Oral History Cover Sheet

Name: Dick Pospahala
Date of Interview: September 16, 2005
Location of Interview: Portland, Oregon
Interviewer: John Cornely

Approximate years worked for Fish and Wildlife Service: 34 years (1969-2003)

Offices and Field Stations Worked, Positions Held: Migratory Bird Population Station, Laurel, Maryland; Assistant Chief, Office of Migratory Bird Management; Chief of Branch Surveys, Migratory Bird Office, Laurel, Maryland; Regional Migratory Bird Coordinator in Alaska, Geographic ARD or northern Alaska; ARD for Budget and Administration in Alaska; served as the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Representative on the International Porcupine Caribou Conservation Board

Most Important Projects: Population ecology of mallards in North America; North Star Project (first off shore oil development in Alaska); analyze what the impact would be of stabilizing hunting regulations for a period of five years; negotiating with Canada over Yukon River fishery; annual status reports for Migratory Birds; Waterfowl Breeding Ground Survey Program

Colleagues and Mentors: Red Shelton, Al Geis, Kahler, Martinson, Dave Allen, George Brakhage, John P. Rogers, Walt Crissey, Dave Anderson, Morton Smith, Ron Reynolds, Bob Jessen, Todd Eberhardt, Carl Madsen, Bob Gilmore, Walt Stieglitz, Glenn Elison, Tom Boyd, Don Berry, Jim Kurth, Fran Mauer, Hortin Jensen, Dr. Fred Glover, Doug Benning, Jim Voelzer, Don Fricke, John Gottschalk, Art Brazda, Ross Hansen, Kent Brace, Bernie Gallop, Harold Weaver, Bruce Turner, Dan Nieman, John Mulhern, Dale Casewell, Ray Greenwood, John Gottschalk, Art Brazda, Ross Hansen

Most Important Issues: trying to enforce Hooper Bay Agreement; changes in regulations, change in relationship with the Canadian Wildlife Service; point system for hunting

Brief Summary of Interview: Mr. Posphala starts off talking about early life, going to college, and joining the Fish and Wildlife Service. He discusses the various positions, issues, and projects he worked on. He talks about the relationship between the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Canadian Wildlife Service and various people he worked with there. He also mentions working with various Fish and Wildlife Service employees from Directors of the Service to biologists.

JOHN: This is John Cornely, it's the 16th of September in 2005 and today we're going to do an oral history with Dick Pospahala; a retiree with many years of service especially in the Migratory Bird Program. So we're going to have Dick tell us something about his life and his career.

DICK: Thank you John. First of all John said my name is Dick Pospahala. I was born and raised in Boulder, Colorado; my parents actually spent their younger years in the San Luis Valley of Colorado where the Monte Visa Refuge is now located. And my dad was an electrician and my mother was a cook at a local school. I have a brother and a sister; my brother is an electrical engineer and my sister was a medical technologist for many years. After I graduated from high school in Boulder, I initially started school at the University of Colorado in Boulder as a combined chemical engineer and business major. After a few years, both the school and I decided that a mutual desire for me to separate and go somewhere else to continue my education. So I ended up in Fort Collins at Colorado State University and I was there from about the fall of 1964 and finished an undergraduate degree in the spring of 1966 and went on to graduate school in the Colorado Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit there working on a waterfowl project on the Monte Vista Refuge under contract with what was then Region 2 of the Fish and Wildlife Service in Albuquerque. Red Sheldon, a rather illustrious historical figure in the Fish and Wildlife Service, was the regional refuge biologist at the time and supervised my work. The work that I did there was a continuation of a study that had been started in 1965. A fellow who went on to achieve considerable fame as a wildlife biologist and scientist, Doctor David Anderson, was the original investigator on a six year study there and I followed Dave and spent the summer of 1966 with him at the refuge and then in 1967 and '68 spent about five or six months a year in each of those two years doing parts of that study, which was concluded a few years later. And that peaked my interest in beginning a career as a migratory bird biologist and I decided then that's what I wanted to pursue as a career interest. It was very convenient for us at that time because the Waterfowl Technical Committee and the Waterfowl Council meetings for the Central Flyway were typically held in Denver, so as a student at the university I was able to take time off and go attend those meetings, and was able to become exposed to people that later on had a very significant influence in my career. The Migratory Bird Population Station had only been established a few years prior to that, I think it was 1963, and Al Geis, who was Assistant Director, of that unit and Kahler Martinson, who was then a section chief in that operation, typically attended those meetings and I was able to gain exposure to them and express in my interest then in going to work with them in Maryland after I finished my graduate degree. Well, as it worked out, by the time I graduated Kahler had moved into a position in Washington as the Chief of the Branch of Management, which in those days it was actually called Management and Enforcement and included two branches; one that included the Flyway Biologist cadre and the other which was a Division of Law Enforcement, and Kahler was over the Branch of Management. And they had a very

Spartan staff in Washington to handle many of their management responsibilities so they relied very heavily on the staff of the Migratory Bird Population Station to assist them in analyzing waterfowl population data. And in the meantime, Dr. John P. Rogers had entertained a transfer from a habitat specialist job in Washington D.C. with the Service to the position as Assistant Director of the Migratory Bird Population Station. So I got to know John early on and I did, in the first few years, worked very closer with Kalher during the waterfowl regulations development process in developing the annual status reports for migratory birds that were then used to discuss, or conduct deliberations with the various Flyway Technical Committees and Flyway Councils in developing the regulations for the ensuing waterfowl hunting season. It was about at that time that two very influential state Fish and Game Directors, one in Utah by the name of Bud Phelps and another in Colorado by the name of Jack Grieb, who were both very influential in the international organization and also very influential in the waterfowl community, decided that the Service had been somewhat autocratic in their approach to establishing hunting regulations. And Kahler and John, especially I think, were very sensitive to those concerns and set about trying to develop a waterfowl regulations development structure that was much more considerate of the views and technical expertise that was housed within the various state conservation agencies in developing regulations. And beginning in about 1970 or 1972 and for an ensuing period of several years, we saw a very marked change in the way regulations were established both in terms of the amount of communication and information exchange that took place between the Fish and Wildlife Service employees and the state organizations and also eventually the makeup of the Fish and Wildlife Service Migratory Bird Regulations Committee. And I haven't followed it closely in recent years but I think now each of the Flyways has two members represented on that committee as well the Service representatives that are on the Regulations Committee.

John has asked me, on aside here, to go back and discuss some of the limited knowledge I have of the makeup of the Fish and Wildlife Service Regulations Committee and exactly how those regulations were established pretty much prior to about 1972 or so. As best I can remember, the Service Regulations Committee consisted of what was then called the Assistant Director for Operations of the Fish and Wildlife Service, and each regional director and the regional chief of Management and Enforcement. In late July of every year, that group would convene on the 6th floor of the Secretary's conference room in the Interior Building and over about a two day period, led principally by staff from the Migratory Bird Population, mostly Walt Crissey and Al Geis, assisted by in some cases their staff, of which I was one; would make recommendations for seasons and bag limits in each of the flyways. And generally those recommendations were the ones that ended up being presented to the individual flyways and to the states from which they were able to make their selections. I think the rigidity with which that process was conducted is what gave rise to the acrimony that eventually led to its downfall in subsequent years. At least as so far as I can tell, I think I mentioned this earlier,

probably Kahler Martinson and John P. Rogers were primarily responsible for entertaining the wishes of the states to become, the Flyway Councils and Technical Committees, to become much more involved that process.

Two other things that were developing pretty much at the same time as the change in the regulations process was developing change in the relationship between the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the Canadian Wildlife Service and the various provincial governments relative to the waterfowl breeding ground survey program that was being conducted in Canada every year. For the most part, prior to about 1972 or so, all of the Aerial Survey Program and all of the so called Air Ground Comparison Transit Program in prairie Canada was conducted by the Fish and Wildlife Service. The aerial surveys conducted by what was then the Pilot and Observer Program, Waterfowl Biologist Pilot Group in the Branch of Management and Enforcement. And most of the ground observers and many of the aerial observers were principally derived from the Division of Law Enforcement. Later on we began to get increased participation from refuges but that wasn't for some number of years. In 1972, effective, I think July 1, the Office of Migratory Bird Management was established and John P. Rogers was moved from his position with the Migratory Bird Population Station into the position as Chief of that office and Kahler Martinson had moved into the position, I think, as Assistant Director for Operations, which meant movement temporary elevation to the Director's job. When that happened, I elected to leave the Migratory Bird Population Station where I had been working for about three years on the first of five publications on defining on what we knew about the population ecology of mallards in North America, a project that was led by Dave Anderson. And one of the few times that I think the Service ever set out on a very ambitious research investigation; this one consisted of about an eight or ten year effort to develop five reports. Usually our track record would be that we initiate a project like that and it wouldn't reach fruition but to his credit, Dave Anderson would never allow a project like that to be conceived and not completed and it was a privilege for me to work with Dave on a couple of those reports and we did finish the entire five by the time Dave moved away from his positon in Laurel.

Anyway, when I went to work for the Office of Migratory Bird Management, I was taken in as the Assistant Chief of the Branch of Surveys under Morton M. Smith, who transferred to that branch under Kahler Martinson only a few years previous. And so one of the things Mort instructed me to do was to improve our relationship with the Canadian Wildlife Service field cadre. While people such as Kahler and John Rogers worked with the senior level Canadian Wildlife Service staff and with the provincial staff, I ended up focusing my efforts with the Canadian Wildlife Service field biologist that then worked out of the Prairie Migratory Bird Station in Saskatoon. At that time their senior official at the field level was a fellow by the name of Kent Brace and they had a provincial biologist in each of the three Prairie Provinces. And within a period of about four or five years, we were able to get them to assume pretty much full responsibility for the ground portions of the air/ground comparison transects and they become co-authors of the reports

that were issued in each of the provinces and they became active in the preseason banding program and things of that sort. And it was actually, I think, a very good and productive period of development. And I'm not trying to take credit for that myself, that effort was certainly led mostly by people like Kahler and John to encourage that all levels we do that, but I did devote a lot of effort to make that work. And as far as I know, even though I've been out of the waterfowl business now for, close to twenty years, I think it continues today as a very successful endeavor.

JOHN: Can you remember who some of the other CWS field biologists were back at that time?

DICK: Oh sure, I can remember who all of them were. In Alberta when I first started working up there, their principle field biologist was a fellow by the name Harold Weaver. He subsequently took a job in Utah as a state biologist, I think, and was replaced with a fellow from Newfoundland by the name Bruce Turner. Kent [Brace] was in Saskatoon, his principle field biologist or the head of the Saskatchewan operation at that time, at least early on, was a fellow by the name of Dan Nieman and to my knowledge Dan is still leading that program in Saskatchewan today. He had another fellow or two by the name of John Mulhern who was widely known in waterfowl circles as quite a character and also worked on that program with Dan in those days. And in Manitoba, early on, a fellow by the name of Dale Caswell was the first one that I worked with and I don't know if Dale is still there?

JOHN: He's still there.

DICK: And then George Hochbaum, Al Hochbaum's son, was also a very key element in that Manitoba office. So those were the primary people that I worked with in those early days. We also had interest on the parts of Duck Unlimited Canada to become a part of that operation. I don't know that they spend a lot of time on that today, but for a period of years they also participated in those ground surveys and we began to incorporate those provincial field biologists reports as a part of what we discussed in the waterfowl status reports. And I think I first assisted Kahler in developing my first Status and Waterfowl Report in fall of 1969; in those days it was all done in Washington. And I worked on the preparation of those Status of Waterfowl in fall flight forecast models, every year from 1969 until I left Laurel in I think 1985, yeah 1984 would have been the last one that I was involved in, and during the later years I was basically responsible for that.

Back track a little bit now, I guess there are two other projects I want to talk a little bit about the development with the Canadians. One of the other things that came out of that was in the late 1970's was, of course the "point system" that was a big thing for us in the early and mid-1970's and was a very hot topic. We went through a period of a number of years where we did so called spy blind operations almost all across the United States and that data was eventually accumulated in our Branch of Surveys office, which I had become associated with within the Migratory Bird Office for summary and analyses to try to assess what the impact of the point system was. It was a very controversial issue for a number of years especially with the law enforcement community. I

think the saving grace of point system might be the fact the average duck hunter actually can't shoot very well and the average bag limits were so low that it almost didn't really matter; not the limits, excuse me, but the actual take on a per hunter basis was so low that it really didn't matter in many cases what kind of bag limit regulations or hunting under. Now there are some primary exceptions, most notably, I think, in the gulf coast areas of the U.S. and perhaps many areas of the Pacific Flyway where there's a lot of hunts done on well managed, private clubs, but we did invest a considerable amount of effort in that. In those days too, there were a considerable number of NEPA challenges against waterfowl shooting hours, black duck and canvasback regulations. And I spent an inordinate amount of time in those days working with John Rogers and others on environmental impact statements, environmental impact assessments, NEPA of course was a fairly new piece of legislation in those days and we were constantly being challenged for negligence relative to what was viewed as adverse compliance with NEPA, so we faced one court challenge after another for many years. I can remember there's a note in these questions to talk about how many hours you work. We didn't look at the clock very much in those days but I used to, just a streak of orneriness that I might have had, when I went to work on the weekends, I'd charge the mileage to go back and forth to the office. So I had some records at the end of one season about how many days I had worked and it ended up that I think I had 184 days in a row without taking a day off that we worked. And many of the times I can remember with John Rogers we worked until the wee hours in the morning and started again at 7 or 8 o'clock the next Saturday or Sunday morning and went on for days and days and days at a time. But I've got to say that I think in the end it was all worth it.

The next project in the late 1970's, I think it was late in the winter of 1978 or so, John Rogers instructed me to develop a program to analyze what the impact would be of stabilizing hunting regulations for a period of five years would be. So I set out, I was given a chuck of money to work with and it seemed to be important at that time not to let anybody know exactly how much money we had to work with because they would have figured how to spend it all. The problem with a stabilized regulations analysis is just the opposite of the design that you would want to seek it you really wanted to try to determine the impact of hunting regulations on waterfowl. What you would really do is randomly vary the regulations without regard to what the status of the waterfowl population was in a given year, but that wasn't the direction we were given; we were asked to do it just the opposite way. If we had to pass muster with the scientific standards under which the Service is working today, I don't think we'd be able to do that study again. We were able to develop a program in concert with the research arm of the Service in those days to provide; I thought if we couldn't do a good analysis of the impact of hunting regulations on waterfowl, we should use it as an opportunity to learn a lot more about waterfowl population ecology than we knew at that time. So we were able to work with the people at Northern Prairie Wildlife Research Center to move them into Canada and out of North Dakota for

the first time. And under the leadership of a fellow by the name of Ray Greenwood, they did an extensive land nesting study of nesting ducks over that five year period throughout the prairie provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba, which I think enhanced our knowledge of the waterfowl nesting populations in that part of the country greatly. And it provided an opportunity for us to do something that we'd never be able to do again. The other part of it that was significant on the management side, with the office of Migratory Bird Management, working in concert with some of the states in the Mississippi, and marginally in the Central Flyway, was a program to try to compartmentalize seasonal mortality components of female, principally of female mallards but also of males. And coping after a program that had been set in place by a fellow by the name of Lew Cowardin in North Dakota in the early 1970's we developed a spring banding program, which I think started out in 1978 and it might have been 1979. Ron Reynolds and I working with some state people in western Minnesota under the leadership of Bob Jessen and Todd Eberhardt and working with Carl Madsen in the local wetland office in Fergus Falls; did our first pilot effort of banding mallards in the spring in western Minnesota. And if memory serves me correctly, we were collectively able to catch about 29 or 30 hen mallards that year, and a lot of people didn't think that was much of a success story but I guess we thought it did gave us enough hope to continue that project in western Minnesota the following year and then later on to move it throughout the prairie provinces of Canada and also in North Dakota and in western Minnesota. And that became a continuing part of the overall analysis of the stabilized hunting regulations and I think that study was completed in about 1985 or so.

I'm going to move on now I guess away from the Washington part of my work.

JOHN: Before you do that, one thing that we don't do anymore that I know you were involved with some was what we called the Denver Status Meeting, and that's something we haven't done for a number of years. Could you just tell us a little bit about those meetings and what went on?

DICK: Sure. That meeting was, let's see, it was traditionally scheduled I think for July 25th and in the early days was held in Denver on an annual basis. And typically, I mentioned earlier that for a number of years I, after Kahler left the scene, had the lead responsibility for assembling the Waterfowl Status Report. We would complete that report late during the night of the 23rd of July and early in the morning of July 24th, several of the staff from the Branch of Surveys in Laurel would board the airplane and head off to the status meeting, and we would convene in Denver on the morning of the 25th and obviously we stayed up all night on the 24th writing our talks for the next day and assembling the slides and materials that were going to be used in those presentations the next day. It's changed quite a bit, now it's all done on video tape and distributed well ahead of time. In the early days we used paper lithograph mats and if you made one typo on them, you had to start the entire page all over again, so our secretaries did some yeomen work in those days and many a day I showed up at my house at 8:00 in the morning on the 24th of July and my wife would have

a shirt in her hand and I put on a new dress shirt and I run out the door with a box full of books and head for Denver, so it was pretty exciting. I can remember one year when we didn't think things were going to go very well, it might have been 1977, and Kahler Martinson was still in Washington then I think. And Kahler and John told me to just get up and give the status report and if any issues arose that I couldn't deal with, they'd be more than happy to help me. Well it didn't take long for a few issues to develop and I looked down in the front row and both Kahler and John were sitting there with smiles on their faces and their arms folded and they never even offered to get up and help me. And I had a brand new suit on and I sweated so badly, that I had to throw the suit away and my belt was saturated with perspiration; it was one of the worst experiences I ever had in my life. But it's good to see that it's evolved into a much more congenial and cooperative program then it was in those days.

Alright, well in 1984, there were changes taking place in the way the Migratory Bird Office, I think, was viewed within the Service. And it was a time when the original leadership, which consisted as I said earlier of John P. Rogers as the Chief of the Migratory Bird Office, George Brakhage, who I failed to mentioned earlier, but was a key player even beginning in 1972 when that office was established as assistant chief. Mort Smith, who was my supervisor for a number of years and then later he took a position in Washington and I replaced him as the Chief of Branch Surveys out at Laurel, MD, for the Migratory Bird office. It became obvious that it was time for a change in leadership in that office, and John elected to take a job as the Assistant Regional Director for Refuges and Wildlife in Region 7 in Anchorage. George elected to leave the Service and went to work for Ducks Unlimited as a Regional Director in southern Missouri. And in early 1984, I decided that I would also seek a change of venue and by the fall of 1984 I was successful in being selected as the Regional Migratory Bird Coordinator in Alaska by, then Regional Director, Bob Putz. I had known Bob for a number of years when he was in Washington and very much looked forward to working under him. Unfortunately I didn't go to Alaska until July of 1985, and when I arrived Bob had already taken another position and gone back to Washington, and Bob Gilmore was the Regional Director briefly and then was followed later on my Walt Stieglitz. So I started as the Regional Migratory Bird Coordinator in Alaska in 1985. The big issues there, the principle one was that in 1984 in response to considerable declines in four species of geese that nested on the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta in Alaska, the so called Hooper Bay Agreement, which had been developed in 1984, which sought to seek an end or provide an end to egging and taking of young birds and flightless birds and nesting birds in the spring and summer for Cackling Canada geese, Emperor geese, White fronted geese, and black brant. So we worked for a number of years, the first couple of years, there are 52 villages on the Yukon Delta and our job was do the best we could to sell the provision of that plan to the natives that lived on the Delta. So throughout the winter months we would spend almost our entire time visiting those villages, on a one by one basis, trying to sell that plan to the villagers with mixed success I guess regionally, but over a long period of time had met

with some degree of success and eventually lead to significant recoveries in two of the populations; the cacklers and white fronts are doing very well now, Emperors and brants I think less well. Emperor geese are a little bit different situation because they don't have the harvest opportunities in the lower 48, so they don't have the shared interest in the lower Pacific Flyway that we have with the other species. But it has been, I think somewhat reassuring, to see the improvements that were made in those lines. We were also at that time trying to continue or revitalize efforts that had been discontinued in 1979 to seek an amendment to the Migratory Bird Treaty with Canada to achieve an amendment to allow a subsistence harvest of migratory birds outside the September 1/ March 10 framework, I believe that was allowed for in that 1916 Treaty. And that eventually came to pass but it wasn't until after I had left the Migratory Bird Program. In December of 1989, late December, I think December 23rd, the provisions of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act that allowed the state of Alaska to manage subsistence hunting opportunities on federal public lands of Alaska was successfully challenged and the Alaska Supreme Court ruled that the state had no authority to provide compliance with those provisions of ANILCA, and thus the federal government entered into an era of responsibility for managing the subsistence hunting program for all species of fish and wildlife on federal public lands in Alaska. It brought together a consortium of four land management agencies in the state, the Bureau of Land Management, the U.S. Forest Service, the National Park Service, and the Fish and Wildlife Service, and one agency that's very much involvement with principally a Native American Program but not solely so, the Bureau of Indian Affairs. So we had a five member consortium, or a five agency consortium that was responsible for developing these federal hunting regulations. The idea initially was that within a matter of months, the state would develop changes in their constitution and their state laws to allow them to once again regain authority to establish subsistence hunting seasons on a statewide basis and the federal government would retire from that responsibility. That was in early 1990 and here we are in mid-August of 2005 and the federal government still has responsibility for that program and the state has been unable to figure out how they can comply with the provisions of ANILCA that require a unique opportunity for subsistence harvest of animals on federal public lands. I elected to assume responsibility, well first I went as a volunteer and worked with a fellow by the name Glenn Elison for a few months, I think I started in May of 1990 working with Glenn who had come down from Fairbanks; he at the time was a manager at the Arctic Refuge. He, at the request of Walt Stieglitz, had come to Anchorage and volunteered to set up the beginnings of that program. In July when we got ready to publish our regulations, Glenn adjourned back to Fairbanks and I assumed temporary responsibility for that program and as it turned out I ended up being responsible for it for the next five years and helped develop, not just the Service reaction or response to that program but also led the federal staff community among the five agencies to develop that program. We created first an advisory group and then later on, an

entity known as the Federal Subsistence Board, which was developed in regulations about a year later that consisted initially of the Regional Director of each of those four land management agencies and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. And they alone were responsible for developing the regulations that governs subsistence harvest of fish and wildlife on federal public lands. Initially we were very reluctant to exert jurisdiction in navigable waters on those, well refuges in the case of Fish and Wildlife Service, but National Forests and National Parks Units and Wild and Scenic River Units that were often controlled by the BLM. Due to some court challenges and for other reasons, we were eventually required to exert jurisdiction in navigable waters within those federal land management unit boundaries to provide subsistence opportunities for fish. And that marked a major change in the program, and such a major change that I thought it was time for me to do something else, so I started to back out of the program a bit. In about '95 our existing ARD for Fisheries in Alaska had taken another position elsewhere. So we decided to combine this Subsistence and Fisheries Programs and I took over responsibility at the regional level for the combination of Fisheries and Subsistence, but I very much back away from the subsistence program and a fellow I had recruited from BLM by the name of Tom Boyd took over that principle responsibility for the Subsistence Program and I focused my efforts mostly on the Fisheries Program. It wasn't too long into that program before we started to go through the series of reorganizations that were initiated first under Mollie Beattie's regime and carried over into the Jaime Clark regime. And of course initially that involved a sharing by many ARD's both geographically and program responsibilities. So initially I had geographic responsibilities for many of the programs and primarily the Fisheries Program in Alaska because we had no field potential in the Subsistence Program at that time, and then later on when it evolved into the so called PARD-GARD organizational structure [Programmatic Assistant Regional Director-Geographic Assistant Regional Director]. At that time when Dave Allen came back from meeting where they were charged with a very short term responsibility to put a package together to develop operating guidelines for the geographic and program responsibilities. I worked with group of five key individuals in the region to develop our regional response for the so called Geographic ARD responsibilities, and Glen Elison headed the regional effort to do the program [PARD] side. It turns out, and you may get different views about this, but the model that was eventually developed, and I don't know whether to be pleased with that or chagrinned by it, but the model we did develop was pretty much the model that was accepted by the Service. And I hold in very high esteem the five individuals that spent the better part of only a week putting that structure, helping me put that structure together and to present it to our regional director shortly before Dave took the package, before the Service Director for its approval. So during that short period that we had that program in place, I assumed the Geographic ARD responsibilities for northern Alaska. It was an exciting period for me because we had discussions that had been ongoing since 1984, I believe, on the Yukon River negotiations for a treaty

with Canada to provide for conservation of shared salmon resources between the fish that spawned in Canada but harvested both commercially in Bristol Bay and in the Aleutian Chain at False Pass and throughout the Yukon River by native and commercial fisherman and were an important component of the subsistence fishery; chum and kings primarily. And were also an important component to a limited, but important commercial fishery in the Yukon Territory of Canada and also a highly sought after subsistence fishery as well. So I represented the federal government on the Yukon River fishery negotiations group and after a few years we were successful in negotiating a treaty with the Canadians; that was a very exciting project. I also was the Fish and Wildlife Service representative to the International Porcupine Caribou Conservation Board. Most of the staff work in those days was performed both by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game and by the staff of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Jim Kurth had worked as my deputy in the Subsistence Program for a couple of years and eventually went on to become the manager of the Arctic Refuge, upon Glenn Elison's departure. So it was good to work again with Jim and their chief biologist at the time for northern Alaska, for the northern part of the refuge, Fran Mauer was a key source of help in managing that program. Another project of interest to me during my GARD era ended up being the first off shore oil development in Alaska; a project called the North Star Project, which was being brought online by BP at the time. They were wanting to develop the first undersea pipeline to transfer oil from an offshore development site, an island, a man-made island that had been developed in the Beaufort Sea. We had a couple issues there, one of them was that the shortest direct route for them to bring that pipeline ashore was through a series of coastal lagoons that were off Prudhoe Bay but were important to migrating waterfowl, especially old-squaws, but they were also important fisheries habitat. And our interest was twofold, one of them was to try to get the pipeline rerouted to an existing causeway called Endicott, which would have lengthened distance of the pipeline by only about 2 miles, I think from 9 miles to about 11. And secondly to use, for the first time anywhere in the Arctic, a double wall pipeline system. As you're always told by engineers in industry, the pipeline had been, a single walled pipeline, had been engineered so it was impervious to any kind of a natural effect and would never leak. But we didn't quite buy off on that and so we held out as strongly as we could for a double walled pipe. And also they had, their leak detection system proposal in their environmental impact statement, consisted of drilling a hole in the ice that once a month during the winter period, looking down in the hole and seeing if there was any oil in the water; that didn't satisfy us very well either. So we ended up, let's see I think, I'm not a very good clean water expert, but I think it was called a 4A & B exemption. We filed exemptions through the permitting process on a number of occasions, and eventually elevated our concerns to the Pentagon and needless to say we were not necessarily received with open arms by the senior leadership of the Fish and Wildlife Service for doing that, but because I had worked in the Migratory Bird arena many years before that with the then Deputy Assistant Secretary for

Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Don Berry, we were able to get some help from Don to support our case and we appealed to the Pentagon to try to get them to reroute that pipeline and install double wall pipe. And we eventually loss the argument, but BP was so sure at that time that they were going to be successful in their efforts to overrule us, that they paid five million dollars to build an ice road to install that pipeline in the wintertime and we were privileged enough to be able to stand by and watch it melt before they were able to get their pipeline in that year. So for the five million dollars they lost in the pipeline, the construction for that year, they would have been able to do what we wanted them to do in the first place. So that pretty much ended my experiences in the GARD arena. When we reorganized, the last time, went back to the program way of doing business and did away with the staff line organizational structure. I knew that my period with the Fish and Wildlife Service was coming to a close and there were many more ARD's then there were ARD positions to be filled, and they were looking for opportunities for people to maybe think about doing other things. And I knew that I was only going to work for the Fish and Wildlife Service about another two or three years, so I went to Dave Allen at the time and our ARD for budget and administration had recently retired; had taken another temporary assignment in D.C. with the intention of retiring. And so I think it was in 2000, I went to Dave and told him that I'd be willing to accept that job for the remainder of my career and I and I served the last three or four years as the ARD for Budget and Administration in Alaska. Little did I know that I was in for but went through all the agony of trying to figure out how to support an administrative program that had been in an erosion process since about 1997 with only some limited degree of success, but I gained a new appreciation for the administrative branch of the Service. And I think those people in those administration functions do a tremendous and sometimes unrecognized contribution to the Service. So I left in May of 2003, and actually I've got to tell you (emotional), I miss it a lot; this was my home for a long time.

After a sidebar conservation here, John and I decided that one of the things that I went a little light on, I guess, are some of the people that over the years that I worked with in the Service and other places that had key elements in my view in my career. First of all, I'd say I've had this discussion with a number of people, but over the years I've been exposed to a wide variety of people in the Service. I think because of the role in the Migratory Bird arena, I have more cross regional opportunities and you go to many field stations and end up being just exposed to a large number of people in the Service and there was a time when I thought I might even know about a third of the people that worked for the Service and it was much smaller than it is today. The good news is, of all the people I've ever met in the Service I think the number of people that I genuinely have any disregard or dislike for, I can probably count on one hand and that's out of thousands of them. Service employees typically are just some of the finest people in the world. My entire working life has been controlled by, or involved the people that I worked with, not just in a work environment but in a personal environment as well; I just can't say

enough about that. And that's especially true in Alaska where you have so many people separated from their families and so the Fish and Wildlife Service becomes your family in Alaska. So it's a little bit stronger there then it is other places, but it's also been true for me throughout my entire career. The first Service employee that influenced me other than my; well the first one that really did influence me was a fellow by the name of Doctor Fred Glover, who was the Leader of the [Colorado] Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit. When I went into graduate school, I didn't go into much detail about my academic background, but Fred really didn't have any reason to bring me into that program. He had a lot of good people to choose from and why he selected me to walk into his unit, I'll never know. But even to this day, I communicate with Fred, not on a frequent basis but occasionally and we chat on the telephone once a while and I still have a great deal of regard for him. Dave Anderson, who was my colleague, both at Colorado State and later on at the Migratory Bird Population Station and has been a friend and colleague throughout the years, of course was a very important influence to me. Well John P. Rogers actually almost throughout my career, both in research, in the Migratory Bird Management Office, and during the period of time he was active in the Service in Alaska and even after his retirement, we spent a lot of time with John. Kahler Martinson, certainly, one of my favorite people in the entire Fish and Wildlife Service. A fellow by the name of Morton Murray Smith, who was a Kahler's branch chief in Branch of Management and later was my first boss in the Migratory Bird Office as a Chief of the Branch of Surveys and I was his assistant. Mort had started his work as a waterfowl biologist in the state of Louisiana and later on came to work for the Fish and Wildlife Service in Atlanta and then moved to Washington in the mid-1960's shortly before I got there. I spent many, many an hour with Mort, both in Canada and flying around the country and in the office. He was a wonderful mentor, great friend, and a good hunting companion as well. George Brakhage, one of the orneriest on the face of the Earth, [laughing] George is an interesting guy and I know a lot of people had mixed views about George. When I first heard the stories about him, and I heard that I was going to end up working with him, I decided to wait and make up my own mind about George and I'm sure glad that I did because he ended up being one of my favorite friends and George and I've shared many a hunting blind together. And many a motel room and some waterfowl meetings as well; even had to get up early once or twice when people woke us in the middle of the night and tried to get us to do things we probably wouldn't have done otherwise. Walt Crissey, who was the initial Director of the Migratory Bird Population Station [MBPS]; Walt was a rather controversial figure in the Service, at least around the time I was there. In the spring of 1970, one of the things that Walt did when he went to work at MBPS was he wouldn't tolerate not being exposed to the continental waterfowl picture in the spring. So we picked up a Beaver in Annapolis in early May of 1970 and spent the next six weeks traveling around the Dakota's, Minnesota, Alberta, Saskatchewan; he knew every important waterfowl biologist and administer all through the prairies. They had an interesting

relationships with one another, but he visited them all every spring and it was an interesting beginning of an education with the Fish and Wildlife Service to spend that time with Walt. Some of the people that I met during that trip, the field biologist that I've already mentioned, of course a long term relationship with Kent Brace; we worked very closer together over the years. Kent subsequently has been overtaken by MS, I still communicate with him, frequently, every couple of months we talk on the telephone and I still hold him in very high regard. Bernie Gollop, who is a kind of fading in his career as a waterfowl biologist when I first met him, but he was the Director of the Prairie Migratory Research Center in Saskatoon when I first started going to Canada. And I had the privilege of spending a month or more in Canada every year for about 13 years and most of it, I was housed in that building in Saskatoon. And Bernie was an interesting character but almost every day he'd come down and ask me if I was busy and if I wasn't, we'd go out and have lunch together and sometimes we'd go out in the afternoon and revisit some of his old study sites or different places or catch butterflies or just chat a little bit about birds; he was a wonderful person. I have very deep admiration for the pilot/biologist cadre. The ones that were there when I started, most of them were first generation, even Hortin Jensen; not too many had left by the time I started working with them. Not being a pilot and coming out of research, I wasn't necessarily welcomed with open arms in the beginning by some of them. But later on I developed a very high regard and deep friendship with many of them and was able to spend a lot of with them over the period of time I was in the Migratory Bird Program both in Canada and at their meetings in the United States and shared opportunities with them at Flyway meetings and that sort of thing. And actually Doug Benning had just started with the Service when I, and Jim Voelzer as well; Jim Voelzer and Don Fricke was with him for a while, were sharing an apartment in Washington and Dave Anderson and I used to go down there and visit with them on occasion when we visited Washington. So I have a very high regard for Art Brazda, Ross Hansen, Hortin Jensen, and I'm going to forget some and I'll be ashamed that I do, and of course Mort, he ended up being one of my favorite people. Bob Blohm is another one. Let's see, some of the Directors; one of the things about the Service in the early days when I started to work, John Gottschalk was the Director of the Service. And some of us from Laurel used to go to Washington infrequently and when we did go we would very often arrive early and go sit down in the cafeteria in the interior building and I'd say 90% of the time when did at 7 o'clock in the morning, John Gottschalk would walk in and take a vacant seat at our table and he would know everybody at our table by their first name; tends to be a rare event for that to happen in the Service these days, and I think that we've just got so much bigger. We've got a number of Directors, Lynn Greenwalt and many others that in the early days were particular influential in my view of the Service. Certainly Walt Stieglitz, Bob Gilmore wasn't in Alaska with me very long but actually I appreciated Bob more than a lot of people might think you would. Walt Stieglitz, and later on Dave Allen, I developed a close, personal and working relationship with Dave; my wife and I are staying with him while

we're here in Portland this week. And every time we come to Portland, we end up spending time with him and many other colleagues in Alaska as well.

Keywords: employee, history, biography, biologist, migratory birds, Migratory Bird Population Station, Office of Migratory Bird Management, Canadian Wildlife Service, waterfowl breeding surveys, banding, Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, Fisheries and Subsistence Program, Lynn Greenwalt, North Star Project, hunting point system, ARD (Assistant Regional Director), GARD (Geographic Assistant Regional Director), PARD (Programmatic Assistant Regional Director), aerial and ground surveys, International Porcupine Caribou Conservation Board, refuges, waterfowl