

Oral History Cover Sheet

Name: Stephen B. Moore

Date of Interview: September 16, 2005

Location of Interview: Residence of Mr. Moore in Sherwood, Oregon

Interviewer: Norman Olson

Approximate years worked for Fish and Wildlife Service: About 29 years.

Offices and Field Stations Worked, Positions Held: Fish and Wildlife Service employee.

Most Important Projects: Worked on the Wildlife Resources Program, involved with the Kenai Plan in Alaska

Colleagues and Mentors: Dick Rogers, Fred Zeillemaker, Larry Debates, Harvey Lee, David Olson, Stephanie Caswell, Bob Delaney, Rick Johnston, Pete Jerome, Gary Gustafson, Art Wemmerus, Noreen Clough, Lisa Langelier.

Most Important Issues: Fish and Wildlife Service Refuge System.

Brief Summary of Interview: Raised in Portland, Oregon, where he picked up an undergraduate degree in general biology. He talks about working part-time in the Fish and Wildlife Service in 1972, working for the US Army Corps for about 3 ½ years, and then returning to the Fish and Wildlife Service, where he worked in Refuges and Wildlife. He then talks about moving to Washington, DC to work on the Departmental Manager Development Program, and was later involvements in several programs in Sacramento and, eventually, Alaska, which he concentrates on. He discusses various jobs and projects he worked on, and the many people he worked alongside in order to make them successful.

Steve Moore - Final

Hello, my name is Norman Olson. I'm a retired U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service employee and a volunteer at the Service's National Conservation Training Center in Shepherdstown, West Virginia. Today is Friday the 16th of September 2005, it's approximately 4:00 in the afternoon and this interview is being conducted in Sherwood, Oregon at the home of Steve Moore who I'm going to interview. Steve is a current Fish and Wildlife Service employee who works in the Portland, Oregon Regional Office. Steve would you please begin by giving us your full name and spelling it for us; telling us when and where you were born and raised; where you went to college and the degrees you received; and where and when you started with your career with the Fish and Wildlife Service.

SM Okay, my name is Stephen B. Moore, the last name is Moore - M O O R E . I was born in Portland, Oregon in 1949 ... December 11th ... and raised in the Portland area, went to high school at Beaverton, Oregon and then went on to pick up my undergraduate degree, which was in general biology, at Oregon State University in Corvallis. The degree was finished in 1971 and then I went on and was in the first class, if you will, the first year that Oregon State offered an interdisciplinary masters degree program. So it was a program that you could design your own program. I did so with a committee I put together from three different schools at the University ... the School of Geography, the School of Outdoor Recreation Resources and the School of Cultural Anthropology ... and I did that in a manner that I thought would best prepare me for future work in natural resource planning, primarily at a large-scale level ... regional sorts of natural resource planning with an emphasis on backcountry, wild lands, public lands, that sort of thing. I actually got my first job with the Fish and Wildlife Service in ... it would have been in 1972 and I worked part-time while I was in graduate school and I did ... I got my masters of arts in general studies, which is what the interdisciplinary program degree was called in 1973. But I worked for the Fish and Wildlife Service as a biotech ... a GS-5 ... at the William L. Finley National Wildlife Refuge in the Willamette Valley just south of Corvallis, Oregon. I worked there part-time, I believe for about 6 months, and worked on a pretty broad array of programs at the Refuge. Everything from running a waterfowl hunt station during the winter, to repairing buildings, to clearing trails, to cutting wood, working on public use programs, a pretty broad array of things. And by the way, a kind of interesting historical note, we had our office at the time in what is an historic cottage on the refuge which has now been restored through an interesting volunteer cooperative effort and it's the ... I don't remember the name of the family ... shoot ... anyway, beautiful little cottage (note: the John Fiechter House which was placed on the National Register of Historic Places on April 11, 2005), and I worked for then Refuge Manager Dick Rogers, who I ended up working with again in the Regional Office in Portland several years later. Fred Zeillemaker was the Refuge Biologist at the time ... a very well known biologist in the western United States, I believe he also worked in Alaska for a while ... a phenomenal biologist. And we worked in this little tiny cabin really this ... this little old house as our office. It had no insulation in the walls, there were squirrels running through the walls, through the attic above us, through the floorboards below us and there were cobwebs all over everything and that was ... Fred kept telling me that was his pesticide-free no-pest strip. (laughter) So anyway, so that was my introduction to the Fish and Wildlife Service ... an organization that I grew quite fond of. I graduated from college as I said in 1973, starved for

about 6 months and then got a job with the US Army Corps of Engineers in their Portland District Office. I worked for the Corps for a handful of years ... I believe it was about 3 ½ years ... and I was fortunate enough to have applied for a job back at the Fish and Wildlife Service in the Regional Office in Portland ... the same office I'm in now, but in a different building ... and was interviewed by Larry Debates who was then the ARD for Refuges and Wildlife. Larry died actually quite recently this year ... a huge loss ... a wonderful man and it just ... kind of an interesting, at least I think, kind of an interesting story in that regard. Larry advertised this job in the Fish and Wildlife Service and two of us, unbeknownst to each other, both working for the Corps of Engineers at the time, applied for the same job. We both interviewed with Larry. We both told Larry apparently the same thing, which is that it was impossible for one person to do this job, so he hired both of us. (laughter) That would never happen today in our budget climate, so that was ... that was great and the other individual who was hired at the time was Harvey Lee ... brilliant fellow ... who had done graduate work at Columbia University and went on, my guess would be in the early 1980's, to go to work for the State Department as a Foreign Service Officer and he has now worked all over the world in that capacity, so very interesting. So then I went to work in the Regional Office in Portland and that started really my full-time professional career with the Fish and Wildlife Service ... in Refuges and Wildlife.

NO Okay, I wonder if we could perhaps focus specifically on a two-month detail to Alaska that you were involved with early in 1983. In fact I believe we first met in January of 1983 in DC when I was back there doing some briefings on a preliminary draft comprehensive conservation plan for Kenai National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska, and the detail involved working on the ... this draft Kenai Plan. Perhaps you could sort of give us your recollections about what was involved and how all that came about and what you did.

SM Okay, just a quick side note, I was in Washington, DC ... I moved to Washington, DC in August of 1979. I had been selected to participate in the Departmental Manager Developmental Program, part of the Department of the Interior's program. So it included representative students, trainees, whatever we were called then, from all the different bureaus in the Department. I think there were 30 or 35 of us and there were oh, 4 to 6 of us I think from the Fish and Wildlife Service. So I was the sole refuge representative and the sole one from our region. So I spent 10 months on that formal training program which includes rotational job assignments outside the Department of the Interior, also a fabulous program, so that's what brought me to Washington, DC. After that program I went to work in what was then called the Program Development Office for Wildlife Resources and that was during ... I don't know how many organizational changes ago that was ... but that was during the time when we had what was called Program Management. So there was a program, actually I think the largest program at the time called Refuges and Wildlife or the Wildlife Resources Program ... it was called both of those things ... and Refuges was the core of that program. But it also included Realty, it included Animal Damage Control, it included Law Enforcement, it included Aircraft Management, Migratory Bird Office, Wildlife Assistance and possibly some other things I can't remember at this time. So it was a huge, huge "program" and so the office that I was in ... that I was hired in following my graduation from the Departmental Manager Developmental Program was an office that provided support to all of those separate elements, sub programs if you will, in the Refuges and Wildlife Program. And the purpose of the office was to provide support in terms of budget, planning, policy and certain other thing that happened to come our way and I

worked ... I did not work as much on the budget side ... I worked primarily on planning and policy-related issues. And a good bit of my effort in fact, while I was in the Washington Office, which was from 1979 until 1985 ... January or February of 1985 when I went to Sacramento ... was involved with planning activities. I was a very active participant in the Fish and Wildlife Service's national planning program, in fact I wrote the planning handbook on how to do regional resource planning and then was also involved in a small team that developed the service management plan and then I also wrote the program management plan for Refuges and Wildlife while I was back there. So planning was a very important part of my responsibilities and I also came from planning ... came to planning I should say ... from academic training and experience ... a job ... professional job experience. Part of my graduate degree, the geography part, if you will, and a little bit of the outdoor recreation resources portion was focused on land use planning, regional planning and then outdoor recreation planning. And so I had received some schooling in that regard and I also got some schooling at the time ... early on in something called NEPA, which was the National Environmental Policy Act, which was brand new at that time. So they were teaching us about that and what the concepts were in graduate school and how to integrate that into ongoing operations and certainly into planning processes. I had an opportunity to ... to what's the word I want here ... to not implement, but to exercise if you will, what I had learned in school initially with the Corps of Engineers and the Corps of Engineers has a very, very sophisticated, very, very complex planning process for their very large projects. So I was involved in several of their large projects in the Portland District and so I became very familiar with their planning process and in fact was hired into the Corps of Engineers because of NEPA being passed. The Corps of Engineers reluctantly admitted after losing several ... several federal court cases that they actually had to hire people that knew something other than civil engineering. So they hired a bunch of us and I was one of that bunch that got hired although with ... with only my master's degree I was actually much lower educated part of that group ... it was a very interesting, high-powered group of people and I learned a lot. But I did learn a lot about planning as part of that. I also worked earlier on, in fact when I was looking for a job did some pro-bono work for the Forest Service and some consulting firms reviewing and commenting on some of their plans and planning processes. So I had at least a moderately good background in that when I went to work for the Fish and Wildlife Service in our Regional Office in Portland in '77. For the couple of years I was there, before I moved back to Washington, DC, I was working on compliance issues. So I worked on NEPA compliance, I worked a little bit on cultural resources ... although we did have an archeologist ... I worked on Section 404 and Section 10 Clean Water Act, and the Clean Rivers and Harbors Act. I worked on Section 7 compliance when you are the action agency and so for refuges that was very important for consultation with our endangered species projects, et cetera, and I did that for some operational projects and some planning projects. For example, we were doing a master plan ... which was honestly primarily a grazing management plan, but anyway ... at Sheldon National Wildlife Refuge because that was shortly after the Game Range Act had been passed, so we received sole jurisdiction for this ... this huge, half-million acre ... and it's a wildlife refuge which by lower 48 standards is fairly sizeable ... and I was involved with the team that was developing the master plan and associated EIS for that ... for that refuge. So I had a good bit of experience. I also had the opportunity ... I mentioned Dick Rogers was my supervisor as Refuge Manager at Finley Refuge when I was going to graduate school and working part-time at the refuge ... Dick Rogers in the late '70s was the regional representative on a national team ... I think they were revising, I don't think they were developing from scratch ... I think they were revising guidance

for master planning on national wildlife refuges. And the Service in general, and refuges in particular, did not have a strong history in planning. The whole concept of land use planning I think was quite foreign to them. What they did have is these things on the shelf that you occasionally could find in refuges, they were often yellowed and quite dusty because they were seldom used, that they called master plans. And I think the general sense for most refuge employees ... and this was from the field to the Regional Office to the Washington Office ... was it was something we had to do, it proved to be of no value, and we shouldn't really spend a lot of time or money doing these things, and I think that that was a fairly commonly held perspective on it. Because of my training and experience I had quite a different view of it. I thought there was real value in planning. And so when Dick Rogers was the representative ... the regional representative on this national team revising the master planning guidance in the late '70s ... when I moved to the Regional Office in Portland I actually sat either in an adjacent cubical or certainly near Dick and so on a chance I actually could chat with him extensively about this ... this whole issue of refuge master planning and provided quite a bit of input to ... to the process with an emphasis on the actual planning process itself, not just the product, because the focus of that group seemed to me anyway, to be how do we develop an outline for the plan. They really didn't have any concept that there was a process that should go along with this and if you actually had the right process you would develop the proper product. That the product was a ... was a consequence of properly ... properly implemented process ... planning process if you will, and that required data, it required analysis, it required public input, it required NEPA compliance, all these other sorts of things. So I focused a lot on the process end and tried to convince Dick, and I think I was at least partly successful, although probably not completely, that we ought to have this link between process steps and outputs or products coming through and I think with the ... the master planning guidance that came out reflected that at least in part, although I have to admit I don't remember the specifics on that. So that ... it's just by way of introduction ... that was my, I guess my training experience and perspective when arriving in the Washington Office, and then ANILCA of course, had been passed in 1980 ... I don't remember the month.

NO December 2nd.

SM December, okay. So that would have been shortly after I finished the management training program in DC and I worked on Capital Hill for a while. I was I think, fairly cognizant of what was going on politically at the time and I remember early on reading the planning portion of ANILCA and the planning requirements and thinking oh, my gosh, this is ... this is a pretty high set of standards. I don't think the Fish and Wildlife Service ... certainly not the Refuge System ... had ever even attempted to reach standards of this nature and then I thought it would be quite a challenge for us. And so, I guess initially my reaction was that I was at least concerned, let me just put it that way, and then ... Norm, we have chatted about this briefly ... somewhere along the way between when ANILCA was passed and when you came in in January of 1983 I'm fairly confident I wrote a memo or two, probably to my immediate supervisor and I believe to the Associate Manager. My immediate supervisor was Dave Olsen, who had also spent a number of years in Alaska, and was also my tennis partner on the Department of the Interior tennis team for a number of years. We were entirely different individuals, had very different playing styles, so I'm sure we were ... we were a very interesting team ... doubles team to watch on the court. But Dave was a great guy and gave me a lot of leeway and flexibility on

my job and I think I wrote to ... and my guess is maybe it was Bob Gilmore and Bob Putz at the time in the two positions as Deputy and Associate Manger for Refuges and Wildlife ... a memo or two between 1980 and 1983 regarding my concerns. And I'm confident that those concerns were stimulated in part by either oral or written briefings we had received from the Alaska Regional Office regarding either their intentions on how they were going to implement the planning provisions of ANILCA ... the first comprehensive conservation planning provisions of ANILCA ... or maybe we even saw some draft products. And I'm not honestly ... I don't recollect exactly what it was and some day maybe I'll find those memos and I'll share those with you Norm, but I haven't been able to find those recently so I'm working off a dusty memory at this point. But I do remember the reaction I received to my memos and this is probably partly just a reflection of my own character, but they said, "Oh Steve, this is" ... and obviously I'm paraphrasing here but ... "this is all very interesting, now go back to your cubical. Everything will be just fine." (laughter) So that was the situation, I've never been one to ... to be ... what's the word I want ... hesitant about voicing my opinion about things and I'm confident that I did that repeatedly and then I think Norm, what did happen is ... is you and maybe Art (Wemerus) came in 1983 ... January 1983.

NO No, actually Art ... Art didn't come along. I think I was the only one that came in with that preliminary draft of the Kenai Plan, primarily to sit down with Stephanie Caswell who was in refuges at that time ... was acting chief I think, of the Planning Branch.

SM The Planning Branch, okay.

NO And we also did briefings for Bill Horn in Interior and ... and ... oh, the name escapes me ... also in Interior and that would have been ...

SM Ray Arnett?

NO Ray Arnett ... Ray Arnett (Note: G. Ray Arnett, Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks during part of the Reagan Administration and the former Director of the California Department of Fish and Game).

SM Ah gee, we could have a lot of stories about Ray, Norm, but we may not have time to do that today.

NO And what we should ... and basically it was, you know, what should we do with this draft?

SM Right.

NO We need to beef it up, we need to do some more on it, what is it we should be doing?

SM Right, and I'm confident I attended at least one of those briefings, maybe more.

NO Oh, I'm sure you did ... I'm sure you did.

SM And I think what it did is it verified, validated, whatever the proper word is here, some of my concerns regarding what ... what I thought might not be happening and that I think I felt strongly that ... and once again this gets back to process and product ... from the briefings I remember earlier on that I did not believe that the process that was proposed and it might have also ... it might have included everything from the dollars allocated, to the schedule being proposed, to the ... to the number and types of disciplinary professionals who were being assigned to the task, et cetera, but I didn't feel that folks had an honest grasp of the challenge involved in doing this well and doing it properly. And I think that in part was because we didn't have a good history, because except when we started hiring people to do the CCPs in Alaska ... like people like Norm ... we did not have professional natural resource planners ... land use planners ... people with professional training and experience in planning in the Fish and Wildlife Service in refuges. And so we didn't have this rich history that most other land management agencies had in terms of the process, how you go through it, how much it actually costs, how long it takes, but then more importantly, the value of doing all of this. And in our region ... in Region 1 of the Fish and Wildlife Service ... we of course are going through the CCP process right now for all of our refuges under a different law ... its under the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997 which mirrors ANILCA in its CCP requirements and in fact, they're all called comprehensive conservation plans even though just prior to the Improvement Act being passed, in all of our policies, in all of our memos, we called them comprehensive management plans. So there's a lot of similarity between the Improvement Act's requirements for planning and what was in ANILCA. ANILCA was a very far-reaching, visionary law in that regard and good solid standards, very, very solid concepts in terms of what we ought to be doing, what ought to be in these plans, how we ought to get the job done, et cetera. So I think that ... that part of why I think we were going array, if you will, is because we did not have planning in our culture. I don't think it was part of who we were as an agency; I don't think it was part of the National Wildlife Refuge System. If we ever did what some people called planning in the past it was done reluctantly, they shut somebody in a room someplace, they told him to write this plan, they gave him an outline, the person wrote the plan, somebody signed it locally and they put it on the shelf and that was it. And as we all know professionally, under any of the legal requirements since ANILCA has been passed, that is not what planning is, that's not what it requires and of course, there's no value ... excuse me, there's very little value, in doing planning that way. The real value is in gathering the data, doing the analysis, involving multiple partners, multiple constituency groups and getting that ... that rich involvement integrated in the planning and decision-making process and NEPA, of course, is part of that whole effort. NEPA's been around since 1970, it's a very, very old law, we've had a lot of history implementing that law, although that's another very minor detour here Norm, if you'll bear with me. When I joined the Fish and Wildlife Service in 1977 we did have policy on NEPA compliance in the Fish and Wildlife Service. It was all for Ecological Services and it was all to help us tell the other agencies what they were doing wrong with NEPA compliance. There was nothing for the action portion of the agency, in other words, the National Wildlife Refuge System had great policies, we had lots of policies, we promulgated and revised and updated policies on a fairly regular basis, we had nothing for NEPA compliance for refuges. I worked with the gentlemen, Harvey Lee I mentioned earlier, in Portland we wrote policy for this region but we ended up ... what we wrote ended up being the basis for the policy that was then adopted in ... it would have been ... oh, I don't know, '78, '79, '80 ... it was the first NEPA policy for the National Wildlife Refuge System. So I feel because of partly my tiny bit of work during graduate school and certainly

extensive work with NEPA with the Corps of Engineers and then my work again in Portland here and then working on that policy, I got a pretty good grounding in NEPA in addition to ... in addition to planning. And I think that as a result of all of that, as a result of the earlier memos, as a result partially I think of the fact that I had warned people in the Washington Office and then when the preliminary internal draft came in for review and people looked at it and after the briefings, I think other folks shared my concern. I think that was all the basis for me having this opportunity ... which turned out to be a wonderful opportunity ... to spend two-months in Alaska ... February through early April, something like that of 1983 working closely with you Norm, on the Kenai Plan and our charge was following the briefings, primarily to do some reformatting, to bring it up to standards as we saw them for ANILCA and make sure they complied with NEPA requirements and then to develop a prototype which the intent was that would be the prototype for all of the CCPs in Alaska. And from what I remember and the little bit of information I've been able to find in terms of sort of the post-detail evaluation, I think folks thought we ... we made good success ... we were fairly successful in achieving that.

NO I think everyone would agree with that.

SM So I think that's just by way of background, how I even got involved in this and I think the other thing that's maybe for ... for people who are interested in organizational history and evolution ... or devolution, depending upon your perspective ... so, as I said, this Program Management system was multiple organizational, reorganizations ago in the Fish and Wildlife Service. I actually was not working in the Division of Refuges, and that's maybe fairly important here, so I was detailed from this small Program Development for Wildlife office to the Division of Refuges for the time, if you will, for the purposes of this detail. So then I was assigned to the Branch of Planning in the Division of Refuges and Stephanie Caswell was the acting chief of the Branch at the time, so I ended up actually working under her supervision for this detail, but in Alaska. So that's maybe a quick introduction on how we got there ... how I got there, excuse me, Norm was already there working hard! (laughter)

NO What can you tell us about actually going to Alaska and the detail you actually experienced when you were there? What did you do, you know, what kind of work did we ... we get involved with doing and what was it like to be in Alaska at that time?

SM Well, I guess a couple of things. I think in ... in part I had always had a ... had a dream about possibly working in Alaska. In fact, even after the detail, I think I applied for a couple of jobs in Alaska. I did not get selected for some reason, they fell through for whatever reason, but ... so it was a great opportunity for me, of course Alaska being the last frontier and all, it was just ... and I was ... by the way, I was single at the time. I had been divorced a few years prior to that and so I was fairly foot loose and fancy free and so this was a great opportunity for me. I had a great time, I learned an enormous amount, I had an opportunity to work with some very, very dedicated and talented professionals ... Norm being one of those people ... and I ... I think I helped make a contribution. I know we worked our butts off ... I don't know if I can use that word ... but anyway, we worked extremely hard, we worked a lot of evenings, we worked a lot of weekends. If I remember correctly our standard schedule ... Norm, maybe you can correct this ... but I think I remember routinely for several weeks anyway, we would ... we would fly down to Kenai on Monday morning, we'd stay there till Thursday night ... we'd fly back Thursday

night ... we'd work in the Regional Office in Anchorage all day Friday and many Saturdays from what I remember.

NO That's right, yeah.

SM And we got good support from the Regional Office, from a number of people ... writers, editors and graphic folks if I remember correctly. But I ... I have to say and, you know, I shouldn't neglect this at all, and I'm sure we'll get into this a little bit more, but the folks at the refuge I think were highly professional, extremely knowledgeable people, with very good attitudes and that wasn't ... certainly was not guaranteed, considering the situation.

NO Yeah.

SM So I think we were very, very fortunate. I certainly felt very fortunate because of that. I felt ... I felt very welcome and once again that's certainly ... that's sort of an environment where you are thrust upon other people and certainly not guaranteed. Bob Delaney, the Refuge Manager, wonderful guy who I occasionally ran into later in my career. He was at the Great Lakes Interagency Facility at some point for several years in his career, overseeing research ... Great Rivers ... Great Lakes?

NO Yeah, actually he worked at ... I believe it was Unalaska ... Unalaska in Wisconsin, I guess it was.

SM Wisconsin.

NO On the Mississippi River and it was a program ... a research program. Yes, he was there for a number of years.

SM So, I saw him in his office one day there because I was involved in some training at that facility. And then Mike Hedrick, the Deputy ... also a fabulous person ... who I believe recently just retired from ... as the Refuge Manager from Charles M. Russell Refuge.

NO I believe that's correct.

SM So, I've run into Mike off and on over the years and Rick Johnston who was there. I remember him as an incredible character and horribly enthusiastic about his work and the issues he believed in. So I think, we just had ... anyway, some very knowledgeable biologists there, one of whom I have to admit I don't remember him from Alaska, but Ed Bangs, who I've since had interaction with. As Norm was saying earlier, he's the wolf man for the Fish and Wildlife Service! (laughter) I honestly don't remember them, I might if I saw more photos or whatever, but I remember we got excellent support while we were there and we were well received and that makes all the difference in the world. I think that that was a major contribution to our success; I don't think we could have succeeded with out that.

NO With out that.

SM To the extent that we did succeed.

NO Yeah, I think that can be largely attributed to Bob Delaney, because I know the summer before, in 1982 when I started working with the Kenai Plan ... to pull together a draft, the first draft we really had of a comprehensive conservation plan ... I know I was sitting down in that conference room at Kenai Refuge headquarters with Bob and his staff and Bob telling the staff this is the most important thing we have to do right now is work on the preparation of this plan that's going to guide management of the refuge in the future. So everything else we do we're going to set aside and that plan was put together basically working in that same room with the staff on a day to day basis, working from 8 to 4 and then in the evening they'd go out ... and the biologists would go out and fly and do their surveys and things in the evening. So Bob I think is probably the one to get credit for that sort of preparing the staff, saying this is ... this is incredibly important, it's the most important thing we've got to do right now.

SM You know that's interesting you mention that because that makes very, very good sense to me. Setting the stage and ... and putting this into context of workload priorities for the ... for the refuge staff, this is honestly a problem we've been having in our region with our CCPs in recent years. And if ... if that stage is not set, if ... if the refuge manager ... the refuge project leader ... does not make it absolutely crystal clear and doesn't have support with the refuge supervisor and the regional chief now for refuges, that in fact that is true, that this is highest priority while that work is under way, the ... the plans languish. The quality of the plans is ... is hit and miss, it's inconsistent, things don't happen when and where and how they need to and we've run into just enormous difficulties and that is I think ... well, I shouldn't say it's completely changed, but in ... well, in some cases where the refuge manager did set that out at the outset it made all the difference in the quality of the plan and the manner ... the speed with which they got through the plan. Even with some incredibly complex issues that they were dealing with, controversial issues, we are ... we are I think changing expectations now in our region with final recognition of how important that is. So just the attitude, setting the stage, making sure everybody understands workload priorities is absolutely critical to getting the job done.

NO Yeah, it was very important for me to hear him tell the staff that because here I was ... I was the only person working from the Regional Office ... working with them at the time on the plan, so to hear him tell the staff that it just made my job that much easier in terms of working with them because I got complete cooperation. The quality of the plan we produced in that first draft might be questionable, but at least there was a lot of sincere effort that went into putting it together and no one had put together a CCP at that time, so there was nothing to measure it against at that particular point. And I think the effort we went through in terms of what we did early in 1983 with your help, I think, as you've already said, vastly increased the quality of that particular document without question.

SM That's good to hear. You know I have ... I have to say also, you know part of my memory here is these ... these flights down in small planes from Anchorage down to Kenai or Soldotna wherever we flew into, and taking off from the big Anchorage airport, but you're in this small plane, and half the time I can remember it was just you and I and maybe a couple of oil field workers or whomever ... not very many people ... and we'd be taxiing down the runway

and only one of the engines was on, and the pilot just wasn't too concerned about that, and they'd get the other one on before we ... before we took off. So it was ... it was a different experience for me, I think I got a flavor of living and working in Alaska. We lived, in if I remember correctly, in actually fairly nice lodging ... a fairly new bunkhouse at Kenai when we were there. I remember I ... before I left Washington, DC, I got myself a big heavy down jacket and some Sorrel Boots and those made all the difference in the world. And I can also remember there was at least one restaurant that you and I routinely went to in Soldotna and it was little ... it might have even been in a house, I don't remember. It was a very small restaurant, excellent food and they had these ... these small little vases ... hand made pottery vases that held flowers and I ended up buying a number of them and bringing them back as Christmas presents that year. But I ... so there are some of those memories that I've got of ... and I can remember that we would go back after dinner and work. I mean this ... this was such an enormous amount of work in honestly a relatively short amount of time, but I think that with everybody pulling together and the full assistance of the refuge staff and then the support we got out of I think some key people in the Regional Office, I think we were able to turn this around and ... and develop a product that ... that apparently was ... was able to fill the needs. So generally I feel good about that. I think though that this ... I did write a fairly scathing memo on my return to Washington, DC about my experience and it has nothing to do with Norm, it has nothing to do with the Kenai staff, except in a very positive manner. But I think what it did talk about ... and it's a memo that is in the "Norm Olson Collection" and is dated 4/20/83, so April 20th of 1983 ... one of the things it talks about is something I've alluded to earlier which is attitude and it is attitude of fish and wildlife management in the refuge system regarding planning and this new responsibility under ANILCA. And I guess to me that was really the ... kind of the crux of the problem, partly because we didn't have planning in our culture and partly because of how at least some key people were interpreting that particular requirement. I don't think some people took it seriously at all ... thought that maybe we could get by with what we used to call master plans and hand it to somebody to write in a back room for a couple of days and they'd put in on a shelf ... certainly that's not what ANILCA required. And I think that some people wanted to take the money that came ... and if I remember correctly, there was a special appropriation; I don't know if it was a line item but certainly ... an earmark or whatever ... but a special appropriation for CCPs to Region 7 for refuges. So there was ... there was money available to do this very important work and I think some people viewed that as an opportunity to get more research done on the refuges, certainly something that we all desire is more information, but we'll never have all the information we need and ... and even today under the Refuge Improvement Act or even our Compatibility Standards, the requirement is that you use the best information that is currently available do the best job you can and you make the best decisions you can in light of that and in light of input from the public, state agencies, other federal agencies, Native corporations in Alaska, tribes down here, and other partners. And then you have the opportunity to test these things out. We use adaptive management to make necessary changes and then we revise the plans when necessary, and at that point you've got more experience, hopefully you have better information because you've had a chance to do necessary research on critical issues, and over time in that incremental and evolutionary process the quality of the plans improve. But it isn't the plan, it's the decisions that improve, it's the opportunities that are available to the public, it's the manner in which we manage the habitat for fish and wildlife and plants, those are the things, that's what the plans are all about. So I guess just overall, my experience in Alaska was absolutely fabulous; it was ... it was magical in a lot of ways. I had this ... this bizarre ... my

lodging when I was in Anchorage was I think on the 19th or 20th floor of the Hilton Hotel. (laughter) I mean it was ... it was just ... it was almost surreal. And I had a view out to the Alaska Range, so I would watch as the sun came up and I believe they're lit up in dawn and the sun coming up would light the ... the snow-topped peaks of the Alaska Range from my view out of the Hilton Hotel. It was very strange, it was not the sort of life I had normally lived and certainly wasn't my view of a traditional Alaskan experience. That said, I also got to watch the Iditarod start and I had read The Last Great Race (note: Tom Jones, 1982), that isn't the name of it ... what's the book that was ... had just been published in the early 1980s on the Iditarod. So I had read that either immediately before or on the way to Alaska, and I got to watch the Iditarod start right down in the street in front of my hotel. Now that was fabulous, just an incredible experience, but it was also interesting in that that year the snowfall wasn't so great and that they had to truck the snow in to get the Iditarod started! And then I think they just kind of ran them through Anchorage and then they put them back on trucks and went out to where there actually was snow on the ground. And that was also the same winter where there was a World Cup cross-country ski race in Alaska ... at the city park ... state park ... (note: Kincaid Park, an Anchorage city park, was the site of the World Cup cross-country ski races in March 1983)

NO Oh, it's the park that's out by the ... out by the airport.

SM Yes, yes.

NO I can't remember the name of it ... it had wonderful ski trails though.

SM Wonderful ski trails ... when there's snow!

NO When there's snow.

SM So this is the world cup cross-country ski race in Anchorage, they had to truck in snow for that race too! (laughter) But I remember going to that, I remember going with ... with I don't know if you were there or not, but I remember a bunch of us going and watching some of the races, so that was another highlight. I remember some great evenings after work and getting together with ... with Pete Jerome and his wife Debra, a friend of mine who was working in Alaska ... Gary Gustafson ... who I actually roomed with in graduate school. He was a childhood friend, he was working at the time for, I think it was then the State of Alaska, he also worked for the Municipality of Anchorage and he's now working I think for Exxon, my god! Anyway, but we would all go out as a group ... people knew each other in town, we'd ... I think Henry Weinhard's was newly introduced ... that's a Portland-based beer brewery, the Blitz Weinhard Brewery ... and Henry's was their ... certainly their highest quality product that had newly been introduced up there, so everybody thought that was pretty good beer. We had good times, we shared a lot of stories, I think we ... I think we ... we gained some camaraderie as a result of that, got to know each other a lot better, and I think that our working relationship improved as a result of that. And we did also spend some time together on weekends ... the World Cup was one example, but I also remember going out to Lake Louise, is it Lake Louise that runs ... there's a lake out to the east of Anchorage about an hour and a half I think it was.

NO I think its Lake Louise, yeah.

SM A very large lake. Anyways to some lodge out there that we stayed in some little cabin that was half buried in the snow and just some great memories, but you know, we really worked ... we worked hard. I think ... I think we got some high-quality work done. I think we ended up developing a prototype that was useful to the folks that did such great plans up there and there is no question that the experience in Alaska on refuges with CCPs is what prepared us --- to the extent that we have been prepared --- for the work that we are doing in the lower '48 or lower '49 with CCPs, and I think we learned a lot from those experiences.

NO Absolutely, I think I might digress a minute here. Your concerns over management's view of ANILCA and the planning process that we were involved with, I can probably support what ... the concerns that you had in something I mentioned to you earlier. I know I was hired by a fellow named Art Wemmerus, who was the Chief of Planning and this would have been in January of 1982 that I reported for duty and after you had been up there, later in 1983, Art admitted to me at one point that ... that he really didn't think that the planning requirements in ANILCA were that important, and that what he viewed this opportunity as, in terms of the money that was coming in, was to hire the resource specialists that were necessary to do the research and actually do the work to provide a better understanding of the habitats that we were dealing with in Alaska and that this was the information that was needed by the new refuge managers to make good decisions, that the planning really was kind of, you know, secondary and irrelevant and that's reflected in the staff that they hired because it took them a year to figure out that they needed to hire a planner. They had all these other resource specialists and I think I mentioned to you that after I had arrived in Anchorage, probably a month or so later, sitting in a room with all these people that had been hired in 1981, botanists and a lot of other people, while they debated for a whole week all the ... all the provisions and requirements of ANILCA ... what did it mean, you know, what was it that the Service was supposed to be doing. And I was the only planner in the room and at the end of the week I finally ... I came out of there with the ... with the feeling that they had been doing this for a whole year and that what I needed to do was simply go down and start working with the Kenai staff to see if we could pull together a document, a plan, figure out the process we needed to use and then actually develop a plan. So I think that confirms the fact that you were right to be suspicious of the intentions perhaps of certain management ... levels of management in dealing with this particular issue, and that was the case.

SM And I think that you bring up Art ... I think that he's one of the individuals who I remember focusing especially ... and if I remember correctly, Art he did have a PhD right ... he was a ...

NO You know, I really couldn't tell you that.

SM I think he did; now I could be wrong about that, but I think his background was in research and certainly you can understand his interest. Well, here comes some new money and we're, you know, we're going to be doing this planning thing, what ever it is, to support management and we need obviously good data to do this. You can certainly understand his interest based on that sort of background and training and experience, but I mean that does, just supports the concerns that I had, that we weren't focusing on the right sorts of things to get the

job done and meet the very, very high standards that were enacted with ... with ANILCA and that obviously requires hiring the sorts of people you need too. At a minimum we ought to have at least a hand full of people who have professional planning training and experience and then we need an interdisciplinary team to work, to be working with ... with that individual, whether that individual is guiding the team or whatever else, but it does take a group of people with a variety of skills and knowledge to do a credible job on these very, very complex pieces of work.

NO Absolutely.

SM I don't know, its just ... it ... well, let's ... we'll just keep moving on here. (laughter)

NO Well, we could maybe talk a little bit about that memo that you wrote which is post ... your post detail memo and who you addressed that memo to and the concerns that you expressed in that memo and how it was received by the people that it was addressed to.

SM Well, I have touched on some of the concerns that I brought out in the memo. As I said, it was dated April 20th 1983 so it was ... it was what, within a couple of weeks after I had returned to Washington, DC, and I point out in the memo that it really was a great personal experience for me. I think I ... I learned a lot, I certainly hope I contributed a lot, I worked with a great group of people, I was very ... very gratified, honored to have had that opportunity, but I also recorded for the individuals who I had targeted with this memo, and I sent this from myself to the Associate Director for Wildlife Resources, so that would have been the same individual who we also called the Program Manager for all of Wildlife Resources or Refuges and Wildlife and I think at that time that was Bob Putz and I think that Bob Gilmore might have been the Deputy at that particular time. I then made copies for Dave Olsen who was my immediate supervisor, Stephanie Caswell who, of course, was the ... at least the acting Chief of the Branch of Planning, possibly the chief at that particular point because she did end assuming that position right, full time.

NO Right.

SM And then of course, provided copies to you Norm, to Pete Jerome, and then to Leslie Kerr and we haven't really spoken much about Leslie. She ... I didn't really have an opportunity to work too much with her and I think she may have only come in or come in part way during my ... possibly during my detail or perhaps only shortly before or something.

NO I think it was probably after your detail.

SM Afterwards.

NO It took a while for her to come on board and start working, yes.

SM Okay, but I ... I think I talked about the types of experiences we had, I think the sorts of ... of changes we made and certainly the hope that the revised document would serve as the prototype. But I think what I did was reiterate some of the concerns I had expressed in those earlier memos I've mentioned briefly and haven't been able to find, but concerns regarding the

future of the planning effort if it continued heading in the direction it was going and I think that that was probably the main issue there. The planning effort did ultimately succeed; Anchorage did hire some professional planners and you all did, you know, you went through the process. It took years, cost a hell of a lot of money, but it's exactly what the law required and I think from what I have heard from people, it resulted in not just good plans but good management, good decisions and it provided a solid foundation for the process we're going through right now which is revising those plans, reconsidering those and I don't know how much, I couldn't honestly say how much, substantive change is being made to those plans, but I think it provided an extremely solid foundation. So I feel good about that, but I'm not confident that either that would have happened, or would have happened as quickly, maybe that's the more accurate way to phrase that, would have happened as quickly if we hadn't really ... hadn't pushed this and sometimes that's, of course, what it takes to cause change and change usually happens incrementally just because we're a giant bureaucracy. Fish and Wildlife Service is not so giant, but any bureaucracy is fairly large and it's difficult to make change and to move the bureaucracy in a different direction. And part of that is changing personnel, part is changing attitudes, part of that's establishing work-load priorities, the sorts of things we've talked about several times. But my memo was strongly worded, fairly scathing and said that even though we had some very capable individuals up there, that if they didn't change attitudes and priorities and schedules and allocation of funding, et cetera, that we probably were not going to succeed across the ... across the Region, so that was basically the same message.

NO Yeah, and I think that work I suspect, you know, the effort that we were both involved with here in terms of reformatting, rewriting the Kenai draft and the memos that you wrote that so succinctly focused on the problems that we faced, I think it did make a difference because it was probably later that year that we actually got the authorization to hire the additional people so that we were able to form the three final planning teams with a team leader, a biologist, a public involvement specialist and a writer editor, so that we wound up with a staff of nearly 14 people actually that was focusing on ... on putting together these plans. And that one of the things I know that I'm proudest of is the fact that ANILCA required that all the plans be completed within 7 years, which would have been 1987 ... December of 1987 ... well, it took a year to hire the first planner but once the first planner was in place, we did in fact complete the plans within 7 years. It was a year after the ANILCA date, but the ... once the teams were in place ... we did do the job in 7 years.

SM That's ... that's extremely impressive considering the scale of the ... of the challenge that confronted you, but, you know, I'm trying to remember ... 76 million acres, it was a lot of land ... more than 13 or 14 units, I've forgotten.

NO There were 16 refuges and it involved 76 million some acres, because I know the projects I worked on totaled almost over 50 million acres. I did the Arctic and the Yukon Delta, which were the two largest refuges, as well as a number of other refuges. So it was an interesting ... an interesting exercise and a very rewarding sort of an exercise in that we were able to get the job done essentially.

SM Well, and once again, I mean I have no idea what ... what small role I may have played in some of this, but I think that ... that the fact that the Region did hire enough people to get

these three teams established is ... is probably the bottom line. That is what guaranteed the success that we enjoyed up there, even with that of course, you drew heavily on refuge staffs and on other disciplinary specialists to pull together the information and the analyses that you needed. I guess I would just observe that this is just sort of classic Refuge System ... although actually it's better than classic Refuge System ... so you had what, 14 people did you say in your three teams?

NO Yes.

SM Fourteen people, 16 refuges, 76 million acres of land in 7 years. That is an impossible task, that's impossible and I'm sure your funding was not overwhelming; you couldn't contract it all out. Any other organization ... human organization in the United States would have had a cast of thousands to do that job, so I think that a huge, huge kudos go out to you and your teams up there for the work that was done, it was a gargantuan happening!

NO It was and another interesting aspect of it was, basically we were dealing with all new refuge staffs since the majority of the refuges had been established in 1980. There were a number of older refuges that had been expanded like Kenai and Yukon Delta, but many of the refuges were brand new and the staff there was brand new. So they ... most of them had come from the lower 48, so this was sort of a new experience for all of us. So there were a lot of people that played a role really in making sure that this was in the end a successful effort and I think the other thing I might add is that has been gratifying to me over the years is to have people that work on Alaskan refuges come back and say, "Oh yeah, we use the plan and when we needed to make this decision, when someone came in and wanted to do something we could simply go to the plan and say no, you can't do that right here, you could do it over here, but you can't do it right there, or if you do it it's got to be under these circumstances." So to know that they were used is probably the ultimate sort of really, you know ...

SM Vindication of your incredible efforts and ... and hard work and really the planning process, the need for planning, the value of planning.

NO Vindication, yeah. Now going back to your role, it was certainly only a two-month role that you played, but what you did bring, and I go back to your experience, going back to graduate school with NEPA ... the National Environmental Policy Act and its intricacies ... you brought all of that to the process and helped us, you know, make it a better NEPA document. Because one thing I was lacking, I had lots of planning experience, but I worked at the state and local levels and had never really worked with NEPA that much. So the document that we put together initially was ... was admittedly very weak, and I think you helped strengthen the document. Your background was important in doing that, your understanding of the process, that NEPA process, integrating it into the planning process, we were trying to use.

SM And ... and it's interesting you bring that up too, because we had at the Departmental level, I think a very rigid view of ... of what NEPA required and how we would comply with NEPA. Yet the reality is that NEPA is a very flexible law and even the CEQ regulations are quite flexible and ... and all the recent evolution over the last couple of decades with NEPA is ... you will see just more and more encouragement of doing whatever it takes to get the job done in

a timely and cost-effective manner, and avoiding redundancy and avoiding length and avoiding all the sorts of things that people thought years ago had to go into NEPA documents. And it was something that once again, as I said, there was this rather stilted view in the Departmental Office of what was required and we deviated from that. And I think what we did is, we focused on the substantive requirements, we got the job done, we created documents that were user-friendly, if you will, to the extent that that still met NEPA requirements, and there are some things in NEPA that are a little bit strange, we all know that, but I think we ended up with some documents that people could actually get through and understand what ... what the message was, and communications of course, is ... is the bottom line on these documents. You've got to communicate with the publics, you've got to communicate with the broad array of interest groups and then I would argue most importantly 5, 10, 15 years later, you've got to communicate with the people who are managing that refuge and trying to figure out what was intended here, what was the ... where were the data, what were the analyses that supported this particular decision, why did we ever think that we ought to do this versus that in any particular spot, et cetera. And so very, very clear communications is essential. NEPA sometimes helps and sometimes doesn't in that regard. Sometimes the information is there but it's extremely hard to find in the traditional NEPA document. So I do remember and you reminded me again this evening that I think we had a few challenges with the document we prepared in getting it through for final approval at the Washington Office level. But apparently it did the trick and I don't remember you saying that we were successfully litigated, at least from the NEPA perspective of the document. So there are lots of other reasons to litigate for refuge CCPs that ... and NEPA honestly is ... is one of the more common ones used, so it is important to have someone working with the team somewhere along the way that at least has enough knowledge to know what is minimally required to create an adequate document. You know, that reminds me of something else to, there's another person who joined us up there. I know Stephanie (note: Stephanie Caswell) came up at some point during my detail and I don't remember how long she was there, but she was there for at least several days and I think we did briefings; we talked about the progress we had made, that sort of thing. So I think that she was up there and she of course, had some good background in both planning and NEPA and provided her perspective on that. And then another person who helped out ... I don't remember if she came to Alaska or she worked from DC ... was Noreen Clough.

NO That's right, that's right.

SM Noreen at the time ... I don't remember if she was actually working in Refuges or just providing us assistance, but Noreen was a NEPA expert, NEPA specialist and the ... and the only reason I ... I shouldn't say the only reason is NEPA, Noreen is a wonderful person and very helpful ... but the one reason I bring this up is that Noreen Clough at that time was a fairly low-graded individual and I'm thinking like 7/9, which is fairly low grade in Washington, DC. She of course, went on to become a Regional Director ...

NO That's right.

SM ... in the southeast, for the entire Fish and Wildlife Service, so she had a stellar career. She was involved with this plan and the NEPA document that went with it, I know it now. What

I don't remember is if she ever came to Anchorage to work with us on that, but I know she was involved.

NO Yeah, you're right ... you're right. In fact I think she was involved primarily from the Washington end, you know, reviewing what we had done, what we had put together, that sort of thing, but you're right, she was involved, that's right.

SM So that's interesting, another person who played an important role here.

NO Yeah, there were so many ... so many. Lets see, we've got about an hour on the tape right now.

SM Gee, I hope its quality Norm. (laughter)

NO Oh, I'm sure it is ... I'm sure it is. Anything else that you can think of at this point that needs to be added or ... or you'd like to add, any observations at this point? I think we've covered a lot.

SM We've covered quite a bit. You know, I think it's interesting this ... this effort that you were instrumental in was a major new phase for the entire Fish and Wildlife Service, in the Refuge System. In the Fish and Wildlife Service of course, the Refuge System is a ... is a ... an entity in and of itself, it's a whole separate program in a variety of regards, we have our own history, our own culture, our own way of doing things. A lot of people if they know about the Fish and Wildlife Service at all may only know about it because of the Refuge System and they may or may not even know that refuges are managed by the Fish and Wildlife Service; they think that those are refuge folks. Or other people may know about the Fish and Wildlife Service and only know about it because of endangered species and regulatory matters and may not even know that the refuges, National Wildlife Refuge System is part of that same organization. The only reason I'm bringing any of this up is that ... is that this project, this huge project that you were involved with, set the stage for what will forever be part of the National Wildlife Refuge System, and I'm not just talking about the plans. I'm talking about planning; I'm talking about the process, about the value of thinking before we act, something that I had lots of discussions about with Dave Olsen over the years. In fact, that was what characterized our tennis playing style and the differences. Dave Olsen was a very action-oriented individual. He had come up through the field, he was very operationally oriented and wanted to get things done. Something I admired greatly and he did a superb job in that regard. When we were on the tennis court, Dave and I would always argue about who acted first and thought latter. I always thought first and occasionally acted, so we used to say there were problems with both of those styles. But it was because of our philosophies; it was the way we approached life and problem solving and how we got the job done. And I think that yes, it takes lots of time and a lot of people and a lot money, but planning is now part of how we manage national wildlife refuges. It is integral to what we do, it's how we make very, very important decisions and that's one thing that ... that we are just now hearing finally in our Region. We finished up a few CCPs, one for Little Pend Oreille National Wildlife Refuge, one for Nisqually National Wildlife Refuge, in fact Nisqually Refuge CCP recently received the first-ever honor as the best CCP in the Nation. First time that honor ... that award has been provided, but both of those plans ... they're good plans, very, very

lengthy planning processes ... took a lot of time, a lot of money, a lot of people. I was involved in both of those early on and throughout the plans, or excuse me, in and out throughout the plans. They developed very valuable documents; I think those documents will be important for guiding management of the refuges and making key decisions down the road. I think that they had ... they had ... they did as good a job as you could with gathering and analyzing the available data. I think they both did excellent jobs in terms of involving the public, other partners, key agencies, neighboring land owners, et cetera, as is required under the Improvement Act. But as important as any of that, is that we used the planning process, not the document, the planning process to address and in both of those cases resolve huge, complex, contentious, longstanding issues at those refuges and I know you guys did exactly the same thing in Alaska, because that's one of the huge values of planning. It's valuable later, its valuable for the people who follow it, it provides a road map and to a certain extent some sort of a historic link, but its extremely valuable during the process. Little Pend Oreille Refuge, we took over management after 30 years of state management in the early 1990's.

NO Right.

SM Lisa Langelier, a superb manager with a huge job, took this on and attempted to grapple with these ... with these several issues ... I won't go into all of these issues, but we had ... we had a number of very contentious public-use issues. We had military survival training occurring on the Refuge with helicopters landing and ordinance exploding and closing off huge areas to public use. We had grazing going on, livestock grazing on essentially a forested Refuge with very valuable riparian areas, not a whole lot of area that I think any wildlife biologist would consider is top notch for grazing, although we will still provide I think a very, very limited closely prescribed grazing program into the future. But what we did in the planning process at Little Pend Oreille is we addressed public use, public access, essentially unlimited public-use camping where you go anywhere you want, unlimited road access, unlimited access to the Refuge from a variety of places. We addressed the grazing issue, even though we just recently just had to readdress it because it was such a politically hot issue. We addressed the military survival school issue, a huge political hot topic. We did that all through the planning process and that is a ... a critically important value of planning, the process itself, and so I guess all I'm saying is what you were involved in, what you were instrumental in starting, the process you set up, the team approach, the ... the training you have provided over the years to I don't know how many hundreds probably of Fish and Wildlife Service employees through NCTC's class, that entire thinking process, analytical process, public-involvement process, all of that is now part of the fabric of how we do business in the National Wildlife Refuge System, a System that I know you agree we hope will be here in perpetuity. And this is now part of how we do business, it's part of how we make decisions; it's part of ... of how we look to providing guidance for those who follow us, it's critical. So what you did is a ... is a key change in how we manage the National Wildlife Refuge System. So anyway, I see that as one of the very important legacies of that whole effort in Alaska.

NO Oh, if that's part of the legacy, that was certainly an important part of the legacy, the one we would have wanted to have seen and it does validate I think everything ... the hard work that went into it back in the '80s. And it was hard work, but it was also a hell of a lot of fun and

exciting. It's sort of one of the highlights certainly of my career ... those years in Alaska ... a great opportunity, yeah. So with that are we probably ready ...

SM I'm ... I'm probably pretty well talked out Norm, yeah.

NO Okay.

SM Thank you very much for this opportunity, I appreciate it!

NO Thank you for spending some time with me.

SM I'm especially honored to just have an opportunity to ... to expound for a while on a few thoughts, on past experiences, so thank you.

NO And now we can have a Guinness, right?

SM Absolutely! Cheers! (laughter)

NO Thanks a lot Steve.

NEOlson 9 July 2009

Key Words for Oral History Cover Sheet

adaptive management	fishes	places (human-made)
aircraft	history	planning
automobiles	lakes	plants
biologist (USFWS)	law enforcement	public access
birds	leadership	public attitudes
buildings, facilities, and structures	legislation	resource management
buttes	leisure activities	roads
collaboration	maintenance	snow
communication	mammals	supervision
conservation	management	training
Directors (USFWS)	meetings	transportation
document	military	vehicles
employees (USFWS)	motor vehicles	waterfowl
environments (natural)	mountains	wildlife management
	parks	wildlife refuge
	pest control	
	pesticide	