

An Interview with
Arthur L. Sullivan

by telephone to
Rock Hill, South Carolina

15 July 1998

interviewed by Will Sarvis



Oral History Program
The State Historical Society of Missouri

© 1998

Collection C3966

Missouri Environment a.c. 46-48

NOTICE

- 1) This material is protected by copyright law (Title 17, U.S. Code). It may not be cited without acknowledgment to The Oral History Program of the State Historical Society of Missouri and the Western Historical Manuscript Collection, a Joint Collection of the University of Missouri and the State Historical Society of Missouri.

Citations should include: [name of interviewee], [name of the interviewer], [date and place of interview], [audio recording or transcript], and [where it can be found, for example, The Oral History Program of the State Historical Society of Missouri, Missouri Environment Oral History Project].

- 2) Reproductions of this transcript are available for reference use only and cannot be reproduced or published in any form (including digital formats) without written permission from the Western Historical Manuscript Collection.

- 3) Use of information or quotations from any Missouri Environment Oral History Project transcript indicates agreement to indemnify and hold harmless the University of Missouri, the State Historical Society of Missouri, their officers, employees, and agents, and the interviewee from and against all claims and actions arising out of the use of this material.

For further information, contact:

Western Historical Manuscript Collection
23 Ellis Library
University of Missouri
Columbia, MO 65201-5149

PREFACE

Arthur L. Sullivan was born on February 9, 1931, in South Manchester, Connecticut, and grew up in Boston, Massachusetts. His Park Service career in 1958 at Harper's Ferry National Monument. His subsequent career took him to the Minute Man National Park, Salem Maritime National Historic Site, Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park (in North Dakota, now called a National Park,) Statue of Liberty, and Big Horn Canyon National Recreation Area in Wyoming and Montana.

Mr. Sullivan's career was typical among employees of the Park Service, Forest Service or other federal agencies in that he moved frequently from post to post. Remarkable in his career, however, was his rapid rise to the level of superintendent by his third assignment, having park historian for his first two. Mr. Sullivan came to Missouri in 1976 and served as superintendent of the Ozark National Scenic Riverways (ONSR) until his retirement from the Park Service in 1995. To date, he has by far the longest tenure of any ONSR superintendent.

The ONSR was involved with several very notable issues during Mr. Sullivan's tenure. In the following pages he describes the lengthy legal battle over canoe concessions, the implementation of motorboat horsepower limitations, the debate over trapping on the ONSR, the wild or feral horse issue, and the possibility of mining on neighboring Forest Service lands and potential damage to the greater ONSR watershed (which remains an ongoing controversy at this writing.)

Mr. Sullivan's recollections of the ONSR itself are extremely interesting and important, and a broader Park Service management context arises through his comparisons and contrast of the ONSR with his experiences at Big Horn Canyon and Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park. The three local communities and Park Service interaction with them offer an idea of the range and variety of challenges of federal land management in these respective West and Midwest areas. Also, pertaining to the topic of wild or feral horses in particular, Mr. Sullivan offers three distinct scenarios from the ONST, Big Horn Canyon, and Theodore Roosevelt areas, the totality of which lends insight into different possible Park Service approaches to management of this particular resource.

The interview was recorded on Sony type I (normal bias) audio cassettes, using a direct telephone link on a Marantz PMD-222 manual recorder (set on automatic recording level.) There is a minimum of background noise interference, and the audio quality is good considering the telephone connection in lieu of a more sensitive omnidirectional microphone.

The following transcript represents a faithful rendering of the entire oral history interview. Minor stylistic alterations -- none of factual consequence -- have been made as part of a general transcription policy. Any use of brackets [] indicates editorial insertions not found on the original audio recordings. Parentheses () are used to indicate laughter or a spoken aside evident from the speaker's intonation. Quotation marks [" "] indicate speech depicting dialogue, or words highlighted for the usual special purposes (such as indicating irony). Double dashes [--] and ellipses [. . .] are also used as a stylistic method in an attempt to capture nuances of dialogue or speech patterns. Words are *italicized* when emphasized in speech. Although substantial care has been taken to render this transcript as accurately as possible, any remaining errors are the responsibility of the editor, Will Sarvis.

WS: I'm here on the telephone in Columbia, Missouri, and on the other side is Mr. Arthur L. Sullivan; and you're in South Carolina. I forgot the city.

AS: Rock Hill.

WS: Rock Hill. First of all, could I get your birth date, Mr. Sullivan?

AS: It's 2/9/31.

WS: Okay. And where were you born, sir?

AS: South Manchester, Connecticut.

WS: South Manchester, Connecticut. Okay, I thought, just to get started, maybe we could just begin with some autobiographical information about how you grew up, where you went to school, and maybe how you began to get interested in the outdoors.

AS: (chuckles) Well, that goes way back. Even though I was born in Connecticut, I have no recollection of Connecticut. My family moved back to Boston, and I grew up in Boston with the rest of my family. All the other members of my family were born and raised in Boston. I was the only one that was born in Connecticut. That was due to my father starting up a business in South Manchester that failed during the Depression. So the family went back to Boston.

But I come from a family of seven children; five boys and two girls. All the brothers and sisters are still living. The parents have both passed away. But I went to grade school in the Jamaica Plain section of Boston. It was Our Lady of Lourdes grade school. From there I went into high school at Mission High, which was run by the Xavian Brothers in Roxbury, Massachusetts, which is a section of Boston. I later

transferred to Malden Catholic in Malden, Massachusetts, and graduated from high school in Malden. Right out of high school I went into the service. Back in those days I didn't know of any grants or any way to go onto college. We did not come from a wealthy family, so college was out of the question at the time.

So I enlisted in the air force in 1949 and took my training at Lackland Air Force base in San Antonio, Texas. I was then shipped to Biloxi Air Force base in Biloxi, Mississippi, for a nine month training as a high speed radio operator. After nine months training I got thirty days' leave before being shipped overseas, initially to Germany. While I was at home was when the Korean War broke out. My orders and those of thousands of others were already designated to Europe, so I was not sent to Korea. I spent five months in Germany. I initially went to a refresher course as a radio operator.

I went out for the local football team and made the team, and spent the next several months playing for the football team in Freising, Germany, which gave us an opportunity to travel around and see much of Germany. After the football season was over, myself and five other radio operators from the team were shipped to England.

At that time it was the big buildup in England in preparation for what was perceived to be the big front coming from Russia. So it was during that period the Army Corps of Engineers were fanatically building and extending military airports at various bases in England to take care of the B-36, which was our largest bomber, at that time. I subsequently was assigned as a intercept radio operator, where twenty-four hours a day,

seven days a week, we collected Russian weather, particularly for high altitudes. I spent nearly two years doing that in England, at a little area called [Upper] Heyford, England, up near Oxford, England.

After that I was shipped to Riverside base in California, where I was a member of the air, sea, and rescue operation until my time was up. I was discharged in December of 1952. Actually, I enlisted for a three year period, but after the Korean War broke out, everybody already in the military was extended for one year of service.

[tape meter, 50]

When the Korean War kind of wound down, our extended period was cut to six months. So I got out after three and a half years. It was after I got out of the service that I decided I would go ahead and go on to college under the GI Bill. I went to Boston College in Boston, Massachusetts, and completed my education for a bachelor's degree in social sciences, with a major in American history and a minor in economics.

WS: Oh. I didn't know you had a history background.

AS: Yes. My background is history. I started my Park Service career as a park historian.

[I married Florence Cahill of Brookline, Massachusetts, right after graduating from college. Our three children -- Kevin (born in '58), Sharon (born in '59), and Kimberly (born in '62) -- were all born at Harpers Ferry. My wife is still hanging in there with me. Our son lives in Birmingham, Alabama; our oldest daughter lives in Jefferson City, Missouri; and our youngest daughter lives in Rock Hill, South Carolina].

Actually, my love for the outdoors developed when I was just a child. I never cared much for intensive city living. We were located near Franklin Park, which is a zoo and a large park area. That was an area that had been designed by Frederick Law Olmsted, who designed Central Park, and is pretty much known as the father of American landscape architecture. There was also an area known as the arboretum, which was a sanctuary; a lot of formal gardens, but some wild areas as well. So, as a kid, I spent as much time as I could in the parks that were there in the city. I always enjoyed being outdoors and being in scenic natural areas. It just came natural to me.

But I wasn't seeking a career (laughs), at the time, with the National Park Service. That came, pretty much, accidentally. After I graduated from college I began to get offers from the government for various positions. I did intend to work for the U.S. government. I was motivated more by service than by seeking my fortune in the business world.

I think it was back in 1956 when the government first instituted what was known as the federal service entrance examination. People would take this examination. It would make them eligible for practically any agency in the federal government. Prior to that, each agency had their own examination procedure. I got some offers from different agencies which did not interest me, until I got one from the National Park Service to work as a park historian at Harper's Ferry; what was known then as Harper's Ferry

National Monument. (The name has since been changed to Harper's Ferry National Historical Park).

So I spent my initial years with the National Park Service at Harper's Ferry National Monument, doing all the routine things that a park historian does; cataloging artifacts, writing manuscripts, giving interpretative programs, manning the visitor center, and things of that nature. I was at Harper's Ferry for between the first five and six years of my career.

Then I was offered a position as a historian at the Minute Man National Park at Concord, Massachusetts. That was just when that park was beginning. It was in its initial stages. It had just been recently created. And Minute Man National Park took in segments of the route that the British took when the Revolutionary War began at Lexington, and on to Concord, and so forth. All of my time at Minute Man National Park was devoted to research. It was pretty mundane research, getting into the old records and determining where the route was; who owned the lands, what the fields looked like, what houses were along this route, and so forth.

[tape meter, 100]

That was a very enjoyable assignment in my career, and I wished I could have stayed there a lot longer, but I was tapped after just nine months at Minute Man to become the superintendent of Salem Maritime, at Salem, Massachusetts. That was in 1963.

WS: So I guess you started at Harper's Ferry; what, in . . .

AS: I went from '58 to (I think it was) the end of '62; February of '58 to the end of December '62. And then for the end of '62 and most of '63 I was at Minute Man. And I think it was September of '63 was when I went to Salem as a park superintendent.

WS: That's quite a jump from historian to superintendent.

AS: Yes, it was. Well, I got regarded pretty highly. I did a lot of hard work and impressed my superiors. I think at the time I was probably the youngest superintendent in the Park Service. At that time Conrad Wirth was the director, so that goes back quite a few years.

So I was at Salem Maritime for three and a half years, and then I was tapped to become superintendent of Theodore Roosevelt – at that time it was known as Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park. That designation has also changed. That is now a national park. I went there in (I think it was) March of 1966, and I remained there until June of 1969. Then I was offered another position as superintendent of Statue of Liberty and Ellis Island, in New York harbor, and served there less than two years as the park superintendent.

Then I was again offered the job as superintendent of the Big Horn Canyon National Recreation Area, which is partly in Montana, partly in Wyoming. That was my longest stint before I went to Ozark Riverways. I was there about six years, from December of 1970 (I believe it was) till August of 1976. Then again, I was offered the job of superintendent at the Ozark National Scenic Riverways, and went there in August

of '76 and served there until I retired in January of 1995. So that, in a nutshell, is my historical career.

WS: Well, you were at the Riverways quite a long time.

AS: Yes. All in all, between my service with the National Park Service and the military, I had over forty years service. I think it was forty years and eleven months; or something to that effect.

WS: Well, this is kind of a broad question, but I wonder how the Riverways compared or contrasted to your other assignments?

AS: That is not an easy question to answer. Of course, my first assignments were predominantly cultural resources, at Harper's Ferry and Salem Maritime, even Theodore Roosevelt; and Minute Man, of course, and Statue of Liberty. I didn't get into a broader park area until my assignment at Big Horn Canyon National Recreation Area. Big Horn Canyon and the Ozark Riverways had many similarities in that recreation was paramount.

[tape meter, 150]

We provided equal protection and treasuring our cultural resources as well. But with the historical areas, of course, the cultural resources are the first thing that you do protect. But in these recreation areas, there are many natural features and cultural features that are of national significance. They don't take a second seat to planning and developing those areas for mass public outdoor recreation. But the emphasis was on recreation, of course. Both areas were created for that particular purpose.

WS: I guess the Big Horn was also sort of your first major experience off of the eastern shore, too.

AS: Theodore Roosevelt would have been.

WS: Where is that located?

AS: That's in the badlands of western North Dakota.

WS: Oh, right; okay. I was thinking --

AS: Don't confuse it -- there are some other Theodore Roosevelt historic sites. But the Theodore Roosevelt National Park is a pretty wild area.

WS: Yes, I guess so. If we take those three western areas -- like Roosevelt, Big Horn, and the Riverways -- I imagine you had different types of local societies around those places. Maybe we could try to compare those.

AS: At North Dakota, it was a strong, supportive society. I don't recall what the name was, but it was Friends of Theodore Roosevelt National Park, or what have you. It was a statewide organization. I really can't tell you how many members were in it, but they had an extensive number of members. Many of them were very active. Theodore Roosevelt was *the* main attraction in North Dakota. It got strong support from the state agencies and the governor. The governor at the time I was out there was named Guy. He made frequent visits to Theodore Roosevelt National Park and dearly loved the area. It did bring a lot of tourism through the state. I don't know if you've ever been to North Dakota.

WS: I lived there for three winters as a boy. I don't remember much of it.

AS: Well, from the eastern part until you reach the badlands is like one gigantic wheat field; from flat to rolling hills. It is not very scenic. You hit the badlands, and then it really just startles you. If you're driving across the state, all of a sudden you come to the badlands. It's quite spectacular. So there was this one organization; as I say, a statewide organization, that gave strong support to the national park. And as I said, there was strong support from the state agencies and from the governor on down. Locally, there was strong support in the local community because they lived off tourism. The local community (if I recall correctly) had a population of 133. So it was a very small town.

Some of the local ranches resented the federal government coming in and "locking up" good grassland that their cattle could have used if the federal government wasn't there. But it wasn't really hostile; it was just kind of a benign antipathy toward the federal government. And the park was also surrounded by national grasslands administered by the U.S. Forest Service.

[tape meter, 200]

So there was a lot of federal ownership of land in the badlands of North Dakota. Most the ranches that were there did not own extensive holdings. They had the base of operations, and most of their grazing was done on the grasslands that the Forest Service administered.

Going to Big Horn Canyon – of course, that was a mixed bag. There were several federal and state agencies all working in the same area. Sometimes there was friction

between the federal agencies and between the state agencies, and resentment on both sides. The Big Horn Canyon Recreation Area was created by the construction of the Yellowtail dam. That's the highest dam in the Missouri River basin; 550 feet high, as I recall. It backs up water for about fifty miles, and it's created a lake of about 12,500 acres.

So the Bureau of Reclamation was involved, as was the National Park Service, and there were times when we had conflicts over the intent of Congress as to what takes precedence. The Bureau of Reclamation saw their duty as generating electricity and providing flood control, whereas we saw fish, wildlife, and recreation as equal resources along with that. So we fought over that several times, to the point where myself and the director of Bureau of Reclamation and several of their people and our people had to go sit down with the Interior Department solicitor in Billings, Montana, to iron some things out. Because the act that created the recreation area and the act that created the Yellowtail dam specified that fish and wildlife would be given equal consideration with the other purposes of Yellowtail dam.

We did get that straightened out, and it resulted in the Bureau of Reclamation changing their levels of the lake from various times. For example, the prime fish in the lake was – oh, I'll have to job my memory on that.

WS: It wouldn't be pike, would it?

AS: No, not pike -- [walleye]. Well anyhow, these fish would spawn along the banks. It was the practice of the Bureau of Reclamation to lower the lake at certain times without regard to the spawning. Once the eggs are laid and it dropped below that level, then a whole generation of fish never made it. So we got them to time their down draws with the spawning of the fish in the reservoirs. There were things like that were in conflict.

WS: So they were actually in control of the dam itself.

AS: They operated the dam. They actually built a visitors center at the top of the dam, which the National Park Service operated under a cooperative agreement with the Bureau of Reclamation.

[tape meter, 250]

We had more cooperative agreements there than I think I've seen (laughing) any place else in the National Park Service. We had cooperative agreements with the Bureau of Land Management, with the U.S. Forest Service, with the Montana fish and game, with the Wyoming fish and game, with the Crow tribe of Indians, Bureau of Indian Affairs. That kind of arrangement, where everybody had their fingers in the pie, would create conflict from time to time.

WS: I guess so.

AS: It was a difficult assignment in that respect. Now, where am I in answering the question?

WS: We're up to the Riverways in terms of the society you were dealing with.

AS: Well, we [at Big Horn] had a formal contract with the Crow tribe of Indians. When the area was created, the act specified that the Crow tribe would be the major concessionaire

in the Montana portion of the recreation area. There was a lot of conflict there, because within in tribe (laughs) itself, there were many, many factions. They were always squabbling. When one side got in, the other would fight them. When somebody else got elected, the thing would just continue.

So, during my tenure there, and during my predecessor's tenure, they were not able to get the Crow tribe up to expectations in developing recreation facilities. I don't know how that situation stands. I think I heard that somewhere, in recent years, that the secretary [of Interior] got in the act. I think their contract has been cancelled. So we had the Crow tribe to deal with in that respect. They had certain committees within the tribe that were set up to support National Park Service programs.

One area of great contention while I was out there was the proposal to develop a road along the west side of Big Horn Canyon from Hardin, Montana, down to Lovell, Wyoming. So the local chambers of commerce from both those areas were very strong supporters of the National Park Service, particularly with an eye on developing a road. And that road never did develop. A portion of it did, but it dead-ended at an area. Coming up from the Wyoming portion it came up several miles to a recreation site in Montana. But the road never continued beyond that. It was one of those things that would have been hugely costly, because it entailed building a tremendous bridge over a canyon.

[tape meter, 300]

From the beginning I didn't think it was feasible. I didn't think the government would ever commit that kind of funding for developing a road in such an isolated area. So there were those supporters, in both those communities.

And Big Horn Canyon was pretty isolated. Our headquarters were located in Fort Smith, Montana, which was forty-five miles south of Hardin, Montana. We're about a hundred miles from Billings. And in between Hardin and Lovell, Wyoming, is really wide open country. So you didn't have many local people living there that were congregated into any kind of organizations. And again, there were some local ranches that resented the National Park [Service] and *any* federal agency coming in there and controlling land.

WS: I have a feeling in that case, and also in North Dakota, the lands in question had never been in their private ownership to begin with. Is that correct?

AS: In most instances, that's correct, yes. Now, at Big Horn Canyon, there were some private lands that were acquired; there were just some pockets of land. At Theodore Roosevelt, I don't recall. But I suspect that land was either federally owned or owned by the state before the National Park Service got in there.

WS: So really they kind of lost their ability to *lease* that land, but they didn't lose the ownership, so to speak.

AS: Yes. And in some cases they still used the land. Lands administered by BLM [Bureau of Land Management] or the Forest Service were open for grazing and those kinds of uses.

Now understand, the National Park Service for the most part was not a land-buying agency until Cape Cod National Seashore was created. That was either 1960 or 1961, somewhere in that area. That was the first time that the United States Congress established a policy that the National Park Service would go out and buy an entire park. Prior to that, all the parks were either carved out of the national domain, or were donated by state governments, or were former lands administered by the Defense Department, or lands that had been acquired by philanthropists such as the Rockefellers, who had acquired the Virgin Islands and Acadia National Park and much of Teton National Park. But until the 1960s, the Park Service wasn't in the land-buying business except for small pockets here and there within existing national parks.

[tape meter, 350]

But from the creation of the Cape Cod National Seashore, it then became policy when creating new areas that the parks would go out and buy the lands. That in itself created a tremendous amount of hostility, when the government started coming in to set aside recreation areas, and in many cases, using eminent domain to acquire the land. That was the case with most of the recreation areas that came into being in the '60s and the '70s. And anytime you get into land acquisition, particularly if you do not have a willing seller and condemnation is used, that creates hard feelings that could last for generations.

[end of side 1, tape I; tape meter, 369]

WS: Well, obviously, I guess, then, when you got to the Riverways you were confronted with that head on.

AS: Yes. I had been pretty well schooled in conflict at Big Horn Canyon, particularly. So I was not surprised with anything when I came to the Ozark Riverways. I had been forewarned that there were certain hostilities lingering there because of land acquisition and condemnation. At the time I came to the Riverways, there was a major controversy brewing over commercial canoe use on the river. And that, in itself, is a long story. Did you want me to get into that?

WS: Sure!

AS: Well, this was a conflict that really wasn't resolved for ten years. I really can't be brief, but I'll try to be as brief as possible in explaining it. The National Park Service, you know, provides most of visitor services through their own employees. But there are certain services that are provided through concessionaires. We believe that the public can be better served if the private sector provides certain services, such as overnight accommodations; motels, or hotels, restaurants, and such things as that -- and including certain services such as canoe liveries and horse liveries, and what have you.

That authority to do that comes from -- well, the latest one is the National Park Service Concession Act of 1965 -- but naturally, the authority goes way back to the creation of Yellowstone. But it was redefined Concessions Policy Act of 1965. So when the Park Service got to the Ozark Riverways, before I reached there, there were two problems that really surfaced right off the bat. One was the perceived overcrowding by

canoeists (particularly on the upper stretches of the Current River and the Jacks Fork) and motor boating, and the conflicts between those two uses and others.

So the National Park Service, in order to try to get a hold on the commercial canoeing, put a moratorium on the issuance of any additional permits, and limited those who were already in operation to the specified number of canoes that they already had. Okay? Well, that did not hold (chuckles), because those that did not have permits defied the government's right to issue permits, and immediately challenged it. And there were several canoe operators that went into business without licenses from the National Park Service.

Well, the National Park Service took the case to court. I think the first one was 1975. It went to federal court. It was before a judge who people say was certainly sympathetic with the canoeists. He was a local judge, and they felt that it was a hometown decision. That judge ruled against the National Park Service and said, in essence, that the regulation governing commercial canoe use was too vague and could not be enforced. So the National Park Service immediately went out and wrote a special regulation aimed directly at this single use of commercial canoe liveries. That took about a year for the whole process to go through, and again it went to court, in 1976, before the same judge.

WS: Would that happen to have been Judge James Meredith?

AS: No, it wasn't Meredith. Again, the name escapes me. Meredith was also a local federal judge, with sympathies toward local people. He too made hometown decisions -- if I'm not confusing the two judges. But there were two different federal judges, both of local origin that got involved in several litigation cases over the years.

WS: Were these tried in Cape Girardeau or St. Louis?

AS: The canoe case was in St. Louis. That's the Eighth Circuit court. Cape Girardeau, there's a federal court there, but it still is an extension of the Eighth Circuit court; it's kind of like a substation.

Well, in any event, when the case went back to this judge in 1976, he again ruled against the National Park Service, which kind of threw the whole thing into limbo.

[tape meter, 50]

The people that held permits held on to their permits, and we continued to honor those permits, and told them that we felt that this was a lousy decision, and we thought that some day something would happen that would overturn that. We just couldn't see the Congress' will being nullified by the local judge like that. Now that decision was not appealed, and I don't know, fully, the reason for it. I've heard that it was not a good case to appeal, and that the federal lawyers were concerned about appealing that particular one because they didn't think they had strong enough footing.

But for whatever reason, it was not appealed. So we were left there for a while where it was wide open. Anybody could operate a commercial canoe livery without a permit. And they continued to do so. This is when I came in. I came in 1976, just at the

time when this decision was handed down. So that blew the whole thing wide open, and there was a lot of quandary about what to do, because we essentially lost control. There were some that said, "Well, let's just open it up to competition and see where the chips fall." I know our regional director was not wanting to do that, but he did want to give our permittees an opportunity to compete favorably with the unauthorized canoe liveries.

So we did authorize temporary increases in the number of canoes, which ironically fed the problem of overcrowding. The other canoers, the non-permittees; of course, they didn't have any restrictions on the numbers that they could have, so they could offer as many canoes as they could afford. So this problem persisted, of overcrowding; and it got worse all the time.

It went on like that for several years until another case came up involving the Eleven Point River, which is managed by the U.S. Forest Service. I believe this was 1980 when the case came up, involving a permittee operating on the Eleven Point River, who the Forest Service wanted. They wanted him to continue to operate, but his fellow was independent, and he just told the Forest [Service], "I don't need a permit. I can operate anyway."

So the Forest Service took him to court. Now, it's strange. The Eleven Point River is located in the western district of the Eighth Circuit court in Missouri, while the Ozark Riverways is located in the eastern district of the court. So the Forest Service case went to Kansas City, and it was tried up there. The Kansas City court came out with a

decision favoring the U.S. Forest Service. And, in so many words, when the written decision came down, the judge referred to the Ozark River case, which was brought as some sort of a precedent into that Forest Service suit. And the judge, in so many words, said, "That's bad law. If the National Park Service ever brings a case before the federal court again, the results may be different."

So, with that kind of encouragement, that's exactly what happened. The National Park Service did go back into the Eighth Circuit court using the decision from the western district as a good precedent to follow. The Park Service did win. I don't recall the years, but I think it was something like 1983 or so, when that happened. We won at the district level. Then I was appealed to the appellate court in St. Louis. It went to the appellate court.

[tape meter, 100]

The appellate court upheld all of the decisions of the district court, but in the written judgment one judge went on to say, "From here on, all of these people will be treated on an equal basis whenever these permits are reissued." At that time I really didn't pay too much attention to that, because that was something of just an aside, as I interpreted it. It was nothing that was before the court at the time.

Under the Concessions Policy Act, concessionaires are granted a preferential right in the renewal of their permits -- which means that's the first right of refusal. If they're offered a permit under certain specified conditions they can accept it or, if they reject it and say they don't want that, then somebody else can come in and outbid them. But this

federal judge said, "Next time the permits are issued, they'll all be treated equally." The government lawyers took that statement as a court order which must be complied with.

So we were faced with a situation even after we won the case. And the renewal of the permits were coming up about that time. So we were told by the government attorneys, "Everybody is going to have an equal chance to bid on these permits." That really threw confusion into the thing. The fellows that had the permits, they got their attorney and sued the government because of the loss of their preferential right. In the meantime, the government did go out and in accordance with the so-called court order, renewed the permits. In the process there were several non-permittees were legalized and issued permits -- with the net result being, even though new permits were issued to new permittees, it did result in a reduction in the number of canoes on the river, because there were several of the operators that couldn't meet any conditions. They were excluded. In the meantime, our concessionists sued the government. Actually, they won their case, but the point was moot because the permits were already issued. There was nothing that could be done at the time, even though the court did come in and say, "Those permittees are right. They *did* have a preferential right. It was violated by this court order."

Is that confusing enough for you?

WS: It makes me think back to when you first began this topic, you were talking about the crowding being a perceived problem. I wonder if that was a Park Service initiative maybe on the part of your predecessor, Mr. Pope, was it?

AS: Yes. Randy Pope.

WS: So was that a Park Service perceived problem, or were there visitors that were complaining about the crowding?

AS: It was both. It was both perceived by the Park Service and numerous complaints from individuals as well as organizations. As I say, at the time it was perceived as a problem, there was something like a little under 1,800 commercial canoes. After ten years of litigation and all of this fighting, I think we ended up with something like 2,400 permitted canoes. At one time there were more than 3,000 operating.

[tape meter, 150]

What really helped the problem was the development of a River Use Management Plan. That's another long story. But the net result of that was, once we developed a River Use Management Plan -- which was opposed by the local congressman and many of the canoe operators -- we were able to confine the permittees to districts. We established in the park three separate districts: the upper Current, the lower Current, and the Jacks Fork. Those that were located within those districts were restricted to operate in those districts, and they cannot operate in any other district unless they had a canoe trip of more than two days. 90% of the canoeists that come there are just day trippers or one overnight.

And that controlled it a great deal. Of course, we still kept limits on the numbers that each permittee could have. It resolved that situation in most instances except the upper Current. There on the upper Current -- there were just a handful of operators up

there -- while I was there, we initiated a program of them timing the number of canoes that could go in over a certain hour period; much like you might do on a golf course; let four golfers out, wait till their out, then let four more out. We couldn't be that concise with that operation, but that in itself pretty much relieved the problem.

WS: Was that River Use Management Plan your creation? Or did that happen during your tenure there?

AS: Let me go back to what is know as the General Management Plan. A General Management Plan had been created before I was assigned to the Ozark Riverways. That plan was drafted up. It went into our regional office for their review. There were a lot of things in there I didn't like, and a lot of people didn't like; and things in there that really conflicted with policy.

For example, there was one major provision in there for creating a town where none existed; say, a typical Ozark town much like you had at Sturbridge Village or Branson or some other historical site where they planned to bring typical buildings and set them up and create more of a recreational, tourist type, sightseeing thing. I'm surprised that that even passed the regional office review. But it went into Washington. And Washington was livid about it and sent that plan back with pretty much a reprimand of the regional director for even sending it in. At that time they said, in so many words, "This plan is so bad it's not salvageable. It can't be resurrected. Strike it and start all over." So. (chuckles)

As I say, I came there in 1976, and that plan was rejected about that time or a little later. We did start all over in 1977. We went through the regular process of first holding a series of public meetings to ask the public to define what they see as their main concerns, what the problems are on the rivers, and so forth.

[tape meter, 200]

We held meetings locally at Van Buren and Eminence and Salem, and we went to St. Louis and Kansas City and Carbondale, Illinois (we got quite a few users coming out of southern Illinois.) So that was the first round of public meetings, and from that people expressed what their concerns were. This was in 1977 before this canoe issue was ever resolved, and before motorboats were resolved. The first thing that came to light were the loud motorboats, the huge size of motorboats, and the canoe problem.

When I first got there at Ozark Riverways, the traditional boat on the river was a propeller-driven johnboat. Most of the fishermen had a 9½ horsepower motor. Some of them had twenty horsepower. Some had as much as forty horsepower, but that was pretty much restricted to the lower Current River, because the nature of the river, you couldn't operate with a large propeller-driven boat with a shaft because the river is so shallow in so many places.

It was about 1977, I believe, when the jet motors first appeared on the river. You know what a jet motor is; it's strictly an outboard motor that has been converted to jet propulsion. The National Park Service did have a regulation that prohibited jet boats on the river. It still does. Our legal people told us that that regulation did not cover these

motor boats that had been converted to jet propulsion. A true jet motorboat is an inboard motor and has a tremendous roar. They were prohibited on the river, and every now and then one of those would appear and we were able to enforce that regulation. But these johnboats with jet-propelled outboard motors were a different thing, and we did *not* have any kind of a regulation to cover that.

With these jet-propelled motorboats you can go in just inches of water, and as a consequence the size of the motors increased dramatically, and the number of motor boaters on the river increased also, because it doesn't take much skill to operate a jet-propelled motor. Whereas, if you're operating a conventional outboard motor on the river, you have to be pretty skilled at riding the shoals and reading the river. They all operated with a lift on the motor where they could lift the motor out of the water and skim across shallow areas. It was something that most people did not want to be bothered with.

So that was a problem that came along with the canoe use. Jet-propelled motors and the canoeists, those were the two things that came up at the public meetings.

[tape meter, 250]

Well then, after the Park Service got all of this input from the public -- and this was through a team. A team was set up with the captain of the team coming out of the Denver service center and several members from the Denver service center, the regional office, and people on my own staff were all members of this planning team.

After all of the public input was analyzed, then a series of alternatives were devised for managing the river. The zoning system was set up, and so forth and so on. This plan was drafted up with the list of reasonable alternatives to each issue and the Park Service's *preferred* alternative. Then again a series of public meetings were held and again comments were received, and ultimately a plan developed from this. The plan called for putting limits on the outboard motors, limits on canoe use, and so forth.

There was a lot of opposition to this plan, primarily from the canoeists -- not the canoe users, but the mostly from the commercial canoeists -- and from all the local motor boaters. They didn't want to have any restrictions on the size of their motors. These people who went to their local congressman, who was Bill Emerson at the time. Bill Emerson invariably sided with the local people on what they wanted in the park. So he was instrumental in holding up the plan because of these two issues. Everything else in the plan, which covered interpretation, preservation, other public uses, was pretty much non-controversial. Most people just accepted them. But these two issues regarding river use were really bones of contention.

So Emerson was able to hold up approval of the entire plan. He indicated he would do so indefinitely. We made a proposal to him somewhere along the line, that if we would take those issues (these river use issues) out of the plan and develop a separate River Use Management Plan, would he go ahead and let the rest of the plan be approved? And he agreed to doing that.

So that's what we did. We took those issues out and started a development of a River Use Management Plan and our General Management Plan was approved at that time. I'm trying to think of what date that may have been; I think it was in the early '80s.

[tape meter, 300]

I think we finished the development of the plan in 1979. I think it was '81 before we could convince the congressman we would treat these issues separately, and we go the plan approved. It was '81, '82, '83. I'm vague on some of these years, some of these dates.

But, in any event, we did go out and develop a separate River Use Management Plan. Again, we treated these issues of the canoeists and the motor boaters. And as I say, in the plan, we set up this district system, which alleviated the canoe problem. We came up with a proposal of limiting the horsepower on the motorboats. The maximum, as I recall, was forty horsepower. We used that number because jet units lose some of their power. They don't have the same power as a conventional propeller-driven boat. In other words, a forty horsepower jet would be equivalent to a twenty horsepower conventional propeller. Those were in operation at the time the Riverways was created, and we felt that was a reasonable compromise.

We set up zones where forty horsepower would be permitted, just on the lower Current River. Above it would be twenty-five horsepower, on the upper Current, and on

the Jacks Fork. Then we also proposed that at certain times of the year on the upper Current, when the canoe use was the heaviest, no motorboats would be allowed. On the upper Jacks Fork, where fishing is very popular -- and it was just some of the best fishing in the Riverways -- during the bass season we also proposed there would be no motors involved.

And again, this thing got very political. The congressman got involved. Through his efforts he was able to hold us up and stymie us for a considerable period of time. We finally worked out a compromise that didn't please anybody, but it got through. As I recall, in the final plan, below Big Spring on the Current River, there would be no limits on the horsepower.

[tape meter, 350]

Then it would be forty horsepower up to a certain point. Beyond that it would be twenty-five horsepower. And then the zones where we proposed no motors for certain periods of the year, we compromised to ten horsepower motors; either five or ten.

Eventually we did get that River Use Management Plan approved and implemented. I'm not sure how well it's working, but I hear from people from time to time, and it seems like the canoe situation has been pretty much resolved. When the first motorboat regulations went into effect, after much squabbling and fighting on the rivers -- and again, more court cases -- I think the motorboat issue has quieted down. Can you confirm that?

WS: I think it has.

[end of side 2, tape I; tape meter, 367]

WS: I've made a few trips down there, and I hear about that motorboat thing mostly in the past tense, so I think you're probably right. I think it has quieted down.

AS: Well, it took a long time to get to that point.

WS: Right. Well, I would think with that heavy visitation you'd obviously have to do something.

AS: Oh, absolutely. You just couldn't let people run wild down there and no kind of regulation.

WS: I'm trying to conceive of what kind of areas faced you as superintendent down there. You had this heavy recreational usage. You also had your interpretative background, and a lot of interpretative programs down there, I know. And then, I would also think ecological matters would have been a major area of your concern. I wonder if I've left anything out, or if that kind of covers it?

AS: Like you say, at the same time, even though Ozark Riverways is a designated recreation area, it does have superlative natural features and cultural resources. We tried to provide for protecting and preserving and interpreting those features as well, to the best of our extent, to the best that our budgets would allow us.

The Red Mill was significant. Again (laughs), that in itself was a source of contention and controversy. I don't know if you know the story behind that.

WS: No. What's this called? The Red Mill?

AS: Yes.

WS: Oh, I don't know anything about that.

AS: Oh, you don't? The Red Mill is near Eminence; about five miles outside of Eminence, on the Jacks Fork. Well, that's probably the principal historical resource on the Riverways. I think it was a late nineteenth century mill, and operated in the early twentieth century. It's a good example of an operating mill. We actually operated it for a while as a going mill. We were selling the corn flour until our own U.S. public health inspectors got after us, (laughs) and said we did not meet public health standards, and we couldn't operate that.

We also had sorghum operation going. And we sold the sorghum through a cooperating historical association. People came from miles around. One guy traveled 300 miles every year just to get our sorghum. He said it was the best he ever had. And, again, the public health caught up with us and told us we could not operate that sorghum mill unless we put diapers on the mules running the mill, and use stainless steel in all of our operations. In other words, just destroy the historical integrity of the operations. That was one of the programs that fell by the wayside, too. As budgets dwindled, a lot got cut in our interpretive operations.

WS: Now would that have been Alley Mill? Alley Spring?

AS: No, that was near Powder Mill, the sorghum operation.

WS: And the corn flour manufacture?

AS: That was at Alley Mill.

WS: Oh, okay. When you were talking about your budgets being cut, I wonder if that was during Secretary Watt's tenure? You were talking about your interpretative programs falling by the wayside.

AS: It probably was, yes.

WS: Does that tend to make much difference in a superintendent's operation, when you have Interior secretaries change, or Park Service directors change?

AS: Yes, policies can really restrict you. But the Park Service has been around for a long time, and we know that secretaries come and go. When we get one in there that's particularly antagonistic to the National Park Service policy, we just kind of hunker down. The Park Service people can be really professional at slowly implementing directives and hunkering down until a new secretary comes along.

But yes, Watt was probably the most antagonistic secretary of the Interior we've ever had.

WS: I guess so, yes.

AS: His philosophy was (laughs) real counter to the National Park Service traditional philosophy.

[tape meter, 50]

WS: When it comes to running an operation like the Riverways, how much autonomy did you have? Did you have to go through regional channels and that kind of thing to do such

things as the open field cultivation program you had, and that sort of thing? Or were you able to make those decisions yourself, pretty much?

AS: Superintendents do enjoy a great deal of autonomy within certain parameters. I mean, the superintendent has got to be aware of what Park Service policies are, and what Park Service rules and regulations are, and cannot violate those. Most of the major programs are done in conjunction with assistance from the regional office. On a General Management Plan, for example, the superintendent doesn't have the authority to approve them. They are prepared at the local level with the input from the service center and the regional office. But the superintendent then becomes a recommending officer. Some years ago the approval had to come from the director -- go through the regional office, and then to the director for final approval on major plans like that. But I think, since then, the approval authority has been delegated to the regional director. So, on any major plan like that, it would take the regional director's okay.

Now, the open field management program was instituted prior to my coming to the Riverways. It was not so much a formal written plan, as much. It was kind of done on an experimental basis. The regional office, of course, was aware of it and had approved it. There were some dissenters in the regional office who felt this was contrary to operating an area in accordance with natural principles. But that program did go on, and it had some historical precedence, so as far as I know, it's still going on.

So there are certain things that a superintendent can do, but there are other things -- any major plan, any construction plan, for example -- has to go through channels.

WS: Well, one of the things I've heard about in my visits down there with some of the older local people -- they will remark on the numbers of people visiting Big Spring. They'll say during the state park days it was very crowded, and then in recent years -- what I'm trying to nail down, is when this change took place. I imagine this was the Riverways initiative in deliberately limiting the numbers of visitors at Big Spring. And I don't know if that happened during your tenure or maybe one of your predecessors?

AS: Yes, I've heard that before, but unfortunately we don't have any visitor statistics available prior to the creation of the [Riverways]. So I'm skeptical that the state park was more crowded than it is now under the national park. That may be true. It may not be.

The only thing I could say about that, when the National Park Service came in, in a formal area like Big Spring, when they develop a formal campground with restrooms and specific sites, that's where you camp. Under state park, as I recall, they had a pretty random camp. You could camp just about any place you could get close to the river. And, of course, the National Park Service has a camping fee. There is no entrance fee there, but there is a camping fee. I don't have anything to compare it with, but I know that we did not discourage visitation to Big Spring. It was just the opposite.

The campground that was developed at Big Spring, I think, was overly optimistic about how many people would be using the area. I think there were too many campsites developed.

WS: Now, were these the campsites in the old airport area?

AS: Yes.

WS: Okay. Now that happened while you were there?

[tape meter, 100]

AS: Well, that construction was just finishing up as I came in. I think that area in particular was over-developed for the numbers of campers that we get in the lower river. Most of the campers go to the upper reaches, to the Jacks Fork. A good number of our campers and users come out of St. Louis and Jefferson City. They come from the north. And the best canoeing is on the upper reaches. So those campgrounds would tend to fill up, particularly on weekends in the summertime. And the people don't come down to Big Spring. They don't canoe down at Big Spring. If you go below Big Spring in the summertime, even on a weekend, you won't see much in the way of floaters, canoeists.

They'll float that gap. When the area was created, Congress provided that there would be a four mile gap at the cities of Van Buren and Eminence. So that's outside Park Service jurisdiction. Those gaps are heavily used. Particularly on the lower Current, tubing has taken over as a favored activity, over canoeing. And people will float above Big Spring, and they'll come down to Big Spring or take out at Van Buren. But below Big Spring you hardly ever see a tuber or a canoeist. Most of the users down there are johnboaters.

But there certainly never was any policy in the Park Service to restrict visitation at Big Spring. I really question the perceptions of local people who think that there's less visitation now than when it was a state park. If you go down there on a weekend --

picnicking is very popular. Those picnic shelters are taken up pretty much all the time during the summer on weekends. There's obviously going to be a lot of people around Big Spring. But the campground is under-utilized, and I think that's because expectations at the time were too rosy. I don't think that campground should have been developed as extensively as it was.

WS: I was just kind of wondering if the development of that campground over by the old airport was maybe because of ecological reasons -- like too many people right down on the riverbank was causing erosion problems, or damage to plants, or something like that. It was just a guess.

AS: That campground *was* developed along the river. There were sites out there on the old air strip, but there are other sites. If you go under the trees there, there are sites right along the river. Those sites have been damaged several times by river action, by flooding. As a matter of fact, I think the last term of my tenure there, we proposed closing down a couple of those loops *because* of the river damage. I believe if you go down there now, you'll see some of those by the river have been shut down. The river's going to win. (laughs) You can delay some action, but ultimately the river is going to take what it wants. So we've been encouraging campers to move out into the air strip area -- which was very uninviting when it was first developed, because there wasn't a tree out there. We have planted a lot of trees out there. I hope by now they're providing some shade.

[tape meter, 150]

WS: Did you ever have much interaction with the Forest Service in sort of comparing notes or something with their management of the Eleven Point?

AS: Yes, we did from time to time. We had a lot of interaction with the Forest Service on any number of programs; training, fire fighting, law enforcement, and planning. I recall, in the early stages, we would sit down with the Forest Service people. They looked upon their Eleven Point River as little used; primarily a natural area. They pretty much wanted to keep it that way. They looked upon the Riverways as an area of high visitor impact. So we developed our plans accordingly.

WS: I was looking through the Riverways' old staff minutes (which apparently began with your tenure, because they don't go back prior to your time as superintendent). But what kind of amazed me, some of the comments on these visits -- you were talking about high visitor impact -- they'll say, "Nothing out of the ordinary. Just the usual number of fights and drug possession cases," (laughs) and I thought, "Well, this is just routine."

AS: Yes, it was pretty much routine. Yes, most of our law enforcement problems were associated with underage drinking and possession of controlled substances. Yes, there was a real problem there with the drinking because Missouri had a twenty-one year age limit where, for a while, Illinois was nineteen. And, of course, these nineteen year olds would come in and find out they were in a different state with different laws. It came as a surprise to some of those teenagers. But I think Illinois is back to twenty-one. I think all states are back to twenty-one age drinking limit.

Yes, we would have some serious law enforcement problems. Mostly it was people just drinking too much and partying too much. Fights would take place, sometimes between canoeists and the local people and their johnboats. Some of them would get pretty serious, with paddles being swung and heads being bashed in. Sometimes not very pretty out there on the weekend.

WS: Did you ever encounter that in any of your other assignments? Big Horn or Theodore Roosevelt?

AS: At these other areas crowding was not a problem. At Big Horn Canyon, it was such an immense area that we didn't have those conflicts. The only boats you found out in the lake were motorboats. And, of course, the lake was so huge there were no restrictions. The water up at the dam was over 400 feet deep, so there were no problems operating motorboats there.

The real conflicts that we had at Big Horn Canyon were between the Crow tribe and the local people; and I say "local" people -- mostly coming out of Billings.

WS: Caucasian people, I guess.

AS: Yes. One major conflict occurred while I was there. There had always been controversy over ownership of the Big Horn River. For many years federal courts contended that the river belonged to the Crow tribe.

[tape meter, 200]

While that was happening the Crow tribe was happy with that, and everybody went along with it. Fishermen came down and they fished. Hunters came down and they could hunt. In Montana, on the Crow reservation, you had to have a tribal permit as well as a state permit, which was for small game. Non-Indians could not hunt big game on the reservation, such as the deer and the elk. (Now they have buffalo that came from my park up at Theodore Roosevelt).

The state has always maintained that *they* owned the river. They kept trying to bring it to court even though it had been ruled upon by a federal judge before. But while I was there, again it went into federal court, and this judge reversed himself. It was the same judge. And he came out with the ruling that the river belongs to the state. Lo and behold, the Crows woke up one morning and, wow! I mean, they were up in arms. I mean literally. They took arms to the river. And fishermen came down from Billings -- they were armed. We had a very tense situation there for a long while, between the Caucasian fishermen and the Crow Indians, over that issue.

That created bad feelings. Then the Crow tribe, in retaliation for losing their river, withdrew the right to hunt on the reservation. So you can no longer hunt birds or other small game. I don't know what the situation is today. It's probably still the same. But I know that the Crow tribe took that issue all the way to the Supreme Court, and they did lose. So the state owns the river.

WS: You mentioned a while ago that that Big Horn Canyon was a difficult assignment in general. I wonder how you would compare that with the Riverways, if the Riverways was more difficult? I assume it was difficult in different ways.

AS: Yes. Well, I think the Riverways was really more difficult. It was so difficult to get anything done, particularly seeing that there was always a small core of local people that would object to any plan that the Park Service would come up to. We did not have any support from the U.S. congressman. It was just the opposite. We were constantly at odds with Bill Emerson over one issue after another.

WS: Now, Congressman Ichord was still in the House when you first arrived, wasn't he?

AS: When I first arrived Ichord was still in, yes. Ichord was in a different district -- there was a change in districts.

WS: Oh, they changed the lines, yes.

AS: Yes. Ichord was in one district, and down in the Van Buren area there was a U.S. congressman; I believe he was out of Poplar Bluff or somewhere.

[tape meter, 250]

I can't think of his name. But he did himself in with some scandals. He made the headlines in the St. Louis paper over a female, her ex-partner or husband or whatever.

He got himself voted out. I think that's when somebody else ran and got in. Oh, I know, there was a fellow over in . . .

WS: [Consulting editions of the *Official Manual of Missouri*:] Let's see; Wendell Bailey was Eighth District for a while.

AS: Wendell Bailey. He was in for a while, and he was a Republican, too. And when Emerson was going to run, when they changed the district and consolidated them, Wendell Bailey was in but he wasn't go to fight Emerson, so he kind of bowed out. And then Emerson came in and took over. But it was a change in the congressional district. There were two congressmen [whose districts contained major portions of the Riverways], and then there was one, and that was Bill Emerson.

WS: It looks like Bill Burlison would have been the other.

AS: Burlison. He was the one I remember.

WS: Tenth District, yes.

AS: Burlison and Ichord were the two when I got there.

WS: Then you ended up with Bailey and . . .

AS: Ended up with Bailey -- and I think it was Ichord, at the same time?

WS: It looks like the change was in the 1980 election. I've got the state manuals here. It looks like Emerson was in the Tenth and Bailey was in the Eighth. I don't know how long Bailey stayed.

AS: He was not in very long. I think we could have gotten along much better with Bailey. He was a lot easier to deal with than Bill Emerson.

WS: I guess your Riverways was consistently in two different congressional districts, though, the whole time.

AS: Not the *whole* time.

WS: They drew the lines so it ended up all in Emerson's Eighth District, I guess. Yes, I can see that, now. They had Texas [County in a different district], but you didn't have very much [of the Riverways] in Texas.

AS: Oh that's right, yes. Just a little bit of Texas County on the upper Current there. That was . . .

WS: The Fourth District, which was Ike Skelton.

AS: Skelton. Yes, well we had very little to do with his office. So little of it was in his district, he felt it was Emerson's worry. So all of the Riverways, for all practical purposes, was in Emerson's district.

WS: And then him being on that Interior and Insular Affairs Committee probably had something to do with his ability to affect --

AS: Yes.

WS: Yes, I begin to see. (laughs) Well, one thing that I came across that doesn't seem to have been that high profile an issue, was the reintroduction of otters, and then the controversy over trapping otters. I think they filed a lawsuit, didn't they, in the late '80s? The trappers down there?

AS: The introduction of otters took place while I was there. I remember that. I don't remember a lawsuit about the otters?

[tape meter, 300]

WS: I thought there was a controversy over whether trapping was going to be considered hunting. They even went to Ichord for his [interpretation of the enabling legislation].

AS: Oh! Oh, okay. That really was not directly associated with the otters. The trapping issue was another issue, which would have happened whether there were otters or not.

WS: Oh, I see.

AS: Well, (chuckling) let me explain that to you, if I can. Way back in the '60s I mentioned how the recreation areas started coming into the system, like Cape Cod and some of the Great Lakes areas, and Ozark Riverways, and the large impoundments out west. This was a new breed of park for the National Park Service to administer. A lot of people in the National Park Service looked down their noses as these "new intruders." There was a lot of opposition to them from within the service, as well as outside the service. I was not one of those opposed. I feel that we don't have enough public lands and public ownership. And I don't care what agency would be administering them. I hate to go to a town and find that you're excluded from going to the ocean, or you can't enter a lake or a river because of all the private ownership and the exclusion that you run up against. So I'm personally very supportive of any program that would set aside recreational areas.

But anyhow, the Park Service really didn't know how to administer these areas. They weren't a park in the sense that Yellowstone was, but they had pretty much the same regulations. Then others felt, "Well, since these are recreation areas, anything can go. We'll be more lenient in recreation areas."

Well, to make a long story short, this was during George Hartzog's tenure. As he saw the problem, he said we were administering three different kinds of areas. There were natural areas, cultural areas, and recreation areas. To him it made sense to develop three sets of separate policies for their administration. And he did this. We had different colored books. It was red, blue, and yellow; and I forget which one belonged to which. But there were separate rules and regulations for the natural areas, separate ones for the cultural areas, and separate ones for the recreation areas. Okay?

[tape meter, 350]

Now the regulations in recreation areas were more liberal than you would find in natural or cultural areas. For example, we're talking about the issue of trapping. Under the regulations that came out for recreation areas, trapping was a permissible activity -- I would say *hunting* was a permissible activity; let's put it this way -- under state law, and if specified in the enabling legislation for that particular area. What the regulation did not do, as I recall, was to separate hunting from trapping, that they were both considered the taking of wildlife, not being a separate definition for trapping.

So, in accordance with regulations, trapping was an authorized at Ozark Riverways, and was pursued right from the outset of the establishment of the park, along with hunting. Hunting was an authorized activity, and continued under state regulation.

Now, along the line, the United States Congress stepped in and threw an amendment to the Redwoods Act and the General Authorities Act of the National Park

Service of (I think it was) 1976 -- Congress, in so many words, said to George Hartzog, "Listen, George, we did not set up three different national park systems. There is only one integrated national park system, and the resources -- be they [natural, cultural, or recreational; not three different areas -- and shall receive equal treatment under the law].

[end of side 1, tape II; tape meter, 387]

So this was a reprimand to the National Park Service, and we were told, "Get back to operating one integrated national park system. And there was some language and court decisions that came out also saying the same thing. So these three books -- the red, yellow, and blue books -- were thrown out the window. A task force was set up to revise the National Park Service regulations. Again, this was in the 1980s. (I can't give you the specific year). But, when the new regulations came out, trapping and hunting were defined as separate and distinct activities.

When those draft regulations came out -- I mean, I didn't have enough (laughing) problems at the Riverways. This created a host of other problems for me.

WS: I guess some of the locals thought that was sort of trying to retroactively change the enabling legislation.

AS: Oh, yes. Right. Well, one of the draft regulations that came out was concerning the taking of fish, and that you could only fish with a single rod and line. Again, he Riverways, if you know the local custom of snagging and spearing fish ("gigging," as they call it), those are extremely popular activities that go back to the first settlers. But those regulations would have eliminated that. When this draft came out on that issue --

on hunting, on even the taking of worms, and trapping -- these activities were going to be eliminated. That created an uproar, locally. I don't know if you read about that or have been involved in that or not. But, in any event, it got so bad that several people from the Interior secretary's office came out to West Plains and to Eminence and conducted public meetings on these proposed drafts. I'm trying to think, now, who were some of the people we were dealing with then. It was Mary Lou Greer. Does that name mean anything to you?

WS: It sounds somewhat familiar. Who was she with?

AS: I think she was in the secretary's office, but she had kind of an oversight of the National Park Service. And this may have been under Watt's administration, too; Watt or [Donald P.] Hodel. But, anyhow, she came out to try to pacify the local people and tell them we weren't going to eliminate gigging and so forth and so on. In any event, we did get some of the draft regulations changed before they were approved, so that fishing at a place like the Ozarks could continue in the traditional manner. So gigging was not going to be outlawed.

But they held their guns at trapping. And the National Park Service position was, "Trapping could be only authorized if specifically authorized by the enabling act for that particular area." Ozark Riverways, the act authorized hunting under applicable state and federal laws, but it did not specify trapping. So, we woke up when those regulations

went into effect to find out that trapping was illegal, that trapping could no longer be done.

I was not a (chuckling) supporter of that. I looked upon trapping as a historical activity in the Ozarks. It was the earliest economic activity there, and it had continued on down through the years. So my sympathies were with the local people on the trapping issue -- although it's not an activity that I would engage in, and found certain aspects of it pretty repugnant. I was not going to let those personal feelings interfere with this traditional activity. But that was not for me to say.

Again, this was a case that went to court. The trappers association of Missouri got together and sued the National Park Service. We went before the local federal judge at Cape Girardeau on this issue. Again, it was a local judge, [Kenneth Wangelin]. But he grew up along the Current River, and during the court session he told of how he rode a mule up and down the Current, and he had his traps up there.

[tape meter, 50]

(chuckles) He thought trapping was a good activity, and so forth and so on. But, in any event, the judge ruled in favor of the trappers at this district level court case. Again, this would have been the Eighth Circuit court.

So the trappers won, but I feel that if the government appealed that, that decision would have been overturned at the appellate level. But I, for one, did not want to see the appeal. I thought that, after twenty-two years, operating legally under the national park system, to all of a sudden to find out what they were doing was illegal was unfair, to say

the least. I had recommended that the case not be appealed, and whether it was due to my recommendation or something else, the net result was the case was not appealed. So trapping continues at the Ozark Riverways, under the narrow decision of this judge. It did not apply to any other area in the national park system. It was confined solely to Ozark Riverways.

WS: When you went to court in a situation like that, I assume, as you mentioned, your own personal feelings you had to keep to yourself. Did you go as sort of the spokesperson for the Interior Department, or what?

AS: I'm trying to jog my memory here on that particular case. I don't know that I was ever called to the stand. I've been involved in so much litigation at the Riverways; I just don't remember. I certainly remember the canoe case very vividly, and the horse case. But I just don't recall being on the witness stand for that trapping issue.

WS: Well, I would guess, from what you were saying, with your discouragement of the appeal, any influence you may have been able to have would have been more kind of behind the scenes with the Interior Department or Park Service; in terms of speaking out for the Riverways in particular and for that historic tradition.

AS: I appeared before a congressional committee in Washington, D.C. on this particular issue. This was chaired by the congressman from Minnesota; he kind of headed up the parks subcommittee. (I can't think of his name). Bill Emerson was there. I just spoke my views on the trapping issue, whatever that was worth.

WS: I would think, as superintendent, it would have caught their attention, anyway. I guess that was one issue where perhaps you and Congressman Emerson were on the same side.

AS: Yes. (laughs) That may be the only one.

WS: You mentioned the horses, and I hate to keep you asking you about controversies, but I understand that was a pretty big one.

AS: Well, it developed into one, yes.

WS: When did that first come to your attention, the fact that those horses even existed?

AS: Oh, shortly after I got there one of my rangers pointed out to me, "Here's some horse tracks. Here's manure. There are some horses that come in and out of the park." I knew right at that time, "Uh oh, when it comes to horses it's about a very explosive issue." And there weren't many. It ranged from half a dozen to eighteen, twenty horses. They would be in and they would be out. It was one issue that I did not want to raise at the time when I was dealing with the General Management Plan, the River Use Management Plan, the canoe issue, the motorboat issue, trapping, and all the others. I learned long ago that you should take one battle at a time. If you try to take on too many controversial issues at one time, it could be devastating. So this was one.

We knew that they were there; the National Park Service knew they were there.

[tape meter, 100]

We knew they were there in violation of regulation and policy, but we also recognized the explosiveness of it, and felt we could live with it until sometime down the line when

we would address it. Now, the reason it came to light, it was not on any initiative by the National Park Service.

Let me go back to the open range laws. Missouri used to have the open range laws. I don't recall what year it was, but they passed a law closing the range *if* the county approved it. It was done on a county by county basis. Down in the Ozarks it was all open range. The common animal that was really ranging in the woods were hogs, and some cattle. Not too many horses. People put more value on the horses, so they weren't really roaming the range as much as hogs were.

But, in any event, Shannon County, as I understand it, was the last county to close the range. The Forest Service, I think, was the first agency to close the range on Forest Service land. Other counties followed suit, Shannon County being the last. I don't recall what year that was, but it was pretty modern. I think it was sometime in the late '50s or '60s before Shannon County closed the range.

But these horses were some leftovers from those days of open range. They were known to certain local people. There were a number of local people who took advantage of this situation where they would come in in the spring, and they would take out some of the foals. They kept the herd well managed that way. But they also used them for personal recreation. Local folks came and got their jollies out of chasing the horses over the range. That's how they go their fun. But these horses were also damaging private property in the area. Some of the local people did not look too kindly on the horse. I'm

sure there has been more than one shot by some local person. Some local people resented the way they were treated by others coming in and maltreating them by running them down and that kind of thing.

So some of these people went to the Missouri Humane Society, and unbeknownst to me. I was at my desk one day when two fellows came in. They were dressed up like cowboys and both sporting badges. They told me they were inspectors from the Missouri Humane Society. And they announced to me that they were going to remove these horses from the park for their own safety, that they had received several complaints from local people that the horses were being abused by other locals, and they had investigated the matter and they had found that these allegations were true. So, for the safety welfare of the horses they were going to remove them, and did I have any objections? (chuckles) I thought, "Well, this is a nice way to resolve the problem. Have the Humane Society come in and remove the horses, and the National Park Service won't be blamed for anything."

I quickly agreed. I said, "No, we don't have any objections to that at all." They have a place outside St. Louis where they have facilities for these horses. So they said, "This is what we're going to do. We're going to come in and round these horses up, and we're going to take them up to St. Louis. We have corrals up there, and we'll take care of them and find them good homes." I said that sounded great. "I do not object. You have my blessing."

[tape meter, 150]

So one of them had a friend in the TV station over in Springfield. He got this TV station to come out and do a story on these ill treated horses, and what they were going to do, and trying to get public support behind them. That got on the news, and that's the first that most people ever heard of horses being in the Riverways. Before that, it was an extremely well kept secret, just for the benefit for a few locals.

When word got out, these fellows from the Humane Society pursued their course of removing them. Some locals got the local state representative involved, and the U.S. congressman, the newspapers, and people who love horses. That's when it became an issue. It became too hot for the Humane Society to handle. So they backed out of it and left me holding the bag; kind of let the cat out of the bag. I said, "Well, now that it's come to the forefront, we can't hide from it. This would probably be a time for us to deal with it."

When they backed out, we started a program of public information, and wrote letters to the local news, and went along with what the Humane Society was saying, that some of these horses were being abused; these people were shooting them for coyote bait and that kind of thing -- that we were proposing to remove them and we were accepting offers from the public to come in here, and we'll accept the best proposal for some local group or individuals to remove the horses and assure they're going to be well taken care of.

We did get a couple of offers. There was one local fellow who had a lot of experience with horses. He indicated how he could round them up. He would take them out and find homes for them and sell them. So we started to go along with him, when the people that opposed the removal -- particularly those that had their fun with the horses -- they formed a new organization. We all of a sudden found out there was a Wild Horse Association of Missouri, or some such name as that. They opposed the removal, and they got the assistance of an attorney from Poplar Bluff; his name was Doug Kennedy. He got involved and wanted to stop the removal of the horses.

We sat down with these people and explained to them that there was no provision under Park Service policy or regulation that would permit these horses to stay. Right from the beginning we explained to the group that there were only three avenues that I could see that were open to them for keeping the horses here. One was the administrative process, the other was a judicial process, and the third was a legislative -- and that all three of those processes had problems.

The first thing they did was try the administrative process. In other words, they went to their congressman and had their congressman go to the secretary of Interior to get an administrative decision out of the secretary to keep the horses. Actually, this went to two different secretaries.

[tape meter, 200]

I remember Luhan being one of them. I don't recall the other. In any event, they failed in their administrative process. Both secretaries of Interior had indicated that, "No, those horses could not stay. There is nothing under the law that would permit us to do that."

The next issue was to take it to court, which they did. This trial was held, again, in Cape Girardeau. It was also before the judge who issued a favorable ruling in the trapping. Okay, well, we went to court. I remember I did testify at that trial. And again, it was what I would call a local decision that came out of that court, that we could not remove the horses. That was appealed. The government wouldn't let this one go by. So that one was appealed, and the appellate court ruled in favor of the National Park Service. Then, the case was brought to the Supreme Court. They went that far with it. But the Supreme Court elected not to hear it, which is tantamount to just letting the appellate court decision stand. So they failed in the judicial process.

The last opening to them was to have Congress amend the Ozark Act or provide some other legislation to give them legal standing. Congressman Emerson, he for some time had a bill in to keep these horses. I don't recall if he was trying to amend our act or put in a separate bill. In any event, he didn't get anywhere with it -- until (again, I don't recall what year this was; it may have been since I retired; it's that recent) a Park Service omnibus bill was passed. I don't know if you're familiar with an omnibus bill or not.

WS: It's a sweeping sort of legislation, isn't it?

AS: Yes. Maybe several hundred things in it. Well, inserted in there were a couple of lines about (chuckling) keeping the horses at Ozark Riverways. So the horses now have legal standing, and that's how they were legitimized.

WS: I wonder how the controversy over the wild horses compared in magnitude to the other controversies you've described, like the concessionaires and the horsepower limitations, and that kind of thing; trapping.

AS: They were all pretty controversial.

WS: Were they? You would not venture to single any of them out as the most controversial, or anything like that?

AS: I think the horse issue was probably the most emotional. Well, one other device they attempted to use -- after they failed in court -- was to take the matter to the streets.

WS: Oh, that's right, I heard about the march on Van Buren.

[tape meter, 250]

AS: Yes, yes. And again, I don't recall what year that was, but of course before the legislation was passed.

WS: But after the judicial decision.

AS: Yes. After the Supreme Court turned them down. That's when this lawyer, Doug Kennedy and aides from Emerson's office--

[brief interruption, while Mr. Sullivan answers his door, tape recorder momentarily off]

The organization of the great horse parade. I don't know if you know Jim Smith.

WS: Sure.

AS: You know him?

WS: I've heard of him, yes.

AS: Well, he conducts the trail rides through the Ozarks. He's got a big operation right outside of Eminence. It's a *big* trail ride. At some of their rides, they'll get several thousand people and several thousand horses and mules. And, of course, he was a "save the horse" proponent. Through him and some others, they did organize a ride -- well, they didn't *ride* all the way to Van Buren from Eminence. But I guess they rode the horses over and they had as many as 300 horses that rode up to my office in protest of Park Service plans to remove them.

So that was probably the most spectacular of the controversies, but I don't know; I don't think it was any more emotional or time consuming than the canoe issue. The canoe issue, as I said, went on for ten years and involved a lot of time in court and court preparation. So the canoe issue, probably -- in *my* estimation -- would be more critical than the horse issue.

WS: The Sierra Club and those type of groups were probably supporting you in the issues of the wild horses and perhaps some of the other things, like the horsepower limitations.

AS: I found that the Sierra Club in Missouri was kind of weak-kneed.

WS: That would be the Ozark chapter there, I guess.

AS: Yes, the Ozark chapter. On particular issues they would be strong. But no, on this horse issue they weren't. It was one of those that was too hot to handle for them. So no, we

didn't get any support from the Sierra Club. I kind of lost respect for that organization. I thought they had more integrity and backbone than that.

[tape meter, 300]

WS: Did you have any kind of national or even regional environmental group that was more strong in that regard? That did support you?

AS: We had the National Park Association that supported us on all issues. In recent years they set up a regional office in Minneapolis. We got support from them, but from where I sat I couldn't measure it as being strong.

WS: How about the Nature Conservancy or Audubon Society? Did they figure into your policy at all?

AS: Again, they're general supporters of the Park Service, but they kind of back off when things become political and they become too controversial. Then they sort of give you a pat on the back and support you behind the scenes, but they don't come out very strongly. In the public input process and developing plans, we do get letters of support saying, "Yes, we like your plans, and we support this and support that," and so forth. But that's about the last you hear. They don't go to court for you or going to their congressman and beat on their doors to help the Park Service out in a lot of instances.

WS: It sounds like you kind of ran the Riverways without many allies at all.

AS: (laughing) We must have had allies somewhere. We did not have strong allies. There was a great deal of intimidation going on from the local people. I think a great many people really feared physically, for their own physical well being, to come down to the

Riverways and support us too loudly. And with some understanding. During my tenure there -- or even before my tenure -- I think we counted five homes burned, occupied by rangers, over the years. I mean the intimidation was real. People (chuckles) tend to avoid that kind of repercussion.

WS: Did that tend to be concentrated in any particular area? Sometimes I've heard people distinguish between the local reaction to the Riverways based on Shannon or Carter County, or Eminence or Van Buren.

AS: I think you'd find more resistance up in Shannon County. The greatest portion of the park is in Shannon County, too. We were located in four counties, but the greatest acreage is found in Shannon.

[tape meter, 350]

Even locally, there were a lot of local individuals that supported us, but they might come up to you one day and say, "Hey, I really support you on this horsepower issue, but I'll never say *that* in public. And don't use my name." That was a common thing. There were lots of local people that hated these big motors, and they were glad to see them get off the rivers. But they sure are not going to stand up at a public meeting and say so.

WS: I was able to meet and speak with Mr. Bill Bailey, whom I'm sure you remember. I'm just wondering if someone like Mr. Bailey was able to act as sort of a liaison between the Park Service and the local people?

AS: Bill Bailey was useful. He was a boyhood friend of Ichord. Even after he retired, Ichord retained him on his payroll as some sort of a special assistant. So Bill Bailey had a direct pipeline to Ichord. The local people knew that, and Bill Bailey was held in pretty high esteem. He was instrumental in getting people jobs and so forth. And Bill, I think, was a good friend of the National Park Service. He did his best. I've heard it said that it was through his efforts that the state agreed to turn over the state parks to the National Park Service. When the area was created, the intent was for the state agencies to contribute the lands to the National Park Service. Without those state lands there really wouldn't *be* much of a park. But the state parks division turned over the three state parks; Alley, Round, and Big Spring. But the Missouri Conservation Department still holds [14,000 acres within the Ozark Riverways].

[end of side 2, tape II; tape meter, 387]

AS: [It was the] initial intent of the state to turn those lands over to the National Park Service. But that never happened. (chuckles) The state decided to keep them. But Bill knew everybody locally. He grew up in Shannon County. He was a good go-between between the park and the people. He could keep the lid on a lot of local issues; personnel issues and conflicts between some people in the field. So he was good to have for that particular time.

But he was put in an awkward position. As his title of management assistant, he was the fellow immediately responsible for the concession operations. And (chuckles) which was not a fair position for either him or some of the concessionaires, because some

of them were his in-laws. One of his son in laws was a canoe liveriest. That was not a good thing.

WS: Would you say Mr. Bailey in that regard? I realize you had a few other local people that worked in maybe a rangers capacity.

AS: Yes, I would say Bill was unique in that he had so many political connections, and being such a buddy buddy with a powerful U.S. congressman. There was nobody else that could match that.

WS: Did you ever sense and tension or conflict among your staff in regard to Mr. Bailey because he had not come up through the Park Service ranks?

AS: Oh, I'm sure that there was some of that. It never really surfaced. Bill was a very likeable person, easy to get along with; very quiet mannered. He wasn't officious or bossy; not the least bit obnoxious. So I think most people genuinely liked him. And those that might have resented that he got where he was because of political connections.

WS: I guess another person you must have had some interaction with was Mr. Leo Drey down there.

AS: (chuckling) Oh, yes, we had lots of interaction with Leo.

WS: Did you ever go over and see any of his Pioneer Forest operation? I got a tour of the forest a couple of months ago. I was really impressed with what they're doing over there. They showed me the white oak natural area, and that kind of thing.

AS: I've been through so many areas. He owns land all up and down the Riverways. He still owns about 5,000 acres within the boundaries of the Riverways.

WS: That's under scenic easement, I guess.

AS: No. (laughs) That's, again, his ability to hold the government off, maybe through *his* political connections. His lands were never acquired. An easement was never acquired of his lands. He is fortunate in that he was really holding off on any kind of acquisition by the National Park Service. And then when Watt got in, (laughs) there was a moratorium put on any kind of land acquisition. Watt left, but Hodel came in, and those policies continued. I think to this day it's extremely difficult for the National Park Service to go back and acquire lands. And so Leo kind of escaped all that. He's operating his lands free and clear. There's no easement, no government restrictions at all.

WS: I get the impression that maybe the '60s and early '70s there was kind of a surge in acquisition efforts and maybe accomplishment. But then, did the funding dry up after that?

AS: I don't think so much it was the funding that dried up as the policies changed. When Watt got in he said, "Stop it." That's one of those policies that really affects you in the field. And then Hodel got in and he said the same thing. He wasn't as confrontational as Watt, but he had the same policies. So yes, that put a stop -- and then, I think, the funds *did* dry up, even if they may have relaxed the policies somewhat. I don't know what their funding situation is.

Leo feels that a promise was made to him that if he gave an easement to the Park Service for 300 feet along the river's edge, the Park Service would not acquire his lands.

[tape meter, 50]

But I don't know of any such promise, and nobody in the Park Service is authorized to make that kind of a promise to *anybody*. So, when you look at the law, Leo was not exempt. The law specified that *all* lands would be acquired within the Ozark Riverways. So Leo, his land is still subject to acquisition, either by fee or by easement.

WS: Did you all never receive the funding to actually survey your boundaries? Because when I was down there people were saying the boundary lines had not really been established.

AS: Yes, that's true.

WS: That's amazing. I'm not sure, but wouldn't that be separate from your operational funds?

AS: Oh, sure. That's such a costly project you can never do that out of operational funding. The time it *should* have been done was when the lands were acquired and when the funds were available through the Land and Water Conservation fund. Now that was done down at Buffalo River when they acquired the lands.

WS: They did survey.

AS: They surveyed at the time of acquisition. Why they didn't do it at Ozark Riverways I've never been able to find out. What we've done, from time to time, if we have a specific controversy and we can scrape up a few thousand bucks, we have gone out and run a

survey on just a segment of part of a boundary to resolve a specific controversy. So some of the area has been surveyed and monumented.

Some years ago -- this had preceded my coming there -- but the Park Service regional office was putting out a few thousand dollars each year to survey and monument the Park Service boundary. Several miles of it was accomplished down in the southern end of the park -- until *those* funds dried up. So the monument and the marking is just one of those things that needs to be done (chuckles) pending availability of funds.

WS: Did you ever have any problem with the scenic easements? Perhaps like a misunderstanding on the part of someone who owned land with a scenic easement, or tried to sell that land?

AS: Anybody with a scenic easement can sell the land, but the easement runs with it. But we haven't had too much trouble with scenic easements for the most part. People pretty much adhere to them. Most people know what the easements are about. When I was there I set up a program where each easement property would be inspected annually to see if there were any violations. Rangers were to make contact with the easement owner to go over the easement, see if they have any problems. And that was working fine. Occasionally we'd find out where somebody cut a tree or did something wrong that they shouldn't have done, and we'd point that out to them. But in most cases, it wasn't through ignorance. (laughs) It was just something they were going to do anyway.

WS: Did you have sort of an unspoken policy just to point it out to them -- I guess in the beginning -- and then, did you ever have to follow it up?

AS: I don't recall anyone being serious enough where it warranted legal action against them. There were minor things. But the easements, for the most part, tended to work out all right.

WS: That caught my attention, because of course when the Riverways was being debated in Congress scenic easement was kind of a new idea at the time, or at least not widely understood. So I'm always curious to find out how those things have worked out over the last thirty years or so.

AS: I would say administering the easements was one of the least of my problems, as a manager.

WS: Oh, one thing I meant to ask you when we were talking about the horses, was if you ever encountered feral horses on the Roosevelt property or the Big Horn Canyon property?

AS: On both of those we had horses.

WS: Oh, you did? So it wasn't exactly a new topic for you. (laughs)

[tape meter, 100]

AS: Oh, no. No, and actually, I had a different perspective and approach at both areas, for legitimate reasons. Now, as I mentioned to you before, Theodore Roosevelt National Park was a cultural area, a historical area. It was administered in accordance with the administrative policies that had been developed for these separate areas; historical-cultural, natural, [and recreational].

When I first went to Theodore Roosevelt, it wasn't too long when found out that we did have horses. There weren't many of them there; there were several horses that roamed a particular part of the park. But I also discovered that the rangers there were on a surreptitious program of eliminating the horses through shooting them and then blaming it on winter kill. I put an immediate stop to that, when I discovered that. I also pointed out to them what the policies were of the Park Service. As Theodore Roosevelt, that park would never have been established if it weren't for the association it had with Teddy Roosevelt, who frequented the badlands. Part of his ranch made a part of the Theodore Roosevelt Park. And Roosevelt, in his writings, wrote about these horses that were roaming "his badlands." He pointed out that some of them were escaped from other ranches, or Indian ponies running wild.

So on that basis I went out to my superiors, "Hey, that's a cultural resource. It's part of the scenery associated with Theodore Roosevelt. And for that reason those horses should be kept and retained." I had to convince my regional director of that at the time, because he was of the school of natural areas where non-native species have to be removed. So, at Theodore Roosevelt, I took the opposite tact, that they were very definitely a cultural resource and that we ought to preserve them. And they are being preserved to this day. I understand that the herd has grown, and they do have periodic round ups to keep within the capacity of the range.

Now, at Big Horn Canyon, that was a different situation. You may or may not be familiar with the Wild Horse and Burros Act.

WS: A little bit.

AS: I think that was about 1970.

WS: Is this where they started the adoption program?

AS: Well, the adoption program kind of followed this.

WS: I see.

AS: You know the history of this Wild Horse and Burros Act goes back to a lady --

WS: Oh! In Nevada. Wild Horse Annie.

AS: Wild Horse Annie. Her name was Ann Johnson. Well, I got to know her through my association with Big Horn Canyon. Wild Horse Annie saw all of the abuses horses were taking down in the southwest where wranglers would go out and throw a tire around a horse's neck 'til it ran and dropped dead of exhaustion. A cheap way of rounding up wild horses. So she got off a campaign of school kids writing to their congressman, with the end result being the enactment of the Wild Horse and Burros act.

One provision in there was for the establishment of a federally established wild horse range in the Pryor Mountains. Big Horn Canyon National Recreation Area is sandwiched in between the Pryor Mountains and the Big Horn Mountains.

[tape meter, 150]

As I mentioned, we had numerous cooperative agreements with other federal agencies. And one of the cooperative agreements was with this wild horse range that was established in the Pryor Mountains. The primary administrator of the Pryor Mountain

Wild Horse Range is the Bureau of Land Management. But there was about 11,000 acres of Big Horn Canyon lands that were included in the Pryor Mountain Wild Horse refuge. That takes in about 32,000 acres. That includes not only Park Service land and BLM lands, but includes some Forest Service lands and some Bureau of Reclamation lands. There were several agencies involved in the continuance of that Pryor Mountain Wild Horse Range. So this was a program that we administered in conjunction with BLM being the lead agency.

Now, one of the programs the BLM established there was an adoption program. You know, the range can hold just so many horses. They developed a carrying capacity for that range. And to keep it within that carrying capacity, every year they weed out so many horses and try to find them good homes. So that was the beginning of the Adopt a Horse program; I think it began right there at the Pryor Mountain Wild Horse Range, but it's being used in other areas of the country where there are wild horses, particularly on BLM lands.

What BLM is trying to do at the Pryor Mountain Wild Horse Range is to retain those horses that have characteristics of the Spanish mustang, which was traditional in the west. And they have drawn up a profile of what characteristics encompass a Spanish mustang. For example, in the vertebrae it has either one less or one more than the horses found elsewhere. They have that particular striping down the back and particular coloration. That's what they're attempting to do at the Pryor Mountain Wild Horse

Range. So I was involved in administering that as a cooperating agency. As far as I know, today, that is the only federally established wild horse range in the country.

WS: So, in contrast, I guess from your point of view, at the Riverways these leftovers from the open range in no way compared to -- obviously not the Spanish mustang -- but not Mr. Roosevelt's personal recollection.

AS: No, no.

WS: (laughing) Those were just leftover wild horses.

AS: We didn't consider them a cultural resource. If you get right down to it, they were trespass livestock. But our goal was, if they were going to stay, they're going to be done above board and through some sort of a legitimization. Well, they finally succeeded in that in getting a couple of sentences included in the omnibus act.

WS: I'll have to research that, but I'm curious; I guess it was more efficacious to push it through that way than to get a separate bill.

AS: Oh, a separate bill would never have made it. No.

WS: That was a way to kind of sneak it through.

AS: That was the *only* way to get it through, to tack it on to something where the president wouldn't (laughing) veto it; one small item like that.

[tape meter, 200]

WS: Quite a while ago I asked you about the open fields. One detail that I was curious about -- I got the impression at one point there was a program (that's maybe ongoing) of having

local people get a contract to grow hay or something like that, and then maybe there was a switch or a partial transition to having wildlife plots. Is that two different programs?

AS: No, they're really one in the same. Now these open field programs are administered through a special use permit system. So there are people that are growing hay or whatever the Park Service specifies on the field, and it may include some wildlife management plots, which is just taking a corner of a field and putting in clover or some such thing. But that's a program that's been done very much in conjunction with the Missouri Conservation Department. It was developed in conjunction with them. So their wildlife biologists worked hand in hand with us over the years in setting that up. We relied a lot on their expertise in that area.

WS: Was there any other program where you worked with the Conservation Department in that regard?

AS: At Big Horn Canyon, within our boundaries down in the Wyoming portion, we had a yellowtail wildlife habitat area, which included Park Service lands and some Bureau of Reclamation land. Actually that was operated under a cooperative agreement by the Wyoming Fish and Game Department.

WS: I see. But in Missouri I guess the open fields was your major thing with the Missouri Department of Conservation.

AS: That was one of the programs. But like I say, we had very good relationships with the Missouri Conservation Department, and worked with them in several different programs throughout the years; one being the reintroduction of the river otters that you mentioned.

WS: Oh, they were involved with that?

AS: Oh, yes. They brought the river otters. They had a program going. They swapped other states turkey for otters. I think some of them came from Louisiana and other states where otters were plentiful. Sometime the Conservation Department would come in and live-trap some turkeys within the boundaries of the Riverways, with our concurrence. And they would use these to trade for otter or for some other species that the state lacked.

WS: I guess your only dealings with the state park system would have been with the Montauk State Park, perhaps; up there near your headwaters of the Current.

AS: That wasn't the only one. We dealt with those people on a local basis, but we had a lot of dealing with the people in the Jefferson City office on many programs. One is the natural area system of Missouri. That involves the Conservation Department, the Missouri Department of Parks, the National Park Service, Corps of Engineers, Forest Service -- you know, all the federal agencies.

[tape meter, 250]

They worked cooperatively since -- I think it was 1976. I think it was the first year I was there that natural area survey was created. Through periodic meetings involving all these agencies, new areas have been delineated and protected and set aside in the state of Missouri. They've come up with a pretty extensive catalogue of all of the designated natural areas in the state.

That's one program we were involved in. Another was in trying to set up a biosphere reserve of that whole area. That involved many of the state and federal agencies, and Leo Drey, and other local organizations. But I think that one has kind of gone by the wayside because of local opposition.

WS: Maybe I had this information wrong, but I thought that territory around the Riverways and eastern Ozarks was a United Nations recognized biosphere.

AS: Yes.

WS: Is that true? Did that happen while you were there?

AS: Did it happen that it was recognized?

WS: Yes, that they recognized it.

AS: No. I said, that was a goal. This was trying to have a wide area in the Ozarks established as a biosphere reserve with recognition by the United Nations. But many local people look upon that as a take over of the UN.

WS: Black helicopters.

AS: Wild stories have been circulated about, "You won't be able to do anything on your land without UN permission," and blah, blah, blah. And so I think that one kind of fell by the wayside, at least temporarily. I haven't heard about it recently. That again was one that required extensive cooperation, coordination, and meetings over several years.

WS: When you mention wild stories about not being able to do anything on your land, that makes me think about that Natural Streams Act that Mr. Drey was involved with.

AS: Yes. (laughs) That went over like a lead balloon.

WS: A pretty overwhelming vote on that.

AS: Yes. Well, the approach to that was all wrong. That was something more radical, I think, than establishing the Ozark Riverways.

WS: What do you mean when you say the approach was all wrong?

AS: They came up with such a comprehensive [plan] without any kind of public education at all; any kind of saying, "Let's go out and talk with the public and involve them; educate the public and get the public involved in working up something that they like and that they could live with." It was done by a handful of people, Leo Drey and probably John Carroll and Roger Pryor -- I think it had their fingerprints all over it.

[tape meter, 300]

I think they just drew this up and tried to push it on through.

WS: So you think it was doomed from the outset.

AS: Oh, yes, it just blew up in their faces. I can recall talking to people from Budweiser, when they wanted to set up a water bottling plant at Greer Spring. Do you recall that?

WS: I've heard about that.

AS: Well, we got to know people in Budweiser because we got them involved in a cooperative public-private clean up program at the Riverways, to which they donated several thousand dollars to publicize; cleaning of aluminum cans in particular off the rivers. They called me one day and asked me about what I thought of them bottling water at Greer Spring. (laughs) I said, "Are you ready to take the heat?" They were kind of

surprised at that, and said, "What do you mean?" I said, "The minute you come up with any kind of a proposal to tap Greer Spring for anything, you're going to see environmentalists crawling all over you." I don't think they took me seriously. They went ahead with the proposal. That blew up in their face. They withdrew after the opposition got overwhelming.

WS: Who manages that Peck Ranch Wildlife Management Area?

AS: The core area there, that's got Conservation Department [land]. Now the Nature Conservancy has acquired some lands, I think that's adjacent to the Peck Ranch. I don't recall the size of their acquisition, but it's substantial enough where I understand they're hired a local manager. There's somebody down at Van Buren who runs their program. That acquisition, I believe, took place while I was still there. They hadn't really done anything with it until after I left. But I think that was about a 7,000 acre plot that the Nature Conservancy acquired.

One particularly explosive issue you haven't talked about was lead mining.

WS: Oh, right. I was surprised at the recent decision on that.

AS: What is the recent decision?

WS: Well, I guess they're going to allow the exploration. It's a bad time, of course, for Secretary Babbitt; he's got other troubles on his mind. But I think they are going to allow some limited exploration.

[tape meter, 350]

AS: On whose land?

WS: Well; I guess it's going to be Bureau of Land Management administered. I don't know if it's going to be on Forest Service land down there. I can't imagine it would be actually on Riverways land, but I'm not sure about that.

AS: No, it wouldn't be Riverways land.

WS: I think it's going to be Forest Service, then. I realize when it comes to mining on Forest Service land, even though that's in Agriculture, the BLM actually oversees that somehow; or is control of the administration.

AS: The Forest Service administers the surface and BLM administers the minerals. But BLM cannot extract without Forest Service concurrence.

WS: For some reason, at least in the media coverage of it, they seem to be focusing on the Department of Interior, which made me think that it was coming down to the Bureau of Land Management's decision on that, rather than the Forest Service. I don't know. I really don't know the details, but the last story I saw on it was they were going to allow limited exploration. And of course everybody says, with reason, "If you're going to explore, obviously that means you will mine eventually, because otherwise why spend all the money exploring?" And then, of course, that will be the mining company's argument as well. So anyway, I guess we'll just have to wait and see.

AS: That was an issue that we definitely got involved in, because the area where they planned the mining was in the recharge basin for Big Spring. We pointed out that that could end up with catastrophic results to Big Spring and the whole lower Current River. So the

position of the National Park Service on that was in opposition to what the Forest Service wanted.

WS: Oh, the Forest Service was in favor of it?

AS: Oh, yes. Very much so. We had a falling out with the Forest Service on that issue. We said we opposed until such time as it could be demonstrated not only that the mining companies *could* prevent contamination [but *would* prevent contamination].

[end of side 1, tape III; tape meter, 390]

AS: [The Park Service] position on that is still the same. We were concerned not only with the drilling, but with the tailings ponds that would be very much part of that operation. That issue -- I think that and possibly the proposal to dam -- what river was that?

WS: I think I came across a clipping on that. It was in the upper reaches -- maybe it was the Jacks Fork. Are we thinking of the same thing?

AS: No, I'm thinking about -- oh, as you age your memory fails on you. What's the big river up near St. Louis?

WS: Oh, you're talking about the Meramec.

AS: The Meramec. I think the proposal to dam the Meramec and the mining issue were probably the two biggest environmental controversies that *I* saw in Missouri. And that's when all the conservation organizations *did* come out in opposition, with those issues.

WS: I guess with the Meramec you weren't directly involved as an agency, right?

AS: No.

WS: I guess with this controversy over lead mining, that may have been somewhat different from these other controversies we've talked about, in that you were dealing with industrial interests and another federal agency, as opposed to local people and their sentiments and economic interests and that kind of thing.

AS: And one that would be far more devastating to the environment than some horses running around in the woods. So big issues like that would get the Sierra Club and other organizations behind it.

WS: I've got a question; it's kind of personal. I don't mean to limit the sort of parameters here, but I would imagine that somebody that came from New England, with a Catholic background, and had seen quite a bit of the country would have maybe experienced sort of a cultural shock going down to a southern, highland, Protestant area. I'm just thinking of the factors that jumped out in terms of contrast. In other words, I don't mean to center on religion necessarily, or something; but it seems that the culture down is distinctive in terms of its Irish-Scottish heritage and the kind of attitudes maybe in common with the Southern Appalachians and that kind of thing. Then, of course, New England has a pretty distinct culture compared to that, or contrasted with that. So I just wonder if, on a personal level, you found that disagreeable or (laughing) strange or what?

AS: No, I don't think I'm subject to cultural shock. As I say, I grew up in Boston, but then I had extensive travel in the different parts of the country, in the military; living in Texas, Mississippi, California, Germany, and England; and had the assignments in small towns,

smaller than Van Buren, at Medora, North Dakota, and Fort Smith, Montana; and also living in New York City. You know, so my family and I (laughs) became accustomed and very adaptable and flexible. So we've always gone to each area with a positive attitude, that there's going to be something about each area that we're going to like, and there will be some things that we don't like. So I don't think we were shocked at all.

WS: I see. Now you were at the Riverways, if I'm correct, longer than any other superintendent since its implementation. You were there for nineteen years, anyway. I wonder what it is that you're most proud of that you got accomplished while you were down there?

AS: I would say my biggest accomplishment was establishing the Scenic Rivers Watershed Committee, and raising the level of awareness of the need to protect the entire watershed if we're going to continue to protect the Current and the Jacks Fork and the Eleven Point River. That's an organization that we started, and got the counties involved; got eight counties involved, and got several different state and federal agencies; private organizations, private individuals -- and they're all part of that organization. It was working very well up to the time I left. It kind of took on a life of its own.

[tape meter, 50]

And I hope that it is still functioning and that people are becoming concerned that what happens miles away from the Current River can ultimately have impact on the water quality of that river. That's what our goal was, to raise this level of awareness and

institute actions that would minimize and mitigate any of the damage throughout the watershed.

WS: I have to say I was impressed with some of the interpretative signs down there at Big Spring showing that some of that water fell twenty days ago as rain as far away as Birch Tree. That was pretty impressive as far as showing the karst topography's influence.

AS: Yes. It can be a very fragile area.

WS: Right. Well, that's what amazed me when they were talking about allowing some mining exploration, because I see your point. If there's a spill it will be impossible to contain.

AS: That's what concerns a lot of people in and out of Missouri.

WS: Right. That reminds me of a comment Alex Outlaw made. I was talking to him there at his home in Wilderness, and he seemed to think some of those local people around there were very well informed and very concerned about their water quality, so that they appreciated it and had maybe made some pretty radical changes in their own lifestyle in terms of putting old motor oil on gravel roads to keep the dust down, and that kind of thing.

AS: Yes.

WS: So that impressed me to, that maybe for once (laughs), you had a meeting of the minds with one federal agency, the Park Service, and the local community, for your common interests.

AS: Yes, Alex was instrumental in getting an educational program through the auspices of this watershed committee. His wife is a teacher. I don't know if she's still teaching in the Van Buren school system. But they got a program going at Van Buren, and I think it was Birch Tree, and maybe Eminence; teaching kids at that level about the watershed, about what they do or do not do can impact water quality on their favorite rivers. It was, I think, pretty successful. We got a grant from, I think it was the National Science Foundation or some organization like that, that helped us out too.

WS: You mentioned your accomplishment. I wonder if there are things down at the Riverways that particularly disappointed you; that you were trying to get accomplished but were not able to, like maybe some of the outcome of these controversies we've talked about.

AS: (chuckles) I don't know; just off the top of my head. What didn't get accomplished? Overall I think we've accomplished most of our goals. It's like pulling teeth down there to get things done. It takes such a long time. Despite the opposition you run into, you just have to persevere and carry on, even though many of the issues have to go to court. Ultimately, if you stick to it, you will prevail. We prevailed in all of our litigation. And even though we lost that trapping issue, I think it was a win. (chuckles)

WS: And then allowing the wild horses to stay down there is not --

AS: As I say, we accomplished our goal of legitimizing the activity. If Congress saw fit to put elephants in the park, the National Park Service is a creature of Congress. They have

to carry out the will of Congress. So if Congress wants horses at the Riverways, then the Park Service will do its best to manage them in the best possible manner.

[end of interview; incidental closing remarks omitted, tape meter, 93-100]