National Park Service (NPS) History Collection

NPS Oral History Collection (HFCA 1817)
Harpers Ferry Center Employees Oral History Project, 2015-2019

Nancy Haack
November 29, 2016

Interview conducted by Lu Ann Jones and Elizabeth Ehrlich
Transcribed by Technitype Transcripts
Edited by Nancy Haack
Digitized by Madison T. Duran

This digital transcript contains updated pagination, formatting, and editing for accessibility and compliance with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act. Interview content has not been altered. The original typed transcript is preserved in the NPS History Collection.

The release form for this interview is on file at the NPS History Collection.

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

ORAL HISTORY INTERVIEW

WITH

NANCY HAACK

By Lu Ann Jones and Elizabeth Ehrlich

November 29, 2016

Purcellville, Virginia

Transcribed by Technitype Transcripts

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

The narrator has reviewed and corrected this transcript.

START OF TAPE

START OF FILE 1

Lu Ann Jones: I'm going to start off by introducing us here today. I'm Lu Ann Jones in the Park History Program, and we also have—

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Betsy Ehrlich. I'm with the Harpers Ferry Center.

Lu Ann Jones: And our guest of honor today is—

Nancy Haack: Nancy Haack, retired cartographer, Harpers Ferry Center.

Lu Ann Jones: So, we're here to chronicle Nancy's career, and it is Tuesday, November 29th [2016], and we're at Nancy's home in Purcellville, Virginia. It's an overcast day, but in some ways, it makes the landscape even more beautiful, I think. So, thank you so much, Nancy. I always — I will ask you to sign a release form later on.

Nancy Haack: Sure.

Lu Ann Jones: But do we have your verbal permission—

Nancy Haack: Yes.

Lu Ann Jones: — to do this interview? And, as I always say, if there's any question you don't want to answer, we don't anticipate that, but it's totally voluntary.

Nancy Haack: Okay.

Lu Ann Jones: Good. So, thanks a lot [laughter]. It's part of the ethics.

Lu Ann Jones: You've lined out some great questions, Betsy, and so if you wanted to get started, that would be great.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: I want to say thank you, Lu Ann and Nancy, both of you, for agreeing to do this today. I've been really excited about this, because Nancy and I were coworkers for years and we've spent long drives talking with each other, and I always knew that what I learned from Nancy was something that lots of people could benefit from. So, I'm just thrilled that you're willing to do this today.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: But I think one of the places to start is even before you started with the Park Service, because there's a history there that I think is fascinating and leads to who you are and what you contributed to the Park Service, so if you could share a little bit about what you aimed for in your education and in your experience before you joined the Park Service, and help us understand your life as a young student and what you were hoping to become as a cartographer.

Nancy Haack: Even before I went to college, I loved maps, I read maps, I was what I always called a "map head," and I liked maps for the information on them, not just for how they looked. That was a really important point of view.

Nancy Haack: We traveled all over the country when I was a kid, four kids in a station wagon; first time, no seatbelts. [laughter] Went to lots of national parks, and I usually got to read the map because I could. My father liked maps. And an important thing is I read Esso maps, Esso road maps, extremely clear and concise. They weren't full of a lot of extra stuff, unlike Rand McNally or National Geographic maps. So that was always, in my mind, my standard of what a good map looked like. They worked, you got to where you needed to go, and they always were there. And they were free, so I didn't put any value on them. I didn't know how they existed. They were just there.

Nancy Haack: So, I went to the University of Wisconsin, family tradition. My son is the fifth generation to go there. I'm the fourth-generation female graduate, which is, to me, a really big deal, that my grandmother's family was really interested in education. So, her mother and all her sisters went to UW, and my mother and her brother and my sister and I.

Nancy Haack: So, I thought I'd be a history major. I loved history. Freshman year, the history classes were really boring. I took geology classes, which were really great; very excited about that. After freshman year, I went on a geology summer fieldtrip up to the Yukon and British Columbia, which is where I met my husband, Stan. He was on that trip too. I got to read the maps to take us up there and back. No such stuff as GPS or whatever. We made it.

Nancy Haack: So, we come back, I'm looking in the university schedule of classes, and I saw "Cartography." I was dumbfounded. I had no idea that you could study cartography, they taught cartography. So being a naïve person, I ran right down and talked to Professor Arthur Robinson, signed up for all his classes. I had no idea he was this world-famous person, no idea that this was the premier school for cartography. It was all just totally lucked out on every level.

Nancy Haack: So, when it came time to graduate, he sent me down to Chicago to interview with one of his Ph.D. students, Barbara Bartz Petchenik. It was a special project, three years, for the Bicentennial, Atlas of Early American History, and we had a contractor do the maps. So, I did what I love, is compiled the information and then the maps were created to the specifications of my boss, the design look of it. I learned so much there because those historians didn't allow you to put anything on the map that wasn't justified in a written resource.

Nancy Haack: So, it wasn't just that, "Oh, I think this fort is someplace near here." You had to have a description of where it was. You can't just put where the map said it was, some other map. In fact, my boss Barbara wrote a whole series of essays about misplaced places that persisted through the ages because people didn't do research; they just looked at other maps that were wrong. So that really made me stop and think about the power of maps, which is one of those clichés, but it's absolutely true.

Nancy Haack: So, Robinson and Petchenik were my two big influences. Robinson wrote a book called The Look of Maps, and Petchenik and Robinson wrote a book called The Nature of Maps. So, Robinson's big point was cartographic language, and the simplest thing to think of that is parks are green and water is blue. That's the simplest, in a nutshell. And Barbara Bartz Petchenik wrote about maps as a system of communication. Once again, the appearance was important, but it had to have a purpose. Otherwise, it wasn't communicating.

Nancy Haack: They also talked about map viewers and map readers. Some people will never be a map reader. They will never get the information. It's not because they're dumb. Their mind's just not wired that way. So, it's another thing we had to consider always with the maps we made is we have to give the information a different way because I think it's even less than half of the population can successfully get the information from a map. So, it's really important to understand that those historians, who are all, of course, very analytical people, historians at the Atlas project influenced my future work with the Park Service, because a lot of the stuff that I saw was real loosey-goosey when I got to NPS Publications.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, your initial dislike of those freshman-year history classes must have evolved somewhere in there to what seems to me a passion for history.

Nancy Haack: Oh, yeah, well, I always loved it, yeah. But the classes were terrible, and Wisconsin was a well-known school for history, but I guess they didn't care about undergraduates, is the only thing I can figure. So, from geology I went to geography, and then I went back, got a master's degree in landform geography and cartography. But that's what grabbed me first with geology was landforms, the shapes of the mountains, and Wisconsin's all glacial geology. That's what I wrote my thesis on for the master's degree, mapping glacial geology. So, then I'm looking for another job, right?

Lu Ann Jones: So, can I ask you — I'm trying to place you in time here, so when did you get your undergraduate degree?

Nancy Haack: 1972. And those geologists told me, "Cartography's a good job for a woman. You sit." And I thought, "Oh, that's nice." [laughs]

Nancy Haack: Then I got my second degree in 1977, and I called the contractors that we used at the Atlas of Early American History, looking for a job, because that was somebody I knew. They were Donnelley Cartographic Services, and, just coincidentally, Vince Gleason had been in contact with them because he had seen their work for Reader's Digest, and he wanted them to contract with him, for him, because he just started the NPS Unigrid Program and he wanted to change the maps from one-, two-, and three-color to four-color maps, and he felt he needed help, needed outside help. He had three cartographers, three people who worked on maps who came from the United States Geological Survey. They were a cartographic technician and two visual information specialists. Technically they were excellent, but they didn't have any concept of a map being a communication device. They also were very resistant to change. They didn't like that their situation was being upset.

Nancy Haack: So, Donnelley Cartographic Services, instead of offering me a job, said, "Call Vince Gleason." So, I did. I called him. No. Did I call him, or did I write him? Anyway, he called me. I must have written him, because he called me, and he said, "You've got to come out here" [laughs]. Of course, the government isn't going to pay anybody to come, and, of course, he knew everything about me because he talked to those people at Donnelley who knew me.

Nancy Haack: So, I came out, had an interview in May, and I had the job by October, which Vince said was a record, record, record [laughter].

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Would it still be a record today?

Nancy Haack: Yeah, oh, yeah. Oh, yeah. Oh, yeah.

Lu Ann Jones: You're going to have to tell me who Vince is.

Nancy Haack: Oh, I'm sorry. Vince Gleason was the head of National Park Service Publications at Harpers Ferry Center, and he really wanted to move forward in the design world with the brochures. I had even noticed as a kid and a young person that the brochures were all over the place, all different colors, sizes, shapes, style, even messages, because there was no centralized structure for them. Now, Betsy can speak more to that Unigrid concept, but it really standardized it as a system of brochures. Is that fair to say?

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Yeah.

Nancy Haack: And four-color, and Vince used the maps as one of his justifications for four-color. Now, he wanted that for photographs, too, of course, because we had brochures that were orange and blue. I mean, really unattractive things.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Purple.

Nancy Haack: Purple. Purple water. My favorite thing is the purple water.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: There was a purple phase.

Nancy Haack: Right, right. So, yeah, he was looking how to improve the program. So, now, did I go beyond what the—

Elizabeth Ehrlich: One detail I want to just go back to, and that is how did you become the one to read the maps in the family car? Who taught you?

Nancy Haack: Oh, nobody taught me. It's like people who are good at music—

Elizabeth Ehrlich: You just looked at them and they became—

Nancy Haack: — I understood it. I understood it right away.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: And the experience of doing multiple trips gave you that opportunity.

Nancy Haack: Yeah, and I was an early reader for books. I had read a lot of books all the time, so I think that assisted in my reading of maps. I read a lot of travel books. My mother had books, people who had traveled around the world to see the wonders, and there are always maps in there, so I would look to see where they went to Petra and to the place in Cambodia, Angkor Wat and all that. So, I knew where everything was from those books, from the maps in those books. Sure.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, your life as a traveler began very early.

Nancy Haack: Right.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Totally intertwined with your profession.

Nancy Haack: Right, yeah. My father, we'd always laugh. He was very angry at me because I was born in August and it ruined his vacation. He couldn't go till November. [laughs] So that's his attitude about travel. Sure. He wasn't really angry with me, but that's always the joke.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, when did you actually start at Harpers Ferry?

Nancy Haack: October 1977.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: And then you retired—

Nancy Haack: I've got it right here. June 2011, thirty-four years later, yeah. I knew I needed notes [laughter].

Elizabeth Ehrlich: There's a couple things I want to come back to, but I think I'm going to hold that for later. Because we already sort of started with some of your experiences with moving into cartography at the time, it would be interesting to hear more about how the technology of cartography changed through your career and how that influenced what—how you looked at cartography as somebody who's practicing having to adapt to the changes in technology.

Nancy Haack: Well, it's just a change in tools. The thinking is absolutely the same. So, the cartography classes I took in college were both pen and ink and just the beginning of the film layers, multiple layers of film that were composited, and essentially, they were scratched or opened up to make the negatives to make the map, essentially. There were all different ways that could be achieved, and that was a big breakthrough. In fact, Donnelley Cartographic Services was one of the first in this country — Rand McNally and then Donnelley — to use that new kind of mapping production.

Nancy Haack: So that you had an analytical mind to follow the different layers to make the maps work, and there were multiple ways you could do it. One way wasn't particularly right or wrong, but you needed, for our case, Publications, you needed to be consistent because you didn't know who would be working on it the next year, so you wanted to have people to be able to step right in and make the changes needed on the maps. So, what was bad about those films is that film is very expensive and very tedious to work on, and I always told my coworkers I got my master's degree so I wouldn't have to be the one, they say, "scribing," drawing the line on those films, because it was a difficult thing to do. Our three guys were fantastic at that, very highly skilled. They knew how to do it. They could draw, copy anything.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: That was Gus?

Nancy Haack: Gus in particular.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Gary.

Nancy Haack: And Bill von Allmen.

Lu Ann Jones: You want to say those names?

Nancy Haack: Okay. Gus Bartoli, Gary Barkman, and Bill von Allmen were the three people working on maps when I got to Publications in 1977.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So was your role then when you started in '77 different from what they—

Nancy Haack: Totally. Totally different.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Talk about that.

Nancy Haack: I was hired as a professional cartographer. Vince was very excited that he would have someone who could help on his path to this high-style, high-quality four-color maps. So, my job was to plan, design, and what we say compile, meaning collect the information for the map itself. Now, I have to say those guys were not very welcoming to me at all. They didn't like that I was a woman, they didn't like I was college educated, and, most of all, what they didn't like is that I was fast, because they were very meticulous and often very slow in what they did. Whether they could have been faster or not, I don't know, but they did not like that their applecart was upset. But I got along with them. I made sure I got along with them. In fact, when they retired, someone in the office said, "Oh, you're going to be so lonely without them."

Nancy Haack: And I said, "No" [laughter].

Nancy Haack: They couldn't handle the computer. They really couldn't handle that transition, when I really embraced that because it was a tool that made everything so much easier to envision. You could make mistakes and know right away you had made a mistake because you could see it right on your own screen.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: When did you begin working digitally?

Nancy Haack: In the early nineties. Donnelley Cartographic Services, who was our cartographic contractor, they were really into it, because, of course, were a business, a for-profit business, and they saw that digital cartography was going to save them a ton of money. Just the film negatives alone, that was very expensive, the silver content of the negatives at that time. So, they really pushed it. And Vince, of course, always appreciated their efforts, but he hated everything they did. He refused to look at any digital map because it had ragged edges on the lines and poor typography, and he was right. They were horrible. Plus, the position of the typography was terrible, and the image of the type was terrible. The font was not refined to be like was the hot-metal type that Vince was so truly enamored of. So, we worked and worked and worked and worked with the contractor in-house, and finally there were a couple of maps that Vince could not tell were made by a computer, and that's when we could move forward.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, what was your role in that transition, sort of determining like how to get this new technology to match so that Vince couldn't tell or nobody could tell the difference between those beautiful, scribed maps for which you had spent, what, fifteen years or so developing?

Nancy Haack: Yeah, yeah, sure. We had a big library of maps, big library of maps that were the four-color maps for the Unigrid system. I would say that after I was hired, we hired three more professional cartographers, and we pretty much were in agreement that we had to move ahead. One person would take a lead and then the next person would take the lead to move it ahead. We knew it had to happen because that's what the industry was going to do. The printing industry could no longer handle this composite photography of the images. Plus, all of us wanted to have really ultimate control. We no longer had to tell someone what to do; we could do it ourselves on the computer. So, the big battle was to get the computers, and the biggest battle was to get Macintosh computers, because that was our industry standard for cartographers.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: From the beginning.

Nancy Haack: From the very beginning. Adobe Illustrator now, of course, is on all different platforms. Then I believe it was only on the Macintosh platform, and that's what we wanted to use because it had the lines that were smooth, the Bézier curves. Mr. Bézier, the mathematician, we thank him.

Nancy Haack: So, yeah, I really think it took several years even to get to — the first all-digital maps we made were very small, just because, I think, of the time constraint, but to get to the total conversion really was a group effort.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: And was there any resistance other than to the transition from scribing, but just generally going digital was — that's a big transition that—

Nancy Haack: Oh, not within our office and certainly not in printing, and I think the other people in the office, some of them were already bringing in their own computers. The editors were bringing in their own computers to do their manuscripts on. It was ridiculous to use the typewriter when at home they had something that they could use to write their own stuff.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, it was the evolution of cartography into digital was compatible with where the other aspects of the publications were.

Nancy Haack: And think about the designers. They had to hand-draw on a big piece of cardboard the components of the brochure, and with flaps instructing the printer how to combine it. That wasn't designing; that was purely paperwork.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Mechanical. It was mechanical.

Nancy Haack: Yeah, it was called a mechanical, right? [laughter] So I think that they were just as excited as we were to be able to completely control it. And to see what you were getting before you ever sent it to the printer is what was really gratifying to me.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: And it changed the pace of the work as well.

Nancy Haack: Oh, yeah. Oh, tremendously, yes.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, the number of parks is growing. The number of people in the office is not necessarily growing, although you came in and were followed by three more people. So, what was the largest number of sort of cartographers in your group?

Nancy Haack: We had six at one time, but briefly, briefly, because Bill von Allmen retired just as Tom came, so really five people. But at the end there, the two guys who had come from the Survey really were only fixing the old, old maps. They weren't — as I said, they couldn't make that jump to computers.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, when the technology shifted, how did — or did the standards, the language of maps evolve, or did it? Was it old standards, existing standards applied with new technology or—

Nancy Haack: Absolutely. Absolutely. There was no difference in a philosophy there. We made a whole series of map standards when we started with the four-color maps, and this where Nick came into play, one of the times that— big, big influence.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: This is Nick Kirilloff.

Nancy Haack: Nick Kirilloff, who was the chief designer for Publications, and he and I spent many hours closeted in a room, and sometimes Phil Musselwhite popped in, but he really wasn't as big an influence, a big part of it. Vince had his definite ideas, most of which were crazy. Because of the language of maps, he wanted the maps to look like the terrain. So, he wanted all the desert maps to look the same. If there weren't trees, he wanted it to be brown.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Tan colors and [terrain?].

Nancy Haack: Tan, right. I would show him examples of Yosemite. Yosemite, up in the northern or the highest parts of Yosemite, there weren't any trees. Was he going to show that differently than Yosemite Valley? Now, this was way before all these aerial photographs are being used as maps. This was still when I felt very strongly that the parks had to be green. That's what people expected. They saw green, they think park and they think National Park, because it was a National Park brochure. So that took a long time to work through that, to keep it simple. Red roads, green parks, blue water. We'd specify what red, what green, what blue, all that kind of stuff.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, talk a little bit about these meetings that you had with Nick Kirilloff, because I'm very curious. Like were you working with sample maps that you were making refinements to? How did that work when you were—?

Nancy Haack: All those things. All those things. We brought in all the maps that we had made and tried to pick out the best of that. We also looked back to what our maps had been, and the reason the roads were a certain width is because we had that scribing tool, that width. So, some of that went on to the computer, the same crazy measurement, only because we wanted all the maps to match. When we converted the maps, we didn't want anyone to know the difference, right?

Nancy Haack: Oh, no, it was a lot of — and, of course, this man is — would you say even though English is his first language, it isn't? Nick. Yeah, yeah, yeah. I love him dearly. So, it was a long process, but I really wanted to get his thoughts because I didn't have the design training, and that's what I learned from him in that situation and all the way through when he was my boss.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Well, that's why I asked about the process, because to talk about these things and to come up with a theoretical set of standards is one thing, blue rivers, etc., but deciding on the exact colors, the exact widths, the reason and how those colors interact with each other, you have to see that to know what you're aiming for.

Nancy Haack: We had a pretty good body of—

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, you're working with existing material and really pulling out those things that were working well.

Nancy Haack: Right. And the big influence he had, both in map standards and then later when I did — well, actually this was earlier. No, no, it was before digital but after the map standards. I did all the typography on the Yosemite map and I did it twice. I did it first how I wanted it, then Nick came in and guided me to do it how it should be. And that was when we took pieces of type on film and, actually, with a wax back, placed it on another piece of film, not a negative but a clear overlay.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Clear plastic.

Nancy Haack: Yeah. That was really the learning experience for me, to watch how his mind worked. And he would say, "Well, it should be this way, Nancy, because—," and he was always right about it.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, what were the kinds of things that he was aiming for, and how was it different from what you had done?

Nancy Haack: Okay. He was looking for much more of a grace of form. When you put an area label on, for example, the computer or a person who had no training would just plop it on there, but he would position it so it covered the area that it was identifying and there was no mistake of what it was. I mean, that sounds so obvious. Cartographers had all sorts of rules about the first position, the second position, where to put a label according to a town dot, and he didn't follow those rules. He went with what worked, how people could understand that that label went with the dot.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So how did that get embedded into standards then? How did all the cartographers, if there's up to six people, and Nick knows this intuitively as a designer how to make this work, how did that transition into a set of standards that everybody was up to that level of?

Nancy Haack: It was never that everybody was up to that level. I think because some people just didn't get it, what he was saying.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, was there a fallback then in terms of the standards, in terms of what you were describing? So, if the dot is here, it's on the left.

Nancy Haack: Oh, yeah, we didn't do that. We professionals said, "Forget about that. We're going to put it where it makes sense." Now, the classic example of that is the cartographic contractor did a map of Shenandoah National Park, and he had every single overlook labeled. It's what the park wanted. However, he didn't put the ones on the east side of the road on the east side.

Nancy Haack: He didn't put the labels on the same side of the road as the dot. The dot was on the correct side, but the labels weren't. They had to completely redo that map because both Nick and I said, "No, doesn't work." Because Nick was a map user, he knew it wasn't just how it looked. It looked fine, what we got from the contractor, but it wasn't usable. So, there's an example that we put a stop to that, and we did that somewhat in the office too. If there were things like that, it would be corrected.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, you and Nick were helping others understand these things, as well as contractors.

Nancy Haack: Well, yeah, but some people didn't like to take our advice. [laughter]

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Well, contractors have to listen to direction.

Nancy Haack: Yeah. No, they did, they did, yeah. They would. Of course, it always was the issue of they had a set job with a set payment, and if we added lots of hours of work, there's always a conflict, yeah.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, the standards aren't necessarily a document that's sitting on a shelf somewhere. The standards are kind of an agreement among—

Nancy Haack: It's big picture, totally. Now, we have something that's called the Standards that we would give out to people, but you would have trouble making a map that looked just like our maps using only that. Sure.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Interesting.

Nancy Haack: Just like editorial standards, right?

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Right. Well, but editorial standards certainly that we rely on, things like the Chicago [Manual of] Style and that. So, there's bodies of work out there that we can just borrow heavily from.

Nancy Haack: Right, right.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Oh, yes, this was a good one. Make sure I don't miss any good questions here.

Nancy Haack: Okay. I'm still looking.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, this has to do with one of the awards that you received. There's a quote from that award, that "your thoughtful questioning and insightful analysis helped illuminate what the specific role and purpose was for each map." So, help us understand what you were aiming for and how others received your ideas.

Nancy Haack: Okay. This goes back to Robinson and Petchenik with the system of communication. One of my favorite things is before I came, there was a little map, a little diagram made for Mound City in Ohio, and they needed a map of Ohio, is what the editor told the cartographer. And there was a map of Ohio there, but—

END OF FILE 1

START OF FILE 2

Nancy Haack: — nothing on that map of Ohio had anything to do with what was on the text or what the point of the park was or anything like that. So that is just in a nutshell what I had to do, felt I had to do to make it a communication device, is the map and the text had to agree. The map had to have a purpose. Our maps were visitor-use maps, and, yes, it might be nice to know this or that, but does a visitor need to know that?

Nancy Haack: So, some parks are very welcoming. Other parks were pretty set in their ways. If it was a new map, it was easier to have a highly edited map, because the genius of the map is what's not on it. We had a map done by a contractor of Mesa Verde and it showed the sewage lagoons. Betsy's heard this. We didn't need to show the sewage lagoons for the visitors, but it was complete. So that's the sort of thing to think about. A map doesn't have to show everything. It shouldn't show everything.

Nancy Haack: It has to have a reason, whether you're driving around or you're highlighting where things happened or—

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, parks are notorious for wanting everything on the map.

Nancy Haack: Everything, everything.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, talk about ways you helped convince them of this careful editing. And how did you help them let go of things that you felt were not contributing to the purpose and focus of the map?

Nancy Haack: I think the proof is when they saw the map and they could read it. I think that's what swayed them. So, there wasn't a lot of "No, no, no" on my part. It was taking in all the information, creating the appropriate map.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, showing them the ideal map that you intend and then letting them judge it on its own merits rather than showing them sort of the bad example, the overarching example.

Nancy Haack: Correct, correct.

Lu Ann Jones: Can I ask? I mean, the idea — this is fascinating. So, the idea that the map is telling a story, I mean, is part of the — it's giving you information, but it's telling you a story. So, was that something that you had to help people understand, that your map was part of the story, that they would—?

Nancy Haack: Oh, yes, absolutely. Absolutely. It wasn't just a separate thing. And because it was part of the brochure, it all had to work together, yes. Particularly in the historic maps, the story was even a bigger part. In a natural area, you had to make sure that what the text discussed was certainly on the map, but it wasn't as intertwined as an historical thing where there are many, many things that could have been chose to be shown. The visitor-use map, it's different than a map up on a wall, it's different than a map in a book, it's different than a map in an exhibit.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: You worked on maps for exhibits and Waysides and other media. Did you—

Nancy Haack: A couple of movies, yeah. [laughs]

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, talk about how those are different and what you—

Nancy Haack: Well, they had to be even simpler than the brochure map, because people had less time to look at them. And I think that there was a lot of pushback about that, because people are always proud of their facilities or their park, and they want to show everything, and often those maps were larger than the brochure map, so they felt more things could go on them.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Didn't some of the standards for your traditional paper map change for things like Wayside maps, which are not necessarily going to have a north-oriented map and—

Nancy Haack: Oh, correct, correct.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: — that ongoing conversation about what the direction of the map should be.

Nancy Haack: And once again, it's a visitor-use map, so it has to be how they understand it. If you're standing looking north, a north-oriented map is fine, or if you're standing and the map is a big overview and you're not really looking at anything, a north-oriented map is fine, but if you're looking at something, the map better be oriented just as the vision is. And that's been an ongoing fight, and I'm sure it's still going on today. The people don't get it. Like a trailhead, you want it to be going out and coming back as you're looking.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Yeah, I think it's a decision that has to be made with each map that's made, but it also seems like it's a bit against convention, and so you have to be a cartographer with a broad enough mind to see that there's a difference here, and you have to let go of that convention of north at the top.

Nancy Haack: Right. And that's just a convention that's pretty longstanding. Now, I don't have enough education to know in the last two hundred years if that truly is worldwide or not. That certainly is what I was taught, but I don't know if that's true. Australians always pointedly make south at the top, just to make the point to us, but whether they really use maps like that, I don't know.

Nancy Haack: But another exhibit type of map which fell out of great favor and now is back, I can tell you from my recent park visits, are the 3-D relief maps. I was thrilled to see them all over the place, old ones, new ones, metal ones, painted ones. I think people relate to those and that that tells a story better than a Unigrid map can, better than a flat map on the wall of the exhibit.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: I was thinking something to address one of the things that we struggle with, which is accessibility of maps, so people who have limited vision can touch a relief map and get a better sense of a place.

Nancy Haack: But it's good for everybody, I think.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Yes.

Nancy Haack: And people who can't necessarily read a paper map often get the relief map more so. Maybe not completely, but more so.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: And is that just because it looks like the landscape?

Nancy Haack: Right. That's exactly right.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Doesn't look like a map.

Nancy Haack: Correct. Correct.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, it breaks through for the brains that just can't interpret a map.

Nancy Haack: Right. It's a big breakthrough for them. It's a different way of looking at it, and I was thrilled to see that, because for years I would hear from people on exhibits, "Oh, those are old-fashioned. Those are old-fashioned."

Nancy Haack: And I was like, "Oh, but they're so great." [laughter]

Nancy Haack: I made a big map of South America out of salt dough when I was in middle school. It was a relief map with the Andes, and I painted it. [laughter]

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, did you have a hand in any projects when you were in the Park Service, with relief maps or—

Nancy Haack: Just on the side, just giving advice. I would have never directed it.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Talk a little bit about maps that aren't necessarily for direction or orientation, but thematic maps, things are, say, to understand a Civil War battle that involves multiple troop movements over the course of a day.

Nancy Haack: [laughs] Which makes me scream. There are many, many excellent battle maps out there, which most people, even map readers, can't understand, and they don't need to understand, right? We don't need to know where so-and-so stopped and tied his shoe on the way to the left oblique or whatever. [laughs] But the Civil War buffs need to know that. That's what the difference is. I ran into a lot of pushback from Civil War people because I didn't want to have maps that looked like that. I wanted maps that would just briefly tell the big picture and move on. If somebody wanted to know where a particular regiment was, there were tons of maps other places. They don't need it in the brochure map or even in an exhibit map that way. There are tons of places they can find that.

Nancy Haack: So, the whole thing was, once again, simplify, simplify. Our late great Publications historian, Ray Baker, was excellent at summing up all — he knew all the little details, but he could sum up the big picture better than a lot of parks could, and that's what led me to realize you could make a very simple map, what we would call multiples, small multiples or series of maps showing change over time, and it would be a snapshot of that time.

Nancy Haack: The only way to really show battle action is with animation, and we couldn't do that in a brochure. The films do a great job of that. That's where you show what happened in the battle, because you really show the troops moving back and forth.

Nancy Haack: The other thing Civil War buffs didn't like is I didn't use all the traditional battle symbols. I used arrows, but there are lots of crazy rectangles with slashes through them and things that meant things to people who knew the code, and even putting a legend wasn't good enough. We found out real early that people read the width of the line as the number of troops, even if you didn't intend that, so we were very careful after that to not show — sometimes you show a wide base because they were coming from a big area. Well, visitors read that as many more people.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, one of the things you just mentioned is getting at, I think, what you were credited for, as being a visitor advocate. So even though all these Civil War buffs go to Civil War parks, why shouldn't we have the Civil War buff map in the brochure? And that's where the conversation about who your audience is and—

Nancy Haack: Right.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: How do you advocate for that visitor and you've only been to the park only once on your site visit—

Nancy Haack: Well, wait a minute.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: — and you've become the advocate. So, talk about—

Nancy Haack: I didn't go to parks. I didn't go to parks for a long time. It was awful. I made maps of these places without going to the parks for the Park Service. I'd been to a lot of them on my own time. So that was another issue that to be a visitor advocate was really difficult when I was never a visitor, but I'd been enough places that I knew that most visitors were very ill-informed. They didn't know the names of the Civil War generals and who they fought for. There was a lot of stuff there that the park staff took for granted. They gave too much credit to the visitors.

Nancy Haack: Plus, the revolutionary parks said everyone thought they were a Civil War park anyway. [laughs]

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, this goes back to your early family vacations.

Nancy Haack: Right. We went to all those places. [laughs]

Elizabeth Ehrlich: That's the root of your being a visitor advocate.

Nancy Haack: Sure, sure, and my dad was interested in all that stuff. He really was the one who would say, "This happened here and that happened there, and those bad guys came from this side." [laughs] That's all I needed to know. Gettysburg is the worst, because the three days, very different action, it really is the worst trying to tell anybody about. And even more so than the map, the tour of the place has gone back and forth from being chronological to being geographical, then chronological again. Geographical is what it has finally landed at, last time I was there, at least, because no one is going to backtrack. Why would they backtrack because some action took place where you're standing? Three days later there's also an action. You're not going to come back there.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, you're talking about the way the brochure conveys the story or—

Nancy Haack: Well, the map was integral to that. We had little battle maps on the Gettysburg brochure, which were one for each day, a snapshot, but as you traveled around, the descriptions and the bullets for the tour stops are what people were really using for the visit to understand what happened. So, the purists wanted it to be the battle, and the practical people wanted it to be how you would travel. So, yeah, those were the biggest challenges.

Lu Ann Jones: How did you make maps if you weren't able to—?

Nancy Haack: It's magic. [laughs] No, a lot of research, a lot of research, and we didn't have the Internet for research, lots of books. The thing that was so great about Ray Baker, this historian I mentioned, is you could go in and ask him any question about anything, not just history, and he'd turn around and get a book off his shelf and give it to you. [laughs] So it was a treasure trove, a treasure trove of information.

Nancy Haack: I'm an information-driven person. I wasn't going to just haphazardly do something. Those historians at my first job in Chicago said, "Somebody knows. You can't put, for example, a French and Indian War fort here. Somebody there knows where that was." There's so much local history that just at that time wasn't available unless you went locally. Now you can get a lot of it on the Internet. So that really made me stop and think that it's serious what you put on a map, and I also felt because we were the National Park Service, we certainly weren't going to put anything on the map that we weren't sure of. Also, when it became digital, once you had an incorrect map, even if you corrected it the next year, that map lived forever.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: It's out there somewhere.

Nancy Haack: It's out there somewhere, right, because we did share all our maps. Once we went digital, they were up online so anyone could use them anytime.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, Ray Baker was an historian and a writer and had a robust library. Talk about your sources, pre-digital, and then how that evolved once libraries kind of fell out of favor. In fact, the library that you probably used as a resource isn't there anymore.

Nancy Haack: All the time. All the time, I used our library at Harpers Ferry Center. I always enjoyed it because it was such an oddball collection of stuff, because it was all specialized to Park Service sites and needs. I was there a lot, and they did a lot of interlibrary loans for me. They got a lot of specialized atlases for me.

Nancy Haack: I remember trying to figure out — I think it was for San Juan Islands — something about the ownership of different islands north of that in British Columbia, and, boy, they went out of their way to get me resources. Had to contact Canada, even, because we didn't know whose jurisdiction that was, whether it was a British Columbia province or, you know, all different things. So, yeah, we went to the sources to find these things out. Lots of time on the phone, sure, talking to people who know.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Were those people often in the parks, or did you have to go — like in terms of the number of historians and the people who were really well versed in the stories of the parks, were they in the parks or did you have to—

Nancy Haack: Usually in the parks, and usually you knew who you could trust, but occasionally there'd be a university person they'd refer you to, sure. Yeah, it was all different, way different than now. You just push a button and the answer comes up. [laughs] We're watching TV and I'm always pushing a button to say, "Oh, what's that?" [laughter] It's terrible to have this quest for information. Why can't I just relax and enjoy the show, right? [laughter]

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So that was part of why Vince Gleason had hired you, was because that was what you were bringing to the table that wasn't necessarily part of the cartographic process at the time.

Nancy Haack: Correct.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: And was that amount of research and in-depth work before making a map, was that always supported through your whole career? Did you see that evolve over time?

Nancy Haack: What do you mean, supported?

Elizabeth Ehrlich: In terms of the amount of time that you had spent doing research.

Nancy Haack: Later, there were a time when money, money, money, budget, budget, budget, nobody wanted anybody to do any research about anything, which drove me crazy, and, of course, I continued as much as I could to do that, but that was also when the Internet came, so it was sort of a balance that things were faster. Vince was always very supportive of that. Sure. He didn't question what I did. He understood, because he'd seen other places I had worked, why I had that mindset.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, when you're working on a brochure with a writer and a designer, are you sharing that knowledge, sharing resources, having regular meetings to talk about, you know, the kind of work that you're doing, or did you feel like it was a little bit more independent?

Nancy Haack: It depended on the group. Once again, personality driven. My ideal was the three as an equal, each as an equal player. And later when we traveled, I always insisted on traveling with the other two. We needed the same park experience to produce a coherent brochure.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, what was the transition? What happened that you weren't traveling at first and then you were able to travel?

Nancy Haack: I don't know. I have no idea. I did go out to Golden Gate in the eighties, which I have no idea — I think Golden Gate probably paid for me to go there, which was really great because it made a difference to the map, a very complicated map, lots of different sites. But I don't know how that happened. Only very few people, and basically only men, traveled, of the writer/editors.

Nancy Haack: There was a classic time when I was working on — we already had started traveling, working on Martin Luther King in Atlanta, and Vince would not send either me or the editor, who was a woman, down there, and we were like, "What?" [laughs] The woman at the park, the chief ranger, went around and did all that research for me, went around and field-checked it for me. That's the only way we could make that map is to have someone on the ground and walk around, because a city, everything's constantly changing. So, I finally did get there later on Park money.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: On Park money?

Nancy Haack: And my own money, too, but Park money too. [laughter]

Lu Ann Jones: Did he think it was dangerous or—

Nancy Haack: Yes, yes, yeah, sure, sure. And often he'd let us go someplace for a day, if you could go to Catoctin or Gettysburg or Shenandoah for a day, maybe you'd get to go, but he was not for anyone traveling, any of his regular workers. Some of his higher chiefs, they got to travel occasionally. And even to Washington, that was a big deal to go to Washington.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, he recognized the importance of the research.

Nancy Haack: Yeah.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: But not primary first-person on-site research.

Nancy Haack: Correct. Correct. Right. Spent a lot of time on the phone with the people in the park asking questions to find out why their current map doesn't work, when it would have taken me two seconds if I was there to see why it didn't work. [laughs]

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Well, there's a couple phrases that I know you've used, and I've heard, and I'd love you to talk about them a little bit. I think you've talked a little bit about the term "professional cartographer" as sort of your starting place. You mentioned a "map head." Can you talk about that?

Nancy Haack: A map head is someone who just loves maps, but usually not in the "I just love maps." [laughter] It's someone who appreciates maps all around for a reflection of our society. There are so many cool maps out there, maps that people have made to show their point of view, propaganda maps and social maps and war maps and things like that that stop people in their tracks. I mean, I used to spend a lot of time when I was a kid looking at the globe, because most people think of a map as being flat. Well, the globe is the ultimate map. And that terrible fear of the Soviet Union and coming over the Pole, they are really close to us from that point of view. You see that on the globe.

Nancy Haack: So, map heads encompass people who make maps, people who collect maps, people who just plain like to read maps, and it's just such a nice term for a community. It's like being a sports fan, a community. Everyone has a different — some people live and die by a particular team, and other people just enjoy sports in general. But it's a fun term. I didn't make it up; I read it in the paper. [laughter]

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Well, and the other that I think you talked around a little bit is the napkin map.

Nancy Haack: The napkin map. We love the napkin map. The napkin map works if you're showing me how to get to your house. You draw it on a napkin, and it's got enough detail that I know where to turn and all that.

Nancy Haack: We had lots of napkin maps when I was — came to the parks, and they were often not successful, those one-, two-, and three-color maps, because they didn't put it in a bigger context of where you were coming from and where you were going, and they weren't true geographically. They weren't — I'll use the big word — planimetrically accurate, which really means three points. If you get three points in the correct relationship to each other, then everything else falls into the correct place. So, a napkin map never has three points the same, except for one, and I'm trying to think if it was Fredericksburg. Somebody drew me a napkin map, it's the only source we had, and we used it. Then when I got real data, it was just about spot on. Every other napkin map—

Elizabeth Ehrlich: It was probably a buff, right?

Nancy Haack: Yeah, a Civil War guy. Sure, sure, yeah. And, you know, once again, maps have all sorts of uses. That's fine. That's no problem to use a napkin map, but not when people are coming at it with different questions and different points of view. It needs to be correct because they need to know where they are. [laughs]

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, the napkin map is a source for an NPS map from somebody who's in the field since you haven't been in the field.

Nancy Haack: Right, right. It was very suspect all the way around, and there weren't good data. Park Service was notorious for not having good knowledge of what they had. Sure. Now, that's really changed now. This whole digital revolution of map data, which in the United States is totally free to anybody, is wonderful. We know where everything is. Even things we're not supposed to know about, we know where it is, because it's all free and open. And aerial photographs of everything. I'm always looking at aerial photographs on Google, where I'm going or where they're putting that road. Sure, it's all out there.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: That's what Street View is, right?

Nancy Haack: Street View is really great. [laughter] My husband and his sisters spend hours on the phone on Street View looking at different places they had lived as kids. "Oh, look at that!"

Elizabeth Ehrlich: [Inaudible].

Nancy Haack: Right. [laughter] So I, for one, love all the digital advances in mapping. I'm not at all threatened by the handcrafted being a way, not at all threatened by data coming from other sources.

Nancy Haack: It's the question of it better be correct, and that if you look at an atlas and you look at an area you know and it's wrong, you can be pretty sure the rest of the book is wrong too. So, you have to bring some knowledge always, too, when you're reading a map.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Okay. This might change the conversation a little bit.

Nancy Haack: Uh-oh.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: How about design-driven publications?

Nancy Haack: [laughs] I don't know what to say about that.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: You talked about your relationship with Nick, and I think that's really important to emphasize the design aspect of cartography. But I think in terms of the office, the Unigrid publications program, the term "design-driven" has been there, and I don't know if it's always sort of been consistently used. It's just a term that I've heard off and on and used to describe how the work proceeds in the office. In other words, its design driven. And so how that meshes with cartography—

Nancy Haack: Well, sometimes the map doesn't get what it needs or sometimes the map is allotted too big a space because of the design of the overall thing, and that's something that if you have a good group, a three-person group, you can work through. Sometimes the map is asked to do something it can't do, and they have to substitute for a written tour or something like that. But, no, definitely. No, Vince had a design office. It was not an editorial office. Sure, and it wasn't a map office either.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Even though you had historians who had time to research and cartographers who had time to research, it was still considered a design-driven process.

Nancy Haack: Right, right. But some of the designers also worked off of that research.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: I would [unclear].

Nancy Haack: I would hope so, yeah. Some people weren't interested in that early on, in my experience. But then most of the people I worked with, that was all part of what prompted their design solution, I would call it, to the problem. Sure.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: It seems an interesting term when, in fact, a lot of what we hear out in the field coming from parks and visitors is that they want the map.

Nancy Haack: I heard that.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: They're getting the brochure. They want the whole piece of paper, but they call it a map. They don't call it a brochure.

Nancy Haack: The printers say that. All these national parks we just visited, we were away for six weeks, it was always, "You want the map? Where'd you get the map?" [laughs] Because I had them all with me. I got them before we left. [laughs] Because some of them, there was such heavy visitation, they had run out of the brochures. So, I was glad I had them ahead of time.

Nancy Haack: But yeah, the map is what people use. What my view is, people use the map onsite. They use the rest of the brochure later, and then they finally read it and look at the pictures and understand. So, I think that's why I think it's referred to as the map. Sure. And that's no disservice to the rest of the brochure. [laughs] It's still design-driven, because they want that as a souvenir, the whole brochure, and the black band is really important to them, and the consistency of it all. I mean, it was a brilliant program compared to what we had in the seventies. Sure.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: I understand it's become popular to put your stamp—

Nancy Haack: Right on there, yes.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: — on the brochure.

Nancy Haack: We saw that on our trip.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Never mind the little notebooks that you can put your stamp in. You put it right on the brochure.

Nancy Haack: Correct, yep.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, another term that may steer us a little bit differently as well, the Reprint Committee. You're on the Reprint Committee. Just talk about the whole publishing, reprinting, the life of a map, when you know that—

Nancy Haack: Okay, I've got some notes here.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: — everything's going to be evolving over the life of that map.

Nancy Haack: Absolutely. Betsy is absolutely right. Most people don't understand that those maps were living — no, I don't see the notes about that — living documents. So, every year a park had an opportunity to update, change, or correct — all three of those things — what was in the whole brochure: text, photo, the map, items on the map. And for years, the chief editorial guy would get this stuff in and would just assign it to be done.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: The changes.

Nancy Haack: The changes. There wasn't evaluation of this stuff. And I certainly saw — I was alarmed — what was going on with the maps, because one park put the glaciers on, took the glaciers off, put the glaciers back on.

Nancy Haack: This was a lot of money, plus no big-picture view of why the glacier should or should not be there. It was individual requests, and the park staff knew they could get it done for free. So that was part of what prompted the Reprint Committee, plus it also made a more fair distribution of who was going to do the work, which was very important. Once again, some people are faster than others, things like that.

Nancy Haack: I loved the Reprint Committee, because I loved seeing what the parks' solutions were when we really needed to know what the problem was, and that's what I think was the big breakthrough in the Reprint Committee, because then there was a conversation with the park about, "Why do you need this change? Talk to me." In fact, I was even — this is when we finally got to travel — sent to a—

END OF FILE 2

START OF FILE 3

Nancy Haack: — couple places, because they just couldn't express — everything was wrong. They couldn't express why the brochure didn't work, and I got there, and I saw why. No one had ever been there and the map, for one thing, was completely incorrect, based on some document from WASO, I'm sure. It was a small history park. The text really didn't support what there was to see. So that was really great that those little parks got some attention they might not have gotten otherwise, once the Reprint Committee started.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, your team, as a Reprint Committee, would call each park, or just those for which you had questions about their changes? How did that work?

Nancy Haack: Well, if it was really, really confusing, we did it, but if it was just regular routine stuff, the person assigned to do the job was the contact. Sure. But often we would say, "We're not doing that."

Nancy Haack: One of my favorite ones is constant requests for detail maps. So, I had to convince them that the public didn't need to know where the ice machine was on the brochure map. That wasn't the function of the brochure map. Usually when you were there, you looked around, you could see everything, so it was a waste of time and money, but people were so in love with maps, they thought that that was a solution. Of course, the percentage of people who couldn't read the map, anyway, it didn't reach; that information didn't get to them. So, we still had detail maps that showed you where the ice machine is, but not as many as—

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Or parking lot maps [unclear].

Nancy Haack: Parking lot maps, yes, the famous parking lot maps that show you how to get to the Visitor Center. I'm sorry. We all go to shopping malls. We find our way into the stores, right? [laughter] So there are a lot of unnecessary maps.

Nancy Haack: The other thing is sometimes written directions are more important or easier for everyone to understand than a map. If you're in an urban area, it's much better to have a written direction to tell you what lane to get in, tell you to look for the sign to Trader Joe's before you turn, something like that.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: And signs are something that I don't think I've [unclear].

Nancy Haack: No, it's not on the list. [laughs]

Elizabeth Ehrlich: But I can ask you.

Nancy Haack: Oh, yeah. Well, I am a bigmouth about signs.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: We evolved a new sign program, and I'm not exactly sure I remember when this sign program became part of Harpers Ferry Center, but it seems to me that even before that, you must have had some involvement with the parks in terms of making recommendations about signage.

Nancy Haack: Well, Mesa Verde is the one that comes to mind, is no one could figure out how to leave that park. [laughs] They'd come to these intersections and there'd be a sign to here, a sign to there, but no sign to park exit, no sign to the Visitor Center, no sign to anything known to visitors, and the park staff actually were very grateful — Bill Gorden was the editor out there with me — very grateful to us because Bill and I had traveled quite a bit and cursed out signs everywhere we went, particularly in non-park areas in New England. We thought the signs were sort of like downtown Washington, D.C., how horrible they are. So, Mesa Verde, they took our advice, they changed the signs, and now people can leave. [laughter]

Nancy Haack: But the maps on the sign program have always been a big concern to me, because, once again, people aren't looking at them for very long. Now, I think most of all this is no longer an issue, with the reliance on GPS. I mentioned that we have our young cousin staying with us. He was driving to a Dulles Airport to go home for Thanksgiving, and I was giving him directions. "I've got my GPS, Nancy. You don't have to tell me anything." Now, around here, GPS is going to be correct. Out by the parks, it isn't true, it's not going to be correct, and it's been a big problem for years and years. But I think that's where the difference with for general transportation people, people don't use maps. We went to a family reunion, gave out a map to people, how to get to the place. Everybody used their GPS. Nobody looked at the map.

Nancy Haack: Going around a park, I'm sure some people are using GPS also, but they're not getting the points of interest that we want them to see. Everything's on an equal level, something like that.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, in terms of the quality of signs — you've been out traveling since you retired — do you see a difference in or an improvement or a change in the nature of signage to aid in the prevention of parking lot maps or to aid in the simplification of what a brochure map can do, based on the reliance that there will be good signage in the park?

Nancy Haack: Oh, that's interesting, because I always say that someplace like the South Rim of the Grand Canyon, it doesn't matter. You can make every map in the world any size, with any detail, and nobody can find their way around there, because it's not what you would expect. It's unintuitive. They've got better signs there now than they used to, but it's still very confusing. They do have signs how to get out of the place, so that's helpful there.

Nancy Haack: But basically, I would say that the sign program, what I saw in the — I don't know how many parks we went to — is really more concentrated on signage of buildings and park entrances, not on directional in parks. So, I don't see an improvement in telling you how you need to go. Now, we did not go to Yellowstone, for example. That's a major place people need to go to different places. And we didn't go to the Grand Canyon this time. We didn't go to the South Rim. So, Zion, the signs are fine, for example.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Yeah, they're relatively — they had a good sign system put in when they had a new Visitor Center put in.

Nancy Haack: Right, right. But basically, I don't see — usually I say you don't need a map if you have good signs, because you rely on what you see on the ground. You see a building that looks like the Visitor Center, you head toward it. You see parking spaces, you pull in, right? [laughs]

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Which all seems like common sense, and it wouldn't be that difficult, but it isn't that easy, and I don't know if that—

Nancy Haack: Well, people want reassurance. They want reassurance. Now, we missed the turnoff for Black Canyon of the Gunnison because it was the world's littlest sign, and I knew it was coming up. I knew it was a left turn because I had my GPS. And we zipped right by it because I was expecting a warning sign and then a big sign, and there was just a little sign like you might have seen for someone's fruit stand. I mean, it was a real sign, but—

Elizabeth Ehrlich: It was undersized for the scale of the road.

Nancy Haack: Or the importance of it, I thought. Don't people want to go to the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park? Yes. [laughter] So I think signs are still a big issue, and they're expensive. They're more expensive than maps. Also, if it's not within the park, it's very difficult for the park to get signage either put up or changed, because they don't administer those signs.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So back to the reprints and the changes that have to get made as these things improve. It seems to me if the problem the park is presenting you is people are missing the turn and they want something bigger and bolder on the map—

Nancy Haack: Right. It's not going to help. [laughter]

Elizabeth Ehrlich: But if you haven't been there, you wouldn't know that the sign was undersized for the road. They have a sign there.

Nancy Haack: Correct. One of the stories is that the park staff said, "Turn after the bridge." Nobody turns after the bridge. We tell them to turn after the bridge." When I finally got there, the bridge was on the same level as the road with very low sides, so you even didn't know you were going over a bridge. There's a lot of foliage around. I mean, you just didn't have any concept you'd gone over the bridge. So, I didn't think — they were trying to say the visitors were stupid, and I figured the visitors were not stupid. I figured there was something onsite that was not as the park saw it.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, all of this, this is just so wonderful. I'm so glad we have this on tape. But I also know that you were a fantastic teacher, instructor—

Nancy Haack: Well, thank you.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: — helping people understand these kinds of concepts and how to think about maps and navigation and understanding your landscape. But are there any things that you haven't already touched on, key points that you know were those critical things that when you taught the "Producing NPS Publications" class that these are the things that this class should probably walk away with or I have missed my opportunity?

Nancy Haack: Okay. I'm looking at my notes just quick here, but I don't know if I have that here. Because I did a little thing about the — I don't have anything right here. But I would say the whole thing was — my big concern was to have a really open mind about maps, that the maps had to be simple, maps couldn't do everything. A lot of people wanted the maps to do everything for them, then they wouldn't have to put any text or pictures or anything in, that would be the whole story of how to visit the park.

Nancy Haack: I would say don't be afraid of the map, which most people were afraid of the map, afraid they might do it wrong or afraid their boss wouldn't like it, those two things.

Nancy Haack: I think the typography really was more important than the lines, what we taught the rangers. Rangers really had no reason to know anything about design or cartography, but yet once desktop publishing came around, their bosses wanted them to produce these things. So that was the biggest value of the class is to make them feel as though it was possible, with guidance, to make something and make something in a system.

Nancy Haack: It didn't have to be what I always called a cartoon map. Yosemite had a series of cartoon maps for the Valley, which confused me terribly, because they actually were adjacent to each other in reality, but the cartoon maps in their handout were close but not in the right geographic relationship, so you wanted to connect them. Once you'd been there, you knew that that store was there and that was there. You wanted to connect them, but you couldn't.

Nancy Haack: So those were the kinds of pitfalls that I think we tried to tell people in the Pubs class, but I also wanted them to embrace their own strength. People who thought they couldn't do maps, we had them draw the map from home to work, and some of them were extremely detailed, some of them were very simple, and some of them weren't even completed because people were so terrified of drawing them.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: You also talked about the mistake of being too focused sort of on the design because we work within this design system, the Unigrid system, the site bulletin design system, and the sort of "map goes here" mistake, which is to just create a box and come back to it later and just fill it in with some sort of a map.

Nancy Haack: Right. It was often an afterthought. And still in publishing, they suddenly say, "Oh, my god, I need the map of Ohio," rather than having it be integrated into the rest of the publication. Don't have it if it doesn't do a job.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: And if you've left too small a box for a big map. So, it's back to the map drives the design or the design drives the map. They're coming in at the same place, it seems to me, that based on what you're describing, you can't oversize or undersize a map, so unless you know what's going on with the map, you don't know what you're dealing with in terms of the size and shape and scale of the piece of paper.

Nancy Haack: And one of the things we talked about early on was the importance of showing the entire park. Now, there are a few brochures that we don't show the entire park, but we saw it as a document of record that you should show the entire park. Even if no one goes to that northwest corner because there are no roads that is still part of the park. There's always somebody who's out there. [laughs]

Nancy Haack: So I think there are a lot of things that someone who isn't used to making a publication for the general public needs to consider, and the first thing is their audience, and the second thing is the map, the purpose of the map, because they could very well not even need one because there's the Unigrid map there, which most people do get.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, the size and shape of the paper, the page size, did you feel like you had a kind of a primary role in the beginning of the conversation about a new brochure to determine the size and shape?

Nancy Haack: Oh, yes. Oh, yeah, absolutely, because of those crazy sizes and shapes of the parks.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: And the scale that you might need to convey what's necessary.

Nancy Haack: Right. The Herbert Hoover map, which is his birthplace and little village and his gravesite in Iowa, I've never been there, still haven't — drove right by it, didn't stop — was vastly over-scaled on the map. I figured this out on a reprint request. People weren't walking over to the gravesite, and there was limited parking over there, so as a result, people drove over there, and there wasn't any parking and they left. So, they missed that part, when they could have easily walked over there. I mean, it would be within anybody's — it would be like the shopping mall from one end to the other. It was not outrageous to ask people to walk that far. That was an example of the whole map was way over-scaled, so people looked at it, everything was really big, so it looked like this distance, a few inches, was miles when it was probably a quarter of a mile to walk to it. And that was done before I had any influence on this stuff and changed after I realized that in a reprint what was going on. So that's a danger when people would make maps to fit the whole rather than the appropriate size. Sure.

Nancy Haack: What else does she have for me? [laughs]

Lu Ann Jones: Interesting.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: You've been so thorough and [unclear].

Nancy Haack: Oh, here. Here's more about the Publications. Let me just see what I see about the Publication classes. This is backing up a little bit.

Lu Ann Jones: That's fine.

Nancy Haack: I say, "Good intentioned rangers were producing dreadful items for the public." [laughter] And I got one on this trip, a really dreadful handout. One thing that we stressed, Betsy and Tom Haraden and I, was the importance of considering the National Park System as a whole, not just their little park, because people go from park to park to park, and the consistency of that, just like the Unigrids were consistent, was, in part, important for the publications, the secondary publications to be consistent and that I wanted, once again, the simplified map.

Nancy Haack: The rangers had no reason to know any of this. [laughs] And I would like to say that the class was on a complete shoestring, was always touch-and-go if it was going to happen, and that my later boss, Melissa Cronyn, always supported me, paid my salary, paid my travel, and that was a real gift. Now, she had worked on a similar class years before and knew how important it was for the rangers, and the rangers had no reason to know this stuff and it wasn't part of what was in their training to know it. So, it was a very valuable class.

Lu Ann Jones: Where did you teach it?

Nancy Haack: Everywhere. More often than not, out of Zion National Park, because the lead on the class, that was where he was stationed, and he didn't have any money for travel. But occasionally someone would pay for him to travel, and we went to various locations, wherever the need arose. [laughs]

Nancy Haack: Had to get a group together to teach that class, and I taught it without Betsy. Tom and I taught it for a long time, and I was alarmed at some of the design principles that were being thrown out there. I knew we needed Betsy there to really become more professional, I'll say, even, more respectful of the design profession. Just like Tom wanted me there for the mapping. He always had liked maps, he was a "map head," but he didn't know many things that — they're not tricks, but they're just something a cartographer knows.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: And once I had to teach without Nancy.

Nancy Haack: Right, because they wouldn't pay. Who wouldn't pay?

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Great Smokies. It was at Great Smokies.

Nancy Haack: Was it Melissa [who] wouldn't pay? I don't remember. Wow!

Elizabeth Ehrlich: I don't recall the circumstances why that didn't happen.

Nancy Haack: But she always would. Maybe she wasn't the boss or something. I don't know.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: It's possible, because they were in a lot of transition.

Nancy Haack: Oh, yes, yes, that's exactly right. She was not my boss at that time. I do remember that now, yeah. Correct.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: And Tom and I did our best to be Nancy. [laughter] We had all your material, and you were very helpful in trying to make all those points, but it wasn't nearly as much fun.

Nancy Haack: Yes, and it was a hands-on class. That's what was so great about this class. Students actually had to do all this work. So, yeah, that's what that situation was. Boy, how soon we forget. I've had many bosses over the years, same job, same job title, same office, but lots of bosses with reorganizations and things.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, as you travel now, do you see the results of [unclear]?

Nancy Haack: Oh, yeah. I collect all that stuff. [laughs] Newspapers and—

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Still room for more classes?

Nancy Haack: Oh, yeah, there's still need for help, particularly this one. It was that Little Bighorn Battlefield. Both the brochure, which Ray and I worked on 100 years ago and virtually has not been changed since we made it probably in the eighties, and the handout that they gave you, because the brochure was inadequate, both are inadequate for the visit. Now, luckily, they have wonderful seasonal rangers. We had a great experience there because of the ranger staff, but I was really dismayed when they handed me this map mess. [laughs]

Lu Ann Jones: Do you reveal to people who you are?

Nancy Haack: Oh, never, not even when I worked for — well, actually, I did at Zion. There was a young seasonal ranger I talked to, and he said, "You know, you sound really informed about it."

Nancy Haack: I said, "Well, I am retired." But otherwise, I never—

Lu Ann Jones: Yeah, I always go as a civilian, and I say, "Yeah."

Nancy Haack: Correct. I go as a visitor, and they'd better give me the same story they're giving anybody else, you know. [laughs]

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, when you first came to the Park Service, what were your first impressions of not just the cartographic group, you sort of described that, but of the agency and of your office?

Nancy Haack: Oh, I was in total awe. Sure. I thought I had landed in heaven there. Sure. And the Harpers Ferry Center at that time was pretty freewheeling, no clocks. We didn't fill out timecards or anything like that.

Nancy Haack: Our office all came and went at the same time without any oversight of that, probably because of our boss, because of Vince Gleason. He expected you to be there if he needed you. Yeah, I thought that it was fantastic, but I really thought they needed my help. I was that tuned in to how poor the maps were. And that sounds egotistical, but, no, I had something I could contribute, is what my view was.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, it was an opportunity.

Nancy Haack: Opportunity, yes, that the right term. I should say it [was] that. It was a real challenge and a real opportunity.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: And they were mostly welcoming of what you had to—

Nancy Haack: Oh, almost everyone, except those three guys were not interested in dealing with me. Sure, sure.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, you just used the charm of your personality to win them over. [laughter]

Nancy Haack: Well, I always said I couldn't take my kids into work because they'd say, "Mommy, is that the guy?" [laughter] You know, you can't hide anything with kids, right? [laughter]

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, over the course of your career, how did those first impressions sort of evolve over time, and maybe as you were leaving, did you—

Nancy Haack: Oh, no, I still thought it was the greatest job ever. Oh, yeah. When I left, I was tired of all the bureaucracy and—

Elizabeth Ehrlich: We had clocks.

Nancy Haack: We had clocks. We had sign-ins. We had to do the timecards. We had to do all this stuff, plus, as Betsy mentioned, we had multiple bosses. So, during that time, you didn't know where you stood. I mean, people who knew me would certainly have supported that class, for example. There's no question it wasn't a boondoggle. It was harder than being at work. I was always exhausted by the end of the week, because you had to be "up" for five days straight and be ready to answer questions and sound like you knew something. [laughs]

Nancy Haack: No, I think the only thing, and we talked about it briefly — you've got a question about other committees and things. Do you want to talk about that now or not?

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Sure, yeah.

Nancy Haack: Okay. Well, I'm an optimist. Like I was saying, I can make a contribution. Well, time after time, I thought I could make a contribution. [laughter]

Nancy Haack: And two times I did. Two times they really were successful. One was very early in my career. I was on the Federal Women's Program Committee, which I don't know whatever happened to that.

Lu Ann Jones: I don't know.

Nancy Haack: I came back. After I had my children, I came back part-time, and I really didn't work on too many of these committees at that point. I had done this before then. And we did a survey — not a survey. We didn't talk to people. We collected data about the status of women in the Center, and there were people like me, professional women. And Vince, in particular, had quite a few professional women working in Publications, editors and designers.

Nancy Haack: But much to my horror, I saw in the data that most of the clerical people were part-time workers, thirty-five, thirty-two, thirty hours a week, but they came in five days a week. They got lesser benefits. They had to pay more for healthcare or health insurance. They didn't accrue their sick and annual leave as quickly, because that's based on the number of hours worked, and, of course, they suffered in their retirement. I actually was horrified. I thought, "This is the 1980s. How can this be true?"

Nancy Haack: I went to the manager before we wrote up our document, and I talked to him about it, and he said, "This isn't a problem, Nancy. These are good jobs. People are waiting in line for these jobs.

Nancy Haack: And I thought, "Whoa!" And they were all women. He certainly never would have done that to a man. I have to be frank. That's how I feel about it. We got that changed. HR changed it. Those people were converted; they became full-time employees. And I still don't know how that happened. I was out on maternity leave and this and that, but it happened, because we wrote a document. I don't know if that document still exists pointing this out. There was clerical, technical, and professional were the three groups of workers, and it was the clerical people, there was no question, they were not treated the same. So that was one good thing, the Federal Women's Program.

Nancy Haack: The second good thing which was — I blocked out most of it because it was such a horrible experience — was A-76 out — how do you say it?

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Competitive sourcing.

Nancy Haack: Competitive sourcing, right. Yeah. We were successful on that. It was a tremendous amount of work, and I do have to say JoAnne Grove, who was our contracting officer, was our angel who led us to being successful. We had to provide all the data, but she knew how to do it and we did not.

Nancy Haack: They wanted to contract out all the publications, because, of course, that's something the private sector does. They make publications. So, we proved — we had the data with work hours and costs of things to show that we were efficient. So that ended up to be positive, but getting through it, oh, we put in tons of late-night hours. And getting the data was often difficult because budget info varied and there were all different kinds of budgets for things.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So how long did that whole process take?

Nancy Haack: I don't know. It must have been several months. It was a long time.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Did you have to set your work aside to get it done?

Nancy Haack: Somewhat aside, yes. I really had to curtail my actual work, which, of course, upset me terribly, because that's what I wanted to do. I wanted to do things for the parks.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Kind of ruins the efficiency, too, I think.

Nancy Haack: Oh, yeah, totally, yeah.

Nancy Haack: So those were two successes. Other things I was involved in were EEO Council, which was just perfunctory, as far as I was concerned; the Diversity Council; and Aiming for Excellence. I was in all those things. Now, Betsy was in Aiming for Excellence. The Diversity Council, you asked specifically about that, and we started that. The manager arranged it, wanted us to hold his feet to the fire. "We're going to do something about this." We had all sorts of great ideas and speakers and—

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Do you remember what year, years, period of time that was?

Nancy Haack: Well, I would say it was pretty early. Oh, before 2005, I think around 2000, yeah. So, we had all sorts of great ideas for speakers to raise the consciousness of our workers, our editors, of these products we put out, that it wasn't just the European point of view, and on and on. And every single thing we suggested was thwarted. "No money, no money, no money" was what we always heard. "There's no budget for that." We did a few programs, which were really, I thought, superficial, weren't thought-provoking. We needed someone to really come and shake you and say, "Wait a minute. Your point of view, Mr. Civil War Historian, isn't everybody's point of view," you know.

Nancy Haack: But things have really changed, because at Glacier National Park we went to a pretty new exhibit that was made not just in consultation with the local tribes, but total participation. I mean, there was no question those people's actual voices were heard, saying things that the U.S. government would not want anyone to hear, and that was in the Visitor Center.

Nancy Haack: So, times have really changed. So, I can put aside my great disappointment about our Diversity Council not — it finally just dissolved because the manager didn't want to convene it anymore.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: But the manager had supported it initially.

Nancy Haack: Oh, yeah, yeah.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, in terms of forming a Diversity Council, there was the idea of doing the right thing.

Nancy Haack: Correct. And I think it was only an idea, personally, because we were considered to be troublemakers with a lot of the things we mentioned. One woman actually went and got a different job, she was so frustrated working at the Center. [laughs]

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Because of the Diversity Council?

Nancy Haack: Well, I think the diversity issues, I think. People weren't taken seriously if they didn't have the normal, the expected response to things. Sure, sure.

Nancy Haack: And then Aiming for Excellence, we'll let Betsy talk for a couple of days about that. But I actually—

Lu Ann Jones: And what was that?

Nancy Haack: Okay. This is the reorganization, and this is when I got the million bosses.

Lu Ann Jones: Is that in the nineties, that reorg or—

Nancy Haack: 2002.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Yeah, it was in the early 2000s.

Nancy Haack: 2002, I left one of those meetings early, and I just had to get signed in blood that I could leave, and I was even upset, because I wanted to make a contribution. It was my mother's eightieth birthday, and we had planned a trip out west. I had come to the morning session, but my plane left in the afternoon, and that was long planned before any of this stuff was set. But I remember feeling so upset that I was letting everybody down by leaving. [laughs] Well, it didn't make any difference that I missed that afternoon. [laughter]

Elizabeth Ehrlich: The idea, I think, was that it was a participatory reorganization, so all—

Nancy Haack: Participatory management. Participatory management.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: — employees at some level would participate in the management of the Center. And we had consultants who came in to help facilitate—

END OF FILE 3

START OF FILE 4

Elizabeth Ehrlich: — than direct the whole effort, and my feeling about it was that it was pretty directed before we got started, so that the way it was organized, we were being pushed all kind of to come to the same conclusion. And if you dissented from the direction, you were either pushed aside or there was some reason given why you were not listening properly.

Nancy Haack: Yeah, because I was there for — you know, you wrote a review. The participants wrote a review at the end of every day, and I was there for the evaluation of the reviews with the bosses and the contractors, and if there was one they didn't like, they'd say, "Oh, that guy's a troublemaker. That guy doesn't understand." And it wasn't. It was a perfectly rational statement of what had gone on that day. So, I agree with you totally, Betsy, that it was a really unfortunate time for morale for the employees.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Because you were enthusiastic about it.

Nancy Haack: Oh, of course. Of course.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: You felt committed to it. I felt enthusiastic and committed, and then we sort of realized we'd been had, and that's when you really hit rock bottom, because now we're dealing with an organization that, as you said earlier, you sort of don't know who's supporting you. You know what you're capable of. Your boss used to know what you were capable of, but that's not your boss anymore. Now somebody is in charge who doesn't know what you have to offer or even why you're there.

Nancy Haack: Yeah. I was even told, if you can imagine, that it costs too much for me to work on this map. So, they had a design school college intern do the map, which after the guy left, I had to redo the map because the map was not at all what was needed for the park. And it may have been an exhibit map, I don't remember, because I was working a lot of different things then. But I thought, "It cost too much for me? You don't pay me enough," was my view, "and you're telling me it cost too much for me to make the map? Don't you know I make it once and I make it right?" Apparently, they didn't know that. So, it was a very frustrating time for me to have — well, when I say "bosses," I'm not kidding — multiple bosses who truly didn't know the capability of this fabulous staff we had.

Lu Ann Jones: Where had the managers come from or the bosses? Where had they—

Nancy Haack: They were there, they were just not familiar with publications, in my case. Or someone who then was put in charge of exhibits, they didn't know those workers or where the process had to do a lot of quick learning, but some of them were overwhelmed. They had too many people to supervise. How could they possibly know?

Elizabeth Ehrlich: And the groups, so there was a Publications Office, and then there wasn't.

Nancy Haack: Correct.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: It was a design group and I guess it was design and cartography, and then there were writer, planner, editor, so the media groups were changed. So, the people who had been supervisors over the media type, who knew their staff, now were supervisors over multiple media but one sort of different sort of stovepipe, and it just made for a lot of confusion.

Nancy Haack: So, we worked, three of us, would work on a brochure. We'd have two or three different bosses. It was crazy.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Over that project.

Nancy Haack: Over that project. So, I was told to do x and the designer was told to work on y and then I'm yelled at, why aren't I working on y? Well, my boss told me to do this other thing. I mean, it was a very false way of trying to reorganize.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: And it seems to me it put at risk all of that collaborative research and kind of foundation that a team needed to build to have a good understanding of what the real problems and the challenges were for the project.

Lu Ann Jones: How long did that last?

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Well, it never sort of really went away. It just kind of faded away.

Nancy Haack: Except for Pubs.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Pubs came back together as a group, as a unit, partly because of the funding, which is separate, but the other groups remained kind of where they are now, although they were since reorganized further into regional groups. But nobody ever sort of turned it off. It just has evolved without any kind of a similar effort since then.

Nancy Haack: So, yeah, that was a — I just laugh at myself. I was afraid of losing the three, four hours I'm attributing to this thing, right? [laughter]

Elizabeth Ehrlich: No, I mean, it's sort of heartbreaking because—

Nancy Haack: Yeah, it really is.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: — you were so passionate about doing the right thing, and we really had an opportunity — and I don't know if you felt that throughout your career — there's always an opportunity to improve.

Nancy Haack: Correct.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: And if given an opportunity, you'll take it. Not that you want to throw the baby out with the bathwater, you just wanted to take the opportunity [unclear].

Nancy Haack: Correct, as in all aspects of our lives. We don't look back. We look forward. Betsy and I both look forward.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: What can we fix?

Nancy Haack: [laughs] Yeah, what can we fix. There's not a whole lot we can fix, except ourselves. Yeah, can't fix people.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: This gets to one of the later questions, I guess it is, and you've been traveling, so what advice you have for Harpers Ferry Center regarding National Park maps?

Nancy Haack: Send that cartographer to the park. Oh, my gosh, that was my big sorrow when I was at Little Bighorn Battlefield, that if I had been there thirty-five years ago, they'd have a wonderful picture. Not because of me. Any cartographer had been there thirty-five years ago, I should have said.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: That's important to hear, because we've had a couple years when there just wasn't money to send people, and we reverted back to work on a brochure without having gone to the park, and that you can produce something there—

Nancy Haack: Oh, you can do it, but it's not as good, because it's for the visitor's use. You've got to be in the visitor's shoes to make it work. So that's the number one. And number two is simplify, simplify, simplify. [laughs] All these new digital maps are fantastic. A lot of them are digital images. A lot of them are too complicated, too complicated. They're wonderful. Put them up on a wall, they're great. Early on, I wasn't the cartographer, but we did for a brochure map, a bird's-eye view of a park. They wanted it. They came to us. They wanted it. I said something in the reprint — it wasn't a reprint, but I said something in the Reprint Committee, because that's my voice. "Oh, Nancy. Oh, Nancy." A year later, they're back. They wanted a conventional map. No one could use that thing. It looks cool, but it wasn't a drive-around map that people needed on Unigrid. So that's a sort of example of with all the great new digital stuff, we have to stop and think about between being cool and being useful. And you can usually do both. I mean, they don't exclude each other.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: You had enough years trying these things, working on maps over and over again to be able to see that evolution. So, if you go in a direction that you know you think is probably not going to work, you can see it come back around. It must be a little satisfying.

Nancy Haack: Yeah. [laughter]

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Were there any parks that you worked on, like through your whole career, that were kind of your signature parks?

Nancy Haack: Oh, that I don't know. That's interesting.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Where you had to redo your own work multiple times over and how the—

Nancy Haack: Oh, Fredericksburg. I was always working on Fredericksburg. [laughs] But I think Yosemite was one that I carried from pretty early all the way through, and the National Park Map and Guide, the map of all the units, that was always my baby because there are so many places where the names of those units are incorrect. There, and in what we call the Red Book, the National Park Index, they were correct. We went to the — what is it — Congressional Affairs. That's not the right office, but—

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Congressional Record?

Nancy Haack: No, the Park Service's liaison with Congress, whatever that is.

Lu Ann Jones: [Inaudible]?

Nancy Haack: That's it. We went through them. Not through public affairs or public policy. We went to them, because they really knew what the name of the place is, and, boy, we had disputes with parks themselves about what their names were, and, also, of course, whether they were a unit or not. I really enjoyed that, because that was that nitpicking little information stuff and then fixing or fitting all those labels on the map. That got to be a challenge.

Nancy Haack: Then when they named parks these crazy long names, Rosie the Riveter/World War II Home Front National Historical Park for President William Jefferson Clinton Birth—

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Boyhood Home.

Nancy Haack: No. It's Birth Home. Birth Home, yeah. I mean, who wants to put that on a map, right? Give me Yosemite National Park. That's easy to put on a map. [laughter] So, yeah, I think that those are too long.

Nancy Haack: Welcome to Washington is now defunct, the one I worked on, but that was a real challenge because there were so many players in that, and we had to sort through so many requests. I went downtown to ride that stupid TourMobile, which I don't even know if it exists anymore, but when I did that, I thought this shouldn't be — it was expensive, and it shouldn't be promoted to tourists. It was a big rip-off, as far as I'm — I should be careful there — a big rip-off, as far as I'm concerned. But, yeah, that was a really fascinating, I thought, an important map to do.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, Yosemite was a green shape when you first started working on the Yosemite map.

Nancy Haack: Right.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Did it remain green, or it did it go to more national colors?

Nancy Haack: [Telephone interruption]. I've lost track of where we are.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, we were talking about the color of maps, and one of the logical colors was that people expect national parks to be green. You worked on Yosemite through your career. Was the Yosemite map, the area of Yosemite, always green or did it evolve and—

Nancy Haack: Oh, originally it was white, and the outside area was blue, when I first got there, if you can imagine. I think it was one of the blue and orange series of maps. [laughs]

Elizabeth Ehrlich: When it was three-color?

Nancy Haack: Yeah, one-, two-, and three-colors, when we did those. Then I think the green — it was green, and the outside was white. It switched to that, because with that old film process, you could make anything any color you wanted. You just assigned it, and the printer put the color in. So, things could flip from year to year on what colors they were. When it got to digital, we put the colors. We assigned what the colors were.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, I do remember hearing Vince Gleason say at one point the park area should be white, because that's where all the detail is and all the labels, and it would make it more legible if you have a white park area.

Nancy Haack: Correct. People didn't buy it as the park. They didn't see it as the park. Sure. And he was always looking at those Swiss maps, very high-style, very detailed maps, and the backgrounds of those were white. As I said, those Esso maps, the background of them were white, very easy to read. So that's correct. So, we tried to choose a green that wouldn't overpower black type was the solution.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: And now you've seen probably lots of maps that have natural colors in them.

Nancy Haack: Oh, yeah, yeah.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Do you think they're working? Do you think it's the kind of thing that we're getting beyond a kind of an expectation that a park area is green? Or is it that it's handled differently?

Nancy Haack: I think we lose where the park — and maybe we want to lose this — where the park begins and ends. Some places, they don't to really emphasize the park boundary because they want to talk about the ecosystem of the whole area. But, no, I still think that you've got to have — often we put a green ribbon around it if it's natural colors. Green is the key. There's no question about that.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So that really hasn't changed.

Nancy Haack: Correct.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: The application of the green has changed, but the use of green has not.

Nancy Haack: Correct. Right.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Were there any examples of in your travel — and you've been to all fifty states, right?

Nancy Haack: Right. More than once. [laughter] And all on my own time and some on the government time.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Are you seeing an evolution in things that excites you or that is disturbing or—

Nancy Haack: In what, maps or in what?

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Yeah, that you're finding when you go out to the parks and—

Nancy Haack: Oh, park maps. Oh.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Anything that you've opened up and went—

Nancy Haack: Oh, I think the legibility has been an issue even when I worked with the Parks. I'm older now and I want bigger type, but even then, often a light font would be used. It's hard to see this stuff outside in the sun, and that's one reason why Pub staff have to go to the parks and try to use these things. Once again, you've got to think of the conditions that people are under.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So that legibility is still a challenge.

Nancy Haack: Oh, yeah, totally, and when you get very complicated terrain information, often the legibility of the type suffers.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Because terrain maps seem to be what people are aiming for now. They call for a lot of shaded relief.

Nancy Haack: And other ecosystem information.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Right, natural colors.

Nancy Haack: Right. Right.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, in terms of we talked about a number of people throughout the conversation, but I wanted to come back to just see if there was anything, any others. We've talked about Vince Gleason a little bit in the course of the conversation. Is there anything else that sort of stands out in terms of Vince Gleason and his relationship to you and your career, positive or negative, or to cartography in general?

Nancy Haack: Oh, I think that he was the driver to create what now is a highly regarded series of maps. Even though he's not a cartographer, he knew it was very important. And not only did he bring me on, but three other professional cartographers to achieve that, and went out and found the best cartographic contractors to achieve that. Sure. So, there's lots of credit due to him, absolutely. And he hired me, right? [laughter]

Elizabeth Ehrlich: We talked about Nick Kirilloff and Ray Baker. Were there others that sort of stand out as people who sort of had an impact on you and your career or cartography in general?

Nancy Haack: Oh, that's interesting. I would say the three other cartographers that came after me, because we all had a similar point of view of making a map that was usable, that we were a pretty tight group. We had lots of disagreements, as people would, and especially you get more than two people, there's a disagreement usually. But I think that that's what made it work, because in the end we were all going toward the same goal. Originally when I came, I worked on everything. I just can't imagine. It's just the new parks I never worked on. But you name almost any park that was around before 1970, I worked on it.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So that's Lori Simmons—

Nancy Haack: Lori Simmons, Megan Kealy, and Tom Patterson.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: I don't know that we've actually touched on this yet, but I have maybe a clue from some of what we talked about. But I'll just ask it directly then. So, is there a time when you felt like really excited or engaged in a project or in your career that stands out to you?

Nancy Haack: We talked a little bit about Washington, D.C. and National Park Service Map and Guide, and there was another project that Ray Baker and I worked on that we could not figure out how if we had no one telling us what to do, was a series of maps for the American Revolution. And that was really great, because we did all the research and we put it together and it was published. There wasn't any text, but he provided the information and I provided the mapping. It was a digital map.

Nancy Haack: So, we didn't really have to have anyone else be involved, and that was very exciting because it wasn't under anyone else's purview for some reason. I don't know. [laughs]

Lu Ann Jones: Who asked you to do it?

Nancy Haack: Well, there was an American Revolution Commission. There was a guy that we worked for and with, but he didn't direct us, is what I'm trying to say. American Revolution at a Glance. I don't know if it's been printed for years. Civil War at a Glance had been around for a long time, and Ray and I had worked on that too. So that was a real fun project for us, because we chose what was on the map, and we did it all. Now, almost everything I worked on I was excited about. There were a couple parks that I thought maybe shouldn't be parks, and we always laughed, the brochure was better than the park. [laughter] But, no, I always thought that—

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Those could remain nameless.

Nancy Haack: Yeah. The idea that you are contributing something for these park visitors was important to me, so that kept me going, kept me going to work.

Lu Ann Jones: And you kept that audience in mind all the time?

Nancy Haack: Yeah, oh, yeah, totally, because I was that audience. We dragged our kids around to all those parks too. [laughs]

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, was there anything in your career that held you back, that kept you from doing what you felt was really achieving what you were capable of?

Nancy Haack: Oh, I think that travel initially was for a long time very frustrating, but my kids were little, so when I did travel a few times, it was a production to have them taken care of.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: We haven't really talked too much about the work-life balance, but I'm curious about that because I know it's a challenge.

Nancy Haack: Yeah, Betsy.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: But everybody deals with it differently. Can you talk about that a little bit?

Nancy Haack: Well, Vince was real supportive and I went to four days a week — first three days a week and then four days a week after my first son was born.

Lu Ann Jones: And when was that?

Nancy Haack: 1982. I worked four days a week until my younger son was [in] kindergarten, so that would have been about 1991, I think. He was born in 1986.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So almost ten years, right?

Nancy Haack: Yeah, almost ten years. It impacted my retirement, you'd better believe it, and I knew it at the time. But I wanted rather [to] have the time than the money at that point. Then Vince was really impatient. When my son was going to kindergarten, he wanted me to come back full-time, and I was like, "I don't know." I sort of liked it, you know. [laughter] But he was right, and I needed, for the office, for me, for everything, for my future, I needed to come back full-time.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: And you were able to also travel without total disruption.

Nancy Haack: Oh, yeah. You've met my husband. He's very supportive. I remember my sister came up once and my mother came down once, but that was when the kids were older, when my mother said, "I'm just the resident adult." They didn't take care of those kids when they were little. That was more than I'd ask anybody. [laughs] Because I really didn't go much of any place. It's amazing.

Lu Ann Jones: What kind of maternity leave did you have?

Nancy Haack: Well, there is no maternity leave. Each one is negotiated individually with your boss. I mean, I told him I wanted three months off, and Vince approved that. Now, I took leave without pay for part of that with both my kids. So, yeah, I don't know what anyone else has ever done, because it's all individual. And with my older son, I really didn't have a lot of sick leave because I'd been very ill when I first came and I had to buy advanced sick leave, and I had to pay it back for all those years. I finally paid it back, but that meant I hadn't accrued it all that time. So, yeah, we did a combination of the sick leave, annual leave, and leave without pay. Everybody, all those people say, I always laugh, "Oh, you work for the government. You get a year off with full pay."

Nancy Haack: I said, "No." [laughter]

Lu Ann Jones: That's a nice fantasy.

Nancy Haack: Yeah, great. It would be great.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Did you flex your hours as well?

Nancy Haack: We had no such thing at that time, no such thing. Eight-thirty to five, absolutely.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: And no teleworking?

Nancy Haack: No teleworking, nothing like that. If my kid was sick, I was home, and I was paying for it with my own leave, not with anything else. They didn't have the family leave or anything like that. Sure. Sure. No, it was a whole different world back then.

Nancy Haack: I had a wonderful neighborhood caregiver, and once the kids were in grade school, we had a wonderful after-school program. I had to be home by six o'clock, so a couple times, like if I went for a day trip, a friend would get the kids because I wouldn't make it back by six.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, keeping up with your profession as an employee, were you able to participate in professional conferences or travel for conferences for things like that, and what did that look like throughout your career?

Nancy Haack: Well, it really varied, really, really varied. Initially, I was able to go. There was a couple of conferences that were over the weekend, so it was just a Friday that I'd miss from work.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Would that be NACIS?

Nancy Haack: No, no. American Association of Geographers was that. It really wasn't until Tom came to our office in 1992 that I heard about NACIS.

Lu Ann Jones: What is that?

Nancy Haack: Which is the North American Cartographic Information Society, which is much more my type of thing. It's about information, not academic. The other was an academic organization. Then I was able to go to that. Usually, we were able to go. It was always a question of funding. Now, I gave some papers, I volunteered to chair sessions as a justification of going for several meetings, but that was always sort of touch-and-go whether we'd get to go. It really was an incredible experience, because it wasn't a fake meeting. It really was people exchanging information, so it was very worthwhile to go.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Did you go as a group, did all the cartographers go, or was it an individual basis?

Nancy Haack: It really varied, it really varied, and that was all at the boss' discretion or the training officer or the manager. So, I don't question these things from above. [laughs]

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Yeah, you went when you could.

Nancy Haack: Right. Exactly, exactly.

Lu Ann Jones: I was interested in that, too, because you talked about when you came. I mean, partly it was because you had come out of this academic setting or place where ideas were fresh. And how do you stay fresh? I think that's the question that's a challenge for professionals in the Park Service, is how do you maintain that freshness?

Nancy Haack: Well, Betsy and I went to the Aspen Institute one year, which was a miracle that we went there, and I went to a couple of Park Service—I went to a Park Service Women's Conference in New Orleans, I think, which when I applied, I told my boss I didn't think I would go, would get chosen, and I was. So that's sort of how I put the request, "Oh, they're not going to pick me." [laughs]

Lu Ann Jones: What kind of meeting? What was the topics there?

Nancy Haack: I think it was a way to empower women was the idea. Now, most of it wasn't of use to me. They had speakers who said things like, "Learn Farsi. Iran is where it's at," which that was not what we needed to learn. [laughter] There were people at all different levels of the Park Service there, which I appreciated. I met not just people who were in management, all different kinds of people. So that was interesting. But the office didn't pay for that. Someone else did, for example. And there was some other conference I went to. I don't remember what it was now.

Lu Ann Jones: Do you remember about what year that—

Nancy Haack: That was really early, yeah. My kids were little then.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: And Vince was active in sort of bringing speakers in.

Nancy Haack: Oh, that was great, yes. That's one thing that we wanted, with the Diversity Council, to have that kind of activity. Vince set up seminars for the whole Center, and he would bring famous inspirational people in to talk about maps and design and parks and exploration, and, oh, it was wonderful. We all worked on that, and that was a lot of work. We met a lot of great people with that. I won't say it was fun because it was so much work.

Nancy Haack: The last one we did, Vince calls us in. And he's never going to say, "Good job," you know. He said, "Well, now we'll do the next one."

Nancy Haack: And we all looked at him like, "Are you nuts? Give us a moment to recover from this thing." Yeah, because there were so many details. We weren't professional planners. [laughs]

Nancy Haack: Bradford Washburn, who was a famous scientist and explorer and mapper of Denali, was one of our speakers. A famous artist from Austria who had done a lot of our paintings of Alpine areas. I'm trying to think who else.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Heinrich Berann was the artist.

Nancy Haack: Yes, Heinrich Berann. There were a lot of connections. I just can't remember the other people offhand. Oh, and, of course, Massimo Vignelli, who was a famous designer who did our Unigrid, he was one of the speakers at another one. Our contractor from Donnelley was there for the mapping one. That's the one I remember the best, because that's one the cartographers worked on.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: People come in from Dorling Kindersley.

Nancy Haack: Oh, yes, that's right. Right.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, he didn't limit himself. People came from far and wide.

Nancy Haack: Right. It was wonderful. And, you know, it's a cheap way to inspire people, to bring someone here. Well, we all went to an Edward Tufte lecture, too. We all went to hear him speak.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Oh, [unclear] presentation.

Nancy Haack: Right, we all did do that. We wanted Tufte to come to the class — I mean to our seminar. Vince contacted him and I followed up, and he wouldn't do that. He said, "Come and pay the money to come to my seminar down in Arlington." So, we all did as a result of that.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Well, it was a giant auditorium with five hundred people, whatever. So, yeah, he didn't do small groups.

Nancy Haack: No, he didn't do small groups like we did.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Grant Auditorium.

Nancy Haack: But his wife came.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Out to Harpers Ferry?

Nancy Haack: His wife came to the seminar, and we didn't know who she was till the end.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Interesting. I didn't realize that.

Nancy Haack: Her name was Ingrid. She was a really interesting person. Finally, she revealed that she was his wife, and she had a good time. She enjoyed the whole program.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: What I recall was a series — and maybe this is what you're referring to — called "A Sense of Place."

Nancy Haack: Yes.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: "A Sense of Place" [unclear].

Nancy Haack: Henry Taylor [phonetic] came.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: "A Sense of Place in Design" and "A Sense of Place in Cartography."

Nancy Haack: Right.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: But everybody in Publications — it wasn't related to the other divisions. I don't believe people from other divisions came.

Nancy Haack: Everybody came.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Did they? It was a whole—

Nancy Haack: Everybody came. Oh, he couldn't have justified it without everybody. Henry Taylor, who's a poet who just lives down the road here, he came and spoke about writing, and Edward Zinsser came, and another writer, about really the kind of writing we do in the whole Center. Oh, no, it was everybody was there, and even people could come from other parks, but it wasn't well publicized, and most of them couldn't get the time off.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: But it was such an expansion of how we think about our work, because when you're working day to day on these teams of people, designer, writer, cartographer, you're focused on a project, but this gave everybody kind of that ability to step back and think about the broader picture of what we're doing from these different perspectives that were not necessarily our own careers.

Nancy Haack: Yeah.

END OF FILE 4

START OF FILE 5

Elizabeth Ehrlich: We got to hear the cartographers speak, and the designers thought that that was great, and vice versa, I think. It was a way to help establish a set of what I think of as kind of standards in terms of a way of looking and thinking about things that we do. So, it brought people together intellectually.

Nancy Haack: And we hadn't had anything like that, have you? Not before I left.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Well, no. I mean, currently we do monthly Pubs Talks, similar to Ted Talks, and we bring people in via video and other means. So, we've had people come in and we've done our own talks among ourselves, so that we're sharing knowledge of ourselves.

Nancy Haack: Good.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: So, on a monthly basis, we talk about some not-project-specific topic that relates to everybody.

Nancy Haack: Because that's what you need, because the problem is you get bogged down in the project and you miss the big picture. Oh, that's great.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Hopefully, keeping people professionally current and abreast of what's going on in the world and talking about things that are going out in the parks. Certainly, a lot of our stories are hitting new points of relevancy today that you wouldn't have thought of. With the North Dakota pipeline issue, people are talking about an 1851 treaty that's on our map in the Fort Laramie brochure. Who would have thought it would have been topic of conversation in 2016?

Nancy Haack: Well, all those treaties are big topics of conversation, and it's fabulous that those people finally have a voice. They have lawyers and they have a voice. I think we haven't seen the end of that, and that's something the Diversity Council was certainly interested in.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Right. And working on things like the Minidoka and the Manzanar brochure, which were just recently redone, and people are talking about internment camps because we're talking about registry. So, you never really know exactly when this stuff is going to become part of the—

Nancy Haack: Or Andrew Johnson. We had to change the brochure after Bill Clinton was also impeached, because it was always "the only President we impeached." [laughter] Yep, yep, he got a lot of attention there, that little national park, briefly. [laughter]

Nancy Haack: So, all that stuff is there, and we had the facts. They don't have to go looking. We have the facts in Pubs. A tremendous amount of information is in those brochures and in people's records.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Yeah, and the importance of that research basis, that is it not just a distillation of the story of the day at the park. And park staff can come and go, and I guess that's something I'd be curious to hear you talk about in terms of your perception of how things changed or didn't change over time in terms of the turnover of park staffs and the training and the background that park staffs have that you were working with as part of your tenure.

Nancy Haack: Yeah, I think the turnover, the rapid turnover is one of the biggest problems we have in maintaining a relationship with the park staff. There were always a few people who were there forever, but Chiefs of Interps and superintendents, two years — whap! — they're out of there, and we have to always reestablish who we are or who we are with that park. Sometimes it's someone we know from another park who has taken over that job.

Nancy Haack: And I find that to be really unfortunate. I think as enthusiastic as some of these people are, they don't really get what a park is after being there even for two years, and that's a little bit dangerous when there are lots of deep issues, like the treaty of such-and-such. If you ask them a question, they'll find out the answer. There's no question that there's not a sincerity there, but there isn't the depth of knowledge about the place. So that's a big problem, I think. Lots of these superintendents, they just have to be money-raisers now.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: It's in their job description.

Nancy Haack: Right. Right. And so much stuff — Yosemite is a prime example — is not paid for by the federal government. It's paid for by—

Lu Ann Jones: The Friends group?

Nancy Haack: Right, the Conservancy, is what they call it. And it upsets me, but I'm also thankful that someone's willing to step in, because it would be a real mess if that didn't happen, because think how old those parks are, when those roads were paved, when they had to redo all those roads in Yellowstone a few years ago. It wasn't a proper sub-surface they put on those roads when they built them in 1910 or whatever. [laughs] I mean, they were there before that when they were the dirt road, but when they paved them. So that was a major, major change. [laughs]

Nancy Haack: So, I think that the future is good because all these fabulous young rangers we saw, but, sadly, all seasonal, all fighting for the next job, but they were all enthusiastic, all excited. We saw many, many young people who want to be rangers.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: And what's your perception of the diversity at this point?

Nancy Haack: Oh, we saw more women than anything else. It was unbelievable how many young women rangers we saw. We didn't happen to see a lot of minorities. We saw people from all over the country, because I talked to them about where they were from.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Visitors.

Nancy Haack: No. Rangers.

Elizabeth Ehrlich: Oh, rangers, yeah, yeah. [laughter]

Nancy Haack: We talked to the rangers to find out why they were young rangers. This one woman from Alabama had never been out of Alabama, and she was a ranger in Sequoia. [laughs] She was wonderful. We had the best time with her.

Nancy Haack: She grew up in Alabama, went to school in Alabama, and there was somebody who had a connection with whoever was hiring in Sequoia, and they needed an emergency hire, and she was there next thing you knew. And I thought, "Yay! Good for her." [laughter]

Nancy Haack: So, I didn't see any officials. I didn't see any Chiefs of Interpretation or any superintendents. I did see a Chief Historian someplace, and he gave the worst talk of all of the ones. We always go to the ranger talks. Driest talk ever. [laughs] Like those history classes I took in— [laughs]

Lu Ann Jones: Yeah, they can get be way. Sad to say.

Nancy Haack: The seasonal ranger — we attended another talk — was fantastic. He was a retired high school history teacher, and he was great. And everybody at that talk will remember his presentation. They really carried part of the park away with them. So, I know there's always been a movement that person-to-person interaction is so expensive, but to me, it still is the key for a positive visit. Does that answer the question?

Elizabeth Ehrlich: It does. Yeah, I was just going to my — is there anything else we've overlooked or anything else that you maybe have keyed on that we haven't fleshed out?

Lu Ann Jones: I think this has been great. Not really.

Nancy Haack: Just looking at my notes here. Yeah, I don't think it's — there were a few things I didn't really take notes on here at the end. Maybe we — I think that's all my — we're just "um-ing" here into the computer now, frankly.

Lu Ann Jones: Maybe we could break for lunch and then if I keep the recorder set up and if we think of something over lunch, we can come back to it. How about that? Does that sound okay?

Nancy Haack: Sounds great.

Lu Ann Jones: Okay, excellent.

END OF FILE 5

END OF TAPE

Nancy Haack, retired cartographer, NPS Publications January 2017

Additional information, not recorded:

Betsy, Lu Ann, and I briefly spoke about the United State Board on Geographic Names, but not in the recorded interview. I want to add another important event in my NPS career.

The United States Board on Geographic Names maintains the list of the one and only official name of each geographic feature in the United States. By law, geographic labels on Federal documents must conform, including maps. The US Geological Survey (USGS) topographic map displays the one and only official name. The US Board works closely with USGS and with the individual State Boards on Geographic Names.

In the 1990s I worked on maps for all the NPS sites in Hawaii. Immediately I was besieged with requests from the park staffs to change some map labels to native Hawaiian words, change some spellings for native Hawaiian map labels, or add diacritical marks to native Hawaiian map labels.

I knew that at this time the US Board did not permit any diacritical or punctuation marks in an official name, except for a rare exception. I asked the park staffs about these requests and heard that the local people wanted native Hawaiian names and spellings on the NPS brochure maps. The US Board welcomed information from the National Park Service, but by law relied on information provided by the Hawaii State Board.

Many native Hawaiian names were the official name, but they did not include diacritical marks and may not have been spelled correctly. Also, there was local disagreement about the spelling and local disagreement about what the name actually should be. I assisted the park staffs by contacting the Hawaii State Board for their recommendations, then worked with the park staffs to come to an agreement with the Hawaii State Board about the proper spelling and proper use of diacritical marks. This involved researching the historic names recorded by the staff of the Bishop Museum and others. Coincidentally, many USGS topographic maps in Hawaii were being updated so the timing was perfect for a thorough review of all geographic labels in the state. As a result of the review, the US Board altered their policy to allow diacritical marks and punctuation marks in order to spell the native names correctly.

I worked with the park staffs, the Hawaii State Board, and the US Board to create a list of geographic names that would appear on NPS maps. After many reviews and park approvals, I submitted the list of geographic names in NPS areas to the US Board. The State Board had to approve, of course, and after a few changes, the NPS maps could include properly spelled native Hawaiian geographic labels. In a few instances, NPS maps could include the native Hawaiian name secondary to the official English name.

This was a major cultural shift for the USGS maps, the NPS maps, and the US Board. I am proud to have been a part in promoting cultural diversity on NPS maps.