be taken to prevent further loss of life. Trying to remove by capture is dangerous and extremely dangerous in the back country, well away from roads and support services. It haunts me to this day that the bears had to be put down and that a visitor lost his life.
Here's another example of bear interaction. One afternoon on the south side of the park, a husband and wife are hiking out a trail when the husband sees a grizzly and three young ones up on a ridge. He loves taking pictures and is always in hope of getting that one great money shot. His wife will wait by the trail head and he will go up for some shots. He climbs up to the ridge top and begins taking pictures of the grouping. He takes 32 photos of the grouping which are on file.

The first picture shows a healthy female with three, not cubs but yearlings, spread out over twenty or so yards just grazing. Hard to tell but he is about thirty yards from the family group. Over the next 25 or so shots, he takes pictures of the group as the group moves over to the east a little. By about the 29th photo the mother is obviously aware and has been since the start of his presence. By picture 30 the yearlings have begun to gather closer to mom and by picture 32 they are almost attached to the mother, they are so close, and the mother is fixing the photographer with a stare. The yearlings are all thinking, “I don’t know what I did but I hope it wasn’t me.”

That was his last photo. As he continued to photograph the mother was watching and at the end had brought her yearlings in to her body for protection. From that point on she attacked the photographer at speed. He had a .45 in his pack which was never used. He climbed a smallish tree as she attacked. She reached
up, grabbed his leg and pulled him out of the tree and did nothing more. She and her yearlings left quickly, having addressed what was a threat in her mind. The photographer as he was pulled from the tree, had his leg cut by a branch severing a main artery and he bled to death there. I took no action against this group because of their actions and attempts to avoid the problem. The mother bear was left with no alternative. For a mother grizzly to have three yearlings tells you something about the ability of this mother to protect her cubs from adult males.

Glacier has a number of policies and regulations that might not be in every park because of the unique nature of the resource. Some of them apply to the Going to the Sun Road. Not long after being at Glacier I read through a number of them and saw that for good reason, there was a length restriction for vehicles going over the Going to the Sun Road, meaning that long RVs and vehicles had to go around the park because of tight turns. As I recall the length of the vehicle was limited to 21 feet. Makes sense and no problem.

One night I received a phone call from a woman at a campground on the east side who was not happy with the length restriction about going over the road. I assumed that there had been some discussion between her and at least one ranger. The problem according to her was that she had been told that she had to go around
the park and her unit was only about six inches over the measurement required. We talked, and I questioned her and being late at night I accepted her word for the vehicle length and told her that she could proceed over the road, having a trailer hitch extending out. That it would be best to go early in the day so that there was no issue.

At six-thirty the next morning I get a call from a ranger up at Logan Pass who had stopped her vehicle as being oversized, based on a call from someone down at east. I don't think his eyesight was good enough to measure a moving vehicle that was six inches over. I told him yes, she could go and noted my concern over enforcement of a rule to a rigid degree, especially that one. I found that to be a very good teaching tool shortly thereafter as to the philosophy of management and how to apply common sense in working with visitors on issues such as this.

Not too long before leaving Glacier we were coming up on a major overhaul of the Going to the Sun Road and started working on plans and concepts with the Federal Highway Administration in Vancouver, Washington. There was an initial disconnect in our discussions as much as we liked the folks we were working with. National Park Service = protection of historic and iconic features and structures. Federal Highway Administration = safety, protection from harm, service to the public. Our first order of business was to insist
that the park be included as a partner in the planning process for the road being done by FHWA, the Region and our Denver Design Office.

This led to the park’s rejection of the first FHWA design for the Lake McDonald segment of the road due primarily to cost and potential resource damage. It allowed us to set the standard to retain historic road widths, guardrail heights, use of historically compatible stonework and replacement of the many incompatible design elements that had crept into the road over the years.

Through our interaction with the FHWA, we rediscovered a relationship that our two agencies had during the teens and twenties but had somehow lost over the years. We found that the FHWA engineers were just as proud of the Going to the Sun Road as we were, although for somewhat different reasons. This allowed a level of trust to develop so that we could, as one example, test the historic guard walls and see that they were safe and maintainable in a park setting.

The Going to the Sun Road is what it is, an historic road carved out of the mountains and the wilderness with designs and right of ways consistent with the 1930’s. There would be no widening, no six foot concrete barriers by drop offs, no chewing up the cliff walls or replacing lovely arched culverts and drainages. Repair, repave, strengthen within concept and protect the road
as you would protect Independence Hall or the Lincoln Memorial.

Our work with the Federal Highway Administration to protect the values of the road was significant, with thanks to the FHWA for a fantastic and historic restoration. I was gone before the work began but I know that it was done well.

During my tenure at Glacier I had a lot of folks more than willing to help me move out and move on, including some Regional staff, a few employees, the Hungry Horse News, our local paper, and Congressman Ron Marlenee. Fortunately, I had the backing of Congressman Pat Williams, Senator Max Baucus, Director Mott and then Director Ridenour. Congressman Marlenee and the Hungry Horse News wanted me gone for my work outside the National Park and for my philosophy about National Parks.

Over eight years, I would say that the weekly Hungry Horse News Editor found something almost decent to say about my work at least five times. I deserved some of his criticism, but not to the degree it was scooped out. Congressman Marlenee could only see me trying to do things like protecting wolves or poking my nose into areas outside the park that were none of my business. He once called me into his office in Washington to dress me down in front of his staff, which was a mistake. I politely explained to him, after his introductory comments, in a
way that he dismissed his staff and we continued on to talk about the park.

One of my failures at Glacier was being unable to bring the Blackfeet Tribe on board to some degree, with the park. We worked well with the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes at the base of Flathead Lake but had little success with the Blackfeet no matter how hard we tried. We sought to employ the Blackfeet, work with them on economic matters and respect their culture. All we ever heard back is that we didn't hire Blackfeet, never sought their people for jobs and had no interest in the Tribe.

We failed largely because I couldn't find the key for working with them. In my defense, I would also say that the Salish-Kootenai Tribes over their history of living in the same part of the world never found the key as well. Associated with the problem were the facts that half of Glacier, the eastern half according to the Blackfeet, was taken from their reservation when the park was formed and the fact that the Blackfeet were still found poaching animals in the park and the laws were enforced.

There came a time when I was in the process of advertising for and selecting a new GM-14 Assistant Superintendent, which was done through the Regional Office. They announced, reviewed and put qualified candidates on a list for the park to select from. Several good people applied, and I received a list of qualified
candidates from the Regional Office. I worked the list, picked who I thought best for the job and hired a new Assistant. Some weeks later I received a call from the Region that I was under investigation for failing to consider and select a candidate from the Blackfeet Tribe who was on the list.

We had no idea as to what they were talking about as there were no candidates on the list from Region with the Tribe and we knew nothing about non-selection of this person. Region's position with the tribe seemed to be that I had failed to consider this person and would have to provide the person with a position. There was never an oops or sorry from Region nor an admission that they never qualified the person for the job, so his name was never on the list or even known to the park.

Region allowed me to be labeled as someone biased against the Blackfeet, unwilling to even consider a member of the tribe. The Region did not make it clear to the person and the Tribe that it was their office that had failed to qualify the person for the position. Regardless, I hired him as a Special Assistant to the Superintendent with the focus being to improve our relations and workings with the Blackfeet and to bring more tribal members on board as employees. We had a good working relationship and he was a well-qualified individual, but not for an Assistant Superintendent position of a major park. Of course, to the Tribe I was the Superintendent
that would not even consider a Blackfeet for a position on his staff which was no help to our relationship. Even with the Special Assistant the park was unable to close the relationship gap with the Blackfeet, but not for trying.

For several of my years at Glacier my annual performance evaluations were done by the Regional Director who did not want me in the position in the first place. A fact that had been well spread throughout the Regional Office Divisions and personnel. I tried to overcome this view and worked hard to do so, but it appeared that I was “damaged goods, not worthy of the position.” One of the lines that I heard during evaluations was the fact that the Regional Director had four large park Superintendents in the Region and I was the poorest performer of the bunch. I would smile and say thank you.

Along with the normal operations and work to secure a better future for the lands buffering the park there were other items as well. I had worked with or helped local folks create a non-profit Friends Group at other parks and found local friends that were delighted to do the same here. It flourishes still with the help of Superintendents and staff from Glacier and the love and care of the people who become Friends of one of the world’s unique parks and places.

Then there was the National Superintendent’s Conference for Canada’s National Park Service. I was
invited to attend their meeting in Quebec and was glad to do so. It was at the Hotel Frontenac in Quebec City a unique gathering place in a unique city. Today, it is called the Fairmont Le Château Frontenac. It was an interesting and fun conference with a skilled group of professionals. One of the historic structures in the town, affiliated with a fort was a tavern. To enhance the feeling of being in a bar, the floor was tilted so that on entering you felt a little under the bottle.

At the closing dinner, attended by the participants and local National History staffs, there was a large crowd and several speeches were made. Our small group of western Superintendents from British Columbia and Alberta were gathered at a large table toward the rear. The program began, and the first speaker rose and addressed the crowd in French giving what had to be a very humorous but very lengthy set of remarks. He then converted to English and gave us the same speech in less than a minute. We were pretty sure that we missed something in the translation, but every National Park Service organization around the world has their little difficulties.

In the west of Canada, a favorite story is the one about the Canadian Mountie who stopped a vehicle for speeding in British Columbia and asked for the normal identification. As he was getting this, the group in the car, all speaking French, ridiculed, debased and really did a number on the Mountie. As he was handing them
their ticket, in perfect French, he advised them that they would now be proceeding to his station where charges would be filed. Did it happen – I have to think that some version of this has happened more than once given the overall character of the debate on language in Canada.

One of the interesting items at Glacier, which consumed the staff hours of one full time person, was a flaw in the Freedom of Information Act. This act requires agencies to provide requested records, which is not personal in nature, to the public. This can be just about everything on file, other than personnel records. By itself, the Act is beneficial and important for many reasons, but without any way for an agency to seek relief from the use of the Act for harassment there is a problem. At Glacier we had one person who continually submitted Freedom of Information requests and never used the information gained for any purpose.

The person was often somewhat repetitive in requesting and did so for no other reason than to create work on our part. I raised this issue with our US Attorneys and was never given any relief, even after documentation that clearly showed how the Act was being misused and applied along with a three page list of FOI requests. Perhaps a limit to the number of requests a year by one person might be a start.

Because of the work done in establishing close relationships with personnel from the US Forest Service
and National Forests I was invited, in 1991, to be the first participant in the US Forest Services “Grey Towers Conservation Fellow” program at the Pinchot Institute in Milford, PA. It was designed to bring in a field Supervisor on sabbatical for three months at Grey Towers doing research, writing or working on a project. I have to say that the new Director of Grey Towers and creator of the program was the former Forest Supervisor of the Flathead National Forest and a good friend and working companion, Ed Brannon.

The sabbatical included work at the Yale School of Forestry and some teaching. It was at that time that I wrote, “Considered Opinions” an honest appraisal of the National Park Service. It is updated and contained herein as a part of this book as the messages contained are even more relevant today than they were in 1991. Like most items I produced in the Service that expressed concerns or identified problems with potential work arounds, the document, submitted to Region and Washington, simply disappeared.

Working at Glacier made me aware of a problem in employee development that is shared in many places around the country. The Mission of the National Park Service is unique in our government and requires special attention being sure that our employees understand why we do the things that we do. So many of our permanent maintenance and administrative employees are
local residents and yet receive little or no training in the policies and management of National Parks and other designated sites.

At Glacier I found a group of good maintenance employees, some having worked at Glacier for twenty to thirty years but having no or little background in the Service or its purposes. If the people that work for us in the local community have no understanding as to why we kill some bears and not others or why we fight fire as we do and yet let stand tens of thousands of acres of firewood, how can they positively represent the park in their community, the community our park depends on. If someone asks his neighbor "why the hell didn't they kill those bears," should he respond, "hell I don't know, they never tell us anything." Several training sessions were offered to bring our employees more up to date, training they should have received years ago.

Another project that we were working on with several communities and groups was the development of a plan for the lands that were within the Governor's Flathead Basin Commission, some 10,000,000 acres. The intention was to try and identify lands that were important for water conservation along with other uses. Not to control or restrict but to at least understand the resources of the Basin. A number of groups came on board along with a nice donation of cash from the Plum Creek Timber Company in support of our group.
Things were working along and then I heard, after leaving Glacier, that the Flathead County Commissioners had voted to suspend the effort. Seems that a new group of individuals in Big Fork, MT, of the militant kind had somehow decided that Flathead County didn't need such an activity. At least so I was told. Quite a loss of an important program.

Time passes for everyone. Director Mott was replaced by Director James M. Ridenour in 1989 and was then replaced by the last Director that I worked for, Roger G. Kennedy in 1993. Both Directors were treated much the same as Director Mott by the so called Leadership Council of that period. Roger, coming from his leadership position at the Smithsonian Museum of American History was very interested in educational outreach and development. His wife Francis, who I had worked with at Valley Forge was very active in the Trust for Public Lands.

Then in late 1993 I received my first notice that I would soon be moving on. I was reading the paper from the Blackfeet Tribe in Browning, Montana and happened upon a piece about a tribal council member, visiting in Washington, DC. In her visit at the Department of Interior she just happened to run into one of the Regional Directors, from another region, who was on the Leadership Council. He just happened to be there with a person who would become the next Superintendent of
Glacier. Her quotes in the paper were explicit in reporting the Regional Director's trashing of me personally and my work with the Blackfeet Tribe. Well, at least I had survived Ron Marlenee and one Regional Director who left before I did.

Also, in 1993 the Montana Nature Conservancy, at their annual conference, presented me with their award "For Exemplary Public Service". I would later serve for a time on their Board of Trustees.

In 1994 Director Kennedy and Congressman Pat Williams came out to visit and while hiking we discussed my move and what I might be interested in doing. Whatever it was, it would probably be my last assignment with the agency. At this point I was very concerned about the level of training and employee development received by our employees, so the Director offered me a position and the authority to completely review the training of the National Park Service, all disciplines.

In effect I was officially going to be the Superintendent of the Albright Training Center at the Grand Canyon as well as the Chief of Training and Employee Development for the Service. Unofficially I would be seen as a Special Assistant to the Director. The job title was immaterial to me, but not the job.

Before the move to the Grand Canyon I started to think about the role that I had been given and the opportunity offered. At that time the budget for all training in
the NPS was just over 1% of the national budget which was slim pickings to support a well-educated work force managing a complex, unique and delicate mission.

My goal was to develop and recommend a program that would meet the training budgets of most agencies and corporations that worked hard to develop their employees, just a little over 3%. Remember that this was for a large workforce of some 27,000 employees across the nation and the US Park Police in Washington, DC and affected numerous disciplines. With the assurance of the Director, I put the path together to develop a plan in three years or less as there was going to be need for a lot of employee participation from the various disciplines. It would be a plan that could be phased into the national budget over several years and would provide career paths for all disciplines and the necessary training to support those disciplines.

It was made clear to the Director that his support and insistence would be needed to implement any plan created. In leaving Glacier I believe that I had the finest of opportunities to work in the two best back country parks in the lower forty-eight states. I lived the dream of any park employee and I can only hope that my presence in those resources was in some way beneficial for the future.
never really asked what personnel in Washington called me, the position I mean. I lived and taught at Albright; I worked in Washington at the Office of Training and Development and spent most of my time in the field, at meetings. My commutes for three years were long. There was a key team formed to guide the process and gather inputs, a fantastic group of people who were enthusiastic and committed to the process, representing all the Regions, career fields and training centers. There are too many to mention but I must mention my assistant at the Albright Training Center, Ann Baugh. Her jobs and roles were many over the next three years and her expertise and competence in helping to organize and be part of the process was outstanding.

Over the next three years we would spend time gathering input from over 300 employees around the nation
as to how we might best train and develop employees in their disciplines. We talked and met with other agencies regarding their programs and consulted with a few private sector firms. Our goal was to not only expand availability of training but to do it using cost saving methods when possible. Media and similar methods would be used to reduce the cost of travel to training and training methods that could be used within a park were explored. The enthusiasm of the employees that we worked with and the members of the key team were a delight to see as their ideas and concerns were being addressed in a meaningful way.

A concept was created that oriented new employees to the National Park Service, all permanent employees. The final plan provided training programs, career ladders and development activities for all of the many disciplines from maintenance to police to science to management, administration, fire and resource management. Career paths were developed for the rational development of employees, men and women, regardless of race or nationality. Reestablishing logical career paths to travel along, always beginning with positions that allowed for experiential development and learning. Even to the point of having the Intake Trainee program and Student Trainee programs brought back.
It was a plan to restore all the career paths from the least to the most with opportunity to use experience across career paths for growth.

Where necessary, incentives were built into the program to allow managers of all career paths to fully explore and experience their fields and be prepared for ascendency to key management and park leadership positions as well as regional positions. This would prevent inexperienced personnel from making poor decisions affecting major resources and enable the proper development of women and minorities, who had not received the opportunities they should have, for all positions within the service. Simply stated, it provided for logical career growth in all disciplines by all employees.

After three years, and thousands of hours, in the fall of 1996, the product was finished and ready for discussion and approval by the Leadership Council. It would require the Director to be firm with his commitment to the program. There had been discussions before with the Council who did not show great enthusiasm, but we finally met and introduced the recommended program to the Leadership Council at one of their meetings. The program would require, for full implementation, just over 3% of the national budget. It could be phased in over a number of years and would be one of the strongest messages to our employees ever sent out by leader-
ship. The team did a magnificent job; they listened, they explored, they created and they produced.

As it turned out, the Director and I and thousands of employees were wrong. There was no need for such expenditure as the current programs were sufficient, and employees received plenty of training. We couldn’t afford such an expensive program. The so called Leadership Council was not interested and the Director, who by this time was nearing the end of his appointment which would come in early 1997, did not put his foot down. I doubt the Council ever even read the plan, the interest was so intense to bury it.

Without his insistence and direction, the plan was complete and never implemented, or even phased in over the years. A few of the Training Centers, Albright, Mather, Park Police and Presidio did implement portions and did change their approaches on a few things and also perhaps our training center at the Federal Law Enforcement Center (FLETC) at Brunswick, Georgia. I felt personally responsible to the employees whose hopes had been raised in the failure of leadership to even consider the program.

All said and done, most historic structures and facilities are still maintained by personnel without specialized training. Superintendents have recently been selected based on a court ordered system to rectify equal opportunity for women and minorities and professions
in the service are mostly without clear opportunities for job performance improvement and advancement. Parks continue to be added as new areas and are almost a routine occurrence in some Congressional District that needs tourism dollars.

Money flows away from basic field personnel, the heart and soul of the Service into grade creep, increased costs, and reaction to problems that should never have happened. This is not a put down of the thousands of great employees and volunteers that now work in the Service, doing a percentage of the things that must be done. It is however expression of a major concern for leadership within the National Park Service, their development, selection and willingness to adhere to long term visions and priorities in the parks.

Where are the career ladders for all the professions working in the service, where are the steps to be taken in creating Superintendents and Managers with the knowledge and skill required in advanced and technical positions? Where are the plans for creating a work force of men, women and minorities equal in skills and development? Well, they exist and are sitting on a shelf or perhaps at the bottom of a desk drawer in some office as part of the plan our employees put together and presented in 1996.

The refusal of the Leadership Council to even consider basic changes to the program was the final straw for
me. The NPS that I had joined in 1962 was not the same agency in 1997 and while solutions existed for the problems none were being sought or supported. Courts and lawsuits would eventually, and properly guide our hiring and placement practices by court order. There would be cases of resource damage to historic and archaeological sites and even a case of serious misuse of Regional funds by upper management.

In January of 1997 I took early retirement at the age of 54, which at that time seemed to be a popular choice in some job categories. No one could say that I hadn't tried but it was obvious that my inputs were neither considered, appreciated or wanted. At my retirement party in Tucson with friends I thought maybe there would at least be a note from the Washington Office. Silly me.

The walk through of my career has shown some of the highs and lows, some of the good things accomplished and some of the things that should have been done better. Some of my comments will make you think that I am just an employee justifying his career and getting even on some things that did not work out. I rank my career as a total success with high accomplishments as seen by the recognitions that have come my way. I have no urge to get even, especially after being retired for over twenty years.

My urge is concern for the Service that I have loved and continue to love today. A need to bring some of the
things happening in the Service to a wider audience than a coffee room in some park in hopes of stirring interest in needed mid-course corrections. Our employees have been good soldiers, lived with funding shortages, done increasing work with fewer people and been loyal to a form of leadership that could stand a change.

My life has gone on after retirement in many productive ways, yet here I sit. Still worried about the people and resources that are a part of me, a part of us. One last try.
Life After the National Park Service

Like most retirees, that first morning of waking up in freedom is challenging and somewhat confusing. Also like most retirees we get through it and continue on. I lived in retirement for about seven years with golf, travel and moving from Tucson to Sahuarita, Arizona. OK, I did sneak in creation of a partnership called the Cholla Group, LLC in 1998 to obtain land holdings in Cochise County for a new concept in ranching. Still working on that.

Then in March of 1999 at the 50th Award Convocation for the Department of the Interior, President Bill Clinton and Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt presented Distinguished Service Awards to a few Interior employees and at least one retiree, me. The award is the highest recognition of service given by the Department, in my case for leadership and achievements from Valley Forge to Glacier. It was an unexpected honor and greatly appreciated on behalf of the dozens of employees who worked hard and true to accomplish things that I received credit for. It was especially hum-
bling to know that this award is one that I share with Director Hartzog. His work far, far greater than mine.

During graduation ceremonies at Gettysburg College in 2001 I was presented with an honorary PhD in Public Service or as stated, Beneficiorium Civibus Doctoris. It was a very special and humbling day.

Today I am as busy as I was in my profession and still interested in making things better, in the local region. I currently serve on the Town of Sahuarita Arizona's Town Council and am in my seventh year. This past year I was asked to join the Green Valley, Arizona Council where I serve on the Executive Committee in the unincorporated town of Green Valley. Along with this I remain the Managing Partner of the Cholla Group, LLC with ranch lands in Cochise County, Arizona and am a Board Member of the Southeast Arizona Economic Development Group in Benson, Arizona.

I continue to have faith and hope that at some point soon, true and beneficial leadership will appear at the helm of the National Park Service. Perhaps it's already there. A leadership that can bring politics into focus, ridding the system of historical bastardization through political correctness and bringing the parks that are truly unique and irreplaceable back to full funding and protection. Please, make it so.

Hopefully, by this point, you will have gained some understanding about me and any credibility I have to
discuss, in some detail, the National Park Service. Its weaknesses and strengths, its needs and values, the challenges that await and the need for help from non-political sources and friends. My concern is that the National Park Service is on a road leading to increasing political manipulation, taking to heart and implementing ideas and concepts from groups with agendas making history comply with their views and having good hearted people damaging resources for lack of knowledge.

The term “Living National Treasures” has meaning and significance; a modern statement about the intent of those who worked to create the vision. We have not passed the point of no return as an agency and its vision of America. A return cannot be assured by political processes and personages, as their desire seems to be more directed to self-interest and exceptions to the policies.

What is needed is a newly created National Commission on the National Parks with the audacity and strength to take the National Park Service to its next level. The complete ability for it to protect the treasures that are managed, not for next year but for the pressures that will be emerging over the next century for access and use of the treasures protected. Even parks have a carrying capacity in a society without controls on population and growth.

A National Commission with membership from the best minds and truest supporters of the National
Parks, from outside the Service and politics. The mandate, not to change the Mission of the Service, but to consider, recognize and find answers to not only the current Service difficulties but to lay in a vision for survival and strengthening of the Service over the next few decades which will be tumultuous and difficult on many fronts. Then, to assure that the work done is achieved and protected by the laws of the land.

My hope is that the following chapters build a rationale for such efforts as they tackle the broader issues and concerns prevalent today in society and culture beyond borders and the National Park Service. Linked, they are. Inescapably so. To understand the value of the National Park System requires an understanding of the values present and at work in society today and why it is so significant that parks and forests maintain a standard, an example for the future that we can achieve. Concern for our future and our mission is real and the time to take needed actions is now.

Never forget: "The paths of history are littered with visions that failed because their proponents were not people of action and endurance."
(Although written in 1991, the following chapters are still relevant and, in some cases, even more relevant in today’s world of mass communication and internet opinion. There will be a few edits of the 1991 material always in parentheses as well as a current update at the end of each chapter.)

The following chapters were written while serving on sabbatical as the first Grey Towers Conservation Fellow in 1991, which was an appropriate year for such a program to be started being both the 100th Anniversary of the National Forest Reserves and the 75th Anniversary of the National Park Service. Perhaps some would see it as ironic that the first US Forest Service Conservation Fellow is a Superintendent from the National Park Service rather than a Supervisor from the United States Forest Service, but it is neither ironic nor out of keeping with the future of our agencies.

Ed Brannon, then Director of Grey Towers and the Pinchot Institute for Conservation and myself were
neighbors and partners for four years, he as Supervisor of the Flathead National Forest, me as Superintendent of Glacier National Park. Our years of working together and sharing a common vision for our agencies and for resources management developed a partnership and a trust that should exist in all regions of the country where forests and parks are neighbors. Sadly, a trusting relationship such as ours remains all too uncommon or "unneeded". As agencies that can do so well in conserving resources, we seem to have little incentive in conserving and developing relationships and cooperative processes between our agencies.

It should be no surprise, therefore, that Ed and I have come back together again at Grey Towers, so that the ideas and concepts with which we dealt at the field level can be put down on paper and provided to others for their information. These concepts and ideas are not new thoughts but have been placed into a matrix of processes and an updated syntax based on field application and experience.

These chapters were written at Grey Towers and are the product of years of experience and involvement with the management of natural and cultural resources, which includes people and community relations. They are considered opinions and observations; written out to stimulate thought, discussion, disagreement and debate. They are not presented as facts nor would they be considered
proper “theology” in many circles. When it’s all said and done, they are simply the wanderings of an old romantic struggling with the realities of bureaucracy. Perhaps they represent pathways into the woods and perhaps they are dead ends. That is up to you.

As such, they will hopefully stimulate exchange and intense discussion in many places, beyond agency boundaries, and between those of us who care for our missions and our future. I often wonder aloud if we have had intense philosophical debate since the days of Muir and Pinchot. I know that we have, but today our leadership seems content, some might even say pleased, to leave that debate to others around us such as conservation, advocacy and political groups. Have we become so intent on bureaucratic process, federal law and defending our decisions and plans that we have lost (or perhaps simply misplaced) the strength of our own missions and their underlying intents and philosophies?

Why, for instance, are the constructive critics of the National Park Service sitting outside and shooting in while we seem to circle the wagons? Why are the Service’s best minds, and there are many, generally being defensive or quiet on these issues, or more disturbing yet, failing to speak out publicly about our strengths, our weaknesses and areas needing improvement? Have our public agencies and their politics come to the point that a person must retire before they are free to speak, to
question and to constructively criticize? I hope we have not, but the signs are not encouraging.

Please understand that these essays do not pretend to capture the simplicity and eloquence of thoughts that were apparent in turn of the century leaders and thinkers. They can only fulfill a useful function when they help, through disagreement and challenge, to stimulate you, the reader, to reassert your own eloquence and understanding which will become a part of a collective body of literature during a critical decade of change and transition. (A decade now well behind us while we still look for more positive reactions.)

Because of my familiarity and long experience with the National Park Service, I will obviously be more precise in my comments on the Park Service. It is time for us to begin our own public debate and to strengthen our house, instead of continually reacting to critics who have their own agendas and political targets. Accordingly, I am not concerned with those in the Service who are unable to accept both public and internal discussion about our problems, our future and needed improvements. Rather, I challenge those many progressive candid spirits and excellent fellow managers and employees who are in the agency to debate, exchange and change.

Even now, thinking of the many books, reports and studies that exist concerning the National Park Service, it is troubling to note that the authors are, almost with-
out exception, from outside the Service or have retired from the Service. Our inability to constructively deal with criticism or to stimulate our own meaningful and constructive criticism is a sure sign of an agency in the advanced stages of becoming the type of bureaucracy that we always said we would never be. Our own people best understand the resources, the needs and the processes with which they must work so who better to work for correction and understanding?

The current challenge is to become an active participant in the debate that now envelops our national parks and the truly unique philosophy that make them the international treasures they are. For us to do so means that we must become proactive, not merely reactive. (Including advanced and more aggressive risk taking on critical issues.)

And while we are catching up with ourselves, our publics and the process we must also keep an eye on the meaning of events such as global change, ecoregional management, the International Parks movement and other major activities going on outside the United States but having future impacts on us and our resources. All employees, regardless of agency, should be familiarizing themselves with "Our Common Future - From One Earth to One World - An Overview by the World Commission on Environment and Development," Oxford University Press 1987. This book and the work of the World Commission are now setting parameters
for discussion on the management of resources around the world and it would be a good thing if those of us in the profession, here in the United States, found out about it and became conversant with it.

Finally, this item as found in the George Bird Grinnell Papers of the Sterling Library, Manuscripts and Archives, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut. George Bird Grinnell (1849-1938), the father of Glacier National Park, was a noted conservationist and activist in natural resource issues from 1870 to 1938. This is a letter from George Bird Grinnell to a friend living on the Blackfeet Reservation in Montana, J. B. (Jack) Monroe, and dated December 12, 1901. Jack has been offered a Forest Ranger position by mutual friend Gifford Pinchot, first Chief of the United States Forest Service, and has asked Dr. Grinnell for his advice on accepting it. Dr. Grinnell responds:

"I have been rather accustomed to think that there was something demoralizing about holding a government job; that the man who fed at the public crib gradually came to lose all ambition except the one ambition of hanging on good and tight to his job. But after all whether the government job is demoralizing or not, depends on the man; and the right kind of man will not be demoralized by it, as is shown by the good work done by so many men who are in government service…"

"Incidentally, there is here an opportunity for you to do a great deal of good for the country, but the only
reward that you are likely to receive for the good you may do will be the approval of your own conscience, and of the few men who know the facts.

It is perhaps fitting that these chapters are being written in a tower room at Grey Towers National Historic Landmark. Working and being in this room, I am struck by it being so out of shape with today, where processes so often force managers into squares, rectangles and straight lines. In this circular tower room, a person is forced to adjust his/her approaches and refine his/her thinking to try to convey the strengths of roundness and the processes of Gaia, which are truly circular in nature. It is also appropriate that the tower has windows and not gun ports.

My thanks to the US Forest Service, Ed Brannon and the dedicated staff of Grey Towers for making this time and facility available to me, to Yale University and Dr. John Gordon, Dean of the Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, for their support of this program and use of their many excellent facilities and to the National Park Service and my boss, the Regional Director, for the “six-week pass.” Don’t worry folks; I know it wasn’t for good behavior.

Gil Lusk
The Tower Room
Grey Towers National Historic Landmark
March 5, 1991
In today's world people rarely take the time to read newspapers or follow current events. Although they may notice headlines or catch second hand snippets of news, few people read and digest factual material and fewer still interpret or project the data into future trends and activities. The age of the sound bite manages our politics and our actions as we continue into the information age and as we struggle to achieve some semblance of the future. Our preoccupation with self, with our own needs and immediate gratification makes it difficult for us as a nation and as a species to plan. Additionally, it is difficult to create a society that is willing to invest in the idea of the future or to try to understand the necessary limitations placed on us as stewards of that future.

We are still the products of our frontier and while Frederick Jackson Turner correctly saw the end of manifest destiny and near term frontiers, his thesis was less clear in its understanding of how long we, as a society,
and our institutions would be influenced by the forces of frontier. Forces reflected in ways such as the predominance of the individual, possession of resources, the power of wealth, the near destruction of all predators and all species bearing fur or seen as a commodity. The willingness of the have-nots to dominate and use the have-nots and for one class or religion or color to think itself superior to another.

Perhaps because of our frontier past and the institutions it helped to create, we still have immense frontiers ahead of and surrounding us. If we can develop the maturity needed to understand them as spatial and societal frontiers and absolute challenges.

A sampling of these frontiers might include space, and all that it holds (including the resources of our future society). It is our next spatial frontier that must be met and understood, but not in terms of the "conquest" of space, as that is a remnant concept from the frontier. If we are to grow and prosper as a species, if you believe in the future, optimistically, then this component is part of your personal frontier and our need.

Nearer to home is the frontier represented by the oceans and seas, vast resources that are already affected by the actions of our species, with our need for food and tragically, garbage pits. A vast storehouse of naturalness that is also a critical part of our future and our survival, where the mistakes of land ownership and exploitation
need not be repeated as if testing the hypothesis and where the idea of stewardship has such a significant role to play.

The frontier of another great ocean is beginning to be felt but not understood, in the very atmosphere that shelters and maintains us. With each space mission we better understand it as a unique occurrence in this quadrant of our galaxy. With air also come soil and earth, which, you will pardon me, we have hardly done more than scratched the surface of.

While we are scratching there is also the frontier of the human body and mind now only beginning to be understood and explored as a physical frontier and not just a spiritual container involved in the rights of passage.

And beyond the excitement and vitality of our physical frontiers there lies an entire range of social and cultural frontiers that must be explored, refined and changed if we are to prove ourselves more than a mote in the eye of time. The ego that drives and sustains us, if not understood, can easily destroy or cripple us before we ever learn to walk in the vast home that has been given to us to live in, care for and share with our fellow inhabitants. Can we ultimately understand it well enough and be caring enough to matriculate to our future or will we cling to the mistakes of the past with
such vision that we are rendered a species that had all the tools and resources, yet failed?

This represents the tip of complex social frontiers such as the concept of one world and one people and one environment, Gaia, if you prefer. Acceptance of social responsibility as a condition of independence and independent action and beyond that an actual part of the price to be paid on a complex social frontier.

Governmental systems, that come to realize the truth of interconnectivity and can accept that for us to succeed there must one day be a system that can balance the world’s needs with its resources, will obviously succeed and flourish. Those systems that try to buy scarce commodities and fail to act as responsible stewards will be replaced. The successful systems will take us as far from the Magna Charta and the systems of the Middle Ages as those systems took us from the Dark Ages and the hunter gatherer systems that preceded them all. To do so will take a vision of time that is sorely lacking in societies that are built upon instant gratification, the ownership of things and status built upon carnage to natural systems and all things of “little concern to me.”

It is asking much and yet is asking little with the future survival of our species in question. Like the physician prescribing exercise and diet to the heart patient, will we listen, or will we go on as before, even with the consequences well defined for us?
From a positive viewpoint there are beginnings happening all the time and progress is evident in many places and institutions, but we are still at an early stage and society must match the rapidity of its changes with those of the physical world that surrounds and sustains us.

To this end there exists a series of resources that can and do play a vital role in the future and in our process of coming to grips with that future. While there are many types of conservation resources, none better typifies the broader and more complex issues than the national parks. They best represent the loci where the values of the past and the needs of the future meet, are debated, argued and moved forward.

Developed by social explorers of the 19th Century, agencies like the National Park Service and the United States Forest Service and ideas like the Conservation Movement came from minds that cared about the future; farsighted enough to see some of the future challenges our society would have, in both physical and spiritual ways.

Today, more than ever, the mission of such agencies and their ability to energize and educate the public is important to our future and the farsighted missions assigned to our agencies. Speaking specifically about the National Park Service, all areas of the National Park System are engaged in the preservation of our culture
and its growth. Even the large natural parks are engaged in the preservation of our culture because the species and habitat contained therein and adjacent to them are the very fabric of our civilization. They represent the forces that have shaped and molded us, even in our reaction to nature as a hostile set of elements to be controlled by man. In today's world and its future, the parks represent our report card as a species. How we are judged by the world civilization of tomorrow will depend in great measure on the lessons we are willing to learn from the parks. Were we ultimately caring enough of all species to allow them coexistence on our world and in our space? Did national parks ultimately become large caged zoos where token and genetically deteriorating species were allowed to exist, reminding us of the glories of our past or did the entire world become a habitat of conserved values and resources generating from the examples of parks and forests of the world?

It is far more than a rhetorical question for us to focus on. Instead it is a question upon which we rest or rise as a civilization. Resource managers deal with resource issues on local and national fronts because of their belief. A belief in the fundamental principles of conservation and the ideals of the National Park Service and to where those concepts can lead, given time. To lose species and key resource values now, after surviving years of resource extraction, greed and manipulation, just as
society is beginning to understand and define greater values and just as we approach the third millennium, would be tantamount to one of our society’s greatest failures. Conservation and preservation represent a system of values and beliefs that were established more than one hundred years ago and must be reestablished again in our present world of changing values and systems. It is not the fight of man and economic values versus wilderness (this is the polarizing political fight that leads nowhere) but rather the fight to understand that both are one and each needs the other. That man and nature (or wilderness) are of the same body and that nature does not manipulate but rather it evolves.

The National Parks are supported by the American people for many reasons, but beneath the rhetoric the American people have a positive sense of tomorrow and a day when treasures can exist anyplace, not just in safety deposit boxes. Ad Astra Per Asperum.

**Update – September 2018**

In the years between 1991 and 2018 American culture has become increasingly negative and angry, much more so than envisioned in 1991. Perhaps it comes from the advancement of the information age where individuals can attack and lie without consequence. Perhaps it comes from a Congress that is now a separate class
in society with entitlements and power not envisioned by our founding fathers. We are no longer red, white and blue, now we are just a confused nation of reds and blues. On our current path it is becoming increasingly hard to visualize a nation working together for our people and resources, for the betterment of our society and the natural wealth of this home we call Earth. The National Parks are our Living National Treasures and they seem headed, unfortunately, to those safety deposit boxes. Fortunately, the die has not been cast, yet.
While we live in a world of constantly accelerating change, our institutions and governmental processes have a hard time dealing with change. Part of this represents our heritage of common law and the rule of precedence in our society and part of it represents a desired end state of comfort and familiarity. Resistance to change and slowness to change is not necessarily a bad thing. Perhaps it even represents a positive value in a maturing society that has seen great change in less than two hundred years, a cosmic microsecond of time.

But it is the agent and mechanism of change, a willingness to change, which has seen our nation and society thrive and grow while others have slowed and even receded. We have invented not only machines and technologies but also processes, law, social mores and values and a standard of living which is based on consuming far more than is returned or produced.

We are a society and a family of nations whose ground rules have been based on extraction, ownership, independence, unending resources, dominion over the world.
earth and manifest destiny. We live to extract growth and wealth from the system and turn movie stars, sports heroes, generals, industrialists and entrepreneurs who best succeed in the quest, into international celebrities and power brokers.

Our society, based as it is on the accumulation of wealth and status, has evolved laws and social mores to assure or protect those values. Having become a collective body of acceptable behavior in our society, it now needs to be changed to represent a time of increasing resource scarcity and population growth. It will not be easy because one aspect of our society is its inability, and seeming discomfort, to deal with the future, a time that will "take care of itself". We leave the future to our religion or our technology but assume little of the responsibility ourselves. To some degree, the past is our religion, the present our church and God will take care of the future.

Have we achieved such happiness and such a standard of living that all frontiers including social, space and the seas are irrelevant? Are we becoming so hooked on greed that our gross national product is us and all that supports us? Have we become a society so captive to our own needs that to spend dollars on science, space and the rest of the world is a waste of money, particularly when it could be spent on "my roads," "my welfare" and "my needs?" If we have, then the time has come to
consider other standards and to begin thinking of our future as our responsibility; getting hooked on the world instead of ourselves.

This represents a change we are neither ready nor equipped to make which will require years of effort and preparation even if we could begin tomorrow. Yet within this millennium it may represent the very success or failure of our society, our species and our world. It is not up to God, to industry or technology, to the United Nations, the Congress, or the President--it is ultimately and solely in the hands of those of us who care, who act in unison.

But it also represents processes and concepts that must be invented in the 21st Century and that must evolve from and because of our past. Concepts that I would characterize as the processes of Gaia--the world as a living place where care and understanding are needed instead of political boundaries and expedient pronouns.

One such process shift occurs when we adjust our pronouns from I, me and mine to we, our and ours. It is neither subtle nor delicate, this change of pronoun and thinking. It drives so many of our processes today and our needs. Perhaps a "new world order" and "a thousand points of light" start with the simple recognition that future survival rests in "our" hands and no longer resides in "my" hands. Likewise, it no longer resides in the hands of one country, my country, but with the nations of the world, our world.
It continues with the understanding that I cannot own what is not mine to own, which is the earth. I may hold and use it for my life and so may my children, but it does not belong to me in the sense of destroying it or taking it with me. The very spirit that created and maintains this nation, and others as well; that spirit of independence and what is mine is mine, that spirit of land owning and being the master of my own fate, is in need of change. If ownership can become stewardship, we have a beginning and one that our own Native Americans believed in long before the arrival of post Magna Carta Europeans. To some degree it goes beyond ownership to the emotions and irrational behavior created by ownership (as 19th Century slaves could attest) in that it is mine and I can do what I want with it.

Modern zoning arguments often begin with the standard refrain “this land belongs to me and no one will tell me what I can or can’t do with it!” It is the expression of an important right under our system but aren’t there also responsibilities and social obligations that go with the right? And what of the principle that the animals on the land are also mine to own and to dispose of as I see fit as though chattel to the deed of ownership? Common law says that they are yours to own, but are they? And if one species may own another species have we truly removed bondage from the earth?

Nor can we argue that man is not a predator, for we are. We kill to survive, and the earth provides for that
concept, not because we own the resources but because it is part of our interconnected system of life and death and it too carries social and humanitarian responsibilities and obligations. Is the starvation of developing nations the fault of this nation? Not entirely, but don’t we still have an obligation to our fellow travelers? Can’t we help them, not because of the dollar but because we care and feel that help is a part of our value system?

Will the “new world order,” to be defined, be built upon the role model of the United States and our definitions of wealth and success and living standards? If so, where will the resources come from to provide 1.8 autos to every family in the world or central heat, air and vacuum to us all? It’s a question without answer, but there is an expectation, a pent up demand, in many places of the world for this very standard of success and development. Or will the new world order be built upon a lower standard for most of the world and a continued high standard for those who already have achieved success—and is such a double standard enforceable or even realistic?

In developing countries around the world there is all too much of the me and mine concept which leads to starvation and death, standards that see even the poorest nations with two classes of people—the super-rich and the dying/surviving. Is it our problem? Of course, it is, and the sooner we begin to interface with it at levels beyond charity the better for our environment and for
our own culture. We are already aware of the chain of events surrounding the loss of our rain forests to pay off loans to banks in developing nations. A typical colonial pattern that sees limited resources sold and lost, bankrupting the culture and the future of nations who have thousands of years of resource need still ahead of them.

As stewards we must deal with our own society and culture in making it self-sustaining and in facing our "habit" as a resource consumption addict. Our obligation is to lead in setting new standards for wise resource use and consumption (which will include making sacrifices) and to accept our role in working with the people of the world on issues so important to us all. To review our processes, developed partially out of Magna Carta and common law, and to begin to change and adapt to a new world order and a period of stewardship rather than ownership. The United Nations and other bodies are beginning the task but without the United States as an active partner can they succeed? Eventually they can and will succeed and if it is done without us will we be comfortable with the standards that have been set for us?

Beyond these generalities are there specific areas that we can focus on in moving to the processes of Gaia and what are they?

We begin with the realization, well developed in other texts, that the ability of the United States to support the current level of its political infrastructure
is overextended and beyond available dollars. For how long will our pride in county and state require us to duplicate services and government rather than fixing problems? How many counties do we need for effective government in an age of rapid transit and communication and how much of the productive tax base could be applied to solving problems with fewer county governments? What of State governments? Each state is rightly proud of its history and its past but for how long will we be able to afford fifty or fifty-one separate and distinct state governments working at cross purposes on eco-regional issues and concerns? Others have suggested the eventual confederation of states with similar resource bases and problems to become more effective politically and environmentally. Presently there are issues developing which could force thinking along these lines within the decade. Look at the water resources of the northwest and the diminishing electoral power of the area. In 1992, Montana will join Wyoming with one member in the House of Representatives while California, a water poor state, grows to 52 seats in the House, or more than 10 percent of the total. What law can such a block ultimately pass? Is there advantage to such strategies as combining over time and will we be willing to put the past behind us when needed?

Within the Federal Government there are similar scenarios where agencies and bureaus overlap or could
be combined to produce better bioregional decisions and reduce the territorial conflicts that are incessant. All these changes lead to new political boundaries but boundaries that could eventually reflect the reality of our natural world as opposed to the realities of our politics and our territorial imperatives. It is a start on a long road, a toe hold on a time when nations, as is currently happening in Europe, make the same combinations. That time when race, religious conflict and history are secondary to our needs for growth and survival on an environmentally balanced planet.

Every effort can be made, right now, to work together in resolving issues and beginning to deal with political turf and boundary issues. This can be a simple directive from the executive branch of government and supported in the language of the laws passed by Congress. While we can understand the long history that exists between the United States Forest Service and the National Park Service, why should two agencies that have so much potential synergy between them insist on remaining jealous rivals instead of fast friends? To succeed in managing ecosystems and not political systems the transition must occur as it must with state agencies, county government, industry and private stewardship. It will radically change the way we do business, will assure better decisions, will generate large operating efficiencies and will open the door to the future needs of the process of Gaia.
We can take global change seriously and begin developing national energy policies with specific targets and incentives for a self-dependent energy future. And we can begin developing programs to retrain a portion of America's work force now involved in resource industries that are changing and starting to decline in their viability and do it so that we rid the system of either/or discussions. The old political dialogue of "We can have jobs and a future, or we can have wilderness and a diversity of species, but we can't have both," is polarizing fiction that needs to be removed from the system in a proactive and positive fashion.

If we follow our old territorial logic to its conclusion are we to be the last species on earth as we sacrifice species after species for the sake of a dollar? What gives us the right to choose survivors and those who disappear? Must these decisions and this dialogue occur now, when we are so close to a major transition in our country and the world that might see environmental values and economic necessities on the same side and in the same place? Now, above all the times in human history, we require patience, moderation and foresight and I think we are going to see those qualities soon - a groundswell of those qualities around the world.

It is our future that extends out for millennia and it is now that we must begin to seriously deal with it and to develop the strategies for survival that will be needed.
Is it so difficult to understand that we are one with the earth and that every person on earth is a cousin?

**Update - September 2018**

Sorry to say, but little progress has been made on the issues of this chapter. The changes are long term, but hope is still not lost, that changes will begin in the coming years or we face the problems and challenges of a diminished world, divided and in conflict. We call it Mother Earth and must realize that Mother Earth is very capable of making changes to correct problems created by an overpopulating species. Climate change has confronted Mother Earth and she is responding as we can see in the beginning changes in our weather and weather patterns. Is the United Nations prepared to deal with migrating millions as the oceans and seas regain elevations? Is any nation so prepared? What will replace food sources from the ocean as ocean waters warm or cool affecting established habitats? Alfred E Neuman said it best, “What! Me worry?”
Politics and micro-management have been a part of governmental process in America for a long time and even today, with more enlightened management and increasing sensitivity for the issue, they continue to have impacts that can be described as both positive and negative. The purpose here is not to delve into the positive application of these concepts as there are many examples. The purpose is to explore how these broad and difficult to define areas of involvement are increasingly affecting the ability of agencies to efficiently define and deliver a final product. It isn’t the intention of this chapter to point a finger at any specific institution or group and say “they are the problem” - because that would be neither honest nor is it the case. Our concern is with the effect on process and the environment created by perceived and sometimes real manipulation of an issue resulting from politics and micro-management.
A clear and first example would be the development of a program over the past decade called the Senior Executive Service (SES). If you read the materials that created the SES you will see a very positive program intended to recognize and reward the senior managers of the government, provide annual bonuses where deserved and develop a cadre of executives who would work across agency lines and carry their skills with them. That remains the stated intention of the program and it is to be hoped that its goals can eventually be achieved. Generally, however, senior government managers are looking elsewhere for better pay and benefits, taking their experience, agency knowledge and understanding with them.

Currently there is a trend, particularly by some of our conservation and environmental groups to focus on the Reagan years as the reason for the decline of our agencies and missions but even this trend is misplaced. Micro-management and politics in land managing agencies are touted as a Republican phenomenon when in reality it has no party affiliation, it comes from both sides of the aisle. In years of government service there have been times of greater abuse than others, but the process is still used regardless the politics of the White House or Congress. Many examples exist between and among all administrations, but in recent years the trends are increasing as laws are passed giving politicians and
others more ability to change or challenge professional management of our natural resources.

Within resource managing agencies, politics and micro-management work best in an atmosphere that is controlled by upper managers unwilling to consider change or options. It allows them to more easily dispel professional judgments of agency personnel as biased, incorrect, inappropriate or destructive of the work environment. Constructive criticism and questioning by resource managers and others are being pulled ever more successfully back into agency file cabinets, away from public view and review. While constructive criticism has never been easy, it is becoming more infrequent and more controlled, a trend that obviously bothers many. Voices of moderation and positive feedback become the victim of a system that is geared to shelter agencies and politicians from opposing viewpoints and concerns.

How often are we told that change is achieved by working within the system? This is a system that will work if change is sought or permitted and if the system is willing to listen. For now, it is a process that is used to shelter mid-level entrenched bureaucrats and to allow them to simply avoid change and alteration in comfortable and often ineffective systems. How many task forces have met within our various agencies in the past 20 years? How many agendas for change have been presented and how many have been filed on the shelf
for "further consideration?" How many Park General Management Plans have been put forward for approval after literally years of effort, only to be shelved for sensitive or political reasons? The actual net change in our organization from such excellent efforts is negligible because the implementation of agendas for change is too often placed in the hands of those who manage the programs and who are comfortable with the processes already in place.

The budget process itself has been shaped and formed over the last 20 years into a system of rationalization for political agendas rather than professional presentation of actual need. Resource managers have absorbed new programs, new laws, new parks and new initiatives often without the necessary funding to implement them because some have not been permitted to make the case for funding. If we are not going to be permitted to request funds, then we should at least be permitted to make the case for doing away with work elements and programs that are of lower priority to the resources. Except for reactive programs, i.e., building is falling down, building must be fixed, it has been a long time since managers were permitted to fully develop a set of budget requests and justification of need with the expectation that they would be presented to the Congress. For the past many years we have been limited to a very few thrusts for operating increases with a major
element being funding for new park areas. (In 1991, for the first time in more than a decade, the Director of the National Park System was permitted to present a real set of needs to the Congress—a hopeful sign that things may be changing for the better.)

Park managers today have simply abandoned the old justification system, since it no longer works for the majority of needs. They now work behind the scenes to achieve line item and add-on elements in the budget that are built in by supportive delegations. This is not an efficient or system serving process, and everyone realizes that -- but it's the only game in town and so it gets much use. Correcting the problem will not come in putting muzzles on managers but rather in making the old systems work again, providing managers with the ability to again compete internally for adequate funding levels. It will also be important for everyone to sense intellectual honesty being applied before the appropriations committees with actual needs being stated and represented, rather than the required and political “all is well, and we have very few funding needs” or the “imposed rationalization,” we have good managers, they can handle that new program.”

The Department of the Interior and the Office of Management and Budget can establish their own priorities and cases for why funding increases must be limited or controlled as that is their valid role in representing
the Administration and its policies. It is an abuse of professional integrity however to have professional agency personnel being placed in the role of administration spokesperson.

Let's also look at the way in which politics can affect exposure of our managers to new ideas or thoughts. I remember helping to set up a Superintendents’ conference back in the 1970’s and a person was on the agenda who could stimulate us into broader thinking and understanding of the systems we work with. He never appeared on the final agenda because of his association with a former administration of the opposing party. This form of litmus test is not at all uncommon and has now become far more a part of our thinking and a very wrong part. One of the successes of the Association of the National Park Rangers has been that, by being outside agency control, it is hopefully a forum for speakers from all views and a place to hear those with critical views or concerns. The message here is that in a system that cannot countenance criticism, employees must look to other places for their expression and participation.

There are many examples and case histories that could be used but they would not be productive in a general discussion of this nature. The point is that several trends and cross-purposed events have become a part of our agencies and efforts should be made to isolate out the most damaging. Long term strategies are needed to
counteract them, rather than allowing them to become more well established under the guises that they are not within our control or are politically dangerous to tackle. The creators of our system and the conservation movement knew political danger too, yet they developed ways to work with and succeed from within the system. If we are truly committed to our principles, so will we.

Can we hope to return to a time when agency personnel positively interact with the outside systems? When we not abandon our principles to outside critics with less clear understanding of the resource and its needs? For a time when we stop thinking of ourselves as overwhelmed and move forward again with positive agendas and purpose? A time when career employees can again aspire to leadership of an agency and a time when adequate resources exist to properly manage the unique philosophies and values of our natural and cultural resources? Absolutely.

*Update - September 2018*

Things have again not really changed from 1991. Political oversight and micromanagement remain much the same as does the SES program now being used to create “change”. Another Superintendent of Yellowstone has stepped over a line and is now offered retirement or relocation, with retirement selected. Courts and
Judges are increasingly becoming resource managers as the actual managers are overridden by extreme environmental groups only interested in their own concept of resource management. It is no longer conservation but rather preservation that affects the resource managing agencies created to achieve the wise use of resources. Activist environmental groups want forest lands managed like national parks. Agencies have libraries of plans for wise use or preservation sitting on shelves unused after four years of work having been abandoned by agency leadership because of controversy. Another four years by another planning group will surely work. Agency scientists and managers are maligned in the media for lies, misrepresentations, failures to consider and intentions to destroy, kill or abuse the environment. Where are the challenges from agency leadership to these continual claims? Go to the “pick a favorable judge” court system, be over ruled and meet your new resource manager? Or, cave in and let the issue fester for another decade?
In our youth, and even today, we enjoyed the wonderful movie classic “Miracle on 34th Street” with one of the favorite themes being the way in which Gimbel’s and Macy’s were brought together by Santa Claus. Two consummate rivals who fought for years yet were neighbors on the same street.

That is how we could characterize the relationship that has long existed between the National Park Service and the US Forest Service - Gimbel’s and Macy’s yet neighbors on the same street. Current need is for a Santa Clause. We have had a long relationship that has mostly been perceived as standoffish, jealous, and competitive. In a world full of missions and goals, we have sometimes competed at the level of young children all the while being goaded on by publics and politicians whose agendas are best served by the hard edged competition.
Our present day positions, like so many things in our society, are the result of events, long association and history. After all, we have lived in the same neighborhoods for over a hundred years. Scholars have reviewed this issue on many an occasion with far greater understanding and depth than can be done here but it is important to have some small perspective on a part of the issue.

The philosophical impetus for our organizations came from many people and places spanning the better part of the 19th Century and early 20th Century. As a concern for our resources rose and took shape, it was filtered through men who were not only successful in their fields but also proud and resolute in their “frontier” bearing. Such early leaders as Gifford Pinchot, John Muir, Theodore Roosevelt, Frederick Law Olmsted, George Bird Grinnell, Cornelius Hedges, and others cannot be easily dismissed. As leaders of their era they possessed strong feelings, pronounced views and opinions, strong egos, pride in abundance and most important of all, a vision of the future.

These were men who believed in themselves and their visions and moved issues forward not as plans or consensus ideas but as dogma. They created, along with many others, the conservation and preservation movements. Movements developed in response to government corruption, greed, mismanagement of lands and
resources, an apparent disregard for the future and the destruction of species. They neither feared nor cared that others might not share their opinions or that disagreement would result because of their strongly held convictions and beliefs.

These were the forces that helped mold three generations of professional land managers and who were instrumental in shaping the philosophies and missions of many agencies but none more so than the United States Forest Service and the National Park Service. It is almost axiomatic that the controversy of Hetch-Hetchy Dam in Yosemite National Park split the conservationist force of Pinchot from the preservationist force of Muir and yet for years there had been mutual respect and association between these men. It isn't simply because of this split that our agencies grew apart, although it was pronounced and undoubtedly affected the early years of both organizations.

For years, after the creation of both agencies, each strongly believing in their mission, with the leadership of Pinchot being pronounced in the early years because of his strong personal vision for wise use. The national parks were created more often than not by being carved from the national forests and the forest reserves. Lifelong feelings were engendered at this point by removing productive and beautiful lands from an agency with a strong sense of mission and commitment. Giving those lands
to a new agency that was still in its infancy and still seeking Congressional support was viewed as questionable. The parks were still defining what many believed to be a nebulous mission, out of keeping with good conservation practice and utilitarian concepts.

These ideas were still being played out in the 1970's when Congressman Phil Burton (D-CAL.) was Chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks, House Committee on Natural Resources. Congressman Burton was able to require the National Park Service to recommend 12 new parks each year to the Subcommittee (it was called the “park of the month club” by insiders). That action, which has since been curtailed, was viewed by many in the United States Forest Service as a license to take assets and land from them in continuation of the age old process of creating parks from forests.

As the national park idea grew and became stronger a great deal of national attention and emphasis was placed on the national parks. They became media darlings and “the” places to go, while less attention was being paid to the many well-managed resources of the National Forest System. Even the fact that Smoky the Bear (a Forest Service icon) was adorned with the National Park Service Stetson, created a sore point and caused confusion for many years. (It also created forty years of aggressive fire management by both agencies, when fire was a beneficial value to many species adjusted
to the role of fire. A primary example being the Sequoia Tree.) Today many people still call us park rangers or forest rangers interchangeably, as though we worked in the same agency. For years, wearing a uniform, I would run into people at functions and events who would come up to me and say “Oh, you must work for the Forest Service” or “Oh, are you a Forest Ranger?” Mostly because of the hat, but not always.

Forest managers often considered park managers less trained, lacking the in-depth understandings forest managers had to possess to manage a forest. With different missions, training was different in both agencies as was the knowledge required to manage. In the National Park Service there was the feeling that forest managers were insensitive and uncaring about their resources. Forest managers and personnel were considered to be cutters and despoilers of the environment with little understanding and support for the natural processes -- and so the lines were drawn, and attitudes emerged.

In truth, those early formative years saw mistakes made on both sides. Pride and prejudice only allowed personnel to look at the other agency without understanding the point of view or management policy being applied.

Another factor that emerged and which helped keep us apart for years was, and remains, our varied constituencies. Gifford Pinchot’s strong emphasis on
decentralization and his mandate that forests were part of their local communities, helped make those communities a primary constituency and supplier of employees and local firms. Forests were viewed as strong economic contributors with specific policies set up to further this linkage, such as payments to local governments in lieu of taxes, road construction and habitat management for hunting and fishing.

The National Park Service however developed its strongest constituencies at the national level and with the Congress. Parks were set aside based on the hard work of many individual citizens and groups, often from areas outside of the region where the park was being established. Major national groups such as the Sierra Club, the Audubon Society, the National Geographic Society, the Conservation Foundation and the Nature Conservancy were part of communities working to establish new national park service areas using their lobbying and citizen members to great effect. While there were local citizens and organizations often associated with the creation of a park there were generally as many or more who opposed the "lockup" of resources at the local level, leaving the national groups with the primary task of moving bills through Congress.

This difference in constituencies is one of the major factors in our long and arduous relationship as we each used or were perceived to use our constituencies to get
at each other over policy and management differences. Parks were often set up as “elitist islands” by local communities and forests as “despoilers of the environment” by the national groups. There is some truth to be said for each if your perspective is from that specific constituency recognizing that neither agency wants to make mistakes, but each has. Regardless, it is all a part of our mutual baggage and must be put behind us as a phase in our early development and maturation as agencies. In effect, we need to provide for young agencies to be somewhat spoiled and hard headed at times, giving them room to mature into roles that can service and win support from both constituencies.

It should also be pointed out that many early national monuments created by Teddy Roosevelt under the Antiquities Act of 1906 began their lives as United States Forest Service areas and were later transferred to the National Park Service. Again a loss of resource and prestige to a young and growing organization helping to create an entire range of issues, which mount up over time.

So, let’s summarize this first segment as showing that there are many reasons for a less than open relationship between our agencies, with some not touched upon in this brief overview. Given that our relationship is still somewhat strained are we therefore two agencies that are far apart and must we stay that way?
Here are a few givens and philosophical points that should provide a framework for a new and emerging relationship between our agencies:

** Each agency has an important and distinct mission that must be maintained and left unaltered in any cooperative relationship. This is not only congressionally mandated and a matter of law, it is inherent in our having different and yet equally important national missions.

** The professional staffs of both organizations are qualified, competent and extremely hard workers who believe in what they are doing. There are few, if any, persons in either organization who knowingly destroy resources or endanger habitat or species. We can and do learn from each other because of the very reason that we have different roles to play and use diverse approaches in our management of resources.

** Our personnel have the ability to associate with each other, train together and work together without "it" rubbing off on one another. We are capable of hearing how "they" do it without going back and doing it that way and we are capable of respecting why it is that they do it in the way that they do.
** A mature relationship exists not only around agreements but also around disagreements and arguments. Where is it written that in working together, we give up our ability to disagree with each other, even in public, to constructively offer a different point of view? The definition of teamwork has nothing to do with always smiling and saying how much we agree in public and then bashing each other in back channels, or vice versa. We should expect there to be disagreements by both parties and we can try to be candid in such situations as a matter of respect for fellow professionals. Our resources will benefit.

** There is already much genuine fellowship and respect between our agencies in locales across the country but like so many other things in life we must bring it out into the open before people will begin to understand what we are doing. There will be those, including some of our own people, who will do everything they can to destroy a cooperative relationship for reasons of their own agendas and power bases. We should expect this as an unfortunate part of the process and avoid overreaction. We could even shock the foundations of the known world and invite a few of “them” to our next party or staff meeting and then actually have a productive time.
We need to recognize the inherent nature of the media to deal with resource stories as charge and countercharge sensationalism. Reporters often seek to obtain an attacking quotation that they can then print to stimulate another attacking quotation from the injured agency, ad nauseum, end of process. This plays out time and again in fire, rescues and critical resource issues. It is quite different from well-thought out differences being stated, which is appropriate, and revels in such glories as personal attacks, denigrating statements and other generally destructive phrasing that destroy relationships even though some of that can still be expected in the early years of developing relationships. If someone gets trapped into a stupid statement don’t attack back but handle it as a genuine mistake and discuss it privately and then publicly.

Emphasis should be given on efficiently combining resources for training and employee development. Even at policy and upper management levels there should be routine dialogue, shared training and opportunities for growth that extend well beyond fire management and fire control. Parks surrounded by forests live in a world of species security and protection for the park.
For ecoregional or ecosystem management to work effectively we will require more than simple agreements that provide for you do your thing, we do our thing and we meet once each month, drink coffee and call it ecosystem management. The approach must be substantive, must include cooperation with privately owned and other involved lands and must work toward a common vision for the system that supports our various missions. It must encompass not only the protection of key environmental values, which are important to conservationists, preservationists and the public, but also must deal with the absolute necessity of a sustainable economy in the system.

It is hard to envision or understand that two agencies that have so much in common must work so hard at being apart. We share ecosystems, species, employees, communities and professional credentials. The main thing we do not share is a common Cabinet Secretary. The very fact that our policies are different represents a natural synergy and beneficial symbiosis that we have refused to recognize in the past. How does a park avoid becoming all things to all people and the potential watering down of its policies? By having a resource nearby which is managed as a wise use area and which might absorb conflicting uses while
still providing for the public. How is a forest better able to manage its assets when habitat issues are present? By having a very conservatively managed park located next door that is supporting a large habitat base. While this won't always work where there are threatened and endangered species present, it can be made to work in most cases and should be discussed. As agencies managing ecosystems together, we can better provide for the public and more readily deal with sustainable economic issues, as economy is generated by both forest and park alike.

Whether there will ever be a combination of all federal resource managing agencies into one department or not is for someone else to say but it shouldn't be feared because of the past. If there are solid reasons not to, that is fine but not for the reason of petty turf and agency jealousy. As for the National Park Service and the United States Forest Service we should continue to put the past behind us and begin emphasizing our need to work together, because we truly are close together! There can be no doubt that it will happen, if not with this generation of employees, then with the next.

Update – September 2018

Ecoregions and bioregions are being mapped and tremendous effort is being focused on the future management of such areas as opposed to state and other arti-
ficial boundaries. Can these regions actually be managed within the political boundaries of our nation? Can they at least be allowed to work together in some way, both for efficiency and resource health? Perhaps we could start by overcoming artificial political boundaries in our Cabinet structure. The US Forest Service and the National Park Service are two of the agencies that could be allowed to form cooperative agreements for ecosystem management, agreements that would improve resource management and yet provide no danger at all to the legislated missions of each. We need to start somewhere because we simply cannot keep going down the financial and resource roads that we are currently on at the national and local level.

Can any nation, built upon total dependence on county and state lines mature enough to realize that tomorrow's resources and the use of those resources will best be done within ecoregions with new boundaries? For how long will we have the resources to underwrite hundreds of counties and fifty or fifty-one states, all basically doing the same things, when fewer would be more efficient and a better utilization of funds and care for resources?
ne of the things that made New England town meetings work so effectively was simplicity itself - everyone came! And in their participation, they brought their opinions and feelings about a wide range of topics and thus assured that both sides would be present for the discussion and heard. It was undoubtedly a model used in the creation of many laws dealing with required public meetings and processes and it was and is an important idea in government as an instrument of the people.

But today our public processes are anything but positive models having become public pillories for officials, whether elected or a member of the Civil Service. We have seen a dramatic shift as the silent majority has become ever more silent and the small, vocal, advocacy groups more effective, bold and invasive in controlling public processes and the media to suit their own narrow agendas.
In the early 1960’s there was little in the way of public process on behalf of various agencies. There were some informal meetings and a variety of community relations programs were carried out, but the requirements for extensive public process were still ahead, to come with the National Environmental Policy Act and other laws. The Civil Service at that time was a challenging job with young people entering the employ of government. Inspired by President Kennedy and others, they were looking for ways to serve greater goals and values than they believed available in industry or other career fields.

Beginning in the 1980’s government employees became a part of the problem rather than being seen as a part of the solution. National election campaigns were mounted on the basis that government employees were the cause of many problems. We helped to create the national debt, we wasted taxpayer money, we were overpaid and under worked and we didn’t listen. No one could tell us anything, we were obstructions to the President’s programs, we controlled government for our own gratification and our own ends, you couldn’t fire us and so the list goes. Not surprisingly, these innuendos and characterizations stuck, sounding a very responsive note with some taxpayers.

Certainly, there are examples of most of the above in our agencies, and none would deny it, but the same
points can be raised about industry, the university systems, Congress, the White House, school systems and, in short, institutions and work places. But the characterizations stuck like stars to stripes and government became not a solution, not a process of simplifying complex and sometimes contradictory laws but rather “THEY ARE THE PROBLEM.”

The great AH-HA! bird of understanding descended and remains with us in full force today, even though President Bush tried to turn the image around or at least not add to the problem. While this characterization of government employees may seem like self-serving justification, it is intended to clarify what is happening at the point of basic contact between the people and their government. It needs to be understood if we are to make sense of public process in today’s world.

So how does public process work today? Very poorly, and it should surprise no one who has been watching. Here is one view of a typical public meeting process, not at all cynical, it happens this way, which lacks the real involvement and interaction needed to make better resource decisions through public process.

First, we have the announcement of a public meeting to review a major plan or action for any community, park or forest. On the date announced 25 people arrive at the meeting who are pretty well known to the town or resource managers and the others in the group. A presen-
tation is made describing the plan or action, the alternatives, the preferred alternatives (based on management's professional judgment of what is needed to resolve the issue) and then discussion and questions and ideas are received. After two hours the meeting is adjourned, and the process continues. Why then is this simple process not productive and why is it such a drag on decision making and the consideration of alternatives?

Those attending the meeting return to their communities and the communities receive information about the meeting from two sources; those who attended and the media. It isn't the meeting or the process but the attitudes and opinions that come from the meeting and which subsequently are reported in the community. You must remember, from the outset, that communities and resource managing agencies are unique institutions with policies and laws that some local people consider to be negative, making least use of valuable resources, wasting assets, overusing resources, etc. And you must also remember that agencies in general are doing their business under complex federal laws with requirements for process, actions taken, legal standards and so on.

So, what has happened at the meeting? An issue that should be of interest to a wide part of the general community draws 25 people, not 215 people. Why don't more people participate in the public process at this point? We again have to look at attitude. People
don't attend because of several typical responses which employees hear continually:

** They have already made up their mind so it's of no use to attend the meeting -- they don't really want our participation.

** I don't go to meetings because they are a waste of time -- the government never listens anyway.

** Well it doesn't sound all that badly and I support what they are doing so there's no reason to go.

** They always schedule the meetings when I can't go-- if they wanted our input they would (select an option): hold more meetings; meet in the daytime; meet in the evening; meet at a location near my home; or meet somewhere I can get to.

** I hear that Fred is going and he will sure keep them honest. He will represent my point of view.

** It's going to be a very controversial meeting and who needs more stress?

So, the people who do attend are also somewhat typical. We very seldom have anyone at public meetings who is "for" something -- they are almost always "against" something. They almost always represent
small special interest groups with specific agendas that they want dealt with and who have little comment on the plan, unless it's to say that the plan or various parts are "terrible." They often present their remarks in very insulting terms and phrasing to make sure that everyone understands that they are against bad government, incompetent government employees, stupid decisions, wasting tax dollars, and so on. Very rarely do we see people wanting to forge consensus or who are working to recognize the legal mandates of the agency and the limited options that are available in the process. It has become a process of posturing, building group membership, making emotional speeches about incompetence and what goes with it.

In reality agencies actually try very hard to get people out to public meetings because the more people there are the better the input, particularly if there are people present with opposing views that can provide a moderating group influence and develop problem solving dialogue. Lacking this, the meetings simply become very pronounced and one sided and they have reminded me of the attitudes shown by lynch mobs on more than one occasion.

It doesn't have to be this way and we do have tools available to us to try to work through these difficulties, but my point is that the public has switched off. They have walked out on public process for various reasons
leaving it to a very few people and groups, which entirely defeats the purpose. It has become a lose-lose situation that must be turned around. Yes, to be fair there are good public meetings, but the fact is that they are far more rare than good governance needs.

A further complication to public process is the role of the media, which generally attends meetings that guarantee good quotes, in portraying issues and meetings. It is a role that I often characterize as inflammatory and counterproductive. Once an issue is framed at a meeting or by other public dialogue, the media responds to the heated quotations and sensationalism of fringe groups on both sides of the issue, groups that dislike each other and are in open conflict with stated positions and, in most cases, groups that will not have a major influence on the solution. But it sells and reads great.

So, we have an issue that an agency is trying to resolve, and we have the media giving column inches and headlines to narrow views at both extremes. Those narrow views represent about 10 to 20 percent of the people involved with or affected by the issue and who generally are trying to solve the problem politically by polarizing the issue. As the intensity grows in the media the clear majority of the people in the middle who really care about the issue, but not enough to attend the meeting, the silent majority, begin to be concerned that the issue is as it is being framed by the fringe groups and the
media. Groups that have made the issue far more or far less than it is, but regardless have created a counterproductive atmosphere.

The agency, despite its best efforts, has now lost control of the issue to those who want no solution, if it isn’t their solution. Agency personnel trying to solve problems are required to give the blandest and least dramatic of quotes on issues, after all they are trying to solve the problem in a public arena and therefore become the backboards for the hot quotation of the day.

This isn’t public process nor is it in the best interest of the public being served. It represents one reason that many issues are not being solved and why large planning processes are routinely taken to court with public process stopped or micromanaged by Judges or Congress. It is also a factor in why the public has lost faith in the public process and why they no longer think that it is working.

To summarize, public process is simply not working because the people are seemingly uninterested in process until decisions are made and then everyone has an opinion. The process was developed for positive interaction, but our publics seem to be saying they want no responsibility for decisions rendered but want the freedom to express their concern and outrage with decisions after they are made.

As a society we must reenergize our public processes from voting to participating in government at all levels.
and to making our collective voices once again heard. To not do so is leading us into a society where the tyranny of the minority is played out again and again.

With the problem now stated, how do we begin dealing with these issues at the community and resource level while we wait for a change in the public's attitude? There are many strategies available but no one cookbook of solutions as each region of the country will have its own unique personality and culture. Resource managers must build individual strategies that might include some of the following characteristics:

** A realistic assessment of where our individual publics are and a complete analysis of all publics including pro, con and uninvolved. The form for this activity would be a public involvement strategy for each resource compiled by resource staff working with community participants and specialized consultants.

** Managers must accept the fact that a clear majority of their time must be spent developing relationships and working with the broad spectrum of publics associated with their resources. This far exceeds past norms of public and community involvement that included membership in the Rotary or Lions Club of a local community. Managers new to an area can hope to find
a public involvement strategy in place but even then, they still must develop their own credibility and standing within the community of interests affecting their resource. This usually requires a period of three to four years regardless of the skill level of the manager involved. Of course, the next problem to solve in this example is that the manager involved transfers to a new area in three or four years and an unfamiliar person comes on board. Is there time allotted for the two managers to meet, discuss and explore strategies and working relationships? No, there is not.

** Specific actions must be taken so as to develop public groups, friends' groups, volunteer groups and others. These groups can provide important and candid input during public meeting processes and can help buffer meetings from becoming negative events and the tyranny of the minority. Groups such as these will retain their own identity, be candid and, hopefully, constructively critical of our decisions. They will have a more thorough understanding of our agencies and how they work, their goals, policies and the laws constraining decisions or actions. As informed groups working to help resolve issues, they will be positive forces in the public meeting process.
** More resources (time and money) must be committed to regular open houses, behind the scenes tours, working with broadly based community groups and becoming a participant in and out of resource communities. For larger and more complex resources this includes public affairs and community relations specialists to work with and advise management. A level of comfort is needed with the expenditure of these resources and the knowledge that programs such as this will save time and money and result in better management over the long term. How much money can be squandered on a major plan put on a shelf because of some problem real or imagined?

** Public meetings need to go beyond simple press announcements and the establishment of meeting times and dates. Specific groups and individuals, representing a full spectrum of views, should be invited to meetings because of what they can add to the process. To successfully do this requires credibility and trust but it can yield better public process.

** A part of every strategy is to know your publics and prioritize limited resources. Too much energy and too many resources can be spent dealing with fringe groups who have no interest
in seeing an issue resolved or moved forward. If a group is not interested in working with a manager in a meaningful and constructive fashion, then why continue to pour limited assets into a nonproductive process? Accept the fact that their position will not change and use your assets to work with groups or individuals who, although opposed, neutral or slightly favoring, are willing to listen and discuss the issue in a problem solving manner. While the use of the Freedom of Information Act as a harassing tactic has been developed to a fine art by some of our fringe groups, assets must be allocated to upholding the intent of that law. Agencies do not need to become so fixed on that process that it colors attitudes and relationships with valid groups and concerns.

**

Organizationally, managers of large and complex resources and communities need to be left in place for many years and not transferred or removed too frequently, assuming they are doing a competent job. It takes time to develop strong public programs and for local communities to get to know the managers. Ways need to be developed to reward and recognize employees who are willing to work for the long term in given resources and who think in the
long term rather than “how to turn a quick promotion or dollar”.

** Managers need further development and training in dealing with the stress and negative values associated with public process today. Too many of us will ultimately fall victim by taking criticism personally and having it affect job performance and health. Positive coping skills need to be taught to and experienced by field managers while strategies and other mechanisms are put in place.

** The values of sociology and the disciplines that deal with understanding people must be better understood by our agencies and resources committed to their use. Our focus needs to expand beyond resource disciplines to include an understanding of the communities and people that surround our resources and have impacts upon them.

There are many ways to develop positive public process, but we must be willing to commit the resources, the time and the energy to the process. We must also be willing to accept the fact that public process is here to stay and that our job is to find a way to make it positive and rewarding rather than resisting its implications. Managers today need to accept the risks associated with
creating new role models for successful management as the job being done today is vastly different from what it was even ten years ago. Finally, upper management must also be willing to allow field managers the opportunity for success and failure in a rapidly changing environment.

**Update 2018**

Agencies continue to have problems with public meetings and laws requiring application of the process. Some have gone to show and tell meetings, using exhibits, maps and flip charts with personnel standing by and answering questions. This keeps things at a conversational level and avoids a typical meeting format. However, there is still the problem of the 25 people attending and the agency getting a true read on reaction to the plan and alternative considerations. Hopefully there are some managers having success with public process and hopefully examples will continue to surface. Then too managers must be willing to commit funds for public meetings, to a planning process costing many thousands of dollars.

Major plans today fail for a couple of reasons. The plan is not thorough enough to get through public process or no matter the quality of the plan a group sues and sends it to court, or wins by having agencies, through
their attorneys, go limp and shelve the plan rather than
go to court. There is a slight alternative process called
removing all the controversial material and then imple­
menting a gutted plan.

On a bigger scale, the United States is currently in a
crisis generated by the media and politicians. Never have
we seen such personal attacks and cruel language spread
before the people of this Nation in pathetic attempts
to rule the country, not govern, rule. Public process is
now measured by how many rioters oppose a change
in law, judicial finding or government decision. Terms
like Hitler, fascist, racist, sexual predator are said by
the very people we elect to govern this country wisely.
Reputations of well-meaning and good people are
trashed for political advantage. Woe the politician that
once belonged to a fraternity or sorority, now fair game
for victimization. We have now implemented a rather
old code from China in America highly supported by
current media. You are guilty until proven innocent.

Many colleges and universities are being turned into
recruitment centers for my way or the riot way, social
unrest and disobedience. We worry about public process
at a time in our nation when the public and elected offi­
cials are permitted to lie, mislead and threaten without
impact, so long as the media agrees with the process.
The media was once called the Fourth Estate but now it
seems to want to move up, and the Fifth Estate certainly
seems appropriate. Why be concerned about things well above those of us who are average citizens? Because there is a large trickle down affect of all this into the communities and issues that we live in and that we live with. More so with each passing year.

Combined with rampant political correctness, public meetings in another decade may well be held on the streets between sides. If this change in our society continues, agencies will be well advised to begin thinking about public process, perhaps not in most of America, but certainly in many areas and the safety of our employees.
within the varied ranks of resource managing agencies at all levels of government, the National Park Service manages its resources in one of the most consistently conservative of ways. With its mission of delivering natural and cultural resources of all sizes and shapes into the hands of untold future generations in an “unimpaired” state, the National Park Service is often faced with philosophical dilemmas and cross-purposed decisions.

Unlike so many other agencies that focus their energies and attention on local and regional constituencies, the National Park Service has always worked with its visitors, not always local, and numerous national organizations, including Congress, as its constituencies.

The combination of conservative policies and national constituencies has resulted, over time, in the creation and use of island models and metaphors when describing the parks. Within local communities, parks
are often thought of as “elitist,” “not caring about their local communities,” “not contributing to the local economy,” “always buying out more lands and neighbors,” and “always opposing those things that are in the best interest of the community.”

My intent is to briefly explore why these attitudes exist, describe avenues open to the parks to change these perceptions and to define one model that might be useful in describing the characteristics of a national park island to local populations and our own employees—so as to increase their understanding of the social and cultural complexities of park management.

The policies of the National Park Service are designed to be very conservative and as unaffecting of the resource as possible while still dealing with growing numbers of users and visitors. Avoiding concepts such as manipulation, manmade change, politics and use, we honor and feel good about concepts such as preservation, the natural world in pre-Colombian times, nature’s way and modifiers that place constraints on concepts like use, such as limited use, controlled use, and modified use.

In forming management policies over many decades, often under political pressure from user groups and other key constituencies, we have built up a system of mental checks and balances that now threaten to topple strategic elements of our philosophy and long term mandates.
Our policies, which make us the unique institution we are, provide for no hunting, no mineral development or extractions, no timber or logging practices, no agriculture (except for small historical vignettes) and tightly controlled interaction with exotic species, pests and diseases. We also place limits on our visitors, the back country and, in general, how people use the resource and how we manage the resource for native species and processes such as wildfire.

From a resource extraction point of view almost all of our policies allow for local residents and populations to see the park as a "nonproductive" component of their region and economy. This is particularly true since parks were often created out of previously "productive" lands or are now viewed as containing valuable resources. Here, value is a time related concept, what once was cheap or plentiful can become expensive and scarce. Many communities, particularly in the West, are still bothered by the loss of tax-revenue because of the creation of federal, non-taxable lands, regardless of other economic gains that long ago surpassed the small return from taxes. This is true of National Park lands but not true of Forest Service lands that pay communities in-lieu of taxes.

Our need to manage usage, to often say no to the most harmless sounding of requests, coupled with sensitivity to our standing in local communities, where we are often considered outsiders and encouraged to do
so, leads us philosophically and pragmatically to defensive positions and postures. Perhaps we come to a place where we are unable to accept who we are and still interact with local communities in a positive or proactive fashion which is a true dead end.

Another aspect that assures our separation from the community, not extant in all national park areas, is the employee housing area. This idea, which was once needed due to isolation from housing markets, is now seriously in need of review. Like the military we often live “on base” (not all employees do, but most of our supervisory and management personnel do) and are separated from the very communities we try to live in and understand. It supports our being seen as isolated from the community. Yet in Park Service ranks, in extreme cases, the movement of a manager’s household from a park to a community is viewed as suspicious and with concern as though he/she was no longer caring of the park.

One of the reasons for this is our seeming inability to capitalize on our known strengths. Most, if not all, parks are gifted with dedicated and committed employees and exceptionally qualified seasonal staffs, which have been steeped in our traditions of preservation and resistance to change. For this and many other reasons managers often avoid or feel uncomfortable in embracing the social and economic idea of “parks make money for local communities.” Park managers who actively
support travel and tourism are often seen as agents of
the concessionaire or big business, becoming managers
who are neither knowledgeable of the value of resources
nor supportive of their protection. We have seemingly
lost our ability and our confidence to discuss and debate
economy and change for fear that if we talk about it we
might not control it. Conversely, some people seem to
think that if we don’t talk about it or bring it up then it
will go away and not bother us.

Why should parks be supporters of the travel and
tourism industry? Because in most areas our visitation
represents solid economic value for the community
and the regions in which parks are located. We need to
capitalize on this strength and use it to rebuild support
from our local and regional constituencies. At Glacier
National Park, for instance, this represents more than
$150,000,000 per year (1991) to the local economy
and represents a major industry for the area. In 2014,
2.3 million visitors to Glacier National Park spent
$193,000,000 in communities near the park. That
spending supported 3,405 jobs in the local area accord­
ing to then Superintendent of Glacier, Jeff Mow. (To be
in the business of protecting our parks, we need to at
least consider ourselves as having one foot in the tour­
ism industry. When the day comes that some parks have
carrying capacities for visitors, that foot will be a critical
one.)
This is not a fact to be shy or retiring about and it should be embraced as a positive way of involving the park in issues outside the park that might affect that industry, ranging from strip development to mineral extraction to subdivisions and loss of environmental values. The travel dollar, often viewed in local communities as nonproductive, is not fully understood in park communities for the very reason that we, a cornerstone of the local industry, haven't chosen to talk about it or highlight it. Often, where we have washed our hands of the industry, the talk is of low paying and seasonal jobs and of how the community must bring in industries that mean real money. Service sector jobs are not seen in the same light as timber industry jobs for instance, which are viewed as substantial, paying good wages, and contributing to the local economy--concepts certainly capitalized on by mill owners and managers as well as other industries. There is truth in some of those arguments, but a truth that diminishes over time assuming that resources are involved which must be replaced. The economic value of environmental resources conserved and protected grows over time while resource use and extraction industries tend to be roman candles. Some examples come to mind such as Butte and Virginia City, Montana, the oil fields of Texas, the coal fields of Pennsylvania and many more.

Our concepts are changing, but this represents an area in which park managers need to work to develop
strategies and the data to support not only significant park values but also the value of a major regional industry which helps them protect their resources. It is a series of critical strategies that can open doors of communication and support at the local and regional level without sacrificing park values. But first we must become comfortable with the image and the involvement if we are to succeed and become a better understood partner with our communities.

The concept of change is an interesting one when you are discussing the national parks. Our definition and understanding of change have lately evolved around a simplistic and inaccurate reading of Aldo Leopold and his use of the pre-Colombian metaphor. Our reading of it has resulted in trying to establish the national parks as pre-Colombian islands where man-caused changes brought about by European man are viewed as "unnatural." It has created a false tension in our management policies that need not exist and has seen us greatly overweight our philosophy against all change and our seeming acceptance of humans as an unnatural element.

The idea of change is further complicated by the difference that exists between natural and cultural resources as managed by the National Park Service. In natural areas our role is to assure change in the system that is evolutionary or natural but not man caused, change being one of the great natural engines that drives our system.
In historical or cultural areas our role is to somehow arrest the natural processes of change and preserve man's fragile construct into the vast future without breakage, termite holes, erosion, the effects of gravity or any other naturally occurring process. To allow Independence Hall to evolve naturally would see it a pile of rubble within several hundred years and thereby the failure to pass on a national treasure "unimpaired for future generations."

Within the tension of two different definitions for change there has emerged a philosophy, that man and his/her actions are unnatural—with the possible exception of pre-Colombian man. We find this definition of man being used in policy discussions and by our own conservation advocacy groups trying to prevent natural change within a resource or trying to limit the impacts of visitors who are often viewed as negative agents of change.

The solution to this amusing confusion is to simply accept biology, evolution and Darwin and also accept our responsibility to make management decisions that often lack simple definition. Man is a very natural creature or species and the works of man, whether positive or negative, are the works of nature in the same fashion as beaver dams, termite mounds and bee hives. A debate on this issue would result in the making of a strong case for cities and all they contain as natural constructs and a part of the natural processes of this world.
We cannot manage on the basis that our goal is to maintain natural parks unchanged by man since the time of Columbus nor on the pretense that we do not, even today, manipulate resources by management decisions—yet we try to.

Positive management and the future of our parks can only be secured through the application of realistic management philosophy, reflecting what has and is happening in our systems and accepting the responsibility for decisions and directions established.

All natural parks have been impacted by man, the species, and most will require active involvement in the future to leave them unimpaired for the future. Wilderness values are affected by air and water quality, conditions that often occur at great distance from the resource itself. They have been impacted by the creation of illogical political boundaries as opposed to more logical natural or ecological spheres of influence. Affected by years of mis-management by many agencies and groups, which saw "good" animals protected and "bad" animals destroyed, even to extinction in a system, with natural fire basically eliminated from the system for several decades.

It will require new approaches and definitions to correct these situations in coming decades and few will or should be corrected overnight. We must likewise accept the fact that man too, and his institutions, are evolving
and that the oft-quoted example of Industrial Age man is not our future, but, like the man of the Inquisition, just a moment of time. To be a steward will require far greater activity in and understanding of our resources, the abandonment of the easier laissez faire attitude of resources management and advanced training and development of our managers and personnel.

(An example [2018] of a hopefully far in the future management issue needing to be thought about in the next ten years or sooner. There are neither controls nor, seemingly, concerns about the world problem of population. In 2017, visitation to the National Parks was 331,000,000 people. Population of the United States in 2017 was 325,700,000 people. What is the carrying capacity of say, Yellowstone National Park, in order to protect its values and resources? In 2017 visitation was 4.3 million visitors. Can it sustain and protect itself in the future when visitation is 8 or 12 million from around the world? Don’t many parks have actual carrying capacities that can be sustained, implemented and provide a positive experience? Will this create issues and big problems? Sure, it will, so be proactive not reactive. How long should a visitor have to stand in line to use a bathroom? Ten minutes, half hour, hour or look for a bush. Of course, we can add tens more restrooms with additional impacts, but what do we want to do when it comes to delivering Yellowstone into the future, unimpaired?)
To achieve successful management within this concept will require markedly different patterns of involvement on the part of park managers and staffs. Much greater emphasis must be placed on understanding the biological and geological forces affecting the resources and on the sociological and cultural forces exhibited by visitors and within the neighborhoods of the parks or within the scope of the issue involved. We must cross an organizational bridge from the place we are to the place we need to be in the future, which will require resources and programs currently unavailable or ill defined.

It will also require a far greater willingness on the part of managers to be less secure and planned risk takers. Risk will become a larger part of our vocabulary and protection strategies will far exceed simple refusals and defensive posits with a reliance on answers and support from above.

Within the concentric rings of influence and interest which surround our parks, greater involvement will be needed with local and regional communities, as well as building stronger economic and environmental links. We will also need to understand sustainable economics and the need for a healthy economy that can sustain, unimpaired, a park system and its surrounding environment.

The following tries to illustrate a concentric ring model showing constituencies as they are currently pri-
oritized within park management philosophy and what they might be, under a reordering of priorities based on ecoregional problem solving and emphasis. This represents an average or general set of priorities as some resources are managed differently than others.

The above ideas can perhaps best be shown by an active model from within the natural system itself. This simplistic model will demonstrate key concepts of change and interaction and will also contain several logical "holes" which do not best fit the concept being presented. It is to be hoped, because there are so few models to use in trying to explain these concepts to public gatherings, employees and others, that the small gaps in logic will be understood, forgiven and made more plausible.

The model is based on a large island, resident in a river of some sizable volume and width—not unlike portions of the lower Mississippi River. The island itself represents a national park and the river is representative of society and people, their values, definitions, needs and perceptions that change over time, represented by the flow of the river downstream.

There are several other givens within this model:

** The river, being of considerable volume and draining a large portion of our continent, has been present for tens of thousands years and
has a good chance to continue to exist into the far future.

** The river will change over time, as it has changed with time. The river bed has grown in size, changed channels, handled small flows and huge floods and has remained consistent with the overall laws of nature and physics.

** The large island has been created over time by the forces of nature and is currently well out toward the middle of the river. The force of the river is gradually moving the island downstream -- it's migrating -- with the river because of the force of moving water, soil, sand and flood.

** The island, while largely rock, sand and soil, houses vegetation, several animal species and has other resources that the river has brought to it and deposited. Large trees occupy the small hills and not only help to anchor the vegetation but also give shelter and presence.

In general, then, let’s first consider management of the island as a national park within pre-Colombian philosophies and with a view of manmade change as negative. In this scenario management’s function is to try and protect or buffer the island from the effects of the river. Huge breakwaters and seawalls are constructed
around the island to considerable height so as to prevent the island from migrating downstream over time, as it is naturally wanting to do. The effects of the river are “controlled” and immediate visible change is prevented, but this manipulation of the system is not without its own critical flaws. The strength of the natural system, over time, far exceeds the strength of our constructs and protective devices.

At first, management is pleased with the results of its work. From within the island things look very natural and while society (the river) has changed its values and definitions the walls seem to be doing an excellent job of holding back the current. Closer examination, however, reveals several facts which should be alerting managers to future problems. The wall, sunk down into the island’s margins has created a series of new natural eddies at its base and materials are being washed away and the wall undercut. At the downriver point of the island some materials are being built up and a sand spit is beginning to grow and it’s actually becoming quite sizeable. In the future it might bury the wall if not removed regularly.

There comes a time when the island does move and when it moves it is the wrenching move of the unprepared resource and is cataclysmic in nature. A large flood has washed over the island, a flood that could not be held back by the walls and sandbags of management. The very nature of the walls, creating swirling currents,
result in even greater damage to the island and more removal of material than might have occurred otherwise. Afterwards, a few crumbled elements of wall remain but the island has moved to a point near the far end of the old island, built there upon the tangled root masses of old trees and other materials washed up and caught.

Having resisted all change and having tried to prevent change, we failed. The values, definitions and concerns of the river (the people) had changed over time and continued to change; definitions and values which we no longer seemed to understand or appreciate, nor were perceived to meet. A society which no longer understood us, found us to be an obstacle to its growth and development and so, by the process of congressional action changed our mandate and our policies--a flood sweeping away obstacles in its path.

While the danger of cataclysmic change always exists, a natural management of the island might provide better chances for survival and even growth during flood stages. The most important element in a more natural management regimen is to accept the laws of nature and accept that the laws of man are also the laws of nature, whether we agree with them or not.

In natural management we appreciate and understand how society changes and how the river influences our island. Instead of fighting these processes we provide for them -- knowing that over time the island will migrate
downstream and will change. Our job in this system is to allow the island to breathe and move slowly over time, trying to avoid sudden movements and shifts. As a rule, change in the national parks should never be as rapid as that which occurs in our society. Damage can only result when we try to carry out rapid policy changes that are based on changing societal values and needs. The sudden emphasis on the automobile in the 1930’s and changing definitions of camping are examples of moving too quickly to meet new standards without “consulting” with the resource first. As a result, we have many parks with roads, visitor facilities and campgrounds in critical habitat or consuming resources that were more critical for other uses. We also have a seeming inability to now change those patterns for the better, even today, when we know a little more about the resource. This also represents a catch-22 between natural and historical management policies as some of the structures occupying critical habitat have now become historic and can be removed only with great difficulty and public opposition.

We expect that movement will occur in our island and that movement will be with society and downstream. Our job is to support buffers and catchments that help to create constructive eddies and a system of expanding growth from the island’s edge. These flats, attached to the island but not “owned” by the island, provide greater surface area to protect the park from floods and pro-
vide a buffer for societal change near the island but not within it. It is in these surrounding flats that our neighboring communities flourish and which are so critical to the island itself, for here there is a natural symbiotic relationship. Properly cultivated and worked with, these communities become fellow travelers and companions on the journey. They help to provide for society's needs and to buffer the park from some new technologies and definitions, at least until proven in the larger system. What is more important, these areas are also vital to the park's natural residents as range and for food and migration, if properly planned and implemented.

By not blocking off the island and by actively working outside the boundaries, management can begin to understand and actually study the river and its characteristics. They become experts at predicting weak points and in shoring up to prevent loss before it occurs. With time they build constructs at the foot of the island to serve as anchors for passing materials, allowing the island to remain in the mainstream and preventing it from migrating too close to shore where it might become permanently fixed—losing its identity altogether. This directional growth would allow for controlled migration over time, within limits, but it is a policy based on working with the surrounding environment and a set of highly developed management abilities that must be supported and encouraged.
Here then is a summary of some of the key ideas represented by the model:

** Parks are in the mainstream of society due not only to their popularity as attractions and destinations but because of the philosophy and policies that they currently represent. There is a romantic attachment with the very idea of a national park and its relative stability in a river of rapid change.

** The National Park Service must never lose sight of the fact that the river created the island and that it depends upon the river for its existence and continuance. As a philosophical entity the island is virtually unique in the world of today, thus its popularity and its vulnerability.

** Even though the river created the island, the island is still dependent on the forces immediately surrounding it, for they shape and facilitate the island’s movement downstream and provide buffering during times of flood.

** The island cannot remain stagnant and simply cease to move, having neither the energy nor resources it would require fighting the river nor the ability to survive the huge floods that eventually result.
** In migrating downstream, if we attempt to figure out the forces affecting us and are vigilant in understanding the island and its environs, we can slow change while not affecting the island and provide some sense of direction for the island in the mainstream. But we must take into account the changing values flowing by and around the island.

** The island was created at a time when the river was much broader and shallower, whereas today the waters are running more quickly and have taken on more depth—thus increasing their potential effects on the island and increasing our need for knowledge and understanding.

** If the island is successful it will, over time, grow in size and begin to have noticeable effects on the river itself, at least near the island. Its growth will not be achieved by the purchase of river bottom or flat, but by the strength of its concepts, becoming a core area in a much broader system where change is also slowed and where sustainable economic growth occurs.

** Species and inhabitants of the island await the development of broader areas around the periphery, for their survival is dependent on them. Species leaving the island today are too often swept away by the rapidly moving deep
waters and lost. We must instead see the con­cepts of mutual survival and sustainable econ­omies grow to the point of recognizing and providing for the needs of species when away from the core.

There are other aspects that the model might help us with, in terms of defining an image for a difficult and often misunderstood mission. If we are to move forward however, we must come to grips with the river and accept it for the powerful and supportive force it has been and can be.

**Update 2018**

It would be nice to think that the NPS trains its managers in the concepts presented, rather than man­agers individually stumbling onto them, piece by piece. There are those that reach out and do but then after four or five years are moved. A replacement comes in with no understanding or management orientation and the do becomes the undone. As a result, another set of communities is exposed to the inconsistent and confusing niche occupied in their community by one of our national parks. Much work remains to be done in the training and transfer of managers and their affect on a resource unimpaired for future generations.
A Critical Appraisal Of The
National Park Service

(Written in 1991 with 2018 Updates to Follow)

When I joined the National Park Service in 1962, it was 46 years old and it seems strange to me, 30 years later, that my career has seen more than a third of the organization’s history.

It’s been a marvelous career, spanning as it does the period from Mission 66 (pre-public involvement) to the period of infrastructure decay and extremely complex public process and environmental review. It covers a time when government service, inspired by President Kennedy (“ask not what the country can do for you, but rather what you can do for the country”) was a sought after career. It was also a time of attacking government service for the problems of poorly written laws, our changing society and the cost of government. It has witnessed a dramatic shift in the styles and concerns of managers as we have moved from the more military
styled leaders of the 1960’s to the more diplomatic, process oriented managers of the present (team players). It has seen a transition in our work force from people who would hardly ever question authority to those who almost always question authority. In short it has been an Orient Express of careers.

The National Park Service has always been an extended family, perhaps a society or a club at times, and this remains unchanged today. The meaning and significance of this relationship has changed over time pressured by politics and decreasing budgets. It is a family not fully understood by some Directors, who have chosen to be diplomatic, instead of creatively feisty within and away from the family.

Experiencing the change of the last thirty years, it is not surprising that we are an organization with a resolve that has dimmed, an organization in search of philosophical reaffirmation during a time of extreme change and a “family” seeking not just management but leadership and vision.

What follows is nothing new nor is it unique to one individual. It represents the thoughts and concern of many authors, critics from outside the Service, and hundreds of my fellow employees and retirees. This is simply one more attempt to clarify that the problems are known, and that support is needed for their solution. Solutions that are available and known.
Research and Knowledge of the Resource

There is a common truism among salespersons that to represent a product you must know it. Perhaps we never considered ourselves to be salespersons or perhaps we felt that our product was natural evolution and we didn’t need to understand it but to keep out of its way. Whatever the reason, we simply have not committed the resources necessary to an understanding of our parks. As parks have come under increasing pressure this lack of scientific and resource knowledge has become a critical issue and is endangering resources and our ability to properly manage complex ecosystems, fragile history and linked habitats.

Regardless of the type of resource (natural, historic, archaeological), we need to more fully understand and monitor that which we are managing in 1991 -- 80,000,000 acres, 25,000,000 museum objects, 25,000 historic structures, and the heritage of our nation. Simply stated, we know some of the archaeology, some of the history and a little bit about a few of the species or the geology of our natural parks, but our total knowledge still falls far short of our need. Every site we manage, including the recreation areas, is a complex ecosystem within a complex ecosystem, attached to an extensive bio-region. To manage such systems requires extensive and long term programs that are multi-disci-
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plinary, based not only on the resources within the park’s political boundary, but also on the resources within the attendant ecological systems and regions.

The obstacles that have prevented us from fully understanding the resources we manage are diverse and many. Some of the more significant ones, not in any priority order, would include:

**Organizational turf**

Competition and lack of cooperation between science, resource management and cultural disciplines results in our inability to establish service-wide programs and goals that are then consistently carried out across the ten diverse regions of the National Park Service (seven regions in 2018). We still tend to think within our organizations that we are wholes as opposed to parts of a greater organizational ecology.

**The Leopold Report**

As surprising as that may seem to those conversant with the Leopold report, it is true that management’s tendency to oversimplify the “parks in pre-Colombian times” concept has affected resource knowledge in some of the large national parks. I have visited with management personnel and others who believe that to achieve “Leopold’s goals” we need to be passive stewards rather
than active managers. Expenditure of limited dollars on research, to them, is a misuse of funds. I've also heard it stated that there may be things out there we don't want to know, as though knowledge could be used against us. (Anyone choosing to be a victim can always become one, regardless the source or cause.)

**Failure to make our case**

Given the significance of the resources we manage our research budgets are almost nonexistent and have been that way for decades. Some would make the case that things are much better than they were and there are some excellent science programs out there (a few). Even so we are still talking about dimension and depth. We have neither truly documented our full need, nor have we received the full understanding and support of decision makers for research needs and their importance.

Even those science programs that exist are generally created out of a reaction to a crisis, not as part of a proactive system of learning about and monitoring the system. If bears eat people, scientists study bears, when wolves reemerge in a system, scientists study wolves and if bricks at Independence Hall begin dissolving because of rain, scientists study bricks. This doesn’t qualify as a science program, it is a system of political response. Where are scientists and science programs accomplish-
ing full scale interdisciplinary research to understand complex ecosystems? Where have we begun building the necessary data and monitoring strategies for predictable future issues and problems?

Our science and resource management programs need national leadership that extends well beyond science personnel and they require a large investment of people and funds if our parks are to survive unimpaired into the future. The poor management decisions that result from inadequate knowledge and incomplete long term monitoring of key indicators will not assure resources for future generations.

Military Base Mentality

For years we have managed on the strength of our national constituencies and have been less involved with those constituencies close by the parks, constituencies that tend to be more critical and opposed to our management policies and goals. This mentality on the part of managements and staff, which is slowly changing in many places, has impeded our ability to think regionally and beyond our boundaries, thereby influencing our goals and problem statements in research planning. Politically, we have often been unwilling to address problems outside the parks because of political pressures brought by narrow but vocal constituencies.
**Staff Changes**

Another scenario in the National Park Service deals with staff development; to progress or advance, you must, in general, move (transfer) between parks and resources. The concept is supportable from several points, but we have few management concepts in place to assure long-term and consistent management of our resources. Each person and each ego upon becoming Superintendent of an area, tends to change focus or direction upon arriving at a resource because of better ideas and the need to convince supervisors of their ability.

This system leaves public programs (i.e., visitor centers, restrooms, campgrounds) unaffected and even improved, but it has maximum impact on park neighbors, land acquisition programs, consideration of what constitutes a threat, and science and resource management programs. Monitoring programs, which should literally be for the life of the resource, bob up and down like apples at a Halloween party dependent on budgets and personalities. We monitor one year (or one decade), but stop the next, based on someone’s judgment of need or relevance, or how to expend very limited dollars (what’s hot and what’s not). This precludes sound resource management and it represents one of the most perplexing blind spots in our organization; particularly irritating since the solutions are easily carried out.
There isn’t a manager in the system who isn’t committed to the mission of the Service and yet our processes for management, employee development and career ladders are political and not suited to our resources. Who is addressing the resource needs for the future and how to fund those needs? Where is the staff training to make the case for long-term resource programs and stability? Why can’t we design programs for 50 to 100 years and beyond, base fund those monitoring and resource needs and then insulate them from the arrival of new managers every five to ten years? Why can’t we meet emerging new needs with new dollars and programs instead of leaving one program behind as we react to another? Obviously, we can, given the leadership and vision necessary, but if we can’t do this, then we need to evaluate our ability to carry resources into the future, unimpaired.

Sociological Research

As little as we currently know about our park resources, there is another area that further defines how out of balance we are in understanding the nature of the resources we manage. With a dual mandate to both conserve and use resources, leaving them unimpaired for future generations, we are presented with a very difficult set of values to understand and translate into management action. We have, as already said, a rudimentary
understanding of the natural and historical resources and processes that we manage, but we have chosen to place the impacts of a major species outside the scope of most studies. “Man”, as a species, is a critical component of the philosophical basis of parks, the prime user in the “use” part of our mandate. The component that most affects our defining mission, the quality of our resource and its value.

Many years ago, Freeman Tilden in “Interpreting Our Heritage” dealt with the people component and their need to understand the parks and their values, to assure their support and survival into the future. It was an active and interactive participation, with our visitors experiencing an educational or interpretive set of mediums and processes.

But now we not only have insufficient funds to work with the ideas of Freeman Tilden, we also are not rigorously moving ahead in our understanding of who our users are. Simple statistical analysis of where they come from and how long they stay does not meet our need for understanding the resource. What are the values they seek, the values they bring with them, the values altered or changed by their visit, if any? How is their use of parks changing and are the values that support the existence of the resources changing, altered by new technology and a changing society?
We have major information and resource monitoring needs in basically understanding our users and in understanding the broad communities in which parks find themselves. Sociology and cultural anthropology represent major research components in which we do almost no work at all. At Valley Forge, statistical data shows that for every visitor who comes to understand the history of the area there are four visitors coming for recreation. (Annual use statistics for the two categories; 1,000,000 to 4,000,000). Commuters through the park are the last statistic and that comes in at about 8,000,000. A danger for the park to be called Valley Forge National Recreation Area or Valley Forge Parkway?

I have spoken about the need to understand our product, but a corollary to this is our serious need to understand the consumer and user of the product. A product, even a unique idea like the National Parks, can fail because we either do not understand it and cannot market it to our publics or because we have lost touch with our customers and our supporters and no longer understand them.

Because of our concern for politics and the fear that sociology might somehow provide ammunition to our critics we have lost time in an important field of study. We have avoided sociology and visitor/community research for a number of reasons including:
** Inadequate resources (people and money).
** Lack of pressure by universities and institutions to perform valid research in these disciplines, or our lack of acceptance.
** Our philosophical inability to believe that this research needs to be done because our job is to protect the resources from people and, as a corollary, not to understand the people.
** Too much emphasis has been placed on the concept that humans are the invader of the natural world and that all the actions of man are ultimately manipulative or bad. Yet it is man that saw the need to create the National Parks and to protect their values.
** The fear that if we study people and their values, we will implement change and permit negative impacts on our policies as a result. As an example, if a study shows that of 1,000 people randomly selected, 800 say they love snowmobiling, then parks, or a specific park, must permit snowmobiling because of political pressure, ergo knowledge is a dangerous thing. This concern says negative things about our system if managers fear knowledge because it may lead to loss of control on an issue. This is a counterproductive pattern that needs to be changed so that confidence can
be restored in a process that exists outside the vernacular of “what’s hot and what’s not.” To do so demands hard decisions on the part of our managers and enough knowledge of the resource to understand both the values of users and communities as well as the need of the underlying resources. Additionally, the ability and willingness to say yes or no on controversial issues and to communicate the reasoning for decisions, a critical skill needed by all managers. Including support from upper management instead of conflict avoidance.

** Lack of adequate management exposure and training in the sociological disciplines and their values.

** Failure to create a Park Management structure that includes women and minorities and broadens our approach to problem solving and understanding publics. (This is changing due to court orders and more enlightened management.)

**Condition of Park Infrastructure**

The parks are suffering from a severe long term deterioration of infrastructure and while some are in worse shape than others, no area smells or looks like a
rose. Current structural assessments put our infrastructure maintenance backlog at $2,000,000,000 but that is an unrealistic figure. Glacier National Park alone would absorb $150,000,000 of that amount in meeting its current structural, historical buildings' needs, utility systems and general backlog problems. What do the other 353 areas need?

(2018 Update. The maintenance backlog is now at $12,000,000,000 plus, the park system has grown to 417 parks, 23 national scenic and national historic trails, and 60 wild and scenic rivers, and we now manage 84,000,000 acres.)

To make matters even more difficult, new construction continues unabated in new areas or in areas with particularly active or influential congressional delegations or members. New areas are new and old areas are ... going, going ...

Some funds have been provided for health and safety and selected special emphasis programs, but these funds could best be described as holding ground or marking time. There is no clear initiative in place at the national level that will clear up this backlog in the future. Lacking such an initiative we are losing infrastructure, both historical and non-historical regardless of coping strategies.

It isn't that we have to deal with this issue all at once, but our infrastructure requires far greater annual
reinvestment than currently available. The levels of funding being applied to new construction should be severely reduced and targeted instead for existing facilities. Savings would accrue not only by not having to replace structures in the future but also from reduced maintenance and operation expenditures in the present. If we can't achieve these needed funds through appropriations, then the parks should be permitted to establish realistic entrance and user fees; retain those fees in the parks where collected and use those funds for infrastructure improvements and operational needs. It would require decades to overcome our deficiencies using this process alone but we could at least begin to address the issue.

For park construction projects, the National Park Service should strongly consider use of locally based Architectural and Engineering firms who can best provide architectural designs and standards from the region of the park involved and be conversant with local ecosystem issues. There is also a need to strongly reaffirm construction and operating cost linkages rather than designing one of a kind buildings and then be unable to maintain them at decent levels because of a lack of maintenance and utility dollars. Too many designs, over the years, have given parks extensive cubic footage at high per cubic foot maintenance cost, but very inadequate square footage that is ultimately where the visitor
and the exhibit or use resides. The Service could benefit locally and dollar wise if public comment didn’t end with a signed concept plan, but also provided for public input on draft building designs and architectural plans.

**Park Operating Budgets**

To arrive at operating levels that would allow for most parks to meet their mission would not require major task forces or study groups; simply double every park's budget in the system and then annually adjust for inflation, pay raises and Federal Employee Retirement System (FERS) expenses. For the very few parks with current budgets over eight million dollars, the increase could be 50 percent with the same annual adjustments as noted above and for central offices a 15 percent increase in base budget and provision for annual pay, inflation and FERS costs. All of this simply brings us back to an even playing field after 15 years of enforced budget restrictions and the absorption of numerous new programs and mandates from new legislation, but in no way reduces the infrastructure maintenance backlog.

It will not be cheap, but this represents what it will take to overcome years of absorbing pay increases, new personnel programs, new health and safety standards, new laws and inspection programs, increasing public process costs, and etc. As one example, support
costs for the old Civil Service Retirement Program were about 15 percent of base salary on average while for the new Federal Employee’s Retirement System it’s rapidly approaching 40 percent. This represents a major percentage increase in the costs paid from park funds with no reimbursement. It also reflects the replacement of aging vehicle fleets, increased fuel costs, garbage handling costs, utilities, and the price of that old standby, couldn’t do without it, toilet paper.

The shortages we face and that seemingly grow worse each year have many consequences. One is that many of our best employees are leaving after a few years because other agencies can pay more for the skills our employees have. Our long suffering seasonals, weary of being cut back year after year, are departing or giving up hope that the job that needs to be done can ever be done again.

(Park Operations – The 2018 NPS budget request is $3.3 billion. This is a decrease of $183 million below 2017, resulting in a decrease of some 1,200 full time employees.)

The parks have absorbed new workloads and new initiatives beyond the breaking point and reasonable assurance of employee health. If we are not going to receive additional operating funds because of other
national priorities, then the time has come to do or seek the following:

** Place a moratorium on adding new areas to the system unless and until the infrastructure backlog is eliminated and park budgets reflect actual needs.

** Limit “new construction” funding and put the emphasis on funding infrastructure projects that are currently sapping large amounts of park operating funds for maintenance because of age, efficiency or technology.

** Prioritize every National Park Service unit in the system for resource value, heritage, significance, etc. It has been done with military bases and can be done similarly by a nationally respected commission for parks. Working with the Congress, adjust operating dollars as follows (recognizing there are different formulas to use): Fully fund the operating needs of the parks at the top of the list, by reallocating operating funds from areas at the bottom of the list. Physically close and put into caretaker status the lowest priority units up to an agreed upon number. Of the remaining say 325 still open areas, the top 100 resources would be fully funded; the second 100 would be funded
at 75 percent; and the last 100 would be at 50 percent with the remaining units at caretaker status. (These numbers are based on the number of 1991 NPS units). Should Congress choose to fund beyond these limits, it would be in their power to do so.

These represent some radical changes in the way we do business, but the patient is sick, very sick, and needs either a total cure or serious bed rest. We cannot keep up the present scenario of working in a driving rain with a high fever and dysentery and still be expected to perform at increasingly high levels and standards.

Leadership and Philosophy

Thirty years ago in 1961, the National Park System had what many might consider today to be a very good system of management. To be fair, it was a system that was not yet subject to the many new pressures of the 1970s, 80s and 90s, including numerous new laws with programmatic elements, attempts at micromanagement through the political process and 354 areas and 80,000,000 acres. It was not yet subject to large and often controversial public processes, negative public attitudes about government employees at all levels and large numbers of visitors. That earlier management system
had its flaws, many of them, but it functioned quite well in the following ways:

** New personnel (025 series) in the interpreter and ranger series attended extensive training at Horace Albright Training Center. While it was short-sighted in not including other disciplines, at least it was an attempt to build key skills and philosophical understandings in a few of our employees. This built an initial cadre of fellow travelers with whom you lived and sweated for three months (boot camp) and a group to remain in touch with over a career. The training function was directly responsible to the Director and was his/her tool for shaping the future of the system.

** There was one park system headed by one director who functioned as the key political strategist for the system. This was best epitomized by George Hartzog who was Director for much of the 1960's. Today there are in effect ten systems (now seven) each headed by a regional director, often with their own agendas, political connections and policy interpretations. As a result, political focus and strategy have been misplaced and so have organizational control and effectiveness. Congress gets
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To hear one problem with three solutions; the park, the region and Washington all with different costs and needs. Congressional support? **

Central offices were smaller and were staffed by experienced field personnel, particularly in the key jobs and particularly in the Washington Office. There was a greater need for field units to be independent and some problems did occur as a result of this. But the present system of heavily staffed central offices, often lacking the presence of large numbers of experienced field staff has also created problems by making the Service more a general bureaucracy and less the National Park Service. More counterproductive second guessing now occurs between regions and their parks and personality is now allowed to play too great a role in our decision making and prioritization processes. The Washington office has far fewer field personnel in key positions and is now largely felt to be out of touch with the field and its rapidly changing needs. While this may or may not be the case it has resulted in lost time and aimless debate on key issues.

To put this into simple perspective the organization is no longer orienting and training employees in all
career fields at the level that is needed. Leadership is not being fully exerted by the Director's office in establishing clear goals and directions for the regions and then assuring compliance. Central offices need more personnel in key positions who have field experience, increased training and should be reduced in size to levels in keeping with our present budget crisis. Field personnel should be required to fill key jobs in all regions and Washington as part of their management development, and people now in the central office should be required and given the opportunity to gain experience in field operations.

Political strategy should again become the principal responsibility of the Director with clear priorities and goals established for this program. Our difficulty in obtaining support for budget increases is more a problem of our own making, as Congressional Sub-Committees have grappled with the lack of clear direction from the National Park Service, more than anything else. The issue can be partially resolved by reassertion of leadership and professional representation. The repeating refrain echoed over the past 15 years of “No, Mr. Chairman, the parks are funded at adequate levels and we have no serious needs,” or “Yes Mr. Chairman, we can continue to meet our needs.” must end and be replaced with professional and candid advice to the Congress and the Executive Branch.
**Political Process**

For many individuals and groups, the National Park System has become politicized to a far greater degree than they deem to be appropriate for the system. Some professionals in the Service have been content to select the "I can’t do anything about it" button, which, as a result, has created a new, and not always productive, political dimension within the Service. Directors have been instructed to support party lines while Regional Directors and Superintendents work behind the scenes to say, “it isn’t so.”

The very process of an orderly budget submission has become a facade. It’s hard to remember when a request for additional operating funds submitted via the formal process was productive for a park. Parks have been mostly told not to submit needs because no funding is available, unless the park is a new or developing area. In order to obtain funds for operational deficiencies, managers now pray for a key member of Congress to be a strong supporter of their park and that they will work hard to achieve funding.

What is needed is a chance to regain the agency’s professional standing, to have elected officials willing to accept our opinions and positions as a part of the decision making process. It’s not that we can’t afford a properly funded and managed National Park System
because we can, but rather are we willing to give it the funding priority that its resources deserve? There are 330,000,000 people in this country. Why has NPS leadership not chosen to engage them in the political fight for support by making hard decisions that require media attention

**Employee Development and Training**

There was a time when the training branch reported directly to the Director and was, or at least had the opportunity to be, a key player in developing employees along professional lines and in support of the Director's initiatives.

Today, because of budget constraints, travel fund limitations, and a general de-emphasis on anything other than basic training, the training division has been placed several levels down from the Director at a time of great change in our country.

Employees do have needs for the excellent training currently given but it doesn't go far enough in a complex system including employee development plans and career ladders for numerous skills and specialties as well as required training such as to maintain law enforcement commissions, sewer operator certifications and the like.

Much of our training has turned from the very necessary aspects of philosophy, vision and future needs to
the maintenance of a basic equilibrium because of the current shortages of funds and people in the parks.

We have required training, skills training, program training (EO, Safety, etc.), correspondence courses, entry level training, SES (Senior Executive Service) training, and OPM courses for executives. But our organization's philosophies and the intricacies of our mission and policies demand far more from our training programs. To grow we must invest in our future and reemphasize advanced levels of professional training as part of that growth.

At Glacier National Park during 1989 a series of seminars for all permanent employees at Glacier was conducted to deal with basic orientation to the National Park Service. This is the National Park Service, its policies, and what we are trying to do. Of the approximately 90 employees who attended the three seminars, some with careers beginning in the 1950's and the 1960's, less than 15 percent had received any training in the mission of the National Park Service or received basic orientation to the agency.

That is an unusually low percentage for most parks, but I would be surprised to find any large park with a percentage higher than 20 or 25 percent. If properly funded, an agency committed to its resources and to its employees, would see this figure closer to 90 to 95 percent of the total.
It is no wonder that our local communities, where many of our permanent and seasonal employees live, are so often given counterproductive or negative interpretations of what a park is doing by our own employees who do not understand the mission or the National Park System.

To help the National Park Service in overcoming some of these problems the following could be put into effect:

** Establishment of a training and employee development division that answers directly to the Director of the National Park Service and which has the same standing as one of the service centers to attend meetings with Regional Director's and other policy level discussions.

** Development of comprehensive, full needs training programs with all costs identified for presentation to Congress as a high Service priority. This will be needed to obtain adequate funding levels for a comprehensive training program supported by training offices as opposed to benefiting account funding. Current levels are completely inadequate for an agency such as the National Park Service and places serious constraints on the existing
training division meaning we cannot possibly meet the needs of our people or the resources.

** Revitalization and complete rethinking of the current training program, including Mather and Albright Training Centers with attention given to include executive training for managers and policy development programs.

** Develop a program that will:

++ Conduct extensive employee orientation and familiarization with the Service mission for all employees of the Service in a setting that promotes development of interdivisional working relationships.

++ Provide necessary skills training to meet various commission, license and legal requirements.

++ Provide advanced level education for interpreters, rangers, maintenance, administration, management, concessions and other employees. We have extensive development needs for our employees and must be careful to offer targeted levels for various or different resources.
+++ Increased support, beyond that available in the Albright Fund, for independent study and sabbaticals by employees.

+++ Formal arrangements with selected universities for executive and advanced needs covering a wide variety of topics and for extended periods of time.

+++ Formal arrangements for a recurring series of management training opportunities in policy and resource management, associated with a name university program(s). This would provide for inclusion of representatives from non-governmental organizations, critics of the Service, personnel from other agencies, and other organizations or groups. The purpose would be to provide for full and candid debate and discussion of issues, the establishment of networks for professionals involved in interdisciplinary and inter-agency problem solving.

+++ Achieve adequate park staffing levels so as to give all employees an opportunity for two to three weeks of training each year, without mission impact or loss of needed operating funds.
++ Encourage and fund park training budgets for the development of local employee assistance programs and on-site training opportunities.

++ Provide for cross-training and special details at other park units to help in broadening employee experience and problem solving skills.

++ Establish a policy center, similar to Grey Towers in the United States Forest Service, for the National Park Service that would be a stimulant for policy and vision discussion within the organization. It would provide seminars and advanced degree programs for the Service's leadership. One possible location for such a program would be the Presidio in San Francisco, California in partnership with Stanford University or a similar institution.

It is imperative that this program, or another like it, begins soon because we will, within the decade of the 1990's, lose a large number of our senior managers to retirement. We have done precious little to prepare for that future and to develop the managers who will be needed to lead us in that future and beyond to our next future.
(This entire training section was fully developed by a team representing all disciplines from 1994 to 1996 but was found to be unnecessary by the Director's Leadership Council in 1996). The plan would have increased spending for NPS training and development from 1% to 3% and could have been implemented in phases over years.)

The Senior Executive Service

Even as this is written (March 1991), Congressman Bruce Vento, Chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, has let it be known that he will not support conversion of several senior park superintendents to the Senior Executive Service (SES), based on a recommendation recently made by the National Park Service. It is important that he not change his position on this issue.

The SES program has an alluring siren song associated with it regarding the development and payment of our top senior career managers. Training, development, careers across agency lines, much improved pay scales (pay increases of up to $25,000 just approved) and yearly job bonuses are but a few of the sirens at work. These are important elements for the support and retention of senior field managers but as currently set up the
potential political price for these benefits is simply too
great, particularly for managers of our finest resources.

Its first application in the National Park Service,
when the program was first initiated by the Carter
Administration, was to transfer a Regional Director to
the Bureau of Mines. Since that time another Regional
Director has retired under protest because of manip­
ulation of his annual evaluation by a former Assistant
Secretary of Interior's office and two Regional Directors,
one from the National Park Service and one from the
United States Forest Service, have retired or resigned
under protest of political manipulation of their jobs and
careers.

This has become a serious problem and the percep­
tion of the program, and perhaps the reality, is grow­
ing more negative over time. Many employees of the
National Park Service are long term careerists because
they believe in the agency's mission and yet have no
intention of joining the current SES program so long as
political agendas, thinly disguised as career opportuni­ties, continue to be present.

If a person is not doing their job, then remove or
transfer that person, but let's get beyond the political
charade of sending people to another agency for "career
advancement." If we can no longer politically afford pro­
fessional and candid management by our top careerists,
what have we become? Professionals are paid to represent
unpopular views and they intend to do so, to the best of their ability, and they should not be labeled as problems for doing so or be given thinly disguised “career advancement opportunities” as discipline.

Given its present application, will the SES program identify and retain our brightest career people (a stated goal of the program)? Not under these conditions. Many eligible people, but certainly not all, are applying for the program because of the salary differentials and that impact on retirement benefits. Others are not interested because they do not wish to work for another federal agency in their career or are concerned that their professional integrity will be compromised by political appointees.

In the National Park Service, the Director had suggested setting up several of our largest parks for SES positions based on criterion that was not fully communicated. While well intentioned, this would seem to be counterproductive. Our goal should be to protect our superintendents from being unfairly pressured by political forces and vocal constituencies, not expose them to further risk of manipulation. There was a requirement in the Director’s proposal for the jobs identified, that they would only be available to career personnel from other agencies. Unfortunately, that doesn’t resolve the issue. There are many people who would like to manage the major parks and the pool of talent available from
other agencies covers a wide difference of personality and background; from active - proactive to passive - reactive approaches. The characteristics of top management can be radically altered by simply selecting risk averse and conflict avoidance personalities.

If the system can identify these folks, so can political appointees who reserve review and clearance authorities on these appointments. The large “troublesome” resources with contentious resource issues could soon be managed by “philosophically compatible” career personnel; the parks and the American people would be the losers.

Until the system is changed, and professionals are treated as such, the parks should be excluded from the SES program. For the present, attention should be given to changing the program in a positive way. We are already losing applicants for key positions such as Regional Directors and other key policy staff, because these jobs are now reserved for SES personnel only.

When an SES manager in the NPS can obtain a large bonus for work performance and that bonus must be approved by the Secretary of the Interior, who does the Superintendent work for? What pressure can a political appointee of either party apply to the management of our prime resources?
When I went to Glacier as Superintendent, I went to a park that, in 1980, had labeled itself, via a self-administered process, as the most threatened park in the system. Threats such as subdivisions, oil and gas wells, forest management, strip development, grazing, and many others were identified. Full scale, numbered maps have appeared in several publications, to further define our state of being threatened.

Frankly, the process was hyperbole and more a symptom of our own internal problems, rather than external threats. When I say this, I draw a clear distinction between a “threat” and an “issue” and state unequivocally that park managers must be able to tell the difference, so as to differentiate immediate tactics from long term strategy.

A threat is imminent and present danger, demanding solution. It is that unhappiest of times when someone has their hands around your throat and clear intent in their eyes. An issue does not have the intensity of a threat. It is open to solution by dialogue, discussion and long term thinking. While any issue can become a threat, particularly if we leave it alone and don’t interact with it, it can also be resolved and dealt with quite routinely.

Glacier has many issues but, fortunately, few current threats. Why do we like to deal in terms of threat
rather than issue? We simply are not trained in the processes needed to keep threats from happening; we too often think of the parks as reserves and generally are not experienced or confident enough at interacting on issues outside our “reserves”. Threats are also more comfortable since they have traditionally been solved for us by special interest groups and the Congress. We are also more comfortable with threats because other people (key constituencies) have specific interests in viewing issues as threats, and perhaps most important of all, threats often get funded and issues don’t.

One of the often used and traditional policies for solving threats in the National Park Service has been use of land acquisition and expanded boundaries. This was often used in the past and certainly through the 1980’s, but more and more this policy should be one of absolute last resort, being relied upon to solve all our problems. Land acquisition will always remain a tool of last resort in threatening circumstances, but it should be used sparingly and only after other approaches have failed. National parks were not generally established as viable ecosystems but rather as politically expedient and beautiful places of high scenic value.

For most units (natural as opposed to cultural) to achieve some semblance of ecological stability on critical issues, except for air and water quality, would require major park expansions. In today’s complex society, such
expansions will simply not happen. Instead, our policy must be one of stable political boundaries, well known by the public, combined with a very dynamic program of management interaction throughout the ecosystem or ecoregion dealing with issues and threats.

The idea of buffer zones for national parks that would require zoning and result in park superintendents becoming local planning officials would not be effective in solving the total problem. This approach still destabilizes park and community relations and avoids the key issue of creating ecological communities of shared interests that support the long term values and health of the parks and the systems in which they exist. If parks cannot establish themselves as neighbors in complex ecological communities then we will always be feared predators of community values. If parks could be given tools, through legislation, they might include the ability to work with and help fund activities occurring outside the boundaries, such as zoning and planning initiatives by the communities, the clear authority to interact on issues outside the parks and funding for research and resource management work outside the parks. Renewal and enhancement of the in-lieu-of-taxes program would also be a significant factor in permitting parks to become community participants as a taxpayer.

We need to know where we have differences, define issues and threats, develop strategies and work on pro-
cesses that help to define park positions on issues. As community members we must be involved with community processes, not as an autocrat or to dictate the solution but as a representative of a very successful concept and its industry, with a position to represent, like any other industry or citizen.

The Dawning of the Computer Age

The age of computers has dawned upon the National Park Service and there are many skilled people working on many systems. Unfortunately, we still lack the coherent long term policy and strategy necessary to set up an integrated system, not to mention the resources and funding needed to develop it. Information technology is a dangerous development to react to rather than proactively plan for.

At the present time our system consists of Datapoint, DEC, IBM, Apple, Data General and probably half a dozen other manufacturers. There are major, often intensive software programs being developed for specific functions, but no attempt is visible on the surface to integrate software programs or make them user friendly.

There is an urgent need to develop a unified strategy and system-wide plan for computerization that goes beyond shelf software and PC hardware in local networks. With the passage of each year there is increas-
ing user frustration and resistance because we have not committed the resources to make this set of tools work for us. There are even those who do not want centralized data bases because data stored elsewhere might be misused up the line. Time and money are being lost each year that the issue remains unresolved and beyond that, we lose ground on use of information and research in critical issue areas.

As park data is developed, whether it’s budget, geographic information systems, maintenance, personnel or resource, it must be integrated and usable across a wide range of issues and report formats. Like other areas we need to get the “cost” factor out of the way and understand the real “cost” of what is being done currently.

Almost everything currently being done is based on a flexible set of standards to be carried out by each area as their funds permit, usually with the “cheapest” units available. Where will the larger system units, the minicomputers and networking systems come from and who is developing the system software? Thus far shelf software is being purchased which will meet certain needs but provide no assistance in integrated decision making at the resource level while creating new staffing requirements at the level of resource inputs.

The United States Forest Service and other management agencies are working to achieve this level of application so there are already models for us to look at
in developing our own standards. The biggest fear is that our standards will be directed to individual users rather than to an integrated system capable of large scale analysis and review and, what is more important, capable of constructing complex models and scenarios dealing with the management of species, structures and resources. Only in this way will we get beyond our current concept of the computer as an enhanced adding machine.

Currently we have software systems, such as our maintenance management program, that are capable of developing data bases regarding dollar expenditures and time commitments spent on specifically identified resources. The system was purchased however with the vendor controlling source code so that simple alteration to meet new needs requires major funding. The system was designed to collect information but does little to creatively use the data in decision making. Managers have to be able to compare cost data for various structures, analyze anomalies and etc. This weakness, identified as the system was used, is now being corrected and we have now purchased or obtained the source code from the vendor. In all candor these problems should not have been built into the system from the outset and would not have been if we had a national strategy for computer systems.
Ecosystems and Ecoregions

Much of the terminology and various connotations used today in managing park resources (some with legal points of reference and some without) was either non-existent or was used differently at the time when most national parks were created (some units in Alaska being exceptions having been created in the 1970’s). At the time when most of the parks were being created our understanding of natural systems was far from perfect, (much as it remains today -- but we are at least beginning to frame the questions) based on our need to be politically expedient and need of a strong inclination to include magnificent scenery and strong geological vignettes.

The species that occupied the lands so created were still abundant, in most cases, in apparent health (except for commercial hunting practices) and considered to be part of the total package like options available on a car (in fact park animals weren’t protected from slaughter until 1894 - twenty-two years after the creation of Yellowstone). Little was understood of habitat or habitat needs for many of the included species, their necessary range and survival requirements. In short, we created beautiful places that today are parts of ecosystems, biological reserves protecting highly valued biological diversity. Our mission hasn’t changed with these evolv-
ing concepts; just our understandings of what parks and their many resources require to survive, unimpaired into the future and the evolving role that must be played by park management teams.

Here is an aspect of our National Park System that represents an interesting management reality. National Park units are created as unique and individual units that reside in their own specific and intimate bioregions of the country. After having been singled-out and remarked upon as unique at the time of their creation by Congress, they then became a part of the National Park System. The system, underfunded as it is, is then pressed to bring the unique park into a system of ten regions, 356 companion units (seven regions and 500 units including rivers and trails in 2018) and a set of national management policies that basically apply to all units of the system. Our management approach is definitely modeled upon politically designated regions rather than resources fitting into ecoregions. While a strong case is being built at various key system resources for ecoregional thinking (Glacier, Big Bend, Yellowstone, Everglades and the Great Smokies as examples) it is still regarded as experimental rather than a major and accepted approach to management philosophies and largely unfunded.

As we work to establish Glacier in its ecoregion, the biggest fears are twofold. One, that a system will be pronounced the “national model” and suddenly other
systems with completely different cultures, habitat and species will be captured by the policies created out of a model and two, that upper management, not sensing the time urgency of change at the local resource level and the windows of opportunity present, will put systems on hold to concentrate on making one model work while losing numerous opportunities elsewhere.

Referring to the earlier metaphor of a river and island there are times in our society’s evolution when there is low water and times when there is high water. Periods of marked transition are high water times that require prompt and well-targeted actions and responses. The decade of the 1990’s and early 2000’s will be such a period of transition as a new world order emerges, as we evolve from the Industrial Age to the Information Age, as old ways of making a living become new ways of making a living and as species and habitat all over the world are put under maximum pressure just to survive.

For these reasons and others, we need to understand within our own management that resources rise or fall because of their individuality and that each resource must be recognized as the unique place it is, rather than conforming to national standards that may work in one system, but not another.

There are many people in the Service who think about the system in this way and who work to achieve the uniqueness of their resources, but there isn’t enough
dialogue about this issue at national and regional levels. As a result, the problem remains of how we manage such a diverse resource base with national policies and yet recognize the uniqueness of our resources?

So, we use terms today differently than at the turn of the Century and the successful fulfillment of our mission requires new approaches. To successfully move into these new arenas will require a series of approaches and philosophies that will be foreign to many and resisted by not a few. Please remember that what follows is not representative of new or unique thoughts, but rather represents use of currently discussed processes and programs being worked on in many places around the world.

*** Science and Resource Management are critical to the definition of our core resource (the park), the surrounding region and the use made of that system by species (including man). Long term monitoring systems and management must all work together in developing key understandings for the extended natural system and its needs. It is necessary that this component be met and supported not just by park science but in concert with universities and researchers from many areas and disciplines. Out of park issues must be considered
in research and project designs if the resource is to be managed effectively.

***
Science must include, by definition, sociological, cultural and economic studies as well as traditional areas of research. Man, the species, also uses this park system and those things needing our system’s support and integrity must also be a part of our understanding. Core park areas will continue to be managed conservatively and in keeping with the mission but surrounding ecoregional lands must be managed to achieve a sustainable economic base for area populations while still sheltering the necessary habitat values and environment needed by all species.

Broad scale support and ecoregional zoning must exist to manage growth and assure development in keeping with underlying and surrounding values. The people living in the ecoregions must ultimately understand and be willing to support the values of the system as an involved public.

A balance must be struck between economy and environment that can be sustained around the world, not just in the backyard. A topic well covered in the Brundtland Report, “Our Common Future - From One Earth to One
World. An overview by the World Commission on Environment and Development” (Oxford University Press - 1987.)

It is here that you will find world dialogue on resources, yet in the United States this report is little known, and little read. How important is it? Attend any international meeting on resource management and if you don’t hear this report mentioned time and again, it will be a very rare meeting.

I often think back to my experience along the Mexican Border at Big Bend National Park and to discussions held with numerous individuals from the now defunct International Park’s Seminar which visited Glacier each year. Those resource managers and people of all cultures possess a love of land and resources still practiced in the United States by many Native Americans, but somewhat forgotten by the broader culture. In their countries, almost every day, people are killing vanishing resources -- not for the love of killing, not out of ignorance, not always for greed, but often for the love of their families and being able to survive to the next day. Given other ways they would be zealous stewards of their heritage as well. While resource managers in the United
States grapple with budget shortfalls, small cadres of stewards in Africa and elsewhere are fighting to assure continuation of their heritage and some die, killed by poachers and the greed of other nations to possess rare things and their own people to possess weapons. If you cannot make this scenario relevant to the national parks today and the ecoregions, we live in then you cannot understand the forces at work on our society and on our future. We cannot afford to write off those who do not understand and that is why dialogue, education and open give and take are so critical to our growth and to conservation and why we must work to achieve exchange and not polarization on issues that exist in our systems.

*** Working cooperatively with our neighbors whether they are agencies, industry or private is critical to ecoregional management. Park managers must accept their role as an active participant in community affairs and work diligently to assure that park and ecoregional values are represented at decision making meetings. Elected officials, communities and agency heads on neighboring lands will make their own independent decisions but the infor-
mation and viewpoint represented by the park must be articulated throughout the ecoregion. The goal is not expansion of the parks by land acquisition or creation of buffer zones nor is it the placement of national park policies on adjacent lands. It isn't to sue over every decision with which we disagree or to construct win-lose scenarios that we then think we can “win”. We can't allow third parties and non-governmental organizations to represent our issues to the public and thereby protect us from being cast in a “negative” light and it is not to dictate to anyone or control processes outside the parks.

The goal is constructive participation in the many public processes of an ecoregion and to be seen as a neighbor and not as an elite and uncaring park. Be a part of mutually beneficial scenarios and debates to honestly represent needs and issues to the public for their understanding and consideration. Accept compromise and consensus on valid strategies protecting resources and to work as a participant in regional efforts. Support regional processes such as emergency response, life support, hazardous material response, zoning, economic development, resource use and conservation.
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To bring helpful data and research to decision makers for their use and to accept our role as a positive participant in political processes affecting the ecoregion.

*** Interpretation and off-site education are critical to an ecoregion. So often today research results become file material or proprietary information rather than pieces of information and exhibits for the public. Many public's view research as a waste of money for the very reason that they always hear about the new research effort but seldom see the final product or are only treated to the reported criticisms by a group or a person whose agenda is not supported by the research finding.

If managers are to work in ecoregions or ecosystems they will need to work at furthering the people's understanding of that system, its values, its sensitive habitats and its non-sensitive habitats. Managers must change their internal approach and understandings to recognize the sophistication of publics and their need for far more than pretty pictures and rather simplistic interpretation of complex interlinked processes.

*** There must be a willingness to work within nonpolitical boundaries. This means involve-
ment with many groups and jurisdictions and can occasionally mean working across international boundaries as well. What has been represented in the Redwoods Act and the Clean Air Act needs further support and understanding in the management of the system. This will require development of new skills and an increasing emphasis on managers who are personally capable of developing and maintaining extensive and often complex public strategies. Managers who can speak well, understand their park, recognize the needs of others, and be a positive representative at the local and regional level as well as at the national level are badly needed and much in demand. They must be able to deal with criticism and enter constructive dialogue with those critics who are seeking solutions rather than those who are criticizing to criticize and for the purpose of their own very narrow agendas. Selection and prioritization, even of critics, is important to managers who will be under constant time and priority pressures in the larger systems and who must select opportunities that yield results and movement. Above it all, regional and national management is needed which will support the actions
and involvement of managers and shelter them from the political fallouts and agendas that will emerge as they become involved outside the parks. Within every ecoregion there will be initial resistance and even hostility to the movement of park management personnel outside their boundaries, but as time goes on and as skilled managers begin to work on issues the resistance will diminish and turn around. It will not happen with arrogance but with caring cooperation and candor and not right away, but in time.

*** A vision of a future built upon an understanding and willingness to work with change and the economic and social forces contained therein is also required. To work in the present there must be some idea of the future that is being worked toward if there are to be effective strategies and benchmarks for progress or slippage. Strategies must be long term in many cases with results measured in decades rather than moments.

*** Finally, a willingness and ability when all is said and done to use all the tools available to us. To deal with issues that have unfortunately become threats in an open and effective way, and not refrain from legal action or third party
involvement when key values are at risk. Such tools cannot be abandoned just yet but should certainly be used after all others have been tried and failed.

To test the need for this level of involvement take any resource, close it to all public use, construct a 12’ high electrified chain link fence around it and leave it for 200 years without monitoring or the direct involvement of people. Will this deliver the resource to future generations in an unimpaired context? My argument would be no, it does not, for the following reasons:

*** Megafauna have been isolated in a restricted gene pool that will have long term effects on the population and its characteristics.

*** The geological resource will do fine as will some of the botanical species, but not all. Some of the present exotic species will move aggressively to capture meadow areas and prime wildlife feeding areas.

*** A time island will have been created, like Galapagos, and in hundreds of years people will look at it as a rare and valuable product but they will never really know how it started and what species failed due to restriction and isolation.
Because of its abandonment and isolation, resources around the park are more fully subdivided and developed (above the fence were beautiful views of the mountains) and the full dimension park that was becomes a limited dimension park in a new suburban core. The park has become a large but failing zoo.

But it's all moot, because 150 years into the experiment the people have forgotten what this national park is and no longer support the concept. What they see is a place filled with valuable resources, available for constructive purposes and use, so a law is passed, and the fence comes down and the will of the people is fulfilled … Too harsh? That depends on your vision of the future.

Politics and Reality

This is not defined as partisan politics but rather the political system that is so involved in law and regulation from Capitol Hill and the White House to county commissioners and mayors; the politics of groups and non-governmental organizations and the politics of interaction, reaction and pro-action.

In truth, politics has been far more favorable to the National Park System than otherwise. We have received
excellent support from the people and from elected officials at all levels of the government. But also in truth, and perhaps because of a misunderstanding of the Hatch Act or because employees only notice the more heavy-handed and negative aspects of politics, politics has a bad reputation in the mainstream of the National Park Service.

Most of the concern centers on aspects of partisan politics such as "political appointees," "political decisions" and "political policies," which have been held up as examples for most employees over the past 15 years. The years of harsh and often abusive rhetoric have left their mark on this and numbers of other agencies as has the blatant application of political agendas down into professional levels and around key issues involving the parks. What was often perceived as politics as usual, but was not, was the gagging of professional managers by political appointees and the control of testimony and dialogue dealing with budget and program issues. (This muting of the professionals has been partially lifted in 1991 for the first time in years.) To the victor belong the spoils but to the people belong the resources, a fact so often forgotten in the press of getting the executive and legislative branches under control.

Regardless, politics is not a dirty word and was in fact a word much aggrandized and sought after by the founders of our constitutional system, our nation and
the National Park Service. Within the parks, personnel need to come to grips with nonpartisan politics and accept the word and its meanings in a more positive way.

Managers cannot afford to simply think of parks as isolated from politics and that isolation is a sought after goal or a desired end state.

To avoid the feeling that success means we keep to our knitting and failure means management is dealing with elected officials or is involved with “political” issues outside the park, there needs to be a willingness to work with employees and constituencies in better understanding management’s role in politics and its value and harm to the resource. “Politics” like “government agency” or “government employee” is a term that should be restored to former definitions and values if the parks are to succeed under the press of a growing population and ever more complex issues.

(If, however, the Congress fails to respond to our needs and recognize the values that are being lost, there is an alternative that I seriously raise as little progress has been made since 1991. It was my feeling in 1991 and since then, that the National Park Service, the resources and treasures protected, is beyond the ability and perhaps the will of the Congress to fund and support. We are just one agency among too many. The past twenty years have shown, I believe, that the Service is handy as another economic benefit for them to have in their
District. Is this too harsh a judgement? Probably, but $12,000,000,000 in arrears for 483 park areas, growing more each year? Or perhaps another Mission 66 program is hiding in some office we are not aware of to bring the parks back to a healthy state?

But the world and the Congress have changed since 1916, dramatically, and yet the National Park Service, which changed its Mission in 2000, continues forward without rethinking or consideration. The Living National Treasures of our Society and History deserve to have a national review, evaluation and reconsideration for the protection of those treasures in this new world, by a National Commission.

Made up of national figures from the fields of science, museums, resources, education and non-profits the task of this National Commission on National Parks, would have a mandate to consider what needs to be done to assure that the Mission of the National Park Service can be fulfilled for future generations. Not to rewrite the Mission but to think about the positive changes that could be made or created to meet today's many fiscal and resource challenges.

In 2000 the Service felt it was right to add a statement to the Mission to reflect change. It should also feel that, after one hundred years, it is time for an appraisal from minds outside the Park Service and the Congress. I would love to think that the National Park Service could
achieve this internally, but my naivety does not go that far. We are now too much a part of the Washington political environment for us to succeed in or even attempt such an effort.

**The Seasonal Work Force**

Often abused, always asked for more with less and as dedicated and professional a group as found anywhere, is an apt description of our seasonal work force. They are too often treated as expendable resources in a cash poor environment that has necessary high personnel ratios and very low supplies and materials ratios. It's not at all uncommon for smaller resources (less than $1,000,000 annual operating budget) to be at ratios of 97 percent personal services and 3 percent other and for larger resources (more than $5,000,000) to be as high as 90 percent personal services and 10 percent other. Basic ratios, used to portray better situations, are maintenance funds, 60 percent personnel and 40 percent other and all other accounts 80 percent personnel and 20 percent other.

Today these ratios have been seriously impacted by unfunded programs such as pay increases, new retirement programs with double the former expenses, new federal laws with testing or other compliance procedures, new requirements for public processes, inflation
and the rising cost of emergency repairs of failing systems. All these components continue to drain park budgets, and when there is need to do a new program thrust or pay for a new retirement program the costs generally come from our seasonal employees, our point of budget "flexibility."

As a result, each passing season finds fewer seasonal employees, our cadre of permanents asked to stretch a little more to the point that we now look at closures and service reductions rather than stretching our employees any further. We are now beginning to replace seasonal staff with volunteers in several key functions.

As a traditional agency the seasonal work force is being managed in much the same way today as 20 or 30 years ago as though nothing had changed: as if parks were still the only place to pay an excellent wage; as if seasonal skills and training couldn't be used by other agencies and work places; as if highly qualified short term employees were available in ever abundant supplies, and as if seasonals should pay us for the privilege.

The time has come and gone to seriously address and resolve the issues of our seasonal employment program and to rethink and restructure the entire program. Parks are in competition for highly skilled employees and personnel management policies and programs need to reflect this fact. It remains an earnest hope that at some time Congress will finally authorize a benefits
package for seasonal employees who meet time or other targets they establish. It is no longer adequate to simply say “hey, if they don’t like the program, we’ll find someone who does,” nor should the answer be to convert long time seasonals with skills to permanent employees to assure their benefits and continuance. Other viable alternatives are needed.

There is a caretaker at Glacier National Park who, attracted by the pay, has worked at his job for 30 years, as a seasonal without benefits. He will have no retirement benefit from his employer when he leaves his position and yet he has committed his life to an agency that must put him aside someday with nothing but a thank you. These are the aspects of our program that should rightly change without having to make everyone a permanent employee.
After 75 years of formal existence the National Park Service has achieved tremendous success, developed a cadre of dedicated and highly trained employees and evolved as a military styled, traditional and family oriented organization. While this paper represents a critique, those who read this must understand that most park employees have spent their lives in an agency that they love and respect, but an agency that also has needs, flaws and old traps that must be reanalyzed and worked through so as to maintain the vitality of the mission and its vision for the future.

The National Park Service manages a philosophy, not a bottom line or product, and must remain vital and enthusiastic in managing such a philosophy, with the correct tools. It must continually adapt its approach to the society and culture in which it finds itself. From the Yellowstone of 1872 to today’s international park system it is an idea of unusual vision and challenge.

To remain vital there must be internal and public critique of the agency and encouragement of the same,
for little is accomplished by covering up the blemishes or by pretending there are none. Critique not just by the non-profits and organizations we work with or by publications and scientific papers from those who are already involved with the Agency. There must be more information provided to our users to assist in gaining their support. Nor do we accomplish anything by abandoning the internal view of our problems, leaving the field solely to critics from outside with limited experience, whose criticisms of the Service often serve a political agenda.

At the time of this 75th birthday there is need to build upon and use our considerable strength and understand weakness because the next 75 years will make the first 75 look amazingly simple by comparison. As much as possible the agency needs to analyze, make mid-course corrections and head into the gale shipshape and conditioned.
have always liked the Japanese Culture, the way that they live both within the environment and in respect of people and the past. There they have designated Living National Treasures, people with rare talents and abilities become National Treasures and are venerated by the people.

In America, our early National Parks were created by folks who I would call National Treasures today. I would also extend that thinking to the natural, historic and archaeological National Treasures within the National Park System. Our National Treasures are venerated by the public, yet they have issues, both serious and pending, and highly skilled and caring workers in numbers far less than needed.

In 1991, when writing Considered Opinions, there were 354 National Park Service areas of some 23 types on 80 million acres in the United States, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa and the Virgin Islands. If I recall correctly there were 54 areas designated as
National Parks at that time. We were past the edge of financial stability even then.

Today, 2018, we have 483 National Park Service areas of some 23 types on 84 million acres with 60 designated National Parks. Given the rate of growth, in the Congress’s number one way to support tourism, where will those numbers be in 2066, our 150\textsuperscript{th} anniversary? The $2 B\text{ILLION}$ maintenance backlog of 1991 has now grown to $12 B\text{ILLION}$. Average annual visitation, if there is such a thing, is generally in excess of the population estimate for the USA. How long a line to the restroom will America tolerate? Well, maybe we could sell the Statue of Liberty when our backlog reaches $30 B\text{illion}$. Its light will burn less bright, but it might still make a good lighthouse.

As of this writing, members of the Senate have mentioned putting in the upcoming budget a sum of $11,000,000,000$ to cover our maintenance backlog. I can but hope yet, even if passed by some small miracle, I still must worry about the way that this potential windfall will be allocated to the parks and spent if passed. I pray that we are beyond the years of ridiculous amounts being spent on structures and contracts. I would prefer to have the Washington Office allocate the funds to the parks and not to the regions, where fat birds tend to lose feathers.
The NPS now employs approximately 19,000 employees who oversee 500 units along with some 221,000 volunteers. There was once a time not many years ago when we employed about 27,000. In 2019, based on the current budget projection, we will go down to just over 18,000 employees. If this keeps up, we will soon see Volunteer Superintendents. Now I happen to love volunteers who provide a great service to our nation and the National Park Service, but we are losing paid employees and seasonals along with skill sets that we badly need. Since 1990, the number of volunteers has increased an average of 2% per year, while the number of seasonals and other personnel have been dropping. Funds for the operation of parks must be increased and hopefully will be in the coming years. Our ranks since 1991 have been thinned to the extreme, for no cause other than inattention. It would seem that our culture, as represented by our elected officials, values its Living National Treasures far less than they deserve, far less.

There exists a plan to train and develop our employees to minimum standards and to provide viable career ladders in all occupations of the Service. It needs to be resurrected and plans made to implement it over a number of fiscal years. It would be one of the greatest rewards possible for our entire work force.

Why do we permit the Congress, without complaint, to create new NPS areas, many with questionable
National Treasure status and expect our agency to run them with little in the way of help for the agency? It's maddening and it's destroying what so many of us have treasured since we knew of it, the National Park System. Another interesting facet is the ability of Presidents to use their executive powers to create open spaces called National Monuments that are managed by the Bureau of Land Management in the Department of the Interior. Another fine agency, but the use of this designation, used by the National Park Service, to create National Monuments with policies that permit hunting, grazing, logging and other forms of development is not a positive development. It is simply a way for a President to let the public think that land is being set aside with strong protections, when it is not. Not because of the failing of BLM but because their policies and the policies of the NPS are radically different.

Executive privilege to create National Monuments without hearings or reviews, simply by signing a bill, goes back to President Theodore Roosevelt and The Antiquities Act of 1906. He signed the bill largely to prevent looting of archaeological and Native American structures and objects in the Southwest by expediting protection of such natural and cultural sites on federal lands. If the President wants to create a National Monument, that's fine, but National Monuments belong in the National Park Service and misusing the
term is going to create problems for both the BLM and the NPS.

A current example being the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument in Utah, managed by the BLM under policies that are 180 degrees from those of the National Park Service. One Congressman in Utah is already suggesting an area within the National Monument be made into a National Park managed by local residents. National Monuments and National Parks are historic trademarks that have meanings that should be protected from misuse. If we can't even protect the designations of our units, we are in serious trouble if even the Congress doesn't come to our aid or understand the problem.

Will we soon see, like prisons, parks that are contracted out to private firms to run? Concessionaires that are permitted to enter National Treasures like Yosemite, take an historic national treasure building like the Ahwahnee Hotel and change its name to a theater, The Majestic. Where was the massive court fight to prevent this? Maybe the Lake McDonald Lodge in Glacier could be renamed for a major donation. I would think that Lake McDonald's would be a real draw and it just requires an apostrophe and an s.

There is a need to catch up with the court mandated correction of hiring practices in the Park Service
for women and minorities so that when boats rise in the future, everybody is on the boat and not just some.

America has put its trust in the National Park Service to protect and sustain our National Treasures. The National Park Service needs to recommit itself, strengthen its ability to withstand undue political pressures and achieve greater support from the millions of people who use and respect their National Treasures. Risk at every corner, certainly. Worth fighting for? Well, is it?
George B. Hartzog, Jr., served as seventh director of the National Park Service for nine years, 1964 to 1972. This oral history, the third in a series of interviews with
former directors by Park Service bureau historian Janet McDonnell, records Hartzog’s commentary and judgments on the events of his tenure. It is a valuable contribution to the history of the national parks and the National Park Service.

I approach this foreword as both participant and historian. As participant, I served as chief historian of the National Park Service through the entire directorate of George Hartzog. As historian, I have had more than three decades to study and reflect on those frantic, momentous years, with the added perspective afforded by the passage of time.

As participant, I remember George Hartzog as an administrator of rare ability. He was a workaholic who drove his staff at his pace. He not only managed, he ruled. He could be deeply caring, friendly, and sentimental with everyone in the Service. He could also be nearly tyrannical in his demands for superior performance. He entertained a broad vision of what the national parks should be and should mean to the American people, and he pursued his vision relentlessly. Above all, both with the Executive Branch and the Congress, he possessed political cunning, insight, and mastery almost nonexistent among federal agency heads, and he employed these talents to the great benefit of the National Park Service.
and the environmental movement launched by his chief, Interior Secretary Stewart Udall.

I have been privileged to call George Hartzog friend in all the years since my experience as participant.

Casting myself now as historian rather than participant and friend, I stand back as far as possible to appraise the Hartzog directorate. In the interview, he deals with the events of his administration with all the charm, wit, candor, verbal facility, and articulation for which he has always been known. Here I place these events in more orderly form as background to his commentary.

Most important, he led the largest expansion of the National Park System in history. During his nine-year tenure, the system grew by seventy-two units totaling 2.7 million acres—not just national parks, but historical and archeological monuments and sites, recreation areas, seashores, riverways, memorials, and cultural units celebrating minority experiences in America.

Working closely with subcommittee chairman Senator Alan Bible in 1971, he laid the legislative basis for the expansion of the National Park System in Alaska. When the Congress in 1980 finally acted on this provision of law, it doubled the acreage of the National Park System.
Determined that the National Park Service reflect the growing national concern for minorities, Hartzog developed programs that gave the Service a different complexion. He named the first black park superintendent, the first career woman superintendent, the first American Indian superintendent, and the first black chief of a major U.S. police department. The promotion of women and minorities has steadily expanded over the years since.

Hartzog persuaded Congress to authorize a program for citizens to volunteer their time and talents to the needs of both park resources and park visitors. The Volunteers in Parks program (VIP) has flourished as budgetary shortfalls increasingly stressed permanent employees.

Beyond the parks themselves, Hartzog pursued outreach programs. Examples are the first environmental education curriculum in kindergarten through the twelfth grade. Complementing this initiative, he inaugurated study areas in a system of National Education and Development Landmarks, christened NEED. He also put into effect programs to make national parks relevant to an urban society, such as Summer in the Parks, Parks for all Seasons, and Living History. He obtained legislation creating the congressionally chartered National
Park Foundation, which funded many worthy projects for which appropriations were unavailable.

Many other achievements and issues could be cited, but as a historian I want to give special emphasis to historic preservation. This is especially timely because in November 2006 Hartzog received the prestigious Crowninshield Award of the National Trust for Historic Preservation. The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 broadened the concept of historic preservation from individual landmarks of significance to all survivors from the past that citizens thought worth saving as part of their local environment. Interstate highways and urban renewal had wiped out much of local value to citizens, not only individual structures, but entire districts and even treasured landscapes. The new act created a National Register of Historic Places, led to a network of State Historic Preservation Officers charged with nominating such local places to the Register, established a program of grants-in-aid to the states, and authorized an Advisory Council on Historic Preservation to advise the president and federal agency heads as well as enforce protective safeguards for registered properties.

The National Historic Preservation Act would not have passed, at least in 1966, but for George Hartzog. Many people worked hard on this initiative, but with-
out Hartzog's largely hidden political labors on Capitol Hill, with congressional staff as well as members, the law would not have been enacted. He not only brought his legendary political skills to bear but ensured that the entire program would rest with the National Park Service. This I know because I witnessed it as participant.

The programs spawned by the National Historic Preservation Act have spread across the nation, onto the state and local levels and into the private sector. For people concerned with the quality of their local environment, the results of the act have proved one of the great success stories of the late twentieth century.

George Hartzog made great things happen. He benefited from a rare combination of circumstances that favored his vision. It fit neatly into President Lyndon Johnson's "Great Society" and into Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall's robust environmentalism. The secretary, moreover, not only had selected George Hartzog for the directorship but gave him full rein and support in pursuing his vision. A Democratic Congress receptive to the "Great Society" proved receptive to the measures Hartzog promoted. And the Democratic Congress also discovered that voters concerned for their national parks and the environment in which they lived were ready for the laws he sought.
Well versed in the history of the National Park Service, I am familiar with the record of every director since the creation of the agency in 1916. Excepting the co-founders of the Service, Stephen Mather and Horace Albright, I have no hesitation in pronouncing George Hartzog the greatest director in the entire history of the Service.

History will benefit from his own view of his legacy as set down in this interview with Janet McDonnell.

Robert M. Utley
Dr. Gil Lusk is a retired National Park Service employee with 35 years of experience, mostly serving as a Superintendent of several National Parks. He served for eight years as Superintendent of Glacier National Park on the Canadian Border and five years as Superintendent of Big Bend National Park on the Mexican Border. He was the first Superintendent of Wolf Trap Farm National Park for the Performing Arts and brought it on line in 1971. He later was the first National Park Superintendent of Valley Forge National Park when it was transferred from the State of Pennsylvania to the National Park Service in 1976 in time for the Bicentennial Celebration.

For his efforts he was awarded the two highest performance awards from the US Department of Interior, Meritorious Service in 1986 and Distinguished Service in 1999. The Distinguished award presented by the Secretary of Interior and the President. In 2001 his alma mater, Gettysburg College, honored him with presentation of an Honorary PhD for Public Service over
four decades. He has served on the Montana Nature Conservancy Trust Board, the Sonoran Institute in Tucson, Arizona and on the Board of the Governor's Flathead Basin Commission in NW Montana and was Chair for two of his eight years on the Commission.

The US Forest Service, a sister agency, because of his relationships and vision in working with the Flathead and the Lewis and Clark National Forests in Montana, selected Lusk as the first person to be a Grey Towers Conservation Fellow at the Pinchot Institute in Pennsylvania in 1991. His sabbatical as a Fellow included writing about his concern for trends that were occurring in the National Park Service along with meetings at the Yale School of Forestry and several national conservation groups in Washington, DC.

The Director of the National Park Service, in 1994, asked him to spend his last few years in the Service working with employees, training centers and the Washington Office to completely rethink the training programs of the Service and establish definable career ladders for all of the various disciplines at work in the National Parks. The program as completed by the employees of the Service, would have increased our national training costs from just over 1 percent to 3 percent over an extended period of time.

Among his other efforts was the stimulus for creation of the Y to Y program (Yellowstone to the Yukon)
and laying the foundation for others, working with Mexico, to create two major protected areas across from Big Bend National Park in excess of one million acres. At Glacier, he and the Supervisor of the Flathead National Forest worked with the Burlington Northern Railroad to create the Burlington Northern Environmental Study Area, to protect Grizzly Bears and other animals from a segment of train tracks, about 14 miles long, running from the Continental Divide down to the town of West Glacier. The concept is now called the Great Northern Environmental Study Area (GNESA) in honor of the first railroad to help establish Glacier National Park. The concept received special recognition from the Department of the Interior in 2008 as an exemplary example of collaborative conservation.
The National Park Service, created in 1916 and now over one hundred years old, has become an immensely popular concept with visitation equal to the national population of the United States every year. Along the way, the Service has picked up a few issues and stresses that endanger the mission of the NPS. Its unique mission is to preserve and protect America's significant natural, cultural, and historical areas for future generations in an unencumbered condition. The areas that are America's Living National Treasures. Those issues need to be addressed to allow the National Park Service to uphold its mission and continue to protect our National Treasures for future generations. This book is dedicated to the identification of some of those issues and presents possible solutions, by capturing the author's experiences over his 35 year career, depicting what working for the Service entails and its challenges. Once the reader has a better feel for work of the National Park Service, there are specific sections dealing with the author's concerns for the future and the changes needed today to bring the Service back to its prime.

**Gil Lusk** spent 35 years in the National Park Service and received the Meritorious and Distinguished Service awards from the Department of Interior, their highest honor awards, for his work as a Superintendent at Glacier and Big Bend as well as other parks. Gettysburg College bestowed an honorary doctorate for his four decades of public service and accomplishments in 2001.