NPS Oral History Collection (HFCA 1817)
Association of National Park Rangers Oral History Project, 2012-2016

Bob Krumenaker
October 29, 2012

Interview conducted by Jeremy Kaufman
Transcribed by West Transcript Services
Digitized by Casey Oehler

NPS History Collection
Harpers Ferry Center
PO Box 50
Harpers Ferry, WV 25425
HFC_Archivist@nps.gov

ANPR Oral History Project

Bob Krumenaker

29 October 2012

Interview conducted by
Jeremy Kaufman

Transcribed by
West Transcript Services

Audio File: KRUMENAKER Bob 29 Oct 2012.mp3

[START OF TRACK 1]

Jeremy Kaufman: This is the October 29th interview, 2012 interview, of Bob Krumenaker by Jeremy Kaufman for the Association of National Park Rangers Oral History Project. So just to start with some general biographical information – when and where were you born?

Bob Krumenaker: I was born in New York, suburbs of New York City, in 1957, March 25th.

Jeremy Kaufman: Were you raised in New York?

Bob Krumenaker: I was raised in the suburbs, Oceanside, New York, went to school my entire life there in Oceanside, a suburb of 40,000 people with no downtown and no [chuckles], no soul.

Jeremy Kaufman: [Laughs.] What were some of your influences growing up – hobbies, interests as a kid?

Bob Krumenaker: My parents were typical post-war suburban newcomers. They'd both grown up in New York City. They were very interested in outdoor recreation, but from a kind of suburban 'using-big-tool' type of recreation. So, we did a lot of boating, in powerboats. We lived right on the water, on the south shore of Long Island, and in the winter, we were downhill skiers. So, I was very interested in outdoor rec, and yet, it was also something you had to have equipment for, you paid money for, or you traveled long distances for. I went to a very good school system, so high-powered academics, you know, sort of the track of "smart kids go to good colleges, go make a lot of money being doctors and lawyers and engineers, and that sort of stuff." We had a station wagon, but we never got in the car and went to western national parks. I knew almost nothing about the National Park Service, and actually if someone had asked me when I was 18, 'Do I know anything about the National Park Service?' I'm not sure what the answer would've been. But I had visited Theodore Roosevelt, ah, Sagamore Hill National Historic Site, and loved it, so I was always interested in history. I had visited Fire Island. I'm not sure I knew either one was a National Park Service site, but I thought they were both really cool places, and one was natural, one was cultural. And I was really interested in politics and government, and so you know I didn't see all these things ahead of me, but some of the influences of what I do and have done as a career were probably there at the time.

Jeremy Kaufman: In school what were your chief interests?

Bob Krumenaker: In high school?

Jeremy Kaufman: And then in college, well yeah, we'll start with high school—

Bob Krumenaker: I mean, you don't have to go back that far. I was a good student, took the Advanced Placement courses in science and math, primarily. My dad was an architect, my brother was following in an engineering path, and I just assumed I would study math and science and do engineering or architecture or something else like that. But I always read history for fun. I really wasn't much of a naturalist, in the way we would use the terms today, although I liked being in the outdoors a lot. My dad was very handy, so I did a lot of hands-on hardly craft, but working with tools and was very comfortable with that sort of stuff. Helped my dad work on the boat, which was constantly requiring something. I went to college, went to Brown University in Providence, Rhode Island, about four hours from where I grew up, and I thought I would go and study engineering and political science. That was my theoretical idea. I was going to go to law school afterwards, and I was going to have this engineering background and I think I was going to do something dealing with urban planning and highway engineering and all that other stuff, and it was a concept I knew nothing about. I had no clue why [laughs] I was doing any of those things. And I remember the first day of college where the university president got up in front of all the freshmen and said, "Ninety percent of you are in the top ten of your high school class. I hate to break it to you, but 90 percent of you are not gonna be in the top 10 percent of this class," and, sure enough, it was a lot harder. And it was much less fun. And I was actually getting good grades in engineering, but hating it. Absolutely hating it. And so, I had no clue what I was doing. I was one of these classic smart kids that doesn't know what to do and it's costing far too money much to keep doing it without any idea about that.

Jeremy Kaufman: So, what point in school was there a sense of "Oh, maybe this path can lead me somewhere?"

Bob Krumenaker: Well, it was a path to get out of there doing that, that ended up with a Park Service direction, but it wasn't because the Park Service was the goal. After, well, in the middle of my sophomore – first semester of the sophomore year was 1976. I was very involved in a political campaign back home. It was much more interesting than what I was doing in school. I was losing much enthusiasm, I was taking an applied math course which I was completely over my head in, and just realizing, "I'm not getting much out of this, it's costing too much money, I feel like I'm doing the wrong thing, I don't know what that should be." I was generally, other than that one course, getting good grades, though, so that made it harder to figure out this was the wrong path. My

brother, who was three years older, had taken time off from school, had done an internship very successfully. He'd come back to school, so the idea of taking time away from school was one that was very comfortable in my family, and that was sort of a model.

Bob Krumenaker: So, could I find some internship? Could I find something to do? And I had this foolish idea at age 19 that someone should pay me to do it. And so, my goal was – go to Washington, D. C., work on Capitol Hill, you know, have a great experience, come back to school. Went down to Washington, D. C. and was quickly disabused of the notion that anyone would pay a nineteen-year-old kid to do anything. But it never occurred to me – or no one ever said to me – "Hey, we have all these great volunteer opportunities down here!" And I assume in 1976 they were probably every bit as prevalent as they are today, but that never crossed my mind. So I went back to school, was depressed, didn't know what I was gonna do, and ate lunch with a friend from college who had, the summer before freshman year, been an SCA out at Natural Bridges National Monument in Utah. And I had known this for a while, but it was one of those things that had no bearing on my life, it wasn't relevant, it wasn't even interesting – until that conversation, which "You know, I had this great experience in Utah. Maybe you should try that." And it was such a dumb idea, it was so irrelevant, it was so different from previous experience – that suddenly it was perfect.

Bob Krumenaker: And he gave me the name of someone that he thought was in charge of Canyonlands, which is what he thought was the real premier park down there, and he said, "Write to this guy." And so I did, and I got the guy's name right but his title completely wrong, and it was Glen Alexander, who has long since retired now, um, he was the Chief Ranger. And [I] just wrote this letter saying, "Hey, I'm a college student, and I'm looking for a volunteer opportunity," which now suddenly was a good idea. And a week or two later I get a phone call in my dorm room from this guy in the Park Service in Utah, who said, "Well, we can offer you this volunteer assignment," and he was very cautious, he said, "This is not a vacation. We're gonna put you to work!" And the irony is, I don't remember his exact words, but it almost sounded like "We'll beat you, we'll treat you terribly," and the more he made it sound unattractive, the better it sounded to me [laughs]! And I think part of why they were at least mildly interested in me was that I had taken a surveying class? And they needed a fence line surveyed, and they thought maybe I could do that for them, and so he asked me if I'd be interested. I said sure. He said, "You won't get to see the West in this experience. You may not even get to see much of the park, but, you know, we'll give you a good experience and we'll give you free housing," and it was perfect. It was so

irrelevant, it was so different, it was 'clear my head, do something really strange'. When I said yes, then this friend gave me a copy of *Desert Solitaire* by Edward Abbey, but I, I really knew nothing about what I was getting into so this was the grand adventure, um, I was 19, almost 20, got in my – my grandfather had recently died, so my grandmother loaned me my grandfather's car – and 'Go on this adventure West'. And I remember with my Instamatic camera taking pictures of highway signs: Chicago, Denver [laughs], you know, and I'd read *On the Road*, Jack Kerouac, so I just thought it was so cool to be in Denver. And I do remember driving into Canyonlands, and, there's this remarkably beautiful drive outside the park for 30 or 40 miles – and I know nothing about national parks, I know nothing about desert southwest scenery, only what I've read in Edward Abbey's book – and I'm wondering, "Where's the park start?" This is the most amazing scenery I've ever seen, and we're not even there yet!

Bob Krumenaker: Anyway, at age 19, I ended up volunteering. They put me side by side with several SCAs, and I think the other reason that Canyonlands was interested in me is that they had a very well-developed pattern of hiring volunteers – SCAs, YACCs, volunteers – paying people as little as possible to do as much work as possible and, you know, just sort of running through us really fast, and I didn't know any of that at the time. And probably the visitor and the resource didn't get terribly good experiences, but we sure did. And, in fact, some friends of mine from that era are still friends of mine, some of them have been extremely successful – at least one other superintendent and one BLM unit manager – and so it was great formative experience and it's like, "Wow. Oh my God, this is just amazing!" And what was so cool was that the seasonals and young permanents – the GS-3s, 4s, and 5s – embraced this kid from the East Coast, and they basically shared their values and their potlucks and their friendship with me. And they – I don't remember ever an overt conversation that says, "This is cool, you should do it," but they were so enthusiastic about it, that it was easy to fall in love with what they were in love with, and they showed me their park. And I got to do this amazing stuff, knowing nothing about it, hopefully learning fast, but it changed my life. I mean, in ways that I didn't come out, and say, "I want to do this for my career," but I kept going back. Ah, and ah, you know, I would never have anticipated then, and we could've all had a really good joke if someone had said, "Well, X number of years from now you'll stick with this, you'll be successful, you'll be a park superintendent, someone'll do an oral history with you" There's no way any of that would've happened. That would not have been predictable.

Jeremy Kaufman: So that first summer, can you just describe a bit about what you were doing? And your responsibilities that first go-around?

Bob Krumenaker: It was actually spring. I got there on March 1st, 1977, and it was, you know, there was still a little bit of snow that was falling. There were no visitors at all for a few weeks, and within a week of my getting there, they had the Annual Ranger Conference, as they called it. Which, today we would call it Seasonal Training, where they brought folks – primarily seasonals, but a lot of the permanents were doing the teaching – together from all the districts. And I remember being exposed to rock climbing and search and rescue – they actually had me out at the shooting range and gave me the opportunity to shoot a weapon. They said, "We're not gonna give you a weapon here, but if you'd like to do this, you can," and, you know, we would never do that sort of stuff today. I even had the authority on the job of issuing courtesy tags – which is the highest level of law enforcement experience, you know, authority I have ever had in my entire career. [Laughs.] But it was a mix of patrol work – they taught me how to four-wheel-drive, and in fact I remember being told about what four-wheel-drive or jeep trails were, having no clue what people were talking about. And I'm just, with no perspective – I'm just trying to imagine, "How bad can a road be?" And I remember going out with one of the rangers there, Greg Gnecios [pronounced 'Ah NEE see os'], and we get to this parking area called Elephant Hill, and he said, "I've gotta clean a pit toilet and I've gotta pick up some trash here, but then we'll go over the hill in the Jeep." And I'm looking for the trail. I'm looking for the road, and I can't find it. I find a rocky trail and [laughs] little did I realize that that was where we were going to take the vehicle. Um, but I was the first – at least I think I was the first – volunteer they ever allowed independent four-wheel driving over Elephant Hills. I was very proud of that, um. Hiking patrols, you know, encountering the few visitors that we had and giving them some orientation and helping them, ah, first aid training, so it was – with the exception of real law enforcement, which in those days there was virtually none going on in the park anyway and nobody carried weapons – you know, I had this broad-based experience, seeing many different aspects of what a field park service person does. Ah, worked the Visitor Center, gave interpretive programs, did some routine maintenance type work, but a lot of independence and go out and explore the park, learn the park, and share that information with other people. Bring back what you see to the rest of the crew so that if something needs work we can deal with it. It was very seat-of-the-pants rangering. I'm not sure what I did as a green volunteer was all that different from at least my perception of what the permanent staff were doing – although I'm probably wrong about that. So, it was just this

amazing opportunity to really see a very remote park, pre- much development. And get out in, in the backcountry! And so, even though there was no designated wilderness, I was out in the wilderness, and just a remarkable experience. And I'm just very, very grateful for that.

Bob Krumenaker: In fact, as an aside, years later, in the mid-90s, when I'm the Chief of Resource Management in the old Southwest Regional office, the Chief of Resources job, a GS-13 at Canyonlands, opened up, and the people in the Intermountain Region – probably Rocky Mountain Region at the time – um, knew me and said, "Hey Bob, you might want to apply for this job. It would be perfect for you." And I thought about it and decided not to because I thought, you know, a week in the office in Moab, I would overwrite every memory I have of being at the lowest point in a totem pole of hierarchy, being in the field knowing nothing about management and budgets and any of that stuff, and those memories are too precious. I love that park, it'll always be my formative park, and even though it's tempting to think about going back there, maybe now as a superintendent – I don't think I should do that, because I want that park to be very special to me.

Jeremy Kaufman: So, coming out of that first experience, that first go-around, then where did you see yourself then?

Bob Krumenaker: Well, I went back to college. I was at Brown University in Providence, Rhode Island and I was – since I had Advanced Placement credit, I went into my junior year, having lost a semester, but really had enough credits that I didn't have to make it up. So, I go into the beginning of my junior year, and I've got to declare a major fairly soon, and it's clearly not going to be Engineering and it's clearly not going to be Political Science. And so, I took an Introductory Ecology class that fall and a few other related environmental type science classes, and Brown had a really progressive program for the time where they allowed people to put together "Independent Concentrations," as they called it. So, there was no Environmental Studies program in any way, but over the course of my junior year, with several mis-steps, I put together an independent concentration called Environmental Planning. And what was really interesting about it is, in theory, you figure out what you want to do, and you pull courses in to match what your intellectual goals are. Well, I'd already taken half or more of my college courses by that point, and I went back and looked retrospectively, "Well, what did I remember, what did I learn, what did I take out of these classes?" Even though I wasn't knowing what I was looking for. And the theme that emerged from that, even though the joke amongst my friends was that I should really call it "Random Studies," was there was something environmental

– in the Economics classes, the Geology classes, the Biology classes, even the Engineering classes that I'd taken. It was the environmental aspect of it that had made some sense to me, at least in retrospect. So, I put together this Environmental Planning concentration and, in fact, another pioneering thing that I did is – most people who did these independent majors got BAs, um, but they gave me the opportunity to compete for a Bachelor of Science, and I did. And I believe I was the first independent Bachelor of Science that Brown had ever issued, and part of it was I still had a pretty rigorous science program behind all this, between engineering and math and chemistry and geology and things of that nature, and whatever biology and ecology I could pick up fairly late in my college career. So even though today I often refer to myself as a biologist, it's a fairly thin academic background in there. But I took whatever ecological related courses I could the rest of my career, and managed to convince the professors that I didn't need to take Intro Bio [laughs], so I never did take an Intro Bio course and any of that stuff. So anyway, I went back and finished my college career, got very involved in the independent sort of student group doing environmental related things – and my major professor was the leader of that environmental program – did some work the following summer dealing with environmental law and policy, working locally. So, the pieces were starting to fit together. And then I kind of had this bug, "Well, gee, the Park Service is still really cool, I wonder if I can get a seasonal job?" And I ended up graduating early, so I only ended up spending six semesters in residence at Brown, but basically graduating in January of my senior year, and took a lucrative YACC job – Young Adult Conservation Corps – back in Canyonlands.

Bob Krumenaker: Twelve-month assignment, paid minimum wage – two dollars and ninety cents an hour. And pretty much it was more of the same, with slightly higher stature, now that I was in this YACC program and I was training volunteers. It was terrific, for a while, and then I realized after a while that "I'm making minimum wage, I have no career path [chuckles] – What am I doing out here?" And I was probably, the longer I stayed the more it became obvious to me and maybe some of the folks there that I was a bit of a fish out of water in there. 'Cause I do remember that there was a lot going on in the park, at least what I could see from my very low level, that wasn't very organized, wasn't very efficient, probably a very inaccurate view today, but I do remember having some conflict with a supervisor about priorities and efficiencies and all the rest, and right about the time where I'm thinking this isn't working out really well, this Glen Alexander out of Moab Headquarters put out a call to the park staff saying, "Anybody know anything about

computers? Because we have an opportunity to get a computer – *a* computer – where we'd like to do some data management for our river-running operation."

Bob Krumenaker: And I jumped at the chance, and said, "Well, I've taken a couple programming classes." And suddenly I became the world's lowest-paid Systems Analyst. And they moved me to Moab, and for the rest of my tenure there, I basically had the opportunity to interact with management and do some customized computer programming to try to track the park's river use. And this is the days – it's 1979 – pre-PC, pre-internet, ah basically the computer we had was purchased by the park or given to the park to deal with fire weather related stuff. And it was this big terminal that was about two feet on a side, and you plugged a phone line into the back end of it, a 300 baud modem integral with this thing. And we dialed up the mainframe computer here in Washington, D. C. and custom programming to track the most basic stuff that anybody could do in Excel in five minutes today. And in retrospect it was like cutting butter with a chainsaw, but it was high sophistication, high technology, and so for a little while I was really enjoying myself, I mean, paid virtually nothing but what we were doing at Canyonlands caught the ear of people at Grand Canyon, which – bigger park, had much more sophisticated river operation – and they invited me and the guy, the permanent guy, GS-5, that I was working with, Bob Dopiriak, D-O-P-I-R-I-A-K, to come down and show them at Grand Canyon what we were doing with this sophisticated computer stuff. And I remember giving a few talks and meeting all the Division Chiefs, and hearing all this, "Wow, we'd love to have you here," and what I was translating it into is, "Your career is made! This is your niche to get in!" And they offered me a job.

Bob Krumenaker: And, course I had no clue how jobs worked or how competition worked in those days, and what it turned out was a GS-4 temporary assignment, and apparently there was some way they could do that without competition. Or at least competition that I was aware of. But they offered me a choice. They said, "We could either pay you GS-4, as a Park Service employee or we could pay you GS-5 if you're willing to work for the Natural History Association." And I thought, "Oh, I want the big bucks!" So, I ended up being the employee of the Grand Canyon Natural History Association. In retrospect that's several months of time in grade that I never got and it doesn't really matter very much, but I also had these visions of permanent jobs and of being the park's computer guy and all the rest of it, and really they were interested in my teaching them what I was doing and handing off the technology and expertise to their staff. And so – really interesting. Got my own office in the old operations building at Grand Canyon and still, whenever I go back

to Albright, it's like, "Wow, this is where it all started!" But it was also a very tumultuous period in my personal life, and there were one-way streets at the Grand Canyon, and all these people – and I was used to the backcountry at Canyonlands. And so, still not really finding my niche, and I think it was about that time that my dad said, "So when're you gonna get a real job?" [Laughs.] And somewhere in there I applied for grad school, and I was still shooting but not sure where I was going, so I applied to law school and I applied to forestry school and thought about geology and thought about architecture, thought about landscape architecture, really not knowing where I was going. I narrowed it to applying to law schools and forestry or environmental master's programs, and ended up getting into law school at Michigan and the School of Natural Resources at Michigan for the master's program – they had a joint program. And I applied to Yale and got into the Forestry School, and did not get into the Law School. And so, I had a choice of doing the combined program at Michigan or not.

Bob Krumenaker: And there was something, and I still can't put my finger on it, 'cause when I'd looked at Yale as a potential undergrad it just didn't appeal to me at all, but there was something about the Yale School of Forestry that just seemed like, "I want to do this." And I ended up going there, blowing off the law school, which is probably one of the best decisions I ever made, even though I'm still fascinated by law. I think going to Yale Law School after spending a year or more in the Utah desert would've been more than any normal human being could've handled. [Laughs.] But the Forestry School was a terrific transition, because it's very unlike the rest of Yale. And there were people who have pickup trucks and flannel shirts and hiking boots, and it was just really cool to drive into New Haven, this very Gothic campus, driving my Utah-licensed pickup truck and I just fit right into the Forestry School and it's terrific! So ended up doing a two-year master's program there, and then, because there was no thesis requirement – which was one of the other nice things about that program – in looking for what should I do in the summer between my two years there, once again, I kind of, you know, went back and said, "Hm, maybe I should work for the Park Service." And did a season at Natural Bridges in between my two years.

Jeremy Kaufman: So now after school, eventually when did you find that permanent job, and was that after Yale – was that the goal then?

Bob Krumenaker: Well, it was starting to become the goal, and when I was looking around for jobs the summer of '81 that I ended up going back to Natural Bridges, I had applied for an internship with the Park Service in DC, in the Washington Office, and actually got offered it, but turned it down because the park in Utah seemed more

interesting. But the person who had called me to talk about it was someone who was in the Presidential Management Intern Program. And I don't remember that fellow's name, but he told me about that program and he said, "You know, this is something you might be interested in finding out more of." And I followed up on that after I got back from Natural Bridges and, while that program – which is today called the Presidential Management Fellows Program – was primarily oriented towards people getting master's degrees in Public Administration, I applied for it, went through a very rigorous interview process, and I remember the key interview question that probably got me the offer was, they said, "Tell us about management information systems." And it was a group interview, something which was very curious, and later on in my career, I've actually been one of the interviewers for this program, so I've seen it from both sides. And so, these other young people coming out of public administration and MBA-type programs are talking textbook stuff on management information systems, and because of what I'd done at Canyonlands and Grand Canyon actually developing – we didn't use the term, but a Management Information System – I'm sure that I aced that because I could talk from real life. And I, so I had, I was offered this opportunity for a non-competitive appointment on a GS-9/11/12 track. And the way the program worked in those days, and I think fairly similar today is, we designate a certain number of people for these internships. The agencies designate a roughly equivalent number of potential internships, and then there's this random motion of people trying to match up. And I interviewed at NASA, and I interviewed at EPA, and I interviewed at the Labor Department – the Park Service had nothing to do with any of this stuff. But none of those jobs looked the least bit interesting, so I didn't take anything. This was in the spring of '82, I was about to get my master's degree, didn't see anything that was a match that I thought I could live with, so ended up back in the Park Service, a seasonal job at Dinosaur. But I had a lot of people who were pulling for me, including the superintendent at Dinosaur, who wrote a letter – Joe Kennedy was his name. He wrote a letter to Lorraine Mintzmeyer, who was the Regional Director, that I still have a copy of – which was a remarkable letter, in that he said, "You know, Lorraine, we don't tend to hire smart people and young people and take advantage of creative opportunities, but there's this kid and he's capable and he's been a great seasonal for us, and he's got this non-competitive appointment. And if you'll only pay for it, Regional Director, we can make not only a great career for him, but we can do some great stuff for the Park Service." Well, I never saw the other side of that – that never occurred – but there were a number of people who were, three or four or five different people who I had met through

my contacts at Dinosaur, through some going [down to] Washington, DC in the spring and meeting people, Bill Supernaugh who was a legend in this organization – that's where I first met him and he was my first mentor in the Park Service. He introduced me to people and told me how I could position myself for a permanent job and anyway, come fall, I'm going to end my season at Dinosaur, I'm realizing that I don't know what I'm doing next, I am thinking "Well, I need to get a real job, and I'm soon to get married," which is another story.

Bob Krumenaker: And so, I went back to those who I'd interviewed with, and I called up the Labor Department people, and it was an IT-related job, and I said, "Hey, are you still interested, 'cause I'd like to come work for you." And they were willing to do it, and so I was a complete mercenary, in that I went there to get a permanent job, had no interest in the Department of Labor. I really took advantage of them, but come January of '83, my first permanent job: it's an excepted appointment, it's a GS-9, and if I had stayed at the Labor Department, within two years I'd been a GS-12, conversion to a regular permanent job, and Lord only knows what I would be doing today. But the cool thing about that program is that, in those days, you did three months at your home assignments, and I was doing all sorts of IT stuff – which was really interesting, with nice people who were working for an administrative arm of an administrative agency and they had no clue what their mission was. It was just a complete disconnect from where my head was and what I wanted to do, but I was learning a lot and it was interesting. And then, after that, they encourage you to do what we would call details, they called rotational assignments, in other federal agencies. And OMB was using a lot of these PMIs, and so I went off to OMB, worked for the Energy Division at OMB, which was right across the hall from the Interior/Environment Division, and got very engaged with some really interesting people that understood interdisciplinary programs. They had no loyalty to the Labor Department, I had no loyalty to the Labor Department. They were getting my free labor, they got me involved in environmental policy related stuff, and in fact I got engaged in a project where some Congressman had submitted a bill to tweak with the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's Small-Scale Hydroelectric Program, which actually was a big deal in the Carter Administration. And this was in the Reagan Administration. And OMB is a naturally conservative place because it's filled with economists, but they were very open-minded, and they knew that I had an environmental science background, and so they paired me up with the examiner who worked on the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service budget, and they had the two of us analyzing this bill and what its impacts were. And I wrote a paper for OMB on the

environmental impacts of this particular bill, and they appreciated the fact that I came from a very different background from what they had. Anyway, make a long story short, they encouraged me to apply for an OMB examiner job in the Interior branch and, had I gone that path, I might have gotten a job as the junior examiner at OMB working on the BIA's budget. But the way they worked was a seniority-based system whereby the most senior person picks his or her Interior agency and I could've probably within five years been the OMB examiner for the National Park Service budget – which would've been really cool, but a completely different path from what I actually wanted. And I also had the foresight to realize that, if I ever were doing that, there's no way I'd ever go back to the field in the National Park Service then. It just seemed like really cool path but not the one I want to be on. And I also, through some of these contacts, was approached by someone who worked in Cultural Resources in the Washington Office, Susan Sherwood was her name.

Bob Krumenaker: She was running a program looking at the impact of acid rain on cultural resources, and she was interested in me because I knew something about computer databases. So, I was working in the WASO Cultural Resource Office as a Presidential Management Intern trying to sort of scope out the requirements for a massive database system so that they could track all this information. Ah, not quite the lowest paid systems analyst in the world anymore, but, you know, still, [laughs] still sort of going down that path. And while I was there, out of the blue, I got – actually my wife, my brand-new wife – got a phone call from the superintendent of Big Thicket. It was a phone call that came to my home, and the superintendent said, "Hello, Mrs. Krumenaker?" And my wife didn't take my last name. She said, "No, there is no Mrs. Krumenaker," and hung up. [Laughs.] And um, she told me about it and I, of course, didn't know where it was [from], and I thought, "Oh, that was interesting," and probably they mispronounced Krumenaker at the time, too. And about a week later I got the call at work, this guy had tracked me down and said, "Strangest thing happened. I called your home phone number and your wife hung up on me. But I'm the superintendent of Big Thicket National Preserve, and I'm lookin' for somebody who knows something about GIS and computers, and I understand that I can hire you through this Presidential Management Intern Program. Are you interested?" And this had come about through connections I had made at Dinosaur and through the fire program at Boise and, just the connections were remarkable, but anyway, make a long story short, nine months after I moved to Washington, DC for a permanent job, I moved to Big Thicket and was still technically part of the PMI program. The deal was I had to give up any hope

of a GS-12, but at the end of two years I would get a non-competitive conversion to a GS-11. And I was willing to go anywhere for an opportunity to get permanent in the National Park Service and, I remember somewhere around this time, talking to my dad who had asked "When are you gonna get a real job?" and I showed him my paycheck, and he thought, "Oh, that's not so bad!" [Laughs]

Bob Krumenaker: And so, you know, within a short amount of time I moved to southeast Texas, and certainly it was not the Park Service experience that, after five years on the Colorado Plateau, I had envisioned, but what an amazing opportunity. I, you know, so some, you know, without sort of planning it, I end up in a permanent track. And I'm not doing quite what I want, 'cause I really don't see myself as the computer guy, and so during any spare time I had I helped the Resource Manager – 'cause I worked straight for the Superintendent, which was a pretty cool opportunity. That was Tom Lubbert [pronounced LOO burt], L-U-B-B-E-R-T, ah, and Jim Woods was the Chief of Resource Management. And I told them if I could help them in any way, and they got me involved in water quality monitoring, and I managed their hunting program through databases, built a GIS for them, ah, wired the building, taught people how to do word processing, did all sorts of things that were well beyond whatever PD I must've had, but a great opportunity and, it was actually, about that time – it was a non-uniform job, which made me feel really weird – about that time, 1984, I joined ANPR.

Bob Krumenaker: I don't remember who first told me about ANPR, but I thought, "I want to stay connected to rangers and field people in the service," and went to my first Rendezvous in Bar Harbor, Maine. And at some point, we can talk about ANPR and we'll come back to that story, but I'm really glad I did that. And a lot of people that I still – a few people – I still see here, these senior people were there then and really had an impact on me.

Jeremy Kaufman: So, if you were there at Big Thicket, you know, thinking of yourself not as the computer guy, what steps perhaps, one being ANPR, did you then take to get back to where you ultimately wanted to go?

Bob Krumenaker: Well, it always felt like an uncomfortable niche, being the computer guy that dabbled in Natural Resources, where I would've been much more comfortable being the Natural Resources guy that dabbled in computers. So, as I said, I worked wherever I could, and they were very welcoming of my time and energy when I had it in water-related stuff, and I got to know people in the Water Resources Division in Fort Collins and some of those folks are still my friends. Sam Kunkle [KUN kul], K-U-N-K-L-E, was one of the

hydrologists that came down to work on a Big Thicket water quality project. Mark Flora, F-L-O-R-A, was the other one. And I'm still friends with those guys. And, in fact, years later, when I worked in Santa Fe and the Associate Regional Dir[ector] – no, it would've been the Chief Scientist job – was open? I recruited Sam – now, that was my boss – but I recruited Sam from the Forest Service to come and take that job, a connection that had been made ten years earlier. So, I did that job for two years, never really had delusions of spending my career in Big Thicket, but had great opportunities down there.

Bob Krumenaker: And the first job I applied for out of there was a little less than two years into it, after I'd gotten the conversion to a permanent job, which was a very uneventful moment, you know – you just got an SF-50 one day. But it was "Okay, I'm really in now." That meant a lot to me. I applied for the Resource Management Specialist at Isle Royale, and was just very fortunate – the first job I applied for, I got offered. And so I left Texas in my rearview mirror, didn't look back, and at Isle Royale, I was given the opportunity to be the Natural Resource guy and one reason that Stu Croll, C-R-O-L-L, was interested in me, 'cause he'd gone to Johns Hopkins, he was a really smart fellow himself, I had a master's degree in engineering, and he liked people that had good academic backgrounds and he really wanted somebody that knew something about computers. But the match was a better match for me, and so that was a terrific opportunity, to go to Isle Royale. It was going from, I used to joke, from the ridiculous to the sublime. Going from the bottom of the national watershed to Lake Superior, the top of the national watershed. So even though I had never been to the Great Lakes, and I really didn't know anything about the North Woods, you know, what reading I did in preparing to apply for the job, I realized, "This could be a very cool place." It's not terribly well known, in my view of the National Park System, but this is a real national park. And so, I just was about as thrilled as a person could be to get that job.

Jeremy Kaufman: What were some of your responsibilities up there then? What were some of your, well, what were some of your expectations going up there and then challenges that you faced as well?

Bob Krumenaker: I'm not sure what my expectations were. This was my first permanent job doing what I felt I had been trained to do. I can't even remember thinking about how long I thought I would be there, or where I would go from there. It was a "I am so thrilled to be here doin' this cool stuff!" And I spent six years there, which certainly was by far the longest I'd spent anywhere – and that's actually true until my current job. But I – it was a park with world-class resources and a tiny staff. It was, in the days where, the last

days where rangers did everything? And so, Stu Croll was the Chief Ranger. He supervised commissioned rangers who also were in charge of interpretation. He had an Interpretive Specialist, he had me as the Natural Resources Specialist, he had a Cultural Resource Specialist. Stu was a 12, I was an 11, all the other positions, I think, were [GS-]9s. No, the Interpretive guy was an 11 as well. So basically, here's the program. You're in charge of it. Tell us what you need to do, in terms of research, in terms of monitoring, uh, I had no wildlife background at all – here I'm going to one of the world's premier wildlife parks, so I had to learn a lot of wildlife fast. And so, I had the responsibility for the world's premier wolf and moose monitoring program. And during my tenure there, 1988, I oversaw – didn't personally do, but I oversaw – the first-ever trapping, radio-collaring, blood-sampling of wolves. I was involved as a non-expert, but nonetheless the park's closest thing to an expert. Rather than let the researchers do all of it, I went out with them the very first time. So, I personally participated in trapping wolves and handling wolves, and so I was also the park's media spokesman on these issues. And it had the potential for being highly controversial, and I guess it was my first exposure to media and controversy, and also dealing with management that was not necessarily proactive or scientifically based. And so, the wolves were really declining rapidly, and there was a real risk that, you know, if things didn't work right that they could go locally extinct there. So, Rolf Peterson, the Michigan Tech wolf biologist who now has worked there for 30-some-odd years, he and I wrote an article in the George Wright Forum in 1988 looking at the pros and cons of wolf handling – which was the first time that park had ever done it – looked at the potentials for what would happen if they go extinct. And it's really remarkable because we were wrong in the sense that the wolves rebounded a little bit from there, but we were right in the sense that we needed to proactively understand this stuff. And the park is facing the exact same issue today. In fact, I've had discussions with the eminent scientists and the park superintendent and the regional office and the Washington biologist – who are bringing me back into some of those discussions because I've got twenty-some-odd years of history with that and am a published author on this topic from twenty-some-odd years ago. So, it's actually pretty remarkable, in that continuity sense.

Bob Krumenaker: We got involved in air quality monitoring when I was there. There had been some forefront scientific discoveries that had been done on Isle Royale and some of its inland lakes before I had gotten there, discovering chemicals that had never been used anywhere near Isle Royale in the sediments and in the lake water or in the lakes. That was in the late 70s and early 80s, forefront world-

breaking news about airborne transport of toxic air pollutants. And so, Isle Royale was a significant site worldwide for environmental science in many different ways, and so I had this great opportunity to be engaged in some really forefront research, as the park's manager of research programs, the interface with the scientific community. Got involved in the George Wright conferences and ultimately in the society with that, so just a remarkable opportunity to put all this training to work and know intimately a park resource, be close enough to management to have some influence, far enough from management that I still got in the field a lot. Great, great job. And the other really cool things – fire. I became the park's Fire Management Officer, which was a collateral duty. So, while I had done some fire work as a seasonal and actually some fire work at Big Thicket, you know, I got trained as a low-level Incident Commander, got trained as a Prescribed Burn Boss, and went to all sorts of advanced fire behavior training, which I realized was far beyond any experience I could ever get at Isle Royale. But I was there and was the Incident Commander on the largest prescribed natural fire, as we called it in those days, in 1988. It burned at exactly the same time that Yellowstone was burning, so we worked really hard to keep it out of the news [chuckles], 'cause prescribed fire was not very popular at that stage. I was the Incident Commander in 1991 on a four-fire complex on Isle Royale, and even though the total acreage was miniscule, four fires burning in the park at once was a hell of a big deal. So, some really cool stuff and therefore got engaged in the fire community.

Bob Krumenaker: And the last really cool program was peregrine falcons. And so, I remember the Superintendent, Tom Hobbs, came to me one day and said, "I want to introduce peregrine falcons into the park." And I actually didn't think it was a particularly good idea, because it didn't seem like it was likely to be very viable and it was going to be a huge time sink. And I didn't understand how management works then [laughs] – I'm not sure I still do – but that's what he wanted to do therefore that's what we were doing, and it turned out to be a good program and, over, I think over five years, we hacked 50 young birds into the park and none came back to nest. And the line we were always trying to convince ourselves and others is, "We are adding this extirpated species to the ecosystem," but there was always this disappointment that "They're not comin' back." There were birds that nested in downtown Milwaukee and on a bridge in Detroit and other places, but none came back to Isle Royale – until this year, 2012. In fact, I just got an email last week saying that they've confirmed nesting birds on Isle Royale for the first time since the '60s or so.

Jeremy Kaufman: So, was that the major goal of introducing them?

Bob Krumenaker: We always said it wasn't, but it really was. You know, we wanted them back here. And so, the park, very graciously and surprisingly, in their announcement – at least internal to the Park Service that this is happening – actually called me out by name and thanked me for the work I had done twenty-some-odd years ago, which was totally unexpected and really very gratifying, that someone remembered that. One of the peregrine falcon hack-site attendants that I had hired there, who then I ended up hiring in a seasonal job, is now a Wildlife Biologist at Bandelier, Steve Fettig [pronounced FET ig]. So, an opportunity for me to mentor a person who's now been very successful in the National Park Service. So, Isle Royale was this, um remarkably broad experience, exposure to national policy on natural resource related stuff, a world-class research program, and I guess after a few years I must've gained some credibility in the natural resources world out of that. And I really enjoyed it, but after, after realizing – maybe after five years – that some of the battles over money and staff that I'd been fighting in year one, I was no closer to winning in year five, I thought, "You know, all right, it might be time to move on." And about that time, we got a new superintendent, Bill Fink, who I didn't really get along with very well and, years later, I thanked Bill for jumpstarting my career and I ah – have to think how I want to say this for posterity [laughs]. It was my realization that it would be very difficult for me to win an argument with a superintendent from where I was sitting that caused me to decide to try to move on.

Jeremy Kaufman: Mmhm.

Bob Krumenaker: And so, in, well, I ended up leaving in the fall of '91, so however many months ahead of that, I think, was the winter before or the spring before, my wife, who was working doing some actual air quality monitoring work for us in the park – a little bit of nepotism being allowed in very remote parks [laughs]. She was also looking at a permanent job, so we both decided to apply for new jobs. She applied for a subject-to-furlough maintenance job doing water quality and wastewater quality lab work, which is her academic background – we met at Yale – at Isle Royale. And I decided to apply for GS-12 Natural Resource Specialist jobs in two regional offices, one in Philadelphia and one in Santa Fe. And I really didn't want to go to Philadelphia, but the day that my boss had been called for a reference from the guy in Philadelphia – Chris Andrus was the one who made that phone call, who was also very active in this organization at one time – my boss comes in, said, "Boy, I'm sure they're gonna offer you this job in Philadelphia," and I *really* wanted the Santa Fe job instead. So, I called Santa Fe and said, "I think I'm about to get an offer from Philly. I'd really rather come to Santa Fe. What are you – are you guys going to

make me one?" And I should ask Rick Smith here exactly what happened next. I never did ask that question but within, I think, 24 hours, I got a job offer from Santa Fe. And Rick, actually, who I had met through ANPR, Rick is the one who called. He was not the direct supervisor, but he was the Associate Regional Director, so he was my supervisor's supervisor. And he said something which has stuck with me ever since, which was, "We are willing to make you a job offer here. We think you'd be really good at this, and we'd like you here. But we're only going to offer this on one condition." And I said, "What's that?" He said, "You've got a reputation as being smart, capable, talented, productive, but a pain in the ass." [Laughs.] And he said, "You don't know how to take no for an answer, and you can be really difficult to work with, and I need you to understand something and agree with. Which is, I will promise you that you will get input into as many decisions as possible here, and then I get to make the decision. And then, once that decision is made, I will tell you why I made the decision, sometimes someone's going to make it above me. But once that decision is made, there's no appeal, and you're going to support it. Do you understand that? And can you live with that?' And, you know, it's one of those 'hit in the face' moments that you wish someone had had the wisdom to share five years earlier. Because even though it was kind of a painful message, it was actually a "We think you're capable of this stuff, you need to hear it." And it's one of the best things that anyone's ever done to me, because it was this, "Well, of course he's right. Yes, I can understand that!" And one of the things I'm most proud of in my time in Santa Fe? Is [that] I developed this reputation – Vaughn Baker, who was later the Assistant Superintendent at Shenandoah, that he and Bill Wade offered me my next job, he said, "You have a reputation as a real team player." And no one would've ever said that about me at Isle Royale. And so, I made a very conscious effort when I went to Santa Fe to fix some of the things that I needed to fix. And what I had come to realize is that I didn't really understand much about management and leadership, and I didn't understand much about supervision, and I didn't have any mentors that were helping me very much, and I think when you're in a park that is remote and relatively limited interactions with other staff and – maybe because you live with the same people that you work with – you get in ruts. And even though I had sort of realized I needed to get out of the rut, it was hard to get out of that rut. Either because I didn't have the skills to get out of it or other people kept pushing me back into the rut, in terms of the personal interactions. So, in going to Santa Fe – and when I've switched jobs since then I've sort of consciously thought about this is – it's an opportunity to do a certain amount of conscious reinvention. Not lying, but saying,

"What didn't work in the last place that I can consciously try to do differently in the next place?" And so, I went into the job in Santa Fe and Rick, and I were probably the only ones who knew about this conversation – but I went in there saying, "That's not going to happen. I'm not going to be like that." And I think that was – I'm always grateful to Rick for that, and I have told him that [chuckles] on a number of occasions.

Jeremy Kaufman: Oh, this might be jumping ahead a bit, but just in terms of your reputation and working as a team, in 1994 you were asked to be part of a Resources Career Task Force. Can you talk a bit about why that Task Force was established? How careers were set up before that? And then ultimately what this accomplished?

Bob Krumenaker: Well, a little bit of background. While I was in Santa Fe, I was the first person in the regional natural resources office that had worked there with a lot of field background, or at least recent field background. And, while there had been some very talented people there, I think they were very research-oriented and the resource managers in the field didn't feel like they had particular understanding of what they were going through. And I went to Santa Fe with the real conscious effort of being the ally and helper for people who were in jobs just like the one I had just left. And as part of that, when people had vacancies in resource management, I became something of a go-to person on position descriptions and what work fits what grade. It wasn't any conscious effort to become an expert in this thing, but I had realized early on in my career that the more I understand about administration and budgets and finance and personnel, and can work with the administrative folks and be, knowing their rules, the more successful I was going to be at that. And Stu Croll at Isle Royale had given me a lot of very good advice in terms of those sorts of things. So, there was this task force that got set up, originally without my involvement at all. Kathy Davis, who at the time was the head of Resources at the Southern Arizona Group Office, she was the head of it, and they held their meeting, I think the first meeting, and they invited me to come to their task force meeting, because I apparently had a reputation of knowing an awful lot about grades and PDs and all that sort of stuff. And I'm not sure I remember exactly how it happened, but I got absorbed into the Task Force really fast, and I became Kathy's essentially Deputy Chair of that thing. And so, at that stage there was a great concern about the fact that in every profession – though we were looking specifically at Resources, Natural and Cultural – there were people who were doing very similar work at remarkably different grades. I mean, in one park, because it was a small park and it was all they could afford, they had some GS-5 Park Ranger do stuff that in another park a GS-11 biologist would be doing. We've seen this all over the Service in

every discipline, but the idea was to do something about that. And so, our task force was assigned to look at what is going on there in the field: What is the common denominator of Natural and Cultural Resources work? Is there a parallelism between natural and cultural resources? What are the range of professions involved? Kathy Jope, who was at the time Chief of Resources in Seattle, was a key player in this group, and she was also very involved in ANPR. And so, we did a lot of field-testing around the Service of, saying, "What are people doing out there?" And what we found was the professional work that needed to be done to write Resource Management plans, to write budget proposals – this was long before PMIS, but essentially what today would be a PMIS proposal – to be a contracting officer's Technical Rep on a research contract, to write or oversee a monitoring protocol. When we looked at the OPM standards for what grade determines what work, or what work determines what grade, it was pretty parallel, regardless of whether it was a curator or an archaeologist or a physical scientist or a wildlife biologist, and that work was GS-11. And while there were many Resource Managers who were GS-11s, more commonly they were GS-9s and often they were 025s or Park Rangers or, you know, there was no consistency. We essentially developed standard PDs, we had a lot of support from the Washington office to do what – we were working with HR in Washington – and basically pioneered the idea of benchmark position descriptions, which later the Ranger Careers Program followed in our footsteps on that, ah, theirs at a GS-9 and ours at a GS-11 level. So, over several years, which transcended my work from Santa Fe to the next job at Shenandoah, that group was really successful, and, in fact, I wrote the memo that I think it was Bob Stanton that was Director ended up signing that 'This is official National Park Service policy." There's still on the Natural Resources website those benchmark PDs – they're still up there – and for many years after that, I was the person, or one of the people, that people called all over the Service, saying, "We're not getting our PDs classified right. We don't think this grade is proper," and all the rest. And I've since moved a lot away from that, but even in my current job there have been cases, times where I have gone back either to other superintendents or to the Inventory Monitoring Network that we're the host park for or my own staff and saying, "Wait a minute. This work requires this grade. It doesn't matter how much money we have." And unfortunately, a lot of that's fallen apart with the budgets, you know, and one of the real flaws in the Park Service is that initiatives never disappear, they just fade away. And so, even though there's nothing that says that this is not our current policy, the whole current generation of personnel people, SHROs, many of the current Resource leaders

and superintendents – this is old news. They don't know this stuff, they don't know its history, and people are making decisions – I see this in recruitments periodically – advertising things that are in gross violation of the Resources Careers – not Guidelines, Policy – and yet there's no sanctions. So, we've kind of lost a lot of ground. But it was nonetheless very rewarding, and it was another example of where deciding to learn something – whether it's wildlife genetics at Isle Royale or personnel policy and position descriptions while at Santa Fe – has been very helpful to me to learn what I need to know in order to be successful and then to help other people with it.

Jeremy Kaufman: Is there any way to rejuvenate that issue and get it more—?

Bob Krumenaker: It's a great question. I would think it would require a champion, preferably somebody in the Washington Natural or Cultural Resources Directorates, maybe a Regional Director. I don't think there's much energy and there's a lot of higher priorities right now, that I don't see that happening. I don't have the particular drive to try to lead it from where I'm sitting, but it's not dead, it's just sick right now. I mean, it's still understood by people who look into it – that standard grades for people at that level are GS-11. But there's not supposed to be a terminal GS-9 in Resources unless it's a term job, and yet we're seeing them all over. But, you know, policy in the National Park Service is only as good as its enforcement. And we do a lot of stuff with carrots and not very much with sticks, and that's the preferred way to manage, but – this transcends this issue – but our accountability for doing stuff consistent with our own direction is terrible in this organization, and this is just a small piece of it, and probably not nearly the most important piece.

Jeremy Kaufman: Well, I guess then I'll ask about how you yourself interpret the mission of the Park Service, and how you see both yourself carrying out that mission, but also see the agency as a whole carrying out the stated mission of the agency?

Bob Krumenaker: Well, you know, the conventional wisdom that people of my generation have been taught is that the Park Service has a dual mission, and you often see the metaphor of scales, where we are to do "conservation unimpaired" on one side of the scale "for the enjoyment of future generations" on the other side of the scale. There's this myth – and I use that word deliberately – that has been created around that that we're supposed to balance these things, and there's nothing in history and law that says that! I had the great good fortune when I worked in Santa Fe to sit right next to Dick Sellars, when he was writing *Preserving Nature in the National Parks*. Dick is a great and former NPS historian that looked into – more than anyone else ever has – the history of natural resource management. He looked into the Organic Act, and Dick and I don't

really agree on this entirely but Ro Wauer published on this and Bob Keiter, University of Utah law professor has published on this, and every single court case that federal courts have ever dealt with on the Organic Act has said you do not have a dual mission. You have single mission with multiple components, and so, whenever I see anyone referring to balance, if I have the opportunity I will try to change their vision about that. And so, I use the word 'integrate'. We are to integrate resource protection or conservation with visitor enjoyment. The history in the law says we do both of these things, but the courts have been abundantly clear, and the 2006 Management Policies, actually starting with the 2001 Management Policies, echo this, which says, 'When we have to choose, if we have to choose, conservation always comes first.' And so, as a Resource Manager that has gotten into park management, I have made it part of my persona and my teaching to others and my mentoring to others, and hopefully, the way I manage the park that I'm responsible for – that that's what we do. We integrate these things, and one of the fascinating things about my teaching at Albright and mentoring a lot of Resource Managers over the years is I've had to teach resource managers that "We do visitors, too." That is important. That's the law, and you know what, it also says 'scenery' and that's actually the very first word in the Organic Act. So, I remember having a fit at Isle Royale when someone wanted to cut a tree down. And I said, "You can't do that!" And yet, it was for scenic improvement – actually, we can do that. So, the real art of all this is integrating all the pieces, understanding the law, understanding what the courts have said, and trying to do as educated a job as we can to do all of them. And I think if we're doing our job well, most of the time we can do good conservation and we can do good visitor enjoyment – hopefully in the same place. Sometimes it's just not possible, and so the other thing that's real important – and this falls on me as a superintendent all the time – is 'Don't just ram it through, people', making – even if it's a good conservation decision – you've got to bring people along with that. Now, it doesn't mean they all have to agree with it, but you need to be educating your staff, and you certainly need to be bringing the public on board with 'Why are you doing what you're doing?' And so I've been at Apostle Islands long enough that I really can't blame anything there on anybody else anymore, but I would hope that the reputation that the park has in my tenure there is one where we do really good conservation and we hopefully do as good visitor services as we can afford to do, but we don't deliberately choose to do one or the other. We try as hard as we can to do both of those things. But they are not equal, and conservation will come first, because the only way to provide for the enjoyment of future generations is if you are

conserving now. And so, we have made choices of what's a priority at times.

Jeremy Kaufman: So, well, how do you then, if people perhaps want to come to enjoy, how do you get the public basically as a partner to go along with that? How do you bring them to that place that suggests that 'Okay, this is maybe we have to step back from our own enjoyment' if that is something that has to happen?

Bob Krumenaker: It's not easy and it's going to vary with where you are and what the nature of your visitation is. I think it's easier in a place like Apostle Islands that's hard to get to, because people self-select and they've really had to work hard to plan their trips, [so] they're really passionate and committed by the time they get there. Which also means, I think, they're really open to the cool stuff that we do. So, there are at least two ways that I would get at your question. One is – and they're both interpretation related – one is I have been well educated by interpreters over the years that we need to increase people's understanding so that they can personalize the passion that we have for themselves, and when they love something, they will care about it; when they care about it, they will be stewards of it. But one way of doing that, and I think we are better at this but not very good yet? People are absolutely fascinated with what we do behind the scenes, but we rarely interpret our own resource management to people. We'll tell the story of the basic theme of the park, but rarely will we tell the story of restoration of a cultural landscape in a Civil War battle. Rarely will we tell the story of the challenge of maintaining a historic building in a really harsh environment and what it takes to do that. I remember going to Carlsbad once when I was at Santa Fe, and they were doing some very cool cave restoration in there, where they were undoing some of the mistakes of the past. The regional cave person Ron Kerbo and the park cave guy, Dale Pate, were taking me through showing me all this cool stuff, but there wasn't a single sign there that told the public what they were doing. And it looked like a construction site in the cave. It was ugly! And so, the first reaction people were going to have was, 'Oh, this is bad', where what we were doing was actually really good. And I said, "You know, if we only put up some tasteful signs here that says, 'This is really cool, this is why we're doing it', odds are people are really going to get behind it. And so, I think we have to do a much better job at those things. But the other thing that I do a lot of as a superintendent, and it's probably easier at an Apostle Islands than it would be at a Yellowstone – it's certainly easier in Apostle Islands than a Yellowstone is – I do a lot of public meetings, formal and informal. I look for opportunities to talk to the people who care about the park, and I never miss an opportunity to talk about how challenging the job is, how important the job is, and I go back to

something that Deny [pronounced DEN nie] Galvin said to me. Deny was the Deputy Director during the Natural Resource Challenge, when we were trying to get it through. And he said "We really need to change people's perceptions of parks from being simply the places they go on vacation to places that preserve American heritage. And therefore, we need to change the perception of the Park Service, from the people who provide a really good vacation experience to the -ologists and the smart people and the hard workers who are protecting this place the 51 weeks of the year that I'm not here so that it will be so cool when I am here." So, I really take that message to heart, and so this talk I'm giving next week in Duluth, Minnesota to a group of shipwreck and lighthouse enthusiasts – they basically asked me to do a keynote and then said, 'What do you want to talk about?' which was nice – and I said, 'I want to talk about the challenge of managing cultural maritime heritage'. So, I'm going to show all sorts of cool pictures of lighthouses, but I'm mostly going to talk about historic preservation in marine environments, the cost of doing that, the logistical challenges of Lake Superior, and I'm going to end my slides with some budget graphs and talk about fiscal cliffs and what happens if. And that's just not the way I think most of us think, and so I'm sure every once in a while I'll piss off some people because I go past where they want to hear a Park Service person, but you know another example that is, virtually every park newspaper has a welcome from the superintendent in it, and these are almost formulaic, in that "Thank you for coming to our park. What a magnificent place. We've got the biggest, the smallest, the big, you know, the most, all this other stuff, you know, be safe here, ah don't fall down, learn something, ah [laughs], you know, thanks for coming!" And I, in probably ten or now eleven years of writing park newspaper columns, with the exception of one year when I was on a detail in the Washington Office where I just didn't have time to do anything other than that, I write an op-ed essentially. And I say, "Here's the challenging issues the park is facing now." And I talk about budgets, and I talk about civic engagements, and I've talked about historic preservation and I've talked about invasive species, and rarely do I ever get any feedback, but I've never got any negative feedback. Ah, you know, every once in a while someone says, "Wow, I read your article, and that was really cool. I had no idea." You know, they're not frequent – that I get that – but you know, as long as someone doesn't tell me not to do that, I'm going to try to use the bully pulpit that I've been lucky enough to have to share that story of mission and passion and law and policy and the behind-the-scenes work, because I want people, as Denny said, to think about what it takes the 51 weeks of the year they're not in the park,

because that's the only way we're going to get support from partners and financial donors and Congress, and all the rest of it. They've got to think what we do is important.

Jeremy Kaufman: I want to ask about your time at Valley Forge then – which was more history-based – but it seems that when you got in, you suggest in your resume that people were, visitors were coming there not particularly for the purpose of the park, like the mission, and you even went out and talked to people sort of incognito, as you say, and try to ask people, you know, what they were coming for. And what did you get out of that and how did you, how did the park then make it so people perhaps were coming for that intended purpose?

Bob Krumenaker: Well, I will say I started something that Mike Caldwell, who was the superintendent there for a number of years after I left, really took off with and did a terrific job. So, I started some things which I wasn't there long enough to finish. But Valley Forge is the biggest open space in metropolitan Philadelphia, and I think there are like 5 million people that live within an hour of it – I may have my numbers wrong, but it's a large number. And it's right located, right where a bunch of highways come together, so it's in the way of a lot of development and it's in the way of a lot of commuting routes. And so, for years it was a very frustrating place for people in the Philadelphia suburbs, because the Park Service had no presence in civic affairs, and we were the people who said no to everything. But it was an incredibly popular place. People loved it because it was scenic and it was open space and, first of all, of the 7 million people we counted as visitors, 5 million of them were non-rec visitors because they were drive-throughs. Commuters. And that didn't even count the two interstate highways that went, you know, on the border or through the park. That was just on park roads. Those people probably weren't going to be influenced a lot, but of the 2 million that were actually recreational visitors – while we don't have real numbers – it seemed from these anecdotal interviews and certainly the wisdom of the people who worked there, that the vast majority of people were coming because it was a great place to walk or run or fly a kite – open space recreation. And our interpretive staff, the joke – probably not very constructive – was that some of them had come in with Washington and never left. They thought the purpose of the park was to tell this historically significant story of six months 200-some-odd years ago, and anything else was inappropriate. And so, this was part of where I really started to understand that recreation and enjoyment is part of our mission, even if they're not coming for the principle purpose of the park. But some of the park interpreters didn't even want to talk to the people who ran the six-mile trail in the park. They just wanted to demean them. I said,

"This is an incredible lost opportunity. Why don't you go out there in period costume and interact with people who are there to walk or run and maybe you can get them interested in the primary theme of the park?" And so, we started doing some of that.

Bob Krumenaker: Ah, there were huge land-use controversies – one associated with highway transportation, another one associated with a huge inholding in the park that sold to a housing developer, a third one having to do with a proposed veteran's cemetery inside the park. Our local congressman, who was generally pretty supportive of the park, but had just bad staff work on his staff's part, never realized that putting a veteran's cemetery inside a national park was actually a really bad idea. And so, we had to help him through that. But part of it was this educational process, where I was able – not alone but with NPCA's huge amount of help – to pull together a coalition of veteran's groups and environmentalists and to sort of ward off the cemetery, ward off the housing development, and, what's really cool is, years after I left, we won both of those battles. Again, I didn't win them, but I got them started, and I was very proud of that. So, a huge part of what I did was talk about 'Why are we here?' and try to change the perception of the park staff that this is not simply a cultural park. First of all, it's not simple at all, but one of the ironies, as a biologist who had a lot of wilderness experience coming into this park – I think I scared the heck out of the interpreters – and but I loved, you know, once I started to learn the purpose of the park, once I learned the amazing history, I loved talking to the interpreters about, 'So why was Washington here? Why did he choose this place?' And I would tease out of them the fact that it was high ground, there were trees, it was next to a river, there were fish in the river – I said, "So what do we call those things? Those are natural resources. This is a natural resources park, folks!" And you know it was just a case of you've got to expand beyond the narrow to context. Context is something I have long believed is critical to our understanding of what we do, so it's okay that people come for open-space recreation here. In fact, we should encourage that, but let's use that opportunity of their love of place to get them tied into 'What are the bigger pictures here? What's the primary purpose?' I worked at – starting when I was in Philadelphia and then finishing when I was in Valley Forge – worked on behalf of Marie Rust, the Regional Director, to try to forge an MOU between state and federal departments of transportation and the Park Service about solving the transportation problems. 'Cause the other reality was everyone looks at us as the guys who never come to meetings but always say no.

Bob Krumenaker: So, I started going to community meetings in uniform, and everybody else in the suburbs is wearing a suit. So immediately I

was the guy who wasn't wearing a suit, and so people knew who I was and – hard to believe, but I'm actually kind of shy in those meetings – and I don't remember people's names, but I'm wearing a name tag. They all know who I am, and they come in and introduce themselves, and I would start talking about the purpose of the park, and would make sure to try to not talk about our conflict but talk about our common ground, you know? They loved Valley Forge. They loved the open space. They just didn't like the fact that the commute was really tough. Well, you know, we had terrible road problems in the park. There might've been something we could do to resolve everybody's issues. And so, we signed an MOU, ultimately the regional directors signed this, that basically said the Park Service and the DOT are committed to resolving regional transportation problems to the best of our ability while fully protecting all the values of the National Park Service at Valley Forge. We're going to – it's this integration, we're going to do both, we're not going to balance anymore. And again, years after I left, started when I was there, a regional transportation plan was developed which – I'm not entirely sure where it stands right now – but the plan as it was finally signed, said "We are going to actually do some road improvements in the park, but we're also going to solve a bunch of park problems that need to be solved." So, it's that common ground thing, going to the lion's den, going to all the people who don't know who you are. The most interesting part of it, though, was Marie Rust used to talk about she wanted superintendents and deputies to be out there in public and doing what I thought I was doing. And Arthur Stewart, the superintendent, was on medical leave a good part of the time that I was there so, most unfortunate for Arthur, but an amazing opportunity for me because I was Acting Superintendent for much of that time. Every time I would get quoted in the newspaper – of course Valley Forge is 18 miles from Philadelphia, it would be the *Philadelphia Inquirer* that would be quoting it – and the Regional Director would read whatever I said over her morning coffee. And undoubtedly an hour later I would get a phone call from the Regional PIO, who said, 'What the heck did you just say?' And I would not have read the paper that morning yet, and I'd say, "Well, what did they say that I've said?" And, you know, sometimes that was accurate, and other times it was not particularly accurate, and I said, "Edie [Shean-Hammond], do you always get quoted accurately in the newspapers?" She said, "No." I said, "Okay, so why do you always assume I've said this? But when I have said it I will stand by it." She was, "Well someone might not like that." I said, "You're right. Someone may not like that. In fact, I'm sure someone doesn't like that. But for every enemy we make, we're probably making ten or a hundred friends."

And again, I think Mike Caldwell after I left did an amazing job at building coalitions around Valley Forge, and I think that park, which while I was there was listed as one of the eleven most endangered places by the National Trust, still has a lot of tough issues but has really turned a corner, and I'm very proud of my small role in that.

Jeremy Kaufman: And, in keeping with, you know, this idea of the community, this perhaps is even a more difficult issue at your current park now, you recently negotiated a treaty with I'm not sure how many tribes, Native American tribes, next to the, or around, the park. Can you talk a bit about that process, how that came about, what the situation was for both the park and those tribes before this treaty?

Bob Krumenaker: Well, I have to correct – I didn't negotiate a treaty. I was negotiating an agreement to honor the treaty. The treaty was [from]1842, but that aside, ah, some context here. In the 19th century in Wisconsin, which was the western frontier in the 1830s and '40s, just like the better known stories of the 1870s and '80s in the far west, the American government coercively forced Indian tribes to sign treaties which gave up their rights to land. And often, as part of the treaty, the tribes kept the right to hunt, fish, trap, and gather, or what was often referred to as the "other usual privileges of occupancy," while they gave up what we would consider to be the ownership rights. And this was all about timber and minerals back in those days. I don't think anyone envisioned that we were going to be settling with suburbs in those days. And so, there was a treaty – actually, you look at a map of Michigan, Wisconsin, northern Minnesota, and the entire landscape was subject to one treaty or another. There was a series of seven treaties that the Chippewa and the United States signed from 1836 through the 1850s. So, every part of that country is part of some treaty, just like most of the west is. Well, like most other Indian treaties, within ten years or so the dominant culture pretty much ignored everything that they had agreed to, and the Indians were forced onto reservations, starting in 1854. And it wasn't until the 1970s and early '80s that Indian culture and governments got strong enough to challenge those treaties, and they went all the way up to the federal courts and in a few cases to the Supreme Court, where those treaties have been ruled to still be valid. The Indians never gave up their rights. And so, while there are people who refer to the 'special privileges' that we are granting to the Indians – they don't get it. The Indians never gave up their rights, and that has been endorsed all the way up to the Supreme Court. So, I had very little direct experience with Indian relationships. I had a little tiny bit in Santa Fe from the Regional Office, but none at Shenandoah, and little tiny relationships with the Oneida at Valley Forge, but very little. So, if the Regional Office had been cognizant of the

significance of the Indian issues at Apostle Islands, they might have chosen someone who actually knew something about them. So, another great opportunity for me, going into something where I'm a quick study and I like reading law, and so I am now periodically asked by Pat Parker, the Washington Office American Indian Liaison, to help teach the American Indian law class for superintendents – which is a really cool thing – that's all been based on learning what I needed to know in order to be successful.

Bob Krumenaker: But within a few months of my arriving in the park, I had been briefed by park staff that there were these Indian treaties and that the tribes were interested in exercising what they believed to be their treaty rights to hunt and trap and gather in the park. Fishing was a non-issue, because fishing had been resolved at the state-wide level by the courts and everybody agreed to that, so we weren't dealing with fishing. But in the 70s and 80s there had been riots, violent race riots in Wisconsin over what they called the "Walleye Wars," over Indian spearfishing, so there was a lot of tensions that had faded but not disappeared. And so, I was essentially visited by a delegation of tribal people who said, "We're going to hunt in your park this fall." And, because it's a National Lakeshore, hunting and trapping are actually authorized in our legislation. So, I knew just a little bit about the issue, so I wasn't shocked by their visit, and I said, "Well, that's great. You're welcome to hunt just like everybody else. It's allowed in the national park." And they said, "No, you don't understand. We're hunting by our rules, not by yours. And you can either allow us to do that or you can stop us, in which case we'll take you to court and we guarantee we will win." And so, in a very short amount of time I needed to figure out 'What the hell do I do now?' 'Cause this could be incendiary, and I tried to become as knowledgeable as I could as quickly as I could. One of the things that is amazingly detrimental in my view to the National Park Service is we don't have our own lawyers, and getting the attention of the Solicitor's Office is totally dependent upon where you are, the regional solicitor and what kind of relationship the regional – the Park Service Regional Office – has with the regional solicitor. For weird reasons, our solicitor was in Denver. The Denver Solicitor's Office dealt with Yellowstone and energy issues in the west and some Great Lakes Indian issues – pretty small, hard to get their attention for. And so, actually the park had written a memo to the Solicitor's Office before I'd got there, asking for some answers to simple questions: Do the treaty rights exist? What are the Park Service's obligations? And got no answer, and when I finally got a hold of the person that was assigned this, he said, "You know, this is so complicated it could go all the way up to the Supreme Court. And in order for me to write an opinion that would stand up at the

Supreme Court, it will take six years." And if he had just said, "I'm not doing this," that would've been a more honest answer, because we've been dealing with this issue now for ten years, and if he'd started when he said that? We'd have finished it four years ago! So, I consulted with everybody I could. The Forest Service had signed an MOU with the tribes on a pretty similar issue, although very different agency legislation background, several years earlier. So, I consulted with the Forest Service and their lawyers. I learned who some of the key academics on Indian law were, and I consulted with them. And, of course, I'm talking to the Indians and the Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission is a consortium of now eleven tribal groups subject to the Treaty of 1842, and they have some very good lawyers – who I did not necessarily view as my allies at the time, but they were doing their best to educate me – and even though I didn't know that I could trust their viewpoints, I was able to use their resources quite a bit. And anyway, I quickly became convinced that, you know, this is real, and this is real important and, you know, it doesn't really matter whether I like the idea of harvest by Indians or anybody else in the park. I mean, I didn't really love the idea that there was hunting allowed in my park, but you know that's what I signed up for. This is the law in this park. And so, easier at Apostle Islands than it would be at a park where hunting and trapping are strictly prohibited, but nonetheless it didn't matter whether we liked it or not. And the fact that we had some harvests going on already meant that harvest itself was not going to be that surprising to us.

Bob Krumenaker: And so, the very first meeting where I'm essentially agreeing to some harvest with the tribes, sticking my neck way out 'cause I don't have the clear support from anybody above me, I'm still thinking that we want to keep this [harvesting] as little as possible. And, what I'm realizing, though, is that the park itself is incredibly vulnerable, because we were giving out 50 permits a year for muzzle-loading deer hunting to the general public, and had never done any NEPA. We had no rationale for why we allowed 50 permits a year, and so there was no NEPA for that. Meantime I'm arguing to the Indians that, "Well, we need to do NEPA on this thing," and they don't know we haven't done the other NEPA but I know how vulnerable we are. But the goal here is to try to get it under one NEPA umbrella if I can. But they quickly pointed out that the treaty is not subject to NEPA, and they're absolutely right. And so, I have actually argued for years and years within the Park Service and the Solicitor's Office that the tribes are right about this thing. And so, one of the ways I deal with issues like this? Being the guy who almost went to law school but didn't? Is [that] I kind of write my own paper, which is sort of arguing with myself what are the legal issues – because I have to write it down, I have a

lousy memory, I don't get this stuff. So, in basically making an argument to the Regional Director as to why I think we should allow this harvest in the park this fall, I'm basically citing the law, the court cases, the context of the Forest Service and all the rest – writing a little brief essentially – and I don't mean to sound like a lawyer because I don't know that it stands up that way. But that particular thing that I wrote in 2002, the summer, over the course of a couple weeks, has morphed probably into 20 different versions or more and is becoming the primary accompanying piece to this agreement that we have negotiated, and it's now being edited by the Solicitor's Office. And they're adding stuff and subtracting and all the rest, but basically that first fall I'll never forget a conversation with then-Regional Director Bill Schenk in Omaha? And Associate [Regional] Director for Operations, Jim Loach, who's still there. And I'm on a cell phone, actually back in Pennsylvania because I moved several months ahead of my wife – and I'm going back in the fall to help my wife move – and movers are in the condo and I'm sitting on the floor with my couch moving over here and I'm talking on the phone and Mr. Loach is yelling at me on the phone and he says, and I'll never forget this, because it really resonated, considering what my background in natural resources is. He says, "You are wantonly disregarding the protection of the park resources." And I said, "Jim, you know, I've been accused of a lot of things in my career, but that's a first. [Laughs.] No one's ever accused me of that before." And ah, and Jim is just telling me that I have no right to do this and he says, "The treaty's old. It doesn't apply anymore." And, being the wise ass that I am and sometimes should learn to keep my mouth shut, I said, "The Constitution's even older. Should we ignore that one, too? Have you read Article 6, which says treaties are the supreme law of the land?" And finally, I turned figuratively to the Regional Director – Bill Schenk was a real quiet guy who'd listen a lot but wouldn't say very much. I said, "Bill, I work for you, not for Jim. What do you want me to do?" And he gave me immortal advice, which at the time I thought was really awful, but in retrospect was actually a lot better than I thought. He said, "Don't do anything stupid." And that really didn't help at the time, but it retrospect it gave me the freedom to make a decision. Now it was [also] the freedom for him to pull the rug out from under me at any time, but basically the agreement that he and I made was, I will agree to something that I think is not stupid with the tribes and I will negotiate with – and I'm doing this with GLIFWC, the Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission who work for the tribal governments, but aren't the tribal governments themselves. And we agreed that when we negotiated something that we were happy with, we both had to send it up our chains. So GLIFWC would

send the thing up to the tribal councils, who would then ratify it, I would send it up to the Regional Director. But the tacit understanding the Regional Director and I had is he would never sign it. So, he would let me do it, but he would never sign it, and that gave him the plausible deniability to say, "Hey, I never approved this," and it would – the tribes didn't really care about that – so we're still playing that game, all these years later. So, within a couple years we actually found out that, certainly that first season, that this was mostly about respect and symbolism. The logistics of hunting on the Apostle Islands are really difficult. If you actually want to kill a deer, there are many, many easier places to do it in the fall on Lake Superior. So, in all the years that we have had these agreements in place, I think there's been about ten deer that have been taken, and probably fewer of any other animal of any sort, and very small amounts of gathering. So, the threat to the integrity of the resources – which we were very worried about an impairment – simply doesn't exist. And the tribes never had any intention of wantonly disregarding the protection of resources, because the real breakthrough in negotiations – which happened a year or so later – was the realization that their commitment to seven generations out, which is a Chippewa philosophy, I guess, for lack of a better word, was really pretty similar to what the Organic Act said for us. And while they were never using the religious argument, they talked often about the sacredness of these islands, which were the center of their universe, the center of their migration story, and we have this amazing stewardship of their place. And so the breakthrough was saying, for different reasons, what is sacred to the tribes is also what is sacred to the American people – that's why it's a national park – and let's find that common ground and so, even though the agreement is yet to be ratified because the solicitors, while they've engaged finally, it's not their priority and I think frankly, the politics of this year's election, I mean, we are – in fact Regional Director Mike Reynolds came up and testified before the tribes in January of 2012, saying, "I am fully committed to this thing. I will sign it." – and it's frustrating to me that now ten months later, nine months later, he still hasn't signed it. But he's ready to sign it, and I'm hopeful after the election it'll actually occur. But right now, everyone's afraid of doing anything at the Washington level. But this is, of all the cool things that I've had a chance to do in my career? I am more proud of this agreement – I mean, it would be nice to get it done [chuckles] – but I am more proud of doing this than anything else I've ever done, because it was in some ways the hardest, and yet the most significant thing that I've ever been a part of. It needed to be done, and I had the good fortune of being in the right place at the right time.

Jeremy Kaufman: And do you think 'cause, I think it's fair to say that in general there's a mixed bag with Park Service relations with Indian tribes around the country. Do you see this in any way influencing dealings, influencing anything beyond just Apostle Islands with the Park Service and other tribes that there are still tensions between?

Bob Krumenaker: I think it's a win for everybody, and one of the arguments I've been trying to make for several years now is it's a victory for the Park Service, it's a victory for the tribes, it's an opportunity for the administration whoever they are, to claim a victory because of all their commitments to Indians. There's no downside, particularly because we've shown there is no threat to the resources at all. Still makes people nervous. Indian law's really complicated, and in our passion for mission in the Park Service we're often really simplistic, and, you know, we tend to think – those who don't have the background in Indian relationships think – that harvesting and killing anything is bad. And while it's not my favorite way to manage a national park, they owned this place before we did! They never gave up the right and, you know what? If we work with them, we can negotiate a framework, and that's the key thing in this agreement: they don't, the courts have given them self-regulatory authority, have given the agencies the ability to intervene only if resource protection or public safety essentially are at risk. So, we've basically upped the bar, and we've said to the tribes, "We are the National Park Service. We care deeply about conservation. You need to have a conservation code that is really strong." And they do! And in fact, it's stronger than the DNR's code! And so that's a leap that most people haven't figured out, but when I have had opportunity to talk to other parks that are dealing with some treaties, I am delighted to be able to share this story and say, "Yeah, it's hard. Yeah, it's complicated. But, you know what? Two things. One is it's the right thing to do. And two is, you need to understand your treaty and your law and your context, because you cannot take our situation and apply it somewhere else, except if you are in a park in the same treaty area." So one of the other things I've tried to do is keep the superintendents of all the other parks that are in the 1842 treaty intimately aware of, to the degree they choose to be engaged, in how these issues play out, because it will affect other parks, and we have all agreed that this agreement is specific to the Apostle Islands 'cause the tribes don't want to over-reach and then later lose. But I know that once we have it signed, they're going to be extremely interested in Isle Royale, and they're already doing some informal stuff at Pictured Rocks and at St. Croix. Isle Royale will be a really tough one, because first of all I have the background there, and that passion about 'You don't want to harvest anything here'. Second of all, there were no wolves and there were no moose in 1842 at Isle Royale, so there's this

wild card of 'the animal assemblage that's there now is not the animal assemblage that was there' and the courts don't actually care about that but we do. And then the most interesting and difficult thing is it's not really clear where the boundaries of the 1842 treaty were, you know, maps weren't all that good in those days, and so there's a pretty strong argument that says Isle Royale is actually outside that. So that's a real tough issue that we can see coming down the pike, and I will offer all of the assistance I can offer to my colleague at Isle Royale, but, you know, even if it's the right thing to do there, it will be painful. But I think the thing to do would be to negotiate a very conservative regime there. I mean, the tribal elders love to tweak us, and at a dinner with Mike Reynolds in January, they said, "Ho! We're, we just can't wait to get a trophy moose at Isle Royale!" And I had briefed Mike ahead of time, so he knew not to [chuckles], knew not where to go, and you know, it's just now, "Well, we'll deal with that when the time comes." But the trick will be, "You want an agreement with us at Isle Royale? Then you're going to have to agree to some really conservative harvest regimes." And you know what? Twenty years ago, the researchers used to take a moose or two a year, so killing one or two animals, we can probably live with. May not be what we like, but we can probably live with it. And if we could accept it for research purposes, why can't we accept it for tribal cultural purposes?

Bob Krumenaker: Now, the court – the tribes can take us to court at any time, but I think we've developed enough trust over ten years that they don't want to take us to court. They want the relationships, they want the partnerships with us, and so actually, over the last year or two when I've been trying to get the Park Service and the Interior Department Solicitor's Office to move on this treaty [agreement] – which we've essentially agreed on all the specifics of – now I really view the tribal attorneys as my allies. And in fact, on a number of occasions, I've said, "Would you contact my boss?" Or "Would you contact the Solicitor's Office?" Or something like, "You guys probably have more political clout than I do on this stuff." So, it'll be interesting to see what happens after the election, because hopefully the last barrier will fall, the nervousness that people will have about signing these things. And, as I said, incredible opportunity, and I think it will – whether it's recognized or not doesn't matter, I mean this is one of those things I don't need any credit for, I mean, it's quite an honor to get credit for it, but if I can be helpful to other parks going through this stuff? And Glacier has issues like this, Olympic has issues like this, Mt. Rainier has issues like this – and in fact I've consulted a lot with them to try to learn from their experience – but, if this thing goes through as I expect, to the best of my knowledge, and Pat Parker in

Washington's knowledge, this will be the first ever explicit acknowledgement by a National, by the National Park Service, that a treaty right exists.

Jeremy Kaufman: As this is the ANPR Oral History Project, I'm not gonna end without asking a couple of things with your involvement. First of all, well, you did mention briefly at one point, when you did join? Can you just restate that? And why you joined? And then how you've been active in the organization since then.

Bob Krumenaker: 1984. I was the computer specialist at Big Thicket. It was my first real permanent job. I was feeling incredibly disconnected with the Park Service that I knew up until then, which was western – it was field-oriented, and it was uniform-based. And even though I had a great job, and I was delighted to have it, I was in sort of an administrative role, not really sure where my career was going, and I didn't want to lose touch with what I thought the Park Service was about. I can't recall who first told me about ANPR, but I joined and went to the Rendezvous in 1984. It was very small, probably 50 people or so, in a hotel not nearly as nice as this, in Bar Harbor, Maine, in the off-season at Acadia. And Dick Martin was the president, first time I met him, and I'll never forget Rick Smith, first time I met him. There were all sorts of business sessions. In this particular Rendezvous, we've got the business sessions kind of as an aside if you're interested in going, but in those days, the business of the organization was the purpose of the meeting. And lots of spirited debate – I don't even remember what the topics were, and I'm mostly listening because I don't know what's going on here and I'm a new guy – but often there would be this debate going on, and Rick typically would stand at the back of the room, quiet, and then, at just a critical moment, he would raise his hand and get the floor somehow and sort of walk up in the aisle or sort of in his quiet, slow-speaking but amazingly articulate way, he'd say what I wished that I was smart enough to say. And he'd do it time and time again, and he's done it ever since then, and he sort of has the voice of Jimmy Stewart and he's like the font of wisdom. What I loved about ANPR then, and I hope is still true today, is that people do not wear their titles or GS grades on their buttons. There's an opportunity for seasonals and regional directors to talk to one another, and superintendents and GS-2s and 3s and 5s or whatever to interact. I learned so much and was welcomed to the organization, and befriended by these incredibly senior people, and ANPR then and ANPR now has always given an opportunity for people to step forward and take responsibility. And within a couple years of getting more vocal at meetings, I decided to run for a Regional Representative role on the board, which I don't think exists now, but, you know, we've gone through several organizations. So, for several years I was the Midwest

Regional Rep for ANPR and, as such, was the, theoretically at least, the liaison between the members within the region and the board, and so was on the phone a lot with people in both directions. Rick Gale was the president after a little while, and Rick is an ANPR legend, and Rick gave me the opportunity to do whatever I wanted and was capable of doing. And Rick of course has been one of the leadership gurus until he died, in the Park Service and the ANPR. He was the best president, at least in my tenure in ANPR, we've ever had. Rick knew how to get stuff done, and Rick knew how to challenge people and pull out the best of them, and he certainly did that with me. So, I was a regional rep for a while. I was one of three people but probably the lead on organizing the Rendezvous in 1994, which I think is still one of the largest Rendezvous we've ever had – it was hundreds and hundreds of people, a far more complex agenda than anything we've had in the last four years. In fact, this notebook I have in front of me is becoming an historical artifact in itself – this is my 1994 planning thing for Rendezvous, and this is ANPR business since 1994. In fact, I've got one, two, three, four addresses during that time, so this probably should go in the ANPR archive when I'm dead. And it also is a record of everybody that I can remember having talked to at all these Rendezvous over these years. A couple years ago somebody borrowed that from me, and I had to pay a significant fine in order to get it back. But the other thing is, ANPR then, even more so than today, was primarily rangers, 025s[1], and I have no ideas what the numbers would've broken down between the commissioned protection rangers and the interpreters – I don't know if that's different today, but certainly the leadership came from the protection ranks in those days – and there were very few Resource Management people involved. There was me, there was Kathy Jope, there was Meg Weesner and maybe a couple others, and so I became one of the more active people in sort of liaising between the Resource Management world and ANPR – saying "Hey this is a group, just because it says Ranger doesn't mean it's not about us" and would often be trying to do the same for ANPR, saying, "Hey, this is the resource world." And two things came out of that. One was I was increasingly getting active in the George Wright Society, and I ultimately became the president of George Wright for a while, and even before that, became the official liaison between the organizations for a few years. And there really wasn't a huge role in that, but it nonetheless was something that I could do, perhaps uniquely.

Bob Krumenaker: But the other thing is, at one time they started the Professional Ranger column in Ranger Magazine, and it was, if I remember

[1] OPM classification, Ranger Series 0025.

right, originally limited to Protection and Interpretation, and then Bill Halainen, who was the editor in those days, asked me if I would be interested in writing a Resource Management column. And I said yes, and for I think about ten or twelve years, I wrote that column. Sue Consolo-Murphy, who I handed it off to, may now have been doing it longer than I did, but at the time I was the longest-serving regular columnist for ANPR. And it felt like it was a really important platform to sort of liaise between two worlds. And so, 'Here's what's going on in the Resource Management world that I want the ANPR membership to know about'. And so those have been my primary contributions. For a while I was on the Centennial Planning Committee, one of which had the idea of doing an oral history thing, although it wasn't my idea. I take pride in saying, "Hey, there is your StoryCorps!" I didn't do anything about it, though, so I'm glad that other people picked that up. I've not been actively in the leadership of ANPR for quite a while, and don't know if I will ever resume that. I know in my current role, I know I don't have the time for it. But also, when Ken Mabery was the president – and Ken is a friend of mine from the Canyonlands days, we've been friends ever since – his career really suffered because of what he did when he was with ANPR. And I don't know if, to this day, Ken would talk about it on tape, but I hope some day he will, and that was a real eye-opener for a lot of us – that Ken, doing what presidents of ANPR should be doing, paid a price for that. And so, I think there's a real hesitancy now that there didn't used to be of people in senior management jobs – and now I'm lucky enough to be in one – to take a leadership role in ANPR, and I think, even though Regional Director Chris Lehnertz today said in essence "There is no conflict," and Jon Jarvis has said that at previous Rendezvous. I think in this administration probably not, but times change and so, part of it is just the demography, but with the growth of the retirees" coalition[2], they are playing the role that ANPR used to play and they're doing it very effectively. I hope someday we can bring the two organizations back and so it's only one organization but I have a feeling that the next really effective president of ANPR might have to be a retiree, so that he or she can do things that those of us who are still concerned about our careers might not feel comfortable doing.

Jeremy Kaufman: Well, so then, in terms of relevancy, um, where do you see ANPR now – I mean, how, how would this, how do you see this still appealing to people, both of your generation but younger generations, and where do you see the state of the Association?

Bob Krumenaker: Well, I was absolutely delighted to hear about the membership numbers that ANPR has right now. I didn't think we were doing as

[2] Coalition of National Park Service Retirees, Tucson, AZ.

well numerically or financially as we apparently are, and that's part of my being out of the loop. That tells me – and then the number of faces I don't recognize around the room also tell me – that there is certainly some appeal to younger people right now, and whether that is because of what happens at Rendezvous, whether it's Ranger Magazine, or maybe it's the health insurance program, or some combination thereof, that's real encouraging to me. I think we struggle and always have, and I hope we can fix this some day, but the very name Association of National Park Rangers to me makes incredible sense, but you know I've only been a park ranger since I've been a deputy superintendent or a superintendent and I've never felt like it doesn't affect me, but the world thinks all of us are rangers. Why do we fight amongst ourselves so much and say, "Oh, you're not a ranger, you're a biologist, you're an admin officer," it's like that's the stupidest and most unproductive thing that we can do. How we get over that? For as long as I've been in this organization we have been asking that and we haven't figured it out. We have discussed, we have voted on, we came really close to changing the name several times, [and] I wish there was another word that started with 'R' that would work as a broader name, but we haven't found it yet. I don't really like the idea – I guess I'm enough of a traditionalist that changing to Association of National Park Employees or something, I think the ranger image is what makes us effective on Capitol Hill. So, we're going to struggle with that. I am disappointed and appalled at how few members there are in my park, in fact I might be the only one right now. And one of the things that I'm uncomfortable with, now that I'm in a supervisory position and leadership, is I want to expose my staff to these really cool organizations like ANPR and George Wright, but I have to be really careful, and I'm not willing to go over what some would perceive as a line and say, "You should join this," and maybe I could go further and I don't. I know superintendents who have funded staff to go, Kendell Thompson was one of them, [but] even if I loved the idea today, there's just no money to do it. I admire those who can figure out how to do that, but I can't in my park. So, I worry about the future. I don't know. I think we have always struggled with a volunteer organization where people tend to have fulltime jobs, and I can't speak about the current board 'cause I don't know very many of the current board, but I don't know.

Bob Krumenaker: I think we're still struggling for our niche, and back in the Rick Gale days, when we were dealing with ranger futures and we were dealing with some serious housing issues, and other things, when Ken Mabery was president we were dealing with the endangered ranger – which was primarily a financial thing – I think we had a greater resonance with people about the relevancy. I don't know

how we do it today, to be honest, so I don't know what the future is. I certainly am committed to this organization, but I don't have unbridled optimism that its niche is clear, and I think it's going to take a lot of work on the part of a lot of people to make sure that it stays relevant. And being of a generation where I'm still not comfortable with Facebook and Twitter and other stuff like that, the thing that I certainly do realize is that it's a huge commitment of time to constantly be communicating with people. I mean, Chris Lehnertz talked about, "You have to constantly demonstrate the relevance and why is this good for people." I don't disagree with that, I don't know how anyone has time to do those things, um, and yet, I also don't think we can offload it, even if we have the money, to a paid staff. We had an executive director for a couple years, and that was a disaster – for a whole variety of reasons, but one of which was I just don't think someone who doesn't have the passion that we have can do that. I think Teresa Ford does an amazing job, considering she's not from our background, but she has adopted us, and Teresa – I don't know what Teresa gets paid, but I'm sure it's a pittance compared to what she should be paid – but the very fact that Teresa had to do a lot of work on this year's agenda, to me is a bad sign, that 'Where was, where were the people doing this [indicating notebook]?' And again, I don't know any of the background, I may be disparaging some hard work that just fell through for people, but I am hopeful – I'm not sure I'm optimistic, to be perfectly honest.

Jeremy Kaufman: And then perhaps just looking forward with the agency as a whole, ah, the way in which you've seen it adapt to change, the way you see it and then your future again, that relevancy question. How, you know, I think last year the topic, the theme of Rendezvous was about this idea of relevancy, and where do you see the agency itself in that discussion?

Bob Krumenaker: Well, I think it's an important conversation. You look around the room and, just stereotyping people by the color of their skin? It's appalling how non-diverse we are in ANPR. And we're worse than the Park Service is, which is pretty bad. We have got to fix that. And it's not for lack of trying and interest, but we're not succeeding at that. I don't know how we change that, to be honest, but we absolutely have to. Ah, the thing that I think will make us most relevant, though, gets to something that Regional Director Chris Lehnertz said today, but I'll go one step further, which is she talked about the employee attitude surveys and how appalling the National Park Service is on those surveys. And there is very little trust and confidence that most NPS people have on senior leadership. And when I filled out that survey this year, I was really concerned about two things. One is, I don't know who we're talking about when we say 'senior leadership'. There was an

attempt to define it, but it still was vague. So, when I'm filling the survey out, I'm thinking Regional Director, Directorate in Washington. When my staff is filling that out, are they thinking the same people or are they thinking me? And I think a huge part of the problem we face, and I see this when I read *National Parks Traveler.com*, which I think the world of it and often see the criticisms of the Park Service, often which look like they're coming from either NPS employees or former NPS employees, you know – management are idiots. Okay, well, I'm one of them and maybe I am – but we, it's too easy to tar everybody with one stroke, and as frustrated as I am sometimes with what I consider senior leadership, hopefully I have enough context and perspective to at least understand why they're doing what they're doing. But it was part of my comment to Chris Lehnertz today, was also the fact that we need to do a far better job at every level of the organization – whether it's the Director, the regional directors, superintendents, division chiefs, first-line supervisors – at communicating the 'Why do we do what we do?' And we have got to be out there managing according to the Organic Act. And I think the passion of the people in this organization is demanding that, and the perception's we're failing them on a regular basis. I don't know whether we really are failing them, but they certainly think we are. So, if people think we're making political compromises all the time, or we're hiring people by the 'old boys' network', whether it's true or not, we're failing. So, we've got to do a far better job at communicating our own passion and then executing that through our decisions and then communicating the 'What are we doing and why are we doing it, why is this so complicated, and why can we not always do what we want but hopefully, God, we're trying really hard and we're making incremental progress forward'. And sometimes we're going to make incremental progress backward, and we have to admit that. Instead of saying "Everything's great!" I think if we do that – and that's hard – but if we do that, then there's going to be this greater confidence in our leadership. And you asked about ANPR, but I think they're hand in hand. If ANPR is standing for something that people believe in, and – this is the problem with the politics – can a president of ANPR stick his or her neck out far, perhaps further than his inside-the-agency boss would prefer, in order to stand up for the resource and the employees and the visitor? Well, I think they're going to get a lot of membership who say, "God, somebody's got to do that, thank goodness." But I don't know if they can. So, you know, I think this is one of those unique things, and I'm sort of on the cusp of trying to figure this out in my own career. Bill Supernaugh once told me, when I was really angry at something that my boss had done when I was at Isle Royale, and I was needing advice and ready to rant and rave and fall on my

sword – he said, "You know, you only get to fall on your sword once. Choose carefully." And he said, "Is this the one?" And the answer clearly was, No. This is not the one. It's not that big, it's too early in my career. And I don't think ideally you ever should have to fall on your sword, but when you reach retirement age and you decide that you're not looking to go anywhere else, that is the point in a career where you can say, "You know, if I haven't been doing all the right things before, why am I not doing it now?" Now I'm at that stage where I've reached retirement age, but I'm not convinced that I don't have another move ahead of me, and so I'm struggling with the frustrations I have of "I'm trying to do the right thing, but I know that I can only stick my neck out so far before it will be cut off." And, you know, whether I decide at some point that, "All right, I'll accept the fact that maybe I won't go beyond Apostle Islands" or maybe I go somewhere else and then say, "Okay, this is my last park," I'm really looking forward to that freedom of saying, "They can only screw with me so much [laughs]. You know, I'm going to do the right thing." I hope that I have developed the integrity and respect of enough people that think that I'm doing that as much as I can right now, but that's something only other people can judge. I, um, I'll be the last to know. I know what I think, but you know, have I effectively communicated that? And that's the challenge for the tail end of my career.

Jeremy Kaufman: Well, that's, I think, a good way to wrap up. Any final thoughts on that future or anything else that sticks out in your mind as we finish up here?

Bob Krumenaker: Well, I think we've probably talked enough, so [laughs], no.

Jeremy Kaufman: Well, thank you, yeah, I do appreciate it. Thank you for your time in sitting down.

Bob Krumenaker: Well, thanks for asking and, you know, as much as I joked about sending you this lengthy resume, you obviously read it and asked a lot of questions about it, so. One never thinks one is old or wise enough to be asked these questions, and so it's humbling to realize that, you know, I'm now one of the 'gray hairs' here. But, you know, mentoring's really important, and there are so many people – and I've mentioned some of them – that, you know, have been really important to me in the Park Service. So, I guess the last other ANPR-related thing is I hope that, you know, my presence here I can be one of the people that somebody who's a yellow button comes up to and says, 'Hey, can I talk to you?'[3] You know,

[3] First-year attendees at Rendezvous have worn yellow buttons so that other members have an opportunity to welcome them personally throughout the event. This practice has been common for at least the last 20 years.

and asks me questions that they can't ask back home. And if I can be helpful to them, as others have been to me, as I said to somebody in my talk this morning, I've been hired by Rick Smith and Bill Wade in the Park Service, and I think I was hired because I was qualified for those jobs, but I know that what they had seen, an opportunity in a non-interview setting when I wasn't trying to impress them, through years at ANPR, certainly influenced their decision that, 'Hey, we should hire this guy'. So ANPR's an amazing opportunity for young people to grab a ball and run with it, you know, and, you know, there are others around the room who will ultimately get to decide, 'Do I want to hire this person or that person? Oh, that person's been an active volunteer in ANPR. They've done some really cool stuff. They didn't have to, they didn't get paid for that, it's generally not on their resume. That, that says a lot'.

Jeremy Kaufman: Well, thank you, very much.

Bob Krumenaker: Well, you're welcome. My pleasure.

[END OF TAPE 1]

[END OF INTERVIEW]