

National Park Service (NPS) History Collection

**NPS Paleontology Program Records (HFCA 2465)
Vincent Santucci's NPS Oral History Project, 2016-2024**



**Dave Shaver
May 23, 2023**

Interview conducted by Vincent Santucci and Julia Brunner
Transcribed by Teresa Bergen
Edited by Molly Williams

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 with the exception of omitted birth date PII.

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

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

Transcript

[General tips and suggestions are given to Shaver before the interview transcript starts. For example, proceeding chronologically, providing an approximate date for events, and giving the position and/or title for the first time you mention an individual]

[START OF INTERVIEW]

Santucci: OK, so I have a very short statement opening statement that I'll just read and then I'll start off with the probably the easiest question at the beginning, so I'm going to shut my camera off so I don't distract myself. And, are you ready?

Shaver: You bet.

Santucci: Today is Tuesday, May 23rd, 2023. My name is Vincent Santucci, the senior paleontologist for the NPS paleontology program. Today we are interviewing Dave Shaver, the first and founding division chief for the National Park Service Geologic Resources Division. We will refer to the geologic resources division in this call as GRD. The interview will better enable us to preserve the history of GRD. We are joined by Julia Brunner, the Energy and Minerals Branch lead for the GRD, a video and audio recording of this interview is being captured through teams. Dave and Julia are participating from their homes in Colorado and I am participating from my home in Gettysburg, PA.

Santucci: So, Dave, thank you very much and welcome.

Shaver: OK. Thank you, Vince. This will be interesting, I think.

Santucci: Yes. So we are going to get personal to start off with, when and where were you born?

Shaver: When and where was I born?

Santucci: Yes.

Shaver: I was born in Manitoba.

Santucci: OK, great. And where did you grow up and attend high school?

Shaver: Yeah, my family immigrated to the state of Minnesota in 1952 when I was just young. So I grew up in a little town called Fergus Falls and went to high school there. Do you want me to continue on with that kind of thing then?

Santucci: Sure.

Shaver: Do you want me to continue on with that kind of thing, then education anyway? Then I went to the University of Minnesota. And got a degree in economics. The other went to grad school at the University of Wisconsin, got a degree in environmental policy, energy economics that I went to law school at Georgetown University, DC, and then I went to work.

Santucci: Pretty impressive! So just one quick thing, going back in time, were there any experiences or individuals or mentors which help to shape your interest in the environment and the outdoors and the future academic and career goals that you that you saw it?

Shaver: Well, probably I think just growing up in a small town rural area of Minnesota, living on lakes in the summer and being outside in nature, pretty much all the time. I learned to appreciate

it and learn to enjoy being out. Probably the most influential in that sense would have been the Boy Scouts. I was very active in Boy Scouts throughout my younger years. I became a senior patrol leader and those kind of things Eagle Scout just pretty much though. And then umm, I-I guess the the-the interest in Environmental Protection and resource management in particular came around the time of the First Earth Day in 1970 when I was still in college. I decided that's when I wanted to get into ohh, environmental policy. Environmental regulation. Try to clean up, you know their quality and things were really nasty in those days. So anyway, that's kind of what got me going when I was in Graduate School, in particular 1972-3-4 in that range.

5:11

Santucci: And you graduated from Georgetown and what year?

Shaver: Georgetown '77.

Santucci: OK. And between your graduation and your being hired by the National Park Service, where there any career or educational experiences that you had that were important, that defined your later career?

Shaver: Well, yeah, when I was in law school, I was interested in energy development in particular. I started working for the Bureau of Land Management when I was still in law school. I've got a job in the Mineral Leasing Office there dealt with coal leasing, oil and gas leasing programs. They kind of got an exposure to the Department of Interior at that stage and then when I graduated, it was December of '77. I had finished at night school, so it took an extra semester. But anyway, when I graduated then I went to work for the Environmental Protection Agency in Washington as a policy and analyst focused on development of national regulations for the energy industry, in particular power plants in particular. I'm getting off track here.

Santucci: No, that's an interesting background for sure. So far—

Shaver: I could ramble on forever about that, no, but the path to the park?

Santucci: Go ahead.

Shaver: Well, we're going to say the past to the Park Service really ties to the passage of the Clean Air Act and the fact that it put I was very much focused on air quality and things like that. And the Clean Air Act past and gave the federal land managers a responsibility of protecting. What we call class one areas and air quality, and while I was at the park EPA, I worked on the development of visibility – visibility, protection, regulations, and these concepts called integral vistas. Views from inside parks to outside parks and was very involved in that. And that's when the Park Service decided it needed to get some more science and initiated the air quality. It was at the time air and Water quality division back in 1978.

And that was staffed by initially the initial director, Barbara Brown, was a friend of mine from EPA, and she ended up bringing and folks from various parts of the EPA. When I started with the Park Service, there were six of us in the first office in Denver and Barbara in Washington, and that was pretty much it for science in the Park Service at the Washington Level, Air and Water Resources Office. Does that makes sense?

Santucci: Yes. So did you joined the National Park Service in 1978?

Shaver: Yeah, I think it might actually—but I think the office was established in '78 and I joined in '79. Ohh, mid – mid '79.

Santucci: And what was your position title called and what were your responsibilities in that first position?

Shaver: Initially I just – I joined as a policy regulatory specialist focused on air quality issues, visibility at the time. The visibility regulations that EPA was developing were in process will be really focused on that at the beginning, getting those done and getting park protection and federal land manager authorities to help clean up the air anyway policy regulatory specialist, that function grew relatively rapidly and I – I think I sent you a sort of a draft evolution of the structure well in 1980, the air quality division split into branches and one was called the energy policy branch which I became the Chief of at that time.

9:45

Shaver: That's when I hired also from EPA, Carol McCoy, who had been in my old office, Vicki Evans, who was an EPA and then a couple other folks from various places. Barbara W. came from the Office of Surface Mining, Eric Cage. Brian Mitchell, D. Morris all came from EPA and Karen Kelly. I'm not sure from work grad school I think. Anyway, we just we had a branch then of half a dozen people. Focused on energy policy working mostly on no internal Park Service, mining minerals, oil and gas management and working externally with no particularly the BLM and four service on energy projects near parks that had the potential to impact them.

Santucci: With him?

Shaver: So anyway, that makes sense.

Santucci: Absolutely. Yeah, this is a very interesting. So in terms of the organization of the Park Service at that time. Were your offices under the Natural Resources Directorate of the time? Or how are you situated?

Shaver: Yeah, well, there was no associate for resources at the time. It was a – I think it was just called the chief scientist fellow named Peter Gove, who I only vaguely knew because he was in Washington and we were getting set up. Getting these in the under to be closer to the parks in theory, or at least the Western air quality issues. Wasn't until I think, yeah, March of '83 that the Washington or the NPS had a reorganization that established the associate Director for Natural Resources for the first time that made it on a Directorate Level Office or responsibility. Before that, it was a staff office basically focused on policy and regulatory functions.

Santucci: You recall who that was? Who the Director for Natural Resources was at that time.

Shaver: Well, the first one was Richard Bryceland. Doctor Richard Bryceland or Dick Bryceland—

Santucci: Yes, OK.

Shaver: —we call them. So, yeah. And that who we reported to until about '84, I think it changed.

Santucci: Is this pre-Eugene Hester?

Shaver: And yes, I'm trying to remember where Hester fit in there. There – no. It was an interesting time in the Park Service. Let's just say that then, as I mentioned earlier, there wasn't science emphasis or resource management really emphasis in the Washington office or maybe even in the Park Service. You know, Park Service had been based basically a visitor management, visitor services, no good neighbor, kind of a place where you know keep the visitors happy and didn't really start to shift to resource management kind of things until the '80s.

And so we were coming in, especially those of us who came in from the APA EPA, quite a few of us were coming in at grades and with salaries higher than most of the Park Service was used to and we were used to an EPA top down kind of function or organizational structure where the Park Service was pretty much the opposite of that. Parks had the power. It's like a large feudal system. Washington didn't really do much more than administer no distribution of monies and things like that and – and it was a very much a visitor oriented operation.

When the science came in and we came in, we had some struggles with all mine parks. Are these people about trying and you know, we try to tell them different ways to do things and that there were regs and laws and things they had to comply with that didn't sit well with some offices initially? Probably the—well, I'm getting off track I think—but probably the best example of that was one of the first things we started doing as an energy policy branch in the air quality division was noticing that and several of the parks were not enforcing were not following. Lining the Parks Act? We're not consistent in how they managed mining and mineral operations. For example there was leasing of lands within the National Recreation Areas without good regs or without good processing. Which led to a suit from the Sierra Club.

With litigation that shut down that kind of operate, that kind of procedure in 1960, 1983 – '83 I think anyway, and then something similar happened when the Alaska parks were set up in 1980, they had mining in them at the time the Park Service did next to nothing to try to control that. And we found out inadequate – put a lot of pressure on Alaska to start managing. Well, they didn't change. They got sued by the Sierra Club and which led to a well—anyway, that led to a lot of growth in the minerals program in the Park Service because they had to respond to the to the suit. Sorry, I'm getting off track, I'll let you work.

16:11

Santucci: No, this is good stuff. Did you have any sort of active role in in the litigation representing the Park Service?

Shaver: Well, I'm trying to respond. Yeah, but an issue in the—well to the record, the Park Service record had a lot of things in it between our offices us and Alaska telling them and we did a lot of back and forth at the time. Both from our office and from the service center there was an office there that was doing and planning and in particular planning for the new parks which included the new Alaska parks included the mining activity. So, they were pushing them to do minerals planning or better minerals management.

So, the record was full of things about how what they were doing wasn't consistent with the law and the existing regs and the mining and the Parks Act in particular and Napa they, they were letting operations happen without plans and without NEPA compliance basically and the record, the record was just full of that and a lot of it from our office. So, like, yeah, I guess we worked with them, but it was an indefensible suit and it pretty much lost right away. And then

shouldn't we or I in particular, but we in the division took a lot of heat from Alaska management for making that happen. Look, it was our fault. But anyway, that led to organizational shuffles in the mid-80s where—well, I'm getting ahead of myself. Let me back up a little bit.

Santucci: Sure.

Shaver: We had put together something called the minerals management issue paper in '82 that tried to hide that highlighted a much of these issues and this was internal to the Park Service report to the director that Associate Director Bryceland had asked us to put together largely that was Carol and myself and our then staff at that time working with the DSC on. So, there's a – there is a historic document called an mineral issues management or minerals management issue paper that ended up that basically proposed there should be a Washington office that would be responsible for policy formulation review, oversight of the mining operations in the system, the particular regarding Alaska and the NRA's and oil and gas development in parks. Anyway, so that went up to the director in 1983 and it led to the creation of something called the Energy Mining and Minerals Division, which was within that or Resources or Associate Director for Resources at the time.

No, and had a relatively significant staff about authorized up to 30 something, but never got really above about 28 people. But you know, mining focused and about a third of it was policy folks in the restroom mining engineers, it was brought. It was created by as all pre-organizations by Shuff putting together three existing offices, is under this new division head with me in charge, but it was the – the old Washington Air Energy Mining Minerals Branch from the Air Division, a group from the Denver Service Center that was doing the Environmental Assessments, Mineral Management Plans and a group of people from various lands – Land Resources Office offices that had been focusing on mineral title in parks, mineral ownership and parks.

So, we had landlord examiners, policy people and mining engineers, folks who had been doing mining claim validity work out of the Pacific Northwest and Alaska offices anyway. All that got put together in kind of the function evolved. Yeah, I'll let you – how would—I don't know how much of that you want to get into?

Santucci: No, that that's very interesting. So, I want to make sure that we have a copy of this minerals management issues paper. Julia, are you familiar with that and do we have a copy of that in the archives?

Brunner: But we probably do. I'd probably do because – and that's – that is important because that is the genesis of GRD right was the creation of this, the EMD, the Energy Mining and Minerals Division based on that paper can I ask a couple questions then said this juncture.

Santucci: Please.

Shaver: Sure. And just – I have that, if you can't find it, I have it. I looked at it yesterday.

Brunner: OK, fabulous. So, I just want to – so, I just wanted, you just said that the original OEM—

Shaver: Having trouble hearing you, Julia.

Brunner: Ohh, can you hear me now? Is that better?

Shaver: Yeah. Yep.

Brunner: OK. So, you're saying that the original EMMD was formed in 1983 and you said it was a compilation of existing, you know? Mining folks, you know, mining engineers and folks that knew the legal stuff and, you know, the validity examiners and plus the energy, mining and minerals branch that was in the old air quality division. Is that what you said?

Shaver: Yeah.

Brunner: OK.

Shaver: Energy policy break. Yeah, if you—

Brunner: OK, great. OK. And then my, my second question, I just wanted to – because I'm taking notes so, that's really helpful. And my question then is you know the 9A regs were written in 1977, so six years before this happened. Who wrote those regs, Dave?

Shaver: Well, not entirely clear, but I believe it was a group in the LED by a group in the Denver Service Center that was headed by a fellow named Larry May. And the staff was other folks you might know Alex Carter, Dan Hampson, Dennis Schramm, Steve Hunt. They were all in the service center and service center at that time did, I think, do a lot of the sort of Reg development that an unusual for the Park Service to write regs but they pull the team together through the service center as far as I can tell. Like Alex Carter would know the true history of that; Alex or Dennis Schramm.

Brunner: OK. But it wasn't the branch, the Energy and Minerals Policy branch, that was in the air quality division. It was a different—

Shaver: No, it happened before that?

Brunner: OK, OK, got it. Alright, thank you.

Shaver: Oh yeah, just along that line. When we first talked about having this discussion, I sent a few documents to Vince. I don't know if I copied you, Julia, but there's one there that it is my recalled history of the organizational evolution that's close to accurate. I would like to check some of it if we're going to use it for much, but that's what I've been following in this discussion.

Brunner: OK, that's great. All right. Thank you. I would just—

Santucci: And I'll forward you copies of all that Julia. So you have it.

Brunner: OK, thank you.

Santucci: And Dave, if you wouldn't mind sending a copy of that minerals management issue paper, that'd be great to make sure we have that archived.

Shaver: Yeah, I will have to scan it or something. I have a hard copy, but I'll figure out how to do that. Best do that. It's not – It's shortened with about five – I mean, it's not short, it's long with about 5 appendices, but I can get it scanned somewhere probably.

25:08

Santucci: OK, thank you.

Shaver: That's best.

Santucci: So, moving into the 1990s, then there seemed to be a lot of changes and there was interest in the natural resource challenge during that time. And you live through all of that it. It sounds like during the '80s you had your hands full with helping to define the role of the Park Service with a lot of this this needed policy. Before the geologic resources division was pulled together. Are there any other historical events during that late '80s, early '90s that would be worth discussing?

Shaver: Well, I think, yeah, I was alluding to the conflicts we had with Alaska and with, I don't know what to call it, I guess the Ranger mentality in general we – there was a shift and we Washington offices reorganized or restructured again in the mid-80s like '86. So, and the – what was then the Energy, Mining, and Minerals Division was moved over under the Land Resources Division, which was in the Associate Director for Operations because they saw the function as basically operational, mining permitting. And I think it was a way to push down a little bit the aggressive – structure the aggressive approaches we were taking at the same time Doctor Bryceland was moved out of the associate Director for Natural Resources and kind of parked over in one of the George Washington University as a special assistant there. There was just a push that had to do with the bigger what I call cultural change; more science, regulatory, focused things as opposed to good neighbor visitor services side.

I had numerous discussions in those years—I guess I call them discussions—with John Cook, Mike Finley, well, Stan Albright, people like that about how we maybe we weren't too concerned as Mike Finley said to me; we were spending too much time on the system, meaning the resources and the parks rather than the service, meaning the people and the Ranger don't make waves with the way we're managing the parks. Anyway, I can think of a three or four really sharp meetings we had on those both in Alaska. John Cook, who we – was the Regional Director in Rocky Mountain at the time, was actually quite helpful to me, but we had some strong disagreements about roles and responsibilities and things. Anyway, that mid-80s restructuring pushed back at the science, pushed back at WASO, science trying to give direction to how parks did things. A lot of parks I think appreciate, especially with the external developments and helping them work. We were pushing hard to get we meaning not to resources in general to get parks to think about resource management and to look outside their boundaries and start to deal with external impacts and things. That was a struggle but I think in the end, most parks ended up feeling it was important.

Anyway, so we got moved. We, Energy, Mining, Minerals, got moved under land resources. And each time you move you lose some of your – if there's any excess money or blank FTE's, they get ripped off by whoever you left from. So anyway, that was a challenge both when we moved into lands and then when we came back with the Park Service restructuring that happened in '96, that's when we moved back '95/'96, moved back into natural resources. And so, to become the Geologic Resource Division. That happened in—there was, you probably don't recall in the mid-90s there we were in the Carter Gore years, I guess. Anyway, Gore was in charge of this reinvention of the government. I can't remember what they call – I think was reinvention or restructuring and that's why the '96 NPS realignment happened and it was really focused at cutting budgets, moving things close to the work, moving resources to the field where possible. That's where the concept of field directors, offices and system support offices, and clusters. The Park Service moved into clusters of like parks or regionally set. It kind of broke up

the hierarchy of the Park Service. Now I am getting off track but anyway, it was during that time looking at the WASO land, their natural resource functions. We started talking about moving back into Natural Resources in the '94 period at that time I was working on the resource side with Denny Fenn was the Associate Director. I think that was post – I think Hester came between Bryceland and Fenn.

But Denny was a geologist who recognized the need when you look at natural resource management in general, you could see a large air quality office, a large and functioning water resource division, and then you saw gaps regarding geology and biology—at the time there wasn't a biological resources division or it was just initiating I think at that time too—so anyway, that's when the – you looked at all the natural resources at Washington where the needs were in geology, was clearly one of them. Because we had minerals and we had policy folks, we had a few folks with backgrounds in geology, but it wasn't their focus like disturbed lands, restoration was a focus for us. But we didn't have caves, coastal soils, paleo, any of that stuff and it was a recognized lack. But trying to figure out how to fill those things from '96 on was pretty much a constant struggle just trying to get resources to do it. So anyway, do you want me to just keep whaling?

Santucci: Yeah. No, this is absolutely perfect. And I also want to compliment you, your memory is really good. This is great detail.

Shaver: Well, some of this I started to write down when I was thinking of it in around 2013, '14 and then I kind of burnt out and didn't finish. But I have been looking up my – I have every day timer or note from 1984 on. I read a few of them this last week. I got lots more I could catch up on, but anyway, yeah, I think it, was an interesting, evolving exciting time.

Santucci: This will be worth you publishing this if you if you had the time and energy to do so.

Shaver: You maybe you. You're getting me interested in it again.

Santucci: So a quick question, do you consider this part of the natural resource challenge? What you've just covered.

Shaver: Well, it's in – when you say natural resource challenge you, I think you're more of what with, you know, it was more formalized around 2000, 2001 as that this was more the earlier stages of trying to figure out what the needs were and what cost the service really for science. Sorry my phone's in the background there.

Shaver: So I see it as an evolving process on you know, we recognize the need for these things and need in '95, '96, '97. That's when we started putting in budget initiatives to get funding for well, a lot of things were going on, then too. There's, we had budget initiatives moving related to mining management in particular because of the Alaska Parks and because of the Cal Desert Parks that were added in '94, '95, yeah, or mid-90s. And they had lots of mining going on and no staff and no people. So we ended up having what was that in the minerals management branch/ GRD staff. Particularly the mining validity examiners, mining engineers, and a couple geologists deeply involved in the setting up of the minerals programs in the desert. We had staff detailed there for several times. Anyway, we put together a budget proposals. We got a couple of them funded. There was one we put in for '98 that got funded at \$600,000 and 6FT's, we had intended that to be used in GRD to cover the salaries of folks doing that work, doing the mining work and that we could then take the salary, the money we had previously funded them with to start hiring

geology specialists. Problem was, we got rolled basically by the region and the park and the money went, instead of to GRD, went right to Mojave. So we did some work but we couldn't get any money out of it. That happened a couple times. So anyway, I guess just those years it was a lot of struggling to try to figure out how we going to get some budget to get some people on board.

37:04

Santucci: Excellent. Two things. Sure.

Shaver: And that finally happened as I'm catching up with you on the challenge, I think we did finally get an increase in 2000 that allowed us to add funding for caves, karst, coastal, paleo, and some restoration staff to morphology. Yeah, just thinking here. Yeah. Yeah. So that's, you know, initially, when we got set up in '96 as GRD, the only additions to the old Mining and Minerals branch were moving Lindsay McClelland who was a volcanologist geologist who had been working with the National Natural Landmarks program. He was assigned to us without base funding, but funding from NNL's for the first couple years. And then Ron Kerbo was reassigned to us from the Southwest, what was then the Southwest Regional Office, with funding – soft funding from the region for the first couple years. So, just Ron and Lindsay were all we could add until 2000. Yeah.

Santucci: So, keeping with the mid-90s, just a couple of things. I don't know if this is coincidence or you have any recollection of how it may affected things for your operation. So under the Clinton/Gore administration, the USGS underwent a RIF [Reduction-in-Force].

Shaver: Yep.

Santucci: It wound up losing quite a number of veterans. Geologists, the entire branch of paleontology and stratigraphy, was abolished. Did that have any influence over things that you were trying to do with the early days and GRD?

Shaver: Yes, I did – directly, almost. I mean the well from the Park Service perspective and the—we should have mentioned that this buyout in '94, '95 that that was happening. The NBS, the Nation—what do they call them—Biological Survey which was split off. Denny Fenn went there. Mike Soukup came in as our associate for natural resources in the Park Service. So that they were very involved. And Mike, in particular, with the whole NBS side of things, but we did also, in those days, spent some time meeting with USGS and that we're trying to figure out how to place some of those people that are moving, but we just couldn't find money. We spend all I can recall and I found my notes about meetings with the, let's see, '95 with USGS on the Mike Lahey I think it was. Is that right there, Lahey and [unclear]. I don't have their names in my head, but we went out there to talk about how we could get – how to make parks hospitable, to do to research, geologic and biologic, and how to get better science to help parks manage at the time the Park Service was initiating the inventory monitoring program.

And we were just initiating getting the USGS involvement in that. Couple of big systems I think was georef and geindex. Basically maps, adding maps for the parks. To that end, we didn't deal with I don't think we'd have any much involvement with the paleo side or already that we did a little work. Lindsay was involved with that the – initially when they were talking about the paleo protection acts, but we didn't really have anybody to push that.

Santucci: Sure.

Shaver: I think we were—

Santucci: Two other mid-90s court of questions and I then I want to give a chance for Julia to ask any questions. One had to do with Clinton and the New World mine, Phil Claus' work. That was in the early days of GRD. Do you have any thoughts about that experience?

Shaver: Yeah. Phil was instrumental, of course. Yeah, we the minerals branch and myself and Carol, in particular, and Phil put an awful lot of time into the New World. Right. And, and I – that was heavy work during that period '94, 5, 6 culminating in the buyout of – which was August of '97 – '96. Yeah, I think that the – it was a lot of work between our Office and Water Resources Division. Then Kimball and his staff, we spent lots of time, lots of meetings. Lots of – I was involved in meetings on that all the way up to the OMB. CEQ, pushing the buyout. Phil Claus was probably was the national expert on the appraisals and the valuation of that property. Critical player. You're right. Anyway, that that was probably one. See, while this was – the whole process of setting up GRD was ongoing, the major focus of our work within the division was still mining and minerals. We had New World, we had a lead prospecting or leasing activity at Ozarks, we had Padre Island. We have a big lawsuit at Padre Island on oil and gas management. Several things like that that the staff, the mining staff—Julia could probably remember this—what was very involved in that. Let's see. Thought I had this here. I had a note about interviewing somebody named Julia Fulwiler.

Brunner: Yeah, that was me.

Santucci: What a memory.

Shaver: May the April 13th 1950 – '95 I think.

Brunner: Not 1959 cause I — yeah, it was 1995.

Shaver: And you started on June 12th, if I have it right.

Brunner: Yep, that's, that's right. And I was like, part-time and summer, and I was bike racing at the time. So I was working part time, but I remember those days and when I first interviewed that you were still the Energy – it was EMBL. The Energy and Mining – Energy and Minerals Branch and the Lands Resources Division.

Shaver: Yeah. Yeah.

Brunner: And then like just what you said somewhere in '95 and '96, it went over to become the geologic resources division in name, this kind of the theme I'm getting it kind of became GRD and name but then it wasn't until four years later that you got the increase in base funding to be able to hire like Rebecca came in.

Shaver: Right.

Brunner: And Kevin Cart. Well, I guess you already had, Ron, but. I remember Mary Martin taking that money in '97. I think so. I guess I did have a question though about you know that push back when you meant just as several minutes ago you mentioned when we – it was the Energy Mining and Minerals Division with 28 staff you know pulling it together and then there was some pushback and basically 1986 the EMMD, the division, became a branch. And you said

it was pushed back on science and WASO and I was wondering which was: was that mostly a pushback on science or mostly a pushback on WASO?

Shaver: I think the latter. You know, this my perspective.

Brunner: Yeah.

Shaver: But in our case, Energy, Mining Minerals Division in particular case it was a push back on WASO trying to direct Alaska. Alaska ended up putting together some kind of—I don't know what they call—a program evaluation of EMD without any of our involvement, just basically their opinions on what we were doing and how it was wrong and how we should all be RFTs, reassigned to the region so they could do the job right. And then we had a responsive program analysis, which I was reading last night and I can't believe all – how nasty I was in her comments to the region, but it was interesting. Anyway, it was just, goes to that whole like the culture control issue.

Brunner: Yeah.

47:00

Shaver: That's when Mike Finley and Roger Cotter told me we weren't being loyal to the right thing, right people.

Brunner: OK. Yeah. OK. Thank—and then it kind of swung really to an extreme. It sounds like in in the in the mid-1990s, with the field offices and the clusters.

Shaver: Yeah.

Brunner: Which have gone away, and now we're going to the other extreme. But I'll be quiet and let Vince continue and asking questions, but thank you. And yes, it was really the Washington thing because it sounds like the science continued to become important and rightfully so.

Shaver: Yeah, yeah. Mike took up, was pushing most of that and responsible for it. Initially—you know, I'm just looking—but a couple days after we interviewed with you, I did sit down with Soukup and stuff and we had our first real discussion about functions for geology came up with a GRD name, talked about and prepared the function statements for the departmental manual and what we were going to do. All that was in April of '95. And we were doing some other geology stuff, in particular—I had notes—Lindsay was working on the Paleo bill comments. Kerbo was moving, and we were also getting – making comments related to the, what was to become the National Cave and Karst Research Institute Act. So we were starting, but we just didn't have the people. And our initial meetings with GS were in that time frame.

Brunner: Vince, class—

Santucci: So, in the early the—

Brunner: —Ohh, I'm sorry.

Santucci: —no, please go ahead.

Brunner: OK, so really April of 1995 would be the kind of the birthday of the geologic resources division, is that true?

Shaver: Yeah, I think so.

Brunner: OK.

Shaver: Yes, at least in my mind. That's when the first time we started using the term GRD or Geologic Resource Division.

Brunner: OK. Thank you.

Santucci: This is great stuff. So, your vision in terms of building your new team in the Geologic Resource Division, in terms of roles, responsibilities, functions that you wanted to capture within this new division, do you have any thoughts in terms of that early team and the leadership that you assembled?

Shaver: Well, I think in terms of the geologic division, obviously the key players were well, were not me, but probably Bob Higgins, Lindsay, and Dave Stinson was with us at the time I think, yeah. And what we did is—we're talking '95 here—we ended up a lot of work, a lot of discussions, going on with the associate of natural resources offices and stuff. And how we're going to – which parts are geology, which parts are water, you know, hydrology issues are those things getting figured out and how we'd operate. But we did hold a geologic resource workshop with field folks and our staff in September of '95. Brought in people, there were some geologists in the field. We brought in people for a few days in Denver just to trying to flesh out what was needed. Where would it be best fit and stuff. I can't remember exactly who was there, but Judy wrote there were field geologists: Ken Mayberry, Judy Rocchio. I'm sure we had one of the paleo, Ted Fremd I think was there. But I can't remember exactly who was there, but I probably have notes on it somewhere. That was the try to get a Park Service science-side or specialist-side agreement on what the division should – what Park Service needed and what the function of the division should be.

That, yeah, so those were the early things in in the 90s, '95, and then at that time also meeting with the I&M folks to make sure we were getting geology or geologic issues worked into the program. You know, ultimately we did get the I&M program to fund several of our positions in that timeframe like we brought in – when we brought in Pete Bigham as a soil scientist, he was funded by I&M. Bruce Heisey and Tim Connors. Tim. Yeah, I think Tim was also funded by &IM in the earlier years. I don't have that in front of me right now. That helpful bits?

Santucci; Yes, very much so. And Carol McCoy was part of this early planning as well?

Shaver: Ohh yeah, Carol was, but I was—Yes. We had two branches or three then?

Brunner: We had 3 branches.

Shaver: Three. Yeah. So yeah, Bob and Carol and who was the third?

Santucci: Jim Wood.

Brunner: Jim Wood.

Shaver: Jim Wood, yeah, doing the environmental stuff.

Shaver: But the focus was what I meant with me. Clearly, Bob was the cheerleader, as everybody knows. I mean, he was the idea guy. He's good at making new — knew a lot of folks. It's helpful. And he and Lindsay, knew folks from GS and Reston and stuff like that. Lindsay started spending a day a week in Reston with GS to try to build linkages. We think that started in in the 90s, probably '95. Yeah, December of '95. He started going out there and spending a day a week, which later I think even went to two days but I'm, I think I'm rambling off here.

Santucci: Do you have any specific thoughts about the whole development of the National Cave and Karst Research Institute? Things that went well or things that didn't go so well.

Shaver: Well, you know we were involved in that with—we, Kerbo in particular, Kerbo and I guess—in getting first to get the law passed. And that had some internal debates too because their eastern parks that thought it should be where they are but basically NCKRI [National Cave and Karst Research Institute] came about largely because of Ron's contacts with New Mexico folks, New Mexico delegation, Bingham and [deManchee?]. And Carlsbad, the city of Carlsbad, pushing hard for something they wanted to — they saw as a major attraction for their city. Anyway we worked on that a lot, got the bill passed but of course the bill passed, it authorized the service, the center didn't provide any money, and ultimately that got assigned to us here at GRD. GRD is the lead to try to figure out how to make it happen. I, personally, Ron and I spent a lot of time on that just trying to get, put together briefings issue papers went to the hill, talked to the delegations. It wasn't exactly — it wasn't something that the Park Service really was pushing, there's always too many needs and not enough money. But ultimately we were able to get a budget initiative for some staffing and that was probably, well, probably around 2000. But it took years of working through that.

We got the detail USGS sponsored a detail of assignment to us to work on developing it and that was a woman named Zelda Bailey. She came over, I think in 2000. We had our on loan from GS, they didn't. They didn't pay for her, but she was good and a very energetic and got it put together. So anyway, we did get that going. And in 2001, we got funding to get some — to actually cover some staff. The key to NCKRI was getting matching involvement from the state and then stayed through New Mexico Tech. Matched NPS funding so we were up around six or \$700,000 in 2001. And then we spent some time working with the construction side of the Park Service and getting construction funding. We ended up getting almost \$2,000,000 through the NPS construction program to build that building, which was matched by the state. Matching was a key to everything there. Anyway, I rambled off. That was — personally, I spent a lot of time on that and it was a good, good to see it. We got a nice building and a small staff which has grown. And that really was just getting off the ground when I retired. But I have kept track and it's still functioning and growing slowly.

58:12

Santucci: Just for the record, what month and year did you retire?

Shaver: 2007. I think it was July 1st or June 30th or something like that.

Santucci: OK.

Shaver: End of yeah, July 2007.

Santucci: OK. Julia, did you have any questions at this point?

Brunner: Do you have additional questions or can I sort of ask them broad questions?

Santucci: Ohh yeah, I mean I can go on for a long time. Dave's got a lot of information in there that we want to pull out.

Brunner: Yeah. So there was summit in the September of 1995 and then didn't we put on a summit also in the year 2000 down in Colorado Springs or something? Dave, the geosummit—

Shaver: Yeah. Yeah, I don't remember specifically. I would have to—I started going through my notes but I didn't get as far as that 2002.

Brunner: OK. OK.

Shaver: Yeah, we have – I mean, there were, we also had maybe less formal meetings or early on. I can remember sitting on the floor of the new office space at Academy Place with a bunch of USGS people and trying to figure out, literally just sitting at, we didn't have desks, we didn't have anything. So we had a lot of informal meetings, but summits you're talking about I think were broader Park Service field related things?

Brunner: Yeah, I was thinking about where we met with the field and some regional folks and just trying to really orient that. Which I think are great really trying to make sure that the divisions work and focus was on being responsive to field needs which from the – as I'm thinking about just sort of the themes of what you're saying is, that was great. And I think it's paid dividends. I'm not sure, do you know if the other divisions in the NRSS group did the same thing or were we alone in that? Do you know?

Shaver: Well, they did similar things like air quality.

Brunner: OK.

Shaver: Air quality early on, set up regional contact networks regional at Park. The bigger difference—oh and well in water too—I think there were the difference there. At least there were a lot more of those kind of specialists in field already. There weren't that many geologists—I think would become a dozen or less when we first started—that were in parks and Bob had a list and it kept growing but was less than 50 for sure. So anyway, that's—I'm off track, but you know air quality always had annual meetings of the coordinators. They moved her on different parks that had them. We never quite got that far. It's hard to get that far. Well, we take where we going to do while we don't. If we didn't have the resources, it's the dollar is basically to make that stuff go and until really—when did we start getting funding '95 or 2005, 6?—Yeah, we had a big one in 2001 with and Heisey and those positions were all I&M funded. I am rambling off.

1:02:13

Santucci: No, I think that again, it's amazing your recollection and memory on this. This is so valuable to capture this. So clearly, you know, when you help to pull together the early geologic resource division, whether or not you had money or not, you planted the seeds for things that we continue to benefit from. Just for example, hiring Julia. I mean, look where she is now and all the good things that that she's doing for the [park] service. One of the things that is part of your legacy was the development of the Geologists in the Park program, which has evolved, but still a very, very valuable program. Any thoughts about the Geologists in the Park program from your days?

Shaver: Yeah. Yeah, I think that kind of grows out of what we were talking about. It's just the lack of people out there with geology expertise in the field. They just, they weren't there. And we were trying to figure out ways to get projects that are even—I would almost think of it as an education process—we wanted to get people into the field that could help parks identify what their issues were and what they needed, really. And this is another one of my – I think Bob Higgins pushed this originates from these ideas. We went and started working or Bob and Julie Geniac started working with the GSA in particular. Geologic Society of America. Early on we met with them several times and with the AGI folks, and the state geologist, everybody, all of that—I'm getting off track but I think it just we decided the best way to get this done is to start getting some people in the field.

Judy got that program started. And we had you know it got moving, it was small at first. But I don't know, I think it really blossomed when Lisa took it over in there and we got more it became more of a program with consistency and working with a broader range of partners. The other thing that was going on, national and service-wide and I guess Gore administration-wide at that whole time was focus on partnerships. They were really pushing partnerships get external people, external agencies and if you could, companies and things like that to provide funding because we didn't have money. This is the Kennedy years, so director Kennedy and I think the G. GIPs or what do we call them Geologists in Parks at the time was kind of an outgrowth of that. We go work with these partners that GSA in particular and they helped run the program, get it – find the people, organize it administratively to kind of grew out of that. Probably more than you wanted to know there. But it worked and then it evolved more broadly into I think now it's Scientists in Parks or something. It's broader. All the other divisions are also involved I think.

Brunner: Yes, they are.

Shaver: Yeah.

Brunner: It's a huge success.

Shaver: But anyway that the focus on—I'm rambling off, I should have said that back in the—you know this whole restructuring was both what do we need, how do we do it, how do we get partners. And one of the big issues we identified in geology was education. We didn't have parks that really knew, identified their problems. You know, they just rocks out there, right? Didn't realize they had hazards, interpretive possibilities. A lot of that early focus and a lot of that also came and Bob and people like that, like the—what do they call the Walk In Time or whatever it is—that you, at Grand Canyon, where they now, you can walk through geologic time as you go down the trail there. Couple other parks have those. Those things didn't exist even in a park like Grand Canyon when we started up. So education was a big issue to – big push interpretation but I think even Julia mentioned that conference at these, that came out of our field meetings that we needed to do more to get parks on good information to use for interp [interpretation] and hazardous assessments and stuff.

Santucci: Very good. We have about 15 more minutes and so I have about 10 more questions that I could save for another time. One I wanted to make sure that any questions that Julie had were addressed. And then also, Dave, if there's anything that we haven't asked you that we certainly want to hear, if you feel that that's important to share. So, Julie, do you have anything for our last few minutes together here?

Brunner: Yeah, so Dave has mentioned, I guess I would, in Dave's mind, I guess I would want to know what does he think were the biggest, coolest things that GRD did. And you've already mentioned the GIP program, the new emphasis on interp—I which is so cool—as well as hazards. You know the New World acquisition, NCKRI. I mean these are phenomenal accomplishments that our little division did or spurred on. Are there others in your mind, Dave?

Shaver: Others that the division—. Well, I'm not sure this is what you're asking, but the other, another big push for the division to get awareness in the fields in particular was that I think was the disturbed lands function that that Stinson was pushing and leading. By the way, I'm sad to see that news yesterday. Anyway, so I don't – I think that getting out in the field and helping with restoration projects helped our image in the field a lot. I mean, we survived the restructuring of Park Service, restructured in the mid-80s because there were a lot of parks out there that really appreciated what was getting done on minerals management. We had one region upset with us, but we had 30 parks in the lower system that were very happy with their—I happen to read through this one of these restructure reports last night and you know, there were 35 park saying, “Good, good help. Great stuff”. The mining guidance document that went out and some of the mining claim things; I'm sure you were involved in two or maybe prior to your time, Julia. Anyway, the whole idea was you got to have a constituency on the parks and inter[unclear] mining. Hazards started to get into that, but that really, well, that was more response to issues kind of thing. Wasn't something you could go out and predict. Those were the focus. I personally, I think we went a little bit too far that way sometimes and neglected the policy, reg, legislative stuff. But for a few of you, Julie in particular, and Lindsay and Vince, I think the work on the Paleo law and the regs, those are important things that that got done that wouldn't have otherwise.

1:11:32

Brunner: OK. Thanks.

Santucci: Thank you.

Shaver: Yeah, I don't I—

Santucci: So, Dave, if you had one last thing to share in the in the few minutes that we have remaining, what would be that reflection over your Park Service career, particularly the Geologic Resource Division portion of it?

Shaver: (laughs) That's a tough one. I think – I don't know. I mean, I just, I think it's just that it was a interesting time. I really enjoyed it. The whole evolution—I call, I think of it as an evolution of the way the Park Service functions and bringing science in and science into resource management really has, not just science, but resource management. I thought it might know it's so early on, we're (Lindsay and I) had several discussions about getting Mike Soukup tuned in to geologic issues the way he's tuned into biology. We got that done. But that was everybody's effort, Bob, Dave, Judy, Carol just bringing the awareness of it's not just rocks sitting there, these things make a difference. And then you guys and your paleo side. I don't know but it's a struggle. I guess all organizational changes it can be a struggle and I kind of – looking back at stuff I wish I'd have been a little more, a little less aggressive, a little better at the networking. Probably should have put more in—thank God we had Bob Higgins and we he was great at that. And guys like you, Vince, you know, there were these subgroups out there that that are critical to getting

things happening. That's it. G ahead with your—if you've got more and we can do this later also too.

Santucci: So what I would suggest is that I'll work on pulling together the transcript and sharing that with both of you. And we can look over that and think about do we want to have a second call and fill in the gaps of things that maybe we didn't flesh out as much as we wanted or we forgot to touch upon in this particular go round. I'd like to get a couple of historic photos that show your early team together. If you have any of those Dave, and put them in this report, I think the young people within the division, I think that they will appreciate understanding the history of this division that they've dedicated, now, their young lives to. I also wanted to just suggest that, here we- are 2025, we're gonna come up on the 30th anniversary of the Geologic Resource Division and maybe we can start planning a reunion or some sort of anniversary commemoration. Very inspired to hear you speak, Dave. My role in GRD, I didn't have as much access to you as I did in this conversation today, and I learned a great deal. So thank you.

Shaver: Well, good. It's been interesting to do too. I think you wanted to get up to the challenge. We just barely got there so maybe we need more later and I can do that. I don't know if you we are, Lisa and I are taking off in a week and I'm gonna be gone for six weeks in Europe back in the middle of July. So we'll see where we are that I guess.

Santucci: Sounds good.

Shaver: That's just a timing thing.

Santucci: Julie and—

Shaver: And I guess I mentioned I have all my notes I could definitely—reading back through them is actually more interesting than I thought it would be, but it's also pretty sketchy. You think my memory's good, but it's not. I cheated and read through a lot of this stuff.

Santucci: That works.

Brunner: Yeah. This—

Santucci: Any final thoughts, Julia?

Brunner: No, this has been. This has been so great, Dave, and thank you so much for taking the time. And yeah, I'm excited to try to help write this up. And to, I'm thinking Vince, the 30th anniversary really of geologic resource management or something, you know, we could kind of be planning an event or planning some outreach or; you know what I mean?

Santucci: Yes.

Brunner: I think there's definitely something we can do to sort of highlight the importance and the relative newness of this particular division and tout some of the major accomplishments that it has had. So it's pretty exciting.

Shaver: Yeah, that's—

Santucci: You have a lot to be proud of, Dave. You're modest about this, but you've really helped to shape where we are today. So thank you.

Shaver: Well, we've had good people, you know the other, I just thinking that as I mentioned, I – one of my first hires was Carol McCoy and she was my right hand person all the way through this to be worth talking to her if you haven't already. She might have similar or different perspectives. Those we went through these wars together.

Brunner: Yeah, I think so too.

Santucci: That's a good quote.

Shaver: It's been—

Santucci: Well, with that said, and unless there's any other final thoughts. Thank you to both of you so much. This is a really good preservation of history of our division. And I'm so glad to have heard it come from you firsthand, Dave.

Shaver: Yeah, well, I appreciate your making that happen. You've been persistent on trying to get this kind of thing going, and I, that's like I said, I've enjoyed going through it. That's good. One procedure question, you sent me this agreement. Do you want me to mail that back to you, or can I just sign and scan it and send it back? What?

Santucci: Yeah. Yeah. They want us to have the original one, the National Parks Service History Program will archive this and they wanted original copy, so I'll email you my mailing address if you can't get to it until after you return from your travel, that's fine.

Shaver: I printed it out. I can get it. Is it C St, just room 2644.

Santucci: I'll go ahead and email you—

Shaver: OK.

Santucci: Yeah, that will work, that'll work.

Shaver: OK, well, tell me what you and I'll just—I'll—

Santucci: Perfect.

Shaver: —I'll mail it back to you before we leave or it won't get there.

Santucci: Appreciate it very much.

Shaver: Alright, thanks for your time and Julia.

Brunner: And have a great time in Europe. That sounds amazing.

Shaver: That's the plan.

Brunner: Woo! Alright.

Shaver: Yep.

Brunner: Well, it's been really nice hearing from you.

Santucci: Look forward to our next conversation.

Shaver: Alright. Thanks guys. Take care.

Brunner: Yeah.

Santucci: Safe travels.

Brunner: Take care. OK. Bye-bye.

Santucci: Thanks, Julie.

Shaver: Bye-bye.

(1:19:15)

[END OF INTERVIEW]