

Transcription: Grand Canyon Historical Society

Interviewee: Pat Grediagin (PG)

Interviewer: Tom Martin (TM)

Subject: Pat recounts work as chief ranger at Redwood National Park 2005-2007, then her travels after retiring in 2007

Date of Interview: March 22, 2021, Part 10

Method of Interview: Telephone

Transcriber: Stacy Birk

Date of Transcription: June 2021

Transcription Reviewers: Sue Priest

Keys: Redwood National and State parks, chief ranger, park resource management, redwood burl and wood theft, Orick, CA, park law enforcement, logging, Bill Pierce, park housing, scope of chief ranger work, Yurok Tribe, private inholdings, retirement, Bend, OR, Incident Management Teams, global travel

TM: Today is Monday, March 22, 2021. This is Part 10 oral history interview with Pat Grediagin. My name is Tom Martin. Good evening, Pat. How are you today?

PG: Well I am fine.

TM: Pat, may we have your permission to record this oral history over the telephone?

PG: Oh, I'm so glad you asked! Yes, you do.

TM: I'm so glad you reminded me before we started this interview! That's great. We talked a little bit about where we left off at the end of Part 9. In law enforcement you're eligible to retire after 20 years, so you could have retired but you got offered another job. Can you tell me about that job and what happened after that?

PG: Yeah, I'd be happy to. That eligibility to retire is 20 years in law enforcement, plus achieving the age of 50.

TM: Okay, thank you.

PG: When I was 49, I think, is when I had applied and was offered this job of chief ranger at Redwood National Park, but it's also formally Redwood National and State Parks because they have some kind of agreement to be managed as one entity. I was like, well, I could retire and I could go travel and do all these things that I would have all the time in the world to do then without trying to squeeze it in to my vacation time or I could go up and be a chief ranger. It's another step up, different challenges, different things to learn, and it would be kind of interesting and intriguing to be a chief ranger. So I accepted the job and postponed my idea of retiring at age 50. Figured I'd work there for a few years and I would still be very young for retirement and I would just go then. So I...

TM: So, Pat?

PG: Yes, yeah.

TM: I've got a couple questions here. Did Redwood people contact you and say, hey, we've got this job coming up or did you just see an opening for it, and say, gee, I'll apply for it.

PG: I did see an opening for it and went through some of the thought process I was just sort of describing when I decided to apply. I was like, huh, I can retire or I could apply and who knows, maybe I'll get it, maybe I won't.

TM: Did you know who the superintendent of the park was or did you know the acting chief ranger?

PG: No, I don't think I had met...yeah, I don't think I had met any of them.

TM: Are there any rivers up there at Redwood National Park?

PG: Not really. The Smith River of northern California comes hits the ocean just north of Crescent City, a few miles. Crescent City was where the headquarters was, but all of Redwood was pretty much south of that point. So there was nothing that went through the park and there was nothing that I really was involved with at all. With my former life of rivers, it was basically no rivers and no desert sunshine. It was the coast, and foggy, and cool. A whole different, new setting, this new job.

TM: Yeah, it sounds like a whole, different ecological niche compared to Sequoia.

PG: Totally.

TM: You mentioned that Redwood National Park was associated with the state parks of which I think there are many Redwood, sort of, State Parks, or state parks in California that have redwoods.

PG: Right.

TM: Was Redwood National Park, way up in northern part of California, did it have any other park branches? I think of Sequoia, has two branches – Kings Canyon and Sequoia side. Did Redwood have a couple different sections like that?

PG: No. I'm gonna do a little recap here. Most national parks are just managed as one unit; has a superintendent and they only manage that one park. Sequoia-Kings Canyon was a little different because it was two parks that was managed under one administrative team, one superintendent and one chief ranger, over the two parks. Redwood National and State Parks was a little different, even more so, because it was one single Federal national park and then there are three parks that are right adjacent. I think they all have a common boundary, but if not, they're very close; so they're in proximity, they're right there. I think one's Jedediah Smith State Park; Prairie Creek State Park; and then Del Norte Redwoods State Park, I think is the third one, I'm not sure about that name; and then Redwood National Park, all in close proximity. The idea was that visitors don't really recognize that it's a state park, often, or a national park so they tried to coordinate management so that visitors passing through that area would not be always confronted with a different management agency that might have a different concept on things and to just kind of unify everything.

TM: Okay. And what year was this?

PG: I got the job in 2005. And the regulations were still the same. Nobody gave up their way of managing or their regulations that would apply to their state-managed lands or the federal-managed

lands. But where we could make it less of a disruption for visitors to go from one to the other, that effort was made to coordinate all the activities.

TM: Sort of seamless, from...

PG: Trying to make it seamless, yeah.

TM: Okay. And of course, when I think of Redwood National Park and State Parks, I think of logging. But, it's 2005 so I'm thinking well maybe a lot of that logging history was behind you -- but maybe it wasn't?

PG: Well, another big broad-brush of what happened: the state parks were set up a hundred years ago, in the early 1900s. And then Redwood National Park was discussed. Hopefully nobody'll quote me exactly for these years, because it's coming straight from the back of my head. Roughly speaking, I think they started talking about designating a federal park to protect the redwoods in the 60s, but it didn't get acted upon for a number of years. It was probably Forest Service land. It was being logged, actively being logged, and it didn't become a park for, like, maybe seven years. Part of it was made a park. No, maybe I'm getting confused. There was an initial park and then an expansion. The bottom line is that the logging companies knew that it was gonna be not-loggable sometime in the near-ish future so they hastened their logging. Consequently, when the park came to its final form, much of the old growth had been cut and it was second-growth coming in. So it's not like its neighbors, the state parks, which preserve old growth sections of redwoods. The national park had a high percentage of second growth, and with that came a lot of natural resource management issues for miles of old logging roads that had to be de-commissioned and stabilized so that they would not erode away, go down into Redwood Creek, disrupt the salmon spawning beds by covering them with silt. There was a tremendous effort or need for management of the second-growth forest, both in stabilizing the landscape and the roads. Then thinning, because redwoods sprout all the way around the stumps. They just will come up with ten new trees, but they're all kind of crowded together. They sprout from the stumps and they just grow into new trees. The biggest part of managing Redwood National Park was managing the return to a redwood forest and trying to figure out how to best achieve that.

TM: I've got a question for you right away about stump sprouts. It just makes me think that the new tree, the new sprout, is anchored to an old stump that's gonna rot out and eventually that new tree's gonna have a little time of its life trying to hang up in the wind there, hanging into this older, woody base. How does that work?

PG: Yeah, they seem to sprout off to the edge of the stump. I don't remember the specific biology but they probably come from where the stump and the roots start going out so that it was more a ring of trees around the old stump; not dependent on the old stump for their physical stability. They would have got their own new root systems going to stabilize them. But still they were crowded so there were projects for thinning. Should we thin 100 trees to the acre or 200 trees to the acre? Those are made-up numbers; but a lot of resource management attention and effort. A lot of that is unseen by the public. That's just what the Park Service is doing to try and manage the lands that it owns.

TM: It kinda reminds me of an agency having to clean up a mine or a Superfund site where industry has walked away and left a mess and...

PG: Yeah, that's kinda true.

TM: ... the agency has to kind of clean-it-up.

PG: Right. And when visitors come, what they largely are looking for is that experience in the redwood groves and mostly just kinda seeing how big and massive they are. That's probably really what they're primarily after. It's really dark under a redwood forest, if you have an old growth one. It shades a lot of the sunlight that would... There's very little sunlight that gets to the bottom so it's lots of ferns and this habitat that is unusual. People aren't used to seeing it and that's why visitors are attracted to it. But there's a whole other aspect to running that park besides what the visitor experience was. I wasn't really involved with the resource management, I was involved with the law enforcement angle of visitor experience, or also protecting Redwood National Park. There was not a lot of crime there. But there were people who were actively working to get chunks of redwood out of the park so that they could sell them. Carve them into...

TM: Really?

PG: Yes. They stole the flooring out of an old barn that the park had inherited and managed, it was part of the landscape. But it had a redwood floor in it and one night it disappeared! Someone took the wood. There were logs that had fallen. There were some people that would go in under cover of dark in the more remote areas and they would cut up the wood into chunks that would be carved into redwood... There's a town called Orick, and they had a lot of wood carvings there for the tourist trade, they usually had bears carved out of it, so that would be where some of the redwood would go. There were other burls, which are kind of a weird growth. I believe it's a sprout that could turn into a new tree or a branch, but it's on the side of the tree. They get quite large and the wood gets very marbled looking, there's not a straight grain. They would saw off the burls, which might be six feet in diameter, and maybe they would go in a foot or two to saw off that. It's kind of like a big pimple.

TM: It'd be really heavy!

PG: Yeah. I can't remember now how they would get 'em out of there, probably with a truck or something.

TM: Were they doing this with hand saws to be quiet?

PG: I don't remember that. It was usually under cover of night and in remote places so I think that they would use whatever they needed to to get away with it. They wouldn't do a hand saw if they thought they could get away with a chainsaw, just given whatever the particulars were of the site. So that was one of the things, protecting the redwoods and trying to catch this group of people that we suspected were routinely... Maybe it was only a few times in the summer. It wasn't like every day they were out there which made it harder to catch them because it was random. But they were still taking redwood out of the park and that was one of the things the law enforcement staff tried to get on top of and make some arrests for. There was also...

TM: Did you have any success with that?

PG: We did have a little success. I can't remember enough of the particulars, but yeah, there was a fellow that lived in Orick that I know we caught and I don't remember the outcome of that. There was a federal prosecutor in Eureka, which is south of Crescent City, but that part of the park must've been in Humboldt County and that's where the federal prosecutor was. I'm trying to remember this all now

from memory. I do remember he was very assertive about prosecuting those crimes if he could get his hands on it. It seems to me we had a case that went to him, at least, but I don't remember the particulars any more.

TM: Yeah, it kinda reminds me of the poachers that you discovered at Dinosaur that went in front of the local judge, who was like, oh well, here's a little fine here.

PG: Right.

TM: And, you know, you got to do all this work to try to catch the bad guys that are destroying park resources and they get a slap on the wrist, or whatever, and that's that.

PG: From my perspective, and I think many rangers' perspective, the very first thing you want to try and do if you're a law enforcement ranger in a national park is protect the park from damage and degradation. So protecting the elk horns or the redwoods. Even though other people would say, "It's just an old stump that was there, what's the big deal?" Well to us, it was a big deal. That's why we were there. We had a secondary purpose of trying to protect people from each other or from the elements. Yes, you want to save a life if you can, but a lot of the people interactions were meth problems – people using meth in Redwood or selling meth or... That just doesn't rate on my radar as how I wanted to spend my time as a park ranger. I wanted to protect the park. I really don't want to deal with drug problems that are imported into the park. Anyway, that was a little bit... It wasn't fitting my idealistic interests to be dealing with people-caused problems that were just cultural and not really having anything to...they just took place in the park and didn't have anything to do with the park resources or visitor experiences. But that was another issue we dealt with.

Del Norte County, which is where the park headquarters was situated, in Crescent City, and a good chunk of park lands were, is a very poor county in northern California. Formally a big logging community. When the federal protections over those lands were put in place... And really, I believe that the logging sort of diminished because they cut down all the trees, pretty much, that they could cut at the time. But the loggers would see it that the federal government came in and locked up the land and took away their livelihood. There was resentment towards the government/towards the Park Service for that role. And there was a lot of unemployment and there was a lot of meth going on in the community. So it was a place that had issues to be a Park Service person there, although I never really felt like we had hostility around us. It's much easier to work in a park where your surrounding community supports the park and supports the park's management and you're kinda all rooting for the same thing. If you go into a place, and you weren't really welcome there in the first place – although it was 40 years later and emotions had calmed down a little bit – it still is not as pleasant as when you've got everyone going, "Oh, you're the best! The Park Service, yes!" Instead you're the, "you guys took our jobs!"

TM: Exactly, tourism, tourist jobs and a sort of "sustainable" economy. People recognize that and appreciate that. Wow, hmm. Who was the superintendent at the time?

PG: It was Bill Pierce and he was a very... I really enjoyed working for Bill. A very easily approachable person that you could talk to very comfortably. He was the kind of person that liked to deal with his staff. He supported his staff well. And let's see... I think he left before I left, I'm trying to remember. I had a whole other topic I wanted to mention to you that I thought of after our last interview,, and that was the topic of park housing or where a person would live. I lived much of my early career, up until Sequoia, in park housing. And if I didn't have park housing, I was sharing housing with friends. Especially

when I was younger and had a seasonal job, then I would be renting a room from someone and living there because I didn't want to rent a whole house for myself. I just didn't have that much disposable income. It wasn't until I was in my...let me see... I would of been 46 years old, I think, when I bought my first house, which was when I moved to Sequoia—Kings Canyon. The Park Service, in places, provides housing, but they really don't want to be in the housing business. So if they can say, "Go out in the community and find yourself a house," that's what they want to do. They usually have a little bit of housing for mid-level or law enforcement. They want a law enforcement person on-scene if they can have it on the park. In some of the places, I was in park housing because I was law enforcement and they wanted someone there for emergency responses. But by the time I got to be the District Ranger in Sequoia, they wanted me out. There was not enough park housing to go around for all of the staff that was there, and there were communities nearby where you could get housing. They would still try and provide it for some seasonals because they recognize seasonals don't have that much money. But I needed to buy my own house and I was excited to buy my own house because I had never lived in my own house before. So I bought my first house in 2001 when I moved to Sequoia, and then I bought my second house when I moved to Redwood. To me, an interesting aspect of working for the Park Service is that oftentimes, for better or for worse, you are not buying your own home for a lot of years, if ever, depending upon where you end up working. I always enjoyed living in parks and the park communities that were there. And usually my park housing was reasonably priced because they would prorate it to the community. If you were remote, they would give you a reduction in the cost because you were not close to medical staff, or groceries, or other things that you need to live your life out there. But it was kind of exciting to buy my first house in Sequoia which I sold when I moved to Redwood and then I bought a house in Redwood. When I finally left Redwood, I had trouble selling 'cause the housing market crashed right then. So I ended up having that house for another six or seven years after I left Redwood, waiting for the market to come back. I just thought I'd mention the housing scenario with Park Service employees.

TM: Yeah, it can be very difficult. And people can retire from the park and have no equity in a home. Look to have to rent and that's their retirement years, that's their golden years is gonna be renting somewhere. It can be very difficult.

PG: Right. You know, in my situation I was always a saver and pretty frugal lifestyle. So the fact that my rentals in the parks were fairly inexpensive because they were remote stations and I got that cost-of-living...no, it wasn't cost-of-living...anyway, because we were remote, they took the price of the rental down to compensate for that. So I felt like I had banked money by living in the park versus having spent higher rent living outside the park. But your point is correct, I also never built up the equity in a home until I was in my 40s.

TM: And the other trouble is, as you mentioned, you move from location to location with the job and then you have to sell your house. And if the market has dropped, you sell with a loss. Or no, you have to hang on and wait for the market to come back, hoping, you hope it does. But that can take, as you mentioned, six years. So it's a problem – housing.

PG: It was, and the Park Service actually had for a while a program where they would buy your house if you were... It became complicated if you got a transfer and you needed to have a new house to live in, but you still owned your old house in the old park where you had previously worked. Maybe that house was slow to sell, maybe it took six months. Well, your money was tied up in that, so it was hard to buy a new house in your new park until you could sell the old one and buy the new one. So the Park Service came up with this program where they would buy your house from you at a fair market appraised value,

give you the money, then they would turn around and try and sell it but you had the money to go ahead and try and buy a new house in your new community. So you got your money out. But it ended up being a real cumbersome and costly program. When house prices plummeted, the Park Service would be stuck with that falling prices with the house. When house prices went up real fast, the value of the house was appraised higher than it would have been had they stayed at a moderate level and suddenly the Park Service is paying a lot more for your house than you paid for it. I don't think that they're doing that much anymore, or maybe at all. But when I moved from Sequoia and the town of Three Rivers to Redwood National Park, I worked with that program. I financially benefited from that program, which wasn't the intent, but the way it worked out.

TM: Great. How?

PG: They ended up...

TM: Oh, okay. So did they then buy your house at Sequoia?

PG: Well, they would of bought my house in Sequoia, but I was able to sell it. Somehow I got involved with trying to sell it... And they gave you a bonus if you were able to sell your own house instead of turning it over to them. It was a hot market right when I was selling and I had no trouble selling my house. But because they had built this incentive into the program to encourage people to try and find buyers... I don't know what I got, it was maybe \$15,000. It was a chunk of change. A chunk of change that I felt really kind of was undeserved. I actually wrote a letter to the regional staff and said, I know this is the program, but I feel kind of badly about this because it wasn't like I had any effort in it. My house was a hot seller because the market changed, and yet I'm gonna reap this benefit. The person in charge of that program wrote back and said, "Yeah, it's not really a very good program for the Park Service. You're right, it's got real flaws in it." That's why I think they started diminishing that program. The intention was good, but the implementation, or the way it worked out, was...

TM: Might not have been good for the Park Service, but I would think that you took initiative. You sold your house, you got a bonus for doing that; now you have to go buy another house. This is all incumbent with the job. And the Park Service encourages this. Three or four years lets you to move to another park and, you know, you get more management skills and you get to use those skills in another park. So it's a benefit to the Service.

PG: It is.

TM: But as you say, you move to a new park, you have to buy a house, and then you have to... Are you having to buy on the peak? Can you see that? You know, gee, I guess I'm gonna buy on the peak, that's too bad; and the market's gonna crash, and then you have to try and get out of that.

PG: Which I did. In Crescent City I bought on the peak and that's why the price plummeted by the time I left. I was, like, I'm not gonna sell and lose all that money, I'm gonna rent it. I was determined to try and get my money out, so I held the house for a long time and rented it. So my money was tied up in it. It's just something you never even think about when you're thinking about being a park ranger, how this whole housing thing works. It can be really awkward if your money's tied up in one house and you're trying to move to a new community for a new job.

TM: In your case, if you had purchased a house, let's say for example in Moab, when you were working at Canyonlands and then kept that house but rented it, you would be an absentee renter and having to deal with those difficulties. You're working two states away, or three, and you've got to fix the hot water heater that's not working. So it's very difficult to get that home equity going.

PG: Right. Housing was a problem for the Park Service in many different realms. One of them is... Like in Big Bend, there wasn't a local community so everyone lived inside the park in park housing with almost no exceptions. That became a burden to the Park Service to make sure there was enough housing. The Grand Canyon's the same way. There's not enough housing for the staff and they're always scrambling and sticking people together in mobile homes trying to make it work with not enough resources to make it work in a reasonable fashion. I mean, they make it work, but it's not always optimal, let's put it that way. So, housing is a burden. It's a burden to the Park Service. The Park Service, somewhere during my career, said, we're getting outta the housing business as much as we can. If there's a community within 60 miles, we want people to go live in that community, I think it was 60-mile limit, and commute to work because we don't wanna maintain all these houses and try and house all these people. That wasn't the job that the Park Service thought it should be doing. They thought it should be managing the park, not the housing for the staff for the park. There's no easy answer for any of the woes associated with housing. It's just one of those things, you try and figure out as a park manager, what you're dealt and what you are told to do and then try and make it work. It was not always easy.

TM: It's funny because when I think of the other land agencies – whether it's Bureau of Land Management or it's Forest Service – oftentimes, those employees live in the gateway communities. They live, you know, 60 miles away or whatnot or further. And, hey, the guy living next door, or the gal living next door, works for the Forest Service or works for the BLM, they're my neighbor. And that citizen/neighborly understanding of who my neighbors are, I think that helps the agency. My next-door neighbor's a nice guy or a nice gal. So the park could get a benefit in that, as well.

PG: Yeah. And park employees could get the benefit of being in a community of mixed assets. Maybe there's a yoga studio down the road, or maybe there's other benefits to living in the community.

TM: A college town, or a movie theater, or a...

PG: Yeah, right.

TM: Yeah, definitely more social amenities, versus...

PG: Right. And schools for kids sometimes were closer or better.

TM: Yep, yep. Medical services, etcetera.

PG: Park communities are very small communities, as you would also know, to where you sort of know everyone's business to a certain level and the gossip mill. A lot of people didn't like that they were living and working with people 24 hours a day; working with them, then living next to them, then working with them. Some staff members did not like that total closed community feeling. I always rather enjoyed it because I liked working... I don't know, it's just different personalities. I enjoyed...

TM: Yeah, it's life in a fishbowl and if you're a happy fish in a fishbowl, it's all right.

PG: Right, right. I always felt that who in this country has the privilege of living in a national park? Almost nobody, unless you happen to work for the Park Service. So I felt like I was a really privileged person 'cause I was living in these places that people came from long distances to visit.

TM: Around the world, yeah.

PG: Around the world, right. I, by and large, enjoyed living in parks. It was exciting, also, when I got my first and second house because that was a whole new adventure. But not everyone shared my sentiments about living in parks. For some people it was not pleasant. Or maybe they had a spouse that couldn't find a job there. I mean, it's lots of different issues that come up when you start either housing, or not housing the staff.

TM: It's interesting, as well, too, because the model is: you get a job, you buy a house, you work for 30 years, you retire, you're still in a house, you have a place to stay. If you go to a park and you stay there a long time, you have a bunch of friends there at the park. They come and go but the long-haulers all know the long-haulers and they got good friendships there. Then they have to leave and they have to buy a house or rent somewhere and try to make friends with neighbors they do not know.

PG: Right. What you do find sometimes, is that you find clumps of Park Service people in communities that seem to lend themselves to Park Service mentality and stuff. I just was in Big Bend; two hours from Big Bend is the closest community of any substance – Alpine, Texas. A lot of people from Big Bend National Park, who lived in the park during their career, they have bought in Alpine and are living in Alpine. So there's a sub-community now in Alpine of people who used to be Park Service. You find that in Flagstaff, in Alpine, in Moab, where people even go away and will return to that community because that was a place that was supportive of what their interests were. But other people do move totally cold into other places where their wife's family is from or something like that. They're essentially starting over with their house and their social structures and a whole new life.

TM: Yes, yeah. This is a good discussion to have because it is part of the territory of the job.

PG: Right. One other piece for my own story, is that when I was working in Sequoia, I started thinking about where I might... And I was thinking about, oh, maybe I'll retire when I'm 50. Where am I gonna retire and where am I gonna live? Well, I had grown up in western Oregon, and we had recreated in Bend when I was a kid. We would go there and go skiing at Mt. Bachelor, and go hiking in the mountains. So I knew Bend, Oregon. I was partial to the sunny side of the...which was the east side of the Cascade Mountains. I was still partial to a drier, sunnier climate than the western Oregon climate. I have two sisters that I'm close to and one was living in the Bend area and the other one was thinking of retiring there. So the other one and I pooled our money in 2003 and bought a house in Bend with a notion that we might both retire there and live in the same house. Then after a little bit we decided, well, we should both have our own houses. So I bought my sister out and ended up owning the house that we had co-owned together. I had bought that house in 2003. I went on a house-buying spree once I got my first taste of it. I bought the house in Sequoia, and then a couple years later I bought half a house in Bend and then paid off my sister a year or two later. And then, meanwhile, I had moved to Redwood and bought that house in 2005. So I rented the house in Bend until... After I had retired and actually done some traveling, was ready to land and live in a place, I eventually did move into that house that was in Bend. So that kind of wraps up my housing history with the Park Service.

TM: Yeah, okay. Well thank you for reviewing that. We were talking about Bill Pierce.

PG: Yes, and I can't remember now, I still think it's... I actually tried to look it up on my email addresses, and I guess I don't... I have his address somewhere but I can't tell you how to spell it correctly.

TM: And he sounded like a good person to work for.

PG: He was a very good person to work for. I enjoyed working for Bill. He would laugh and he would go out during his lunch break and walk. I had tended to just kinda work in my office and keep working on stuff and eat my lunch while I was working. I liked the fact that he set an example of going out, with whoever wanted to go, and walking around for 20 minutes, kind of clearing your head and getting some exercise and just chit-chatting. I enjoyed doing that with him and was happy that I had learned that from him. It was a really good staff at Redwood. There were two superintendents: a superintendent of the state parks and a superintendent of the national park, which was Bill. The superintendent of the state parks was a woman named Marilyn Murphy. She was terrific. She and Bill worked together real well so the fusing of the state park mission and management style and the national park mission and management style went well because they were both really good managers but also worked together and would collaborate well. They didn't have as much staff as we did. They didn't have as much budget as we did. We actually supported some of their clerical work, as I remember. But Marilyn was terrific. She had a chief ranger who was my equivalent, basically. I didn't work with him so much. We would get together some and kind of coordinate what the rangers were doing. He must've had his office somewhere else but Marilyn's office was in the same building that the park staff was in. Was it? I think it was. Maybe it wasn't. Maybe it wasn't...? Anyway, I saw Marilyn around a lot more, and we became personal friends, anyways, so my biggest relationship was just with her. My equivalent in the state parks, their chief ranger, and I would... I think they had a couple of 'em over time, so I never really formed strong bonds with their chief ranger because I just don't remember seeing much of that person. I saw much more of the park's staff and worked together with that management team: the chief of maintenance, the chief of interp, the chief of resource management. We were a management team that would figure out how we were supposed to spend our budget, and who was gonna get what money, and how we were gonna make cutbacks. We were always in planning... Well, we had a meeting once a week, I think, to go over the latest what was going on and what was expected out of the park management team. So they were the people that I worked more with. But we did try to coordinate that all with the state park staff.

TM: Okay. When you first show up at Redwood National Park, was your replacement still there? Did they have a chance to get you landed in an office and understand the lay of the land? Who kind of gave you a tour and...?

PG: No. That almost never happened in any park that I... I mean, the model is that someone leaves, there's a vacancy, they advertise it, they recruit. That whole process takes four months before someone shows up and that other person is long gone. So you just learn from every single job. You learn from the people that were left behind. Your boss would try and tell you stuff. Your secretarial staff would tell you stuff. Your subordinates would say, oh, here's what we used to do. You just kind of hold it together. I did happen to know my predecessor because he had worked in Kings Canyon when I was there, then had gone to Redwood, and then he moved to the regional office and I filled in behind him. But I don't remember, I might of called him and said, Okay, so what's your perspective on this? If I did call him, it was probably just that once. I just leaned on the people that were there to help guide me with how to do stuff.

TM: Once again, it kinda makes me question that whole concept of institutional memory.

PG: Yes. That's something that is sometimes in short supply with the rate of turnover; when every three or four years, it's a new person in a job. Maintenance tended to have more longevity. But when you had someone who had been around for a number of years... Our chief of resource management at Sequoia, a terrific fellow named Terry Hofstra, he had been there for a while. He knew his job, but he also knew a lot of how the whole management of the park, the trajectory it had taken, what had worked, what hadn't worked with working with the state. He was invaluable in providing that long-term memory to the rest of us that hadn't been there so long. So you're absolutely right that longevity is of value. And very sadly he passed away a number of years ago from I think it was lung... He wasn't a smoker. I think it was lung cancer; it might have been something else. He was terrific. Very sad. I was already retired by that time when he did pass away, but he was a really good employee with the Park Service and a decent man to be in the position. Was saddened to hear when he passed away.

TM: Okay. This was at Redwood or was this at Sequoia, that he'd been around a long time?

PG: That was at Redwood, and that's where he just had that longevity that you referred to. I recognized the fact that he'd been there for a while, and he was a great person to ask about what had happened in the past.

TM: Okay. So he was helpful with some of the institutional memory.

PG: Yes. Oh, I have another little...totally different subject...but I thought of this when I was anticipating this interview. I found it of interest to myself that my grandfather Grediagin was a Russian immigrant to Eureka, California, which is south of Crescent City by maybe 80 miles. He ended up working in the redwood logging industry. He was a bark peeler. In the 20s, and the 30s, and the 40s, especially when he was younger, they would cut a huge redwood tree down and his job, with a spud bar or a potato bar... What do they call those? Anyway, just a big, heavy bar. It was his job to peel the very thick bark off. It was very, you know, manual labor and hard but he was tough and strong. He'd go off into these logging camps and live with the loggers for five days and then he would spend his weekend's home. So my grandfather was in the redwood logging industry and two generations later I come back to the same general area and am protecting redwoods. I just thought that was kind of an interesting circle, and in my mind a nice circle. I don't know if he would of found any value in protecting redwoods since that wasn't his frame of reference at all.

TM: That's really neat. Were you able to track any more of his history down when you were there at Redwood National Park, just to kind of dig in to that a little bit?

PG: No. No, not at all. I don't think I know of him, just from when I was a kid and my grandma, and stuff like that. My dad had also grown up around Eureka and had worked for a timber company, as well. This was a plywood plant. I'm not sure, I don't think they were going after the redwood as much. He was a surveyor and he loved to hike and walk. He loved being outdoors and doing timber cruising, so he was very familiar with the southern end of Redwood National Park, outside of what is now that park. That area outside the Park on the southern end he was familiar with through his work when we lived in northern California, which was up until I was nine-years-old. Then we all moved to Oregon. But he knew that countryside. He came and visited me and we drove into places where he had worked before and he tried to remember what it looked like then. So that was nice to share that with him.

TM: Nice, yeah, cool. I'm trying to think of the challenges of the job. What did you find as a chief ranger that was a surprising challenge to you that you hadn't appreciated as a district ranger or, you know, simply as a regular law enforcement ranger?

PG: Well each of those steps involved a broader spectrum of what was going on with managing of parks. When you're the law enforcement ranger on the scene you're looking at everything pretty close-up. And then as the district ranger, I was overseeing a law enforcement operation over a wide landscape, but I was still in that cone of the law enforcement realm of things by and large, or my focus was. When I became a chief ranger, I became part of the management team which was the chief of resource management, the chief of interpretation, the chief of maintenance, the administrative officer, and superintendent, working also with the state parks. A much broader view of how... It wasn't just the law enforcement anymore, I was working/collaborating with these other functions and making sure that what we were doing fit with what they were doing, and budgeting was going on. There was an interest by the Yurok Tribe, which owned land along the Klamath River. Redwood National Park was a thin ribbon north and south, and the Klamath River ran east to west and exited through the park into the ocean. I can't remember how big our strip of land there was. The Park Service controlled some of that land and the Yuroks wanted to become a third entity in this partnership and have it be Redwood National and State and Yurok Parks. There were conversations with them about what that might look like. They were interested in the mouth of the Klamath River, which they had a lot of historical use of, and fishing. They fished for eel and they fished for salmon. That was part of their cultural livelihood and history. They were interested in developing a lodge near the mouth of the Klamath River and having that become a tribal business. That was Park Service land, but they were hoping to have that granted to them by legislation in Congress. So they had been lobbying to try and get that and to become kind of a partner with the state and national parks, and become a third leg on that triangle of management. I was the representative that was attending meetings with the state and the Yurok Tribe. This is another area where my job was not narrowly focused, but it became broader and broader and broader. Now I'm representing the park and collaborating, trying to explore the idea of involving Yurok Tribe in the management of the lands. That never came to any kind of conclusion that I know of. It didn't come to any conclusion when I was there. The park had some strong reservations about how this might work and some of the problems that might accompany it, so there was ongoing conversations. The Yurok Tribe was making a real run at trying to have that land taken from the national park and legally given to them. The locals at Redwood National Park, the local park staff, were not really on-board with that idea of taking lands out of National Park Service management to give to someone else because we're charged with protecting these lands. We weren't sure how well they would be protected with this other entity so we were kind of possessive of that. I don't think anything ever was done legislatively, to my knowledge, and it's still part of Redwood National and State Parks, Federal being the owners.

TM: Which is interesting because I would think that the Yurok would have an argument to say, well, we were here before you-all showed up.

PG: They certainly did. Yeah, and that's what they...

TM: And talk about having a possessory interest in the heartland; so what a fascinating kind of journey.

PG: Yeah, yeah It was very interesting because of their very legitimate rights to all kinds of...I mean, their tribal rights to lands that we took away from them and their interest in managing those lands. Frankly, my personal worry was that I have seen some examples of tribal efforts that never took off, and became abandoned. I can give you an example. Have you floated Desolation Canyon?

TM: Yes.

PG: Remember, I think it's McFarland Ranch isn't it?

TM: McPherson?

PG: That's on the tribe... McPherson. Yeah. On the tribal land where they had a lodge. And now it's ruins, and a wreck, and an eyesore. My fear was that they might not be successful with their attempts at building a business there and walk away from it. And then you've got a worse situation, you've got an eyesore sitting there. Nobody pays to take those things down and take it back to natural; they slowly deteriorate. That was one of the things I worried about, my own self. That's not to say they didn't have rights; but it was to say, in practical terms, I've seen some things that were big ideas that didn't work. And then the land is left the worse for it. I was worried about that.

TM: Right. And some agency has to clean it up. Or they don't and the place is just a mess, sort of like an ecological disaster. Yeah, yeah, sure.

PG: Right. I think all of us, if we had a real strong sense that this was going to succeed, would've been quite onboard with becoming a three-way management team. But they didn't have experience in managing parks. There was just caution, cautionary concerns on the part of park staff that... Well, another thing is we tended to be economically supporting some aspects of the state park's operation because the state parks were financially strapped more than we were. And then, again, if you invite a third person into this agreement, and if their economics don't work out, then are the Feds carrying the ball a little bit for them, as well. There were aspects of this that it was like, well, what happens if this goes this way, or...? So there was just some... Everybody wasn't just totally all for it, from the Park Service, because of those kinds of concerns. There was a lot of support at the regional level for this exploration of whether this made sense to do. I haven't even checked in the last 10 years, to know what's come of that whole effort. But I don't believe anything changed.

TM: I'm sorta thinking about, you know, the chief ranger's job and I think about South Rim road patrol. You're not doing road patrol any more.

PG: Not at all.

TM: You're not doing trail patrol or field patrol; you're working budgets and weekly meetings with the team – "I" team or whatever they call it. And that's a much different role.

PG: Yep. But it was one that I wanted because I wanted to see what I could contribute at that level, what I could learn at that level, what would be new for me at that level, what I could grow into. I also inherited just this oddball side piece of work that somebody had to do, and they had landed it in the chief ranger's office, and that was to deal with issues with lands. The Park Service owns land, and sometimes there's private inholdings that are surrounded by park, and there's legal right-of-ways by utilities across park lands. There's a staff at the regional level that deals with these issues of titles, rights-of-way through lands. It was a whole thing I'd never even heard about or thought about. It became my responsibility to answer the random and infrequent inquiries about, hey, I have a piece of land here and I need to get access to it. Can I make a road? Can I drive on your closed road? Things like...

TM: Oh, so private inholdings and people would want access to their inholdings across park land?

PG: Right. So it became very interesting to me that different land laws... Sometimes they didn't have rights of access across park lands. It kind of depends upon what's in the title and how they got it, and whether they were there before the park or after. Did they buy it after the park had already been established from someone who had been there before the park. Fortunately for me, there were experts in the regional office, which was in the Bay Area. I worked with them on a couple different issues. At least one I can remember in particular was an access issue that... I don't remember all the particulars of it now, I just remember that I didn't have a clue about stuff. So I was learning about it, and talking to our staff who did know, and then kinda that link between the inquiry and the local management at Redwood. I was that link between the user end and the people who knew what was going on. I learned a lot and I was intrigued by it. I didn't feel at all like it was something that I didn't want to be doing. It was fascinating to me. I didn't deal with it much, but it was like, Wow, who knew there was this kind of stuff out there that we had to manage as well and know about, and have legal insight into the legalities of this or that? So, yes, you're right, I was totally in the office, totally working on supervising a few people, but managing budgets, managing these...oh, there's a word I'm missing right now...but some other tasks that came to me just because somebody had to do them.

TM: Did you get a chance to mentor any of the law enforcement people coming in new to the ranks?

PG: Not much. I had two district rangers that worked under me. They were the ones that were directly supervising the field staff. I'm trying to remember if any of them left during my tenure there and now I can't remember. For sure one, I think, was around the whole time. There was a law enforcement specialist, which was a third person that I supervised; a person who was not assigned based on the south district or the north district. She worked with making sure, if we had cases that went to court, that the rangers were ready for that. Kind of the legal end of things for whichever ranger might have some legal stuff going on; whether there were citations, were they proper filed, did we close the loop on them, were they paid? So she dealt in the realm of the law enforcement. I'm trying to think of this. I don't know how to describe it better, but she was a law enforcement specialist. I think there had been one before when I got there, and this woman got it while I was there. So I worked with her to help figure out what she should be doing. Actually, we worked together, she and I worked together, on this redwood poaching. We called it "redwood poaching" when they were taking the logs out of the park for commercial purposes. She and I were working kind of as a team on trying to figure out how we were gonna catch that. She took the lead on it, as I remember, but we would say, okay, let's setup some cameras, let's have some late-night patrols that go out. So I worked with her. I would say I didn't really mentor. Because she stepped in this job new and I was her supervisor, I explained to her what her job was and helped her be able to achieve what her tasks were. I guess that's kind of... It's really supervising more than mentoring, I think. I don't know quite what the right word is.

TM: Okay. Did you have problems like you'd had at Sequoia-Kings Canyon, of growing marijuana in the backcountry areas?

PG: No. Not to the...

TM: Not like down south?

PG: Not like down south. Now, we did have some concerns that there could be some stuff growing in the park, and that we ought to be trying to figure out if there were. It seems to me we had a couple of

flights over the park. There was a special agent for the Park Service that wasn't assigned to Redwood, but was assigned to the regional office, I think. Where did he come out of? No, he might of come out of Whiskeytown. I think it was in Whiskeytown that this special agent was assigned, or that's his home park. But he worked with some other parks, well, he worked with us to investigate whether we might have some marijuana growing. Whiskeytown had a big problem and he was all over marijuana groves in Whiskeytown. I think through him, we got a couple flights over Redwood to see whether there was something going on in the back forty that we didn't know about, you know, in areas that we didn't get to. We weren't sure if we were maybe too cool and too far north? Although Humboldt County's famous for grows and we were just mostly in Del Norte County, just a little north of that. I don't remember that we found anything. We might of found something that I forgot about. I think that there could be more of a problem now. I think people might of been thinking about getting into Redwood National Park lands when I was there. I somehow have a sense, or I had a sense, that if we didn't have it now, it was gonna be there at some point and we should keep our eyes out.

TM: Okay. Yeah, I'm just trying to think of what... You certainly think of Grand Canyon, where there's people falling off the edge, there's people that are always getting lost, there's heat and cold, and automobile accidents. And, you know, the busy parks like that, that's a lot of what's going on, speeding and things. But, I just don't think...

PG: Right. Not too much so at Redwood; it was local abusers of the park. Either the meth entity or the redwood poaching entity. And then your random somebody needs help for this reason. Not a big workload with medical, not a big workload with any kind of fire. There was probably illegal parking and congestion and staff dealing with those levels of things. I'm probably forgetting some things that were more significant. I was a level removed from most of that incidental stuff. It was the bigger stuff like marijuana grows or like poaching of redwoods that kind of came across my desk. We would be like, okay, here's a problem. How're we gonna address this? Yeah, I didn't get involved with a lot of the stuff that was more minor.

TM: Yeah, yeah. So it's life at 30,000 feet. You don't get a chance to take your shoes off and put your feet on the grass because you're at 30,000 feet, but you're watching these huge chunks of landscape go by and understanding how everything connects together.

PG: That's a great description of it. Yes, I like that. Trying to get the big view and how do we make this work from the...

TM: And of course, in your own personal plan, here, you're thinking, well, I'll do this for three years. I can retire but I'm gonna do this for a little while. I can see that there could be a trap here, because you can see your own life clock ticking out. But you've learned so many skills that you're a valuable asset to the Service, anywhere you would go.

PG: Yeah, well, and that's true. And in a way, that's the downside of early retirement for law enforcement people is, you're just getting to where you're pretty darn good at what you're doing and you retire because you can, or because you need to when you hit 57 and you haven't transitioned to some other form of a job. In my case, once again, I really enjoyed that job. I don't think there was a job that I didn't enjoy and learn something new from, and get really curious about...well, how's this gonna work? By and large, all the parks I worked in had great staff that I enjoyed working with, and that was the same at Redwood. I think I got there in March of...I think I got there in March of 2005 and I worked through March of 2006. By March of 2007, I was like, okay, I'm here for two years, do I want to go for

another whole year and go through another winter in this cloudy, damp environment? So, I said, you know what, I think I'm ready. I think, come summer I'd like to go off and do fun, summery stuff and not be working for another year. So after two years in... I retired in June of 2007 because I didn't want to miss out on summer! I just said, okay, I'm going to do it. So that was two years and three months, I think or so, that I was at Redwood which was in some ways... Three years would of been really kind of what the norm would of been, maybe, to stay for three years because they just get you trained up and then ya leave. You know, two years, they're still getting me trained up and then I was gone. So, I did feel like, oh, I should stay another year but then I just said, but I really kind of want to retire. So, I just retired. I think I was 52 years old in the summer of 2007. I said, I just wanna go do this! My plan was to travel extensively for a couple years and I wanted to go do that. So I did retire and I got rid of...I basically downsized. I left my renters living in my house in Bend. I tried to sell my house in Crescent City but the market had just crashed and I wasn't finding any buyer for anything close to what I was asking. As winter starting approaching, I thought, I don't want this house to be empty in a damp environment all winter long; just gonna rent it. I'll figure out what to do with it later. So I got a renter into it and I got rid of most of my possessions. I downsized tremendously. I bought this six-foot by twelve-foot cargo trailer and I stuffed everything that I wanted to keep in that cargo trailer, which was like a mobile storage unit. I towed it up to my sister's house near Bend, Oregon and I parked it on the back part of her couple-acre piece of land. I made plans, or I had been making plans all along, about, okay, where do I want to go? I took off and traveled basically for two years. Was using my sister's address for my address and was basically homeless because I just left my renters in the home that I owned, and had renters in the other home that I owned. Did some great traveling. That was an attractive dream to me and I didn't want to wait another year of working at Redwood. Though there was nothing wrong with working at Redwood, it was just that I was eager to go off on this adventure.

TM: Yeah. Yeah. Now sometimes the Park Service will reach out to people like you, who have retired but have a skill set, to deal with special problems. Did the Park Service try to reach out to you, or were you just gone?

PG: I was just gone. There was another job I forgot to mention that I did get involved with when I was at Redwood. The Park Service has incident management teams, which you may be familiar with. They're teams of people who... It's based on kind of a militaristic structure of something's going wrong, usually, that we need to tend to. It's very common at fire camps. You have an incident commander that becomes the person in charge of dealing with this incident. They have a planning chief, and they have an operations chief, and they have an administrative officer. It's modeled on the military structure where you have people in charge of different aspects, and then they have people working for them in sub-functions. The Park Service uses that to deal with hurricanes that come through and damage parks, with fires that get going in parks, sometimes they use it for when Presidents visit parks and they need to implement a whole other level of operation because it's a President and there's all kinds of security issues, and you want to have... Mostly it's about security, and what the President's going to do, and where they're going to be, and how you manage the visitors. They have these teams that will go around, pulled from different parks. There might be a person from Grand Canyon, and a person from Big Bend, and a person from Yosemite, that have different roles that, along with the other people, goes and manages incidences. I became a Plans Chief. I can't remember if that started in Sequoia or not? No, that started in Big Bend, actually, that I got some Plans Chief training. I'm trying to remember if I did much in Sequoia.

What I do remember was when I got to Redwood, they wanted a team to go down and manage the park's recovery from Hurricane Katrina that hit New Orleans. There's a park area there called Jean

Lafitte that has six or seven components in different areas. The Park Service wanted to send a team there to help the park staff become functional enough and stabilized enough in their own personal situation that they could go back to work and try to manage the damage that had been done to the parks. So the team would go there and first of all try and figure out where everybody had evacuated to, and were they okay, and could they come back to work? Or when could they come back to work? And what kind of damage recovery needed to happen at different parks; pull special teams in to cut all the downed trees that had fallen at a unit of Jean Lafitte of Katrina. I was the Plans Chief that went on that team, and...was I? I think I was the Plans Chief on that team, or I worked in Plans. I was Plans Chief some places. Maybe I worked, maybe I...no, I think I was Plans Chief. So anyway, I was part of that incident management team. I did that a few times at Redwood. So I had that skill set that I had worked with that is often... People who work on incident management teams will hire back after they retire and do further work on incidents whether it be fire crews – not the firefighters so much, but managing the aviation management, or working the plans team. They will get hired on in an emergency appointment to come bring that knowledge base that they have to this emergency and be part of that team. I thought that I might do that when I retired because I thought that I had those skills that might be requested, and it was a great way to make money, and it was a great way to go out on some adventure. But when I started thinking about my intentions and my plans to travel, I knew that it would get de-railed if I got a call to go out on some fire camp thing that went on for two months, you know, on and off and on and off and I really wanted to go travel. So I did not ever sign up to do that kind of work because part of my whole intent with travel was that I would now have free time that I could do to pursue my own interests in whichever manner I wanted to, which was travel. If I signed up to work somewhere, then I was, once again, not using my time to the ends that I was interested in using my time for. So I didn't get reached out to, but I didn't open myself up for invitations, either.

TM: So where did you go? Where did you travel in your first couple years?

PG: Oh, my gosh. Well, let's see. So, the first fall, I went to... I gotta remember, reconstruct this... I went to Italy, my sister was there and some other friends had rented a house and were there for a month. We explored around in the general Florence area. Then I went to Germany, 'cause I'd always heard about the Christmas... What do they call those Christmas markets? I don't know, I just had this idea that it'd be cool to see the Christmas markets in Germany. Where I wanted to go, and was on my way to, was India. I did end up spending 99 days, not quite 100 days, in India. For some reason I was going there in early January, so between Italy and my flight there, I said, oh, I'll just go to Germany for a while. So I went to Germany. Then I did go to India because I just wanted to see what India was about. I traveled from the south part to the north part over the course of basically three months, or a little over three months. And that was all independent, solo travel. But then I had some Park Service acquaintances that were going to Central Asia. I had heard about this trip and I said I would love to get on that! It was something setup with a tour company. We had a driver and we had a guide. We toured, spent three weeks in Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan... Let me think...Turkmenistan, and another...Kyrgyzstan. We called it the "stans" trip because it was four of those former Soviet countries that... Once again, I'm really fascinated by arid cultures and landscapes and peoples. I was like, ooh, that's an area I'm really curious about. So I went there, and then I went to Turkey for a month. And then what'd I do? Then I was a little bit in, kind of, southeastern Europe, but I was ready to go home, which was the US. I went to my sister's for a while. Then I hopped in my car and I did a big trip around the US like I just did as we've been doing these interviews, but I was just in my little station-wagon car, not a little RV. A friend joined me on and off for parts of that trip, as well. I decided I was gonna do a big sweep around the US, which took about four months. That was the fall of 2008.

Then in January of 2009, I decided to go to the Western Hemisphere. I went down to Mexico for a month and then I went to the Galapagos and Ecuador for three or four weeks. Then I went to Antarctica on a cruise; it was a 21-day cruise to Antarctica. Then I spent a month in Argentina. I came back, I think, in about... May of 2009 is when I finally said, okay, I'm done with these travels and places that I wanted to go see and explore. I told my renter in my house in Bend that I was going to be moving into that house in July of 2009, which I did. So that's when I landed again after... I retired June of 2007. I stayed in Crescent City for a couple month, kind of wrapping things up and trying to figure out what to do with my house. And then once I put everything in my little cargo trailer and took off, then I, essentially, was pretty mobile until July 1st of 2009 when I moved into my house in Bend and lived there for about nine months. Then I moved to Tucson because I had a sweetheart that was there, and went and lived with him for a few years. That didn't work out so well so then I moved back to my house in Bend. I still live in Bend, but I actually bought a different house because I decided I liked this other one better. I'm still in Bend and somewhere along the line, I finally sold the house in Crescent City. That's where I've been until Jeff and I took off on this year-long road trip, in March 1st, 2020, a little over a year ago. We took off and have been traveling around the US since then. We'll get home in May.

TM: The Covid tour.

PG: Yeah, the Covid tour. It was actually a good time to be camping, in my opinion.

TM: Yeah, very good. Wow! Well, this has been a wonderful interview series. I just want to thank-you so much for taking the time to guide us through your career with the National Park Service; which sounds like it was very rewarding. A very rewarding career.

PG: I cannot think of anything that I would've rather have done. It was a perfect fit for me. I fit into it well and I think that it kind of molded a lot of who I am now is because I was working for the Park Service and gained certain interests and skills. And so, yeah, I can't think of anything that I would've wanted to do differently.

TM: That's a wonderful thing to be say as one has retired from a life's service. That's pretty neat.

PG: Yeah.

TM: Is there anything else you'd like to bring to this interview series? Thinking about someone thinking about the Park Service 50 years from now: What would you like them to know?

PG: Oh boy, I'm never good at these kind of profound statements, summarize anything, or... One thing they will know 50 years from now, is that it's not simple to manage parks. There's a lot of behind-the-scenes ideological and practical decisions that have to be made that direct parks and park services in certain directions, and then back in other directions. As you know, I think, early in the Park Service, there was interest in attracting lots of tourists to parks to help sell parks to the public. These are great places to visit, word-of-mouth...yeah, it's great to go visit there. And to gain support in Congress, that these parks deserve money. You wanted the loyal subscribers to parks, essentially. And then the parks started shifting and saying, wait a minute, we need to manage the land more specifically. The visitors are great, but it's the lands we need to focus on. So there's always this new interpretation of where the emphasis should be based on our new insights about what we're doing, and we made mistakes and we changed courses. I just hope that 50 years from now, that Park Service is... I have a feeling they'll be more significant 50 years from now, for the history and the ecological values that we might take for

granted now that might be more meaningful even 50 years later when people are trying to reconstruct what life would've been like in the "old days," those parks will represent a lot of that. I don't really know what I wish they would know now, but I feel happy to have helped manage something that is, I think a treasure to the Nation and to the future. We all try to do our best with information we know at the time when we're there; but, you know, we all look back at things that happened in the past and say, well, why did they do that? This should have been the priority. You just don't know those things until later. So who knows what 50 years from now they'll say, why did they do that? But at this point, I feel like the Park Service does a pretty good job of trying to jump political hurdles, and budget shortages, and really do what's best for the parks themselves.

TM: Cool, that's really good.

PG: I don't know if that was any kind of summation or more of a ramble. But anyway, wherever it went...

TM: It's good; it's good. Well, wonderful. With that, I think we'll conclude Part 10, Grand Canyon Oral History with Pat Grediagin. Today is Monday, March 22nd, 2021. My name is Tom Martin. And Pat, thank you so very, very much.

PG: Oh, it really has been my pleasure to revisit all these experiences in parks in my own mind and my memory, the bits and pieces of my memories that I still have about all of those places. It was a tremendous opportunity for me to re-live some of that. So thank you very much.

TM: Thank you, I'm glad we did it. All right, thanks, Pat.