

**National Park Service (NPS) History Collection**

---

NPS Oral History Collection (HFCA 1817)  
September 11, 2001 Oral History Project, 2001-2004



**Richard Childs**  
**May 6, 2002**

Interview conducted by Mark Schoepfle  
Transcribed by Unknown  
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

**September 11, 2001**  
**Oral History Documentation Project**  
**Northeast Region, National Park Service**

INTERVIEWEE: Richard Childs  
District Rangers  
Shenandoah National Park  
(Interview No. Unlisted)

INTERVIEWED BY: Mark Schoepfle, Ph.D.  
Ethnographer  
Archaeology and Ethnography Program  
Washington, D.C.

INTERVIEW DATE: May 6, 2002

PLACE: Shenandoah National Park

PROJECT COORDINATOR: Chuck Smythe, Ph.D.  
Senior Cultural Anthropologist  
Boston Support Office  
National Park Service  
15 State Street  
Boston, MA 02109

## START OF TAPE

- Mark Schoepfle: This interview is with Richard Childs on May 6th, 2002. Okay, is it Rich? Richard?
- Richard Childs: Rick.
- Mark Schoepfle: I'm sorry. My first question is: from the moment you were aware of what was going on, what happened on September 11th?
- Richard Childs: On September the 11th I was on my day off, and I happened to be in Williamsburg, Virginia. And my wife and I were doing some shopping, and recreating in that area. And needless to say, we were stunned when we got the news, and we made it back to our unit that we were staying in down there rather rapidly so we could catch the television reporting of what was going on. Needless to say, we were both stunned and devastated by the news. However, as the reports came in of what actually had occurred, that it was three airlines that had been hijacked and crashed into public buildings in a terrorism effort, in retroflection to the modus operandi that the terrorists used, I was not at all surprised, having, like most Americans, been witness to lax security at most of the nation's airports in recent years.
- Richard Childs: Needless to say, we stayed glued to the news, ongoing news of that for the remainder of the day, and returned the next day back home, and back to work thereafter. Being a supervisor in the law enforcement function, needless to say the first questions that came to mind when I got back to work were: how would this affect the protection function, not only in this park especially, but throughout the National Park Service? And of course we found out early on the necessity of protecting those potentially high risk, or parks at high risk for terrorism — terroristic targeting — in the future. And so it was a matter of just several weeks before we started sending park rangers, law enforcement rangers, out to various parks all over the country for security efforts that are, of course, ongoing even today.
- Mark Schoepfle: Alright. Just to back up here just a little bit. You said you and your wife were in Williamsburg?
- Richard Childs: Mmhmm.
- Mark Schoepfle: Just on a day off?
- Richard Childs: Days off, yeah.
- Mark Schoepfle: And you returned to your unit. Now where was the unit at that point?

Richard Childs: Here at Shenandoah National Park, South District. South District of Shenandoah National Park. I'm the District Ranger. The district is about 81,000 acres of the park.

Mark Schoepfle: Okay. Now as a supervisor, okay, one of the things you mentioned that you were trying to figure out was how did the situation affect the protection function.

Richard Childs: Right.

Mark Schoepfle: Okay. What are some of the things you did, and some of the things you had to do?

Richard Childs: Well the — wait for the truck to go by.

[Interview was conducted outside and an 18-wheeler semi was downshifting down a nearby hill.]

Richard Childs: Well, obviously, the planning effort was important because early on it became obvious that people from the South District, and also the Northern District of the park would be detailed to Homeland Security assignments throughout the country. So the planning effort was not only for them to be mobilized, and sent to the various parks, receiving parks, but also figuring out how to get the work done while they were gone, through changes of work schedules, people being asked to work overtime, that type of thing. As far as security issues back here at this park, they seem to be rather minimal, so there was not an overly enhanced effort towards beefing up security at this park. Only at those parks, like Independence and Boston, and some of the Western parks that needed assistance from the other parks in the system.

Mark Schoepfle: Which were some of the parks in which people got detailed?

Richard Childs: Early on, it seemed that the only parks that we had people going to were the two Eastern, large Eastern, parks that were deemed as targeted areas: Independence National Historical Park in Philadelphia, and Boston National Historical Park in Boston. We did have a couple of short assignments for people at the Interior Building in Washington, D.C. But most of the assignments in the first few months of the Homeland Security detail were in Boston and Independence. In recent months, however, other areas have requested assistance, at least from this park. I'm sure that other people from other areas have already been detailed to these areas. But Shasta National Recreation Area out in California, Hoover Dam near Lake Meade National Recreation Area. I think that pretty much takes care of the areas that people have gone to from this park. Of course, there are other areas as well.

Mark Schoepfle: Did you notice anything — okay, this was in the first several days of what happened. It was mostly just coordinating some of the people, and making sure that they were getting to these high risk, or —

Richard Childs: Parks at risk.

Mark Schoepfle: Yes, parks at risk.

Richard Childs: Let's just stop.

[Pause: another truck passes]

Mark Schoepfle: A lot of the folks say people had been detailed later on then to Shasta, and to Hoover Dam.

Richard Childs: Correct.

Mark Schoepfle: Okay. Then going back, you said that the planning effort was important because of the other places people had to be detailed, and how work was going to get done around here?

Richard Childs: Correct, yeah. We couldn't just let patrol coverage, and project work, and targeted — we have here in Shenandoah what we call a work plan. And these are the priority tasks that we need to get done in any one given season. For example, right now we are in the spring/summer season, and we have a work plan of all the different functions that we want to get accomplished during this period. So we feel that those are important enough that even if we have, say, two people on Homeland Security assignments that we need to make sure that that work gets done, if at all possible. Now I already mentioned that there is some funding available to get work done by other people while they're gone, either on overtime, or schedule changes, or whatever. However, there are some traditional functions that just cannot be done as a result of this, and coverage has had to be shrunk, as far as hours, response zones, this type thing. Some types of visitor assistance is either not timely, or cannot be accomplished at all, just because of less people being around, being able to get this traditional work that any ranger program would do in most parks.

Mark Schoepfle: So the, for example, when you mentioned some of the traditional functions that coverage for these has shrunk a little bit, what would some examples of that be?

Richard Childs: Coverage that, for example, during certain times of the day, we would not patrol as large an area. We may not be able to respond to a visitor assistance of a disabled vehicle. We might not be able to respond to certain things like a dog that may have appeared on the Skyline Drive away from its home. While some of these things are not emergent, we have furnished those type of services in the past.

- Richard Childs: And with the reduced manpower we just are not able to provide those services as much as we have in previous seasons.
- Mark Schoepfle: No matter what, in other words.
- Richard Childs: What's that?
- Mark Schoepfle: I mean, even though they're not emergency type situations, you just can't supply —
- Richard Childs: Yeah.
- Mark Schoepfle: You used to be able to supply them as you could, but you can't do them now.
- Richard Childs: Yeah, we're reduced in our response to those type of public service type things.
- Mark Schoepfle: Okay. Now some of these people that have been moving, say, back and forth, say, between Boston and Independence are still going there? Do they still tend to go there?
- Richard Childs: Yeah. Yeah, we've had some people that have gone on more than one detail, and some people have only gone on one, and some people haven't gone yet. So it's kind of a total cycling of who goes when based on schedules, and personal needs, that kind of thing.
- Mark Schoepfle: Okay. Just based on schedules. Not on job, or anything like that?
- Richard Childs: Well, anyone that has a law enforcement commission is certainly available to go. Sometimes personal needs have to be taken into consideration; things like child care, and minor physical problems, that kind of thing.
- Mark Schoepfle: But as far as coverage is concerned, are there areas where you have seen changes as a result of the lighter coverage? For example, when I've been talking to people in the national [inaudible] their forces more in to — their patrolmen more in to guard sort of like a hardened perimeter around [inaudible].
- Richard Childs: Oh, exactly.
- Mark Schoepfle: And they can't go out and make their presence felt as much in the area around the parks.
- Richard Childs: In the periphery. That's exactly right, yes.
- Mark Schoepfle: Could you give me an example of what that's like here? I mean, there it was drug busts and, you know, keeping things away from the. What kinds of things go on out here that have been attenuated?

- Richard Childs: Well, I wouldn't say that anything has been ignored. It's just, as I had referred to before, the area of regular response has been more around the developed areas. For example, we have two lodges where there's visitors every night that tend to provide more emergency response frequencies, Skyland and Big Meadows. Therefore, our rangers have been scheduled and directed to provide fairly rapid response to those areas. Whereas the extreme outlying areas, both north, the extreme northern part, and the extreme southern part of the parks have not been patrolled as frequently. And therefore, because of less emergency response necessary to those areas, rangers are further from the extreme southern and northern end of the park.
- Mark Schoepfle: So the result's been what? It takes them longer to respond to things out there?
- Richard Childs: Oh certainly.
- Mark Schoepfle: Or they do as many things as they can?
- Richard Childs: Both, mmhmm. Exactly.
- Mark Schoepfle: Okay. Another question that comes into line as — okay. I've sort of scrambled here between things that have, and I'm sensing this, at least, that have occurred later on through time. If we back up a little bit to the days immediately following what had happened, were there specific changes that were placed, you know, as far as mobilizing your people were concerned? Specific things that you had to do in the park? Certain things that you had to do to get people out? A little more detail on those things maybe?
- Richard Childs: Well, getting people out to their assignments, the Homeland Security assignments was really no major problem, because our mode of getting people out, and all the planning for that was done by the Eastern Interagency Communications Center, which is based here in this park. And they do an outstanding job of mobilization. And once we found out who was heading out at what date, then the changes that we had to do within the scheduling, and the response zones, that kind of thing was done fairly quickly. It was not a major problem. Sometimes maybe a couple of days of planning, schedule-wise, and that kind of thing. But usually it could be accomplished in 24 hours or less, to get the changes in personnel and areas of responsibility taken care of.
- Mark Schoepfle: So the Eastern Interagency Communication was — that's located here.
- Richard Childs: It's in this park, right. They take care of the mobilization and assignments of everybody in this broad region here. Where they're going, and what their assignment is, and dates, and that kind of thing.

Mark Schoepfle: Okay. As far as just the effect on individuals, I gather people are working longer shifts now, I would imagine. Or are they working longer shifts?

Richard Childs: Well, the people — yeah, the people that are gone definitely work much longer shifts. I would say the average shift for somebody assigned to a homeland security assignment in Boston, Independence, or out West is a minimum of 12 hours per day, 7 days a week. And I think in some cases they went up to about 14 hours a day. So really once one left on a Homeland Security assignment, they had little time to do anything, other than eat, sleep, and work. Those were 21 day assignments with a travel day at each end, or at least a travel day. So in essence, you're looking at probably them being gone from the park a good 23, 24 days. Which, of course, obviously is a long time. You're talking about the effect. Which is certainly a long time not only to be away from home, but needless to say when they got back they were obviously very tired. I won't use the word "exhausted," but you'd probably have to interview one of the participants in one of these assignments to find out whether they were exhausted or not. I'm sure they came back very ready to get a good night's sleep, and catch up on their rest.

Mark Schoepfle: Well, I was talking to people who were working out at Manassas. You know, that's definitely the impression I got from them.

Richard Childs: Yeah. Well, it's just like being out on a, you know, a big fire, a big project fire out West. By the time you get back, you're ready for two or three days of nothing but trying to get some rest, and get back in — you know, of course you're going to have jetlag, and all of this kind of thing.

Mark Schoepfle: Sure.

Richard Childs: But the people here, during this period, we're dedicating less overtime to filling in behind them now, the people that are gone. But in the early to late fall into kind of the midwinter, we did have a lot of people that were working long hours on overtime. Nothing like, of course, the people on the Homeland Security assignments themselves. But there was a certain fatigue factor there. Where people may have lost one or more of their days off having to come into work, that kind of thing.

Mark Schoepfle: You were mentioning that this was sort of the early to late fall. Am I getting the right impression that things have kind of leveled off a little bit?

Richard Childs: Well, they haven't leveled off at all, as far as the numbers of people going out for these assignments. In fact, back in April, we got a directive from the regional chief ranger directing that for every three week assignment cycle we had to send out, from this park alone, two rangers.



- Richard Childs: And there had been some periods back before that directive came out that we were only sending one ranger out on a three week cycle, and then when that person got back, then another ranger would go out. In other words, one at a time, instead of two at a time. Right now we're on two at a time, so we basically are having to cinch the bolt up, so to speak, even greater now than we were before. However, we're doing it in creative ways that we already just talked about a few minutes ago. Shrinking response zones, and directing work specifically to those priority areas that we've identified in our work plans.
- Mark Schoepfle: Are these work plans just in the parks themselves, or is there a way we could get to these just to see what — an idea of what these —
- Richard Childs: You'd have to talk to the Chief Ranger about that. It probably would be too sensitive for you to look at.
- Mark Schoepfle: That's what I was wondering.
- Richard Childs: That's why I can't specifically go into, you know, what we're prioritizing as work that needs to be done, and what things — well, I already mentioned some visitor services type things that we're not available, as in past years, to do.
- Mark Schoepfle: Yeah, well I'm only speculating, but coming at it from our program it would be everything from ARPA violations, people out pot hunting, that kind of thing. I mean, all sorts of patrolling like that, I imagine, would be involved in this, right?
- Richard Childs: Oh yeah, certainly. If you're talking about archaeology, you know, obviously here in this park, this park has a very rich archaeology. Not only Native American, prehistoric Native American, but of course Civil War, and even 20th century archaeology that does need to be protected. We are certainly not ignoring those sites. Obviously, we can't protect all of them all the time, but we're not ignoring them. I mean, we have a prioritization of what sites are deemed at highest risk that we certainly continue to do the best protection efforts we can on.
- Mark Schoepfle: Did you notice anything about the visitors that have come here after September 11th? Some were mentioning that there had been quite a stream of visitors out in the first several weeks just to get out of — get away from the stress and strain.
- Richard Childs: You know, I think you'd have to talk to somebody who has the visitor use statistics. You could probably get that from park headquarters. But I have not — I have certainly not seen a decrease in visitation. And there may be — and you'd have to do a psychological study, you know, to figure out the reasons why people come here.

- Richard Childs: But during some periods over the last seven or eight months there seems to have been an increase in visitation during periods that have not been traditionally high visitation periods. Now whatever those reasons are is up to speculation. Unless somebody has done some type of an informal poll that I'm not aware of, you know, it's obviously speculation. Somebody would probably have to do, you know, some interviews with park users over the last eight or nine months over a crosssection of society, and Lord only knows how many states to try to figure that out. We haven't done anything like that here, you know. We haven't done any type of survey. So.
- Mark Schoepfle: The reason I was just wondering was that I had gotten the impression, some people had mentioned anecdotally that visitors had talked to them, and how they just wanted to get out of town.
- Richard Childs: Oh, I'm sure, yeah. I'm sure there are people that probably have visited this park that may not have visited here in the last couple, three years. That, you know, because of stress relief, they wanted to get out and do some hiking, camping, get into nature, and forget about some of the stress as a result of the terrorist acts.
- Mark Schoepfle: Sure. Sure. Alright. In your judgment, has there been — I mean, has there been any kind of equilibrium as a result, you know, after these events? Have things gotten back to any kind of normalcy?
- Richard Childs: Oh, I think it's gotten back to as close to normalcy as you could expect. However, I think the National Park Service as the population as a whole is certainly much more vigilant, you know, to potential acts of terror, and more suspicious of people along the boundaries or even, you know, internally into the park than they have in the past.
- Mark Schoepfle: You mean a heightened alert?
- Richard Childs: What's that? Oh yeah, I would say there's certainly a heightened alert. And we haven't — we've had a couple of incidents that could be termed potential incidents of suspicious activities, or suspicious persons. They turned out to be nonconsequential, but we're certainly on a higher state of alert. We probably would not have been putting the activities that were noted in any degree of surveillance or concern a year ago; whereas obviously we are now. Anything out of the ordinary is going to be noted not only by the rangers, but the people at entrance stations, and visitor centers, and other places in the park; in the concession operations, and at Big Meadow, Skyland, and the other concession areas in the park.

Mark Schoepfle: One thing I noticed was — I've been getting this from quite a number of people. I get, really, the impression that as far as this emergency concern, people pretty much hit the ground running. I get the impression people pretty much just acted, and did what they knew how to do. They knew who to contact, that kind of thing. Indicating to me that there had been a lot of preparation beforehand for these kinds of things. Am I correct on that?

Richard Childs: Before 9-11?

Mark Schoepfle: Yeah, through the years, I would say.

Richard Childs: Well, we've got, obviously, SOPs in all the parks, you know, for emergency response. I don't know that many of the parks had counterterrorist SOPs. Probably some will be written now, and some at the Washington level, and maybe there will be some at the park levels too. Obviously, you know, we've always had SOPs for emergency operations. Whether they be search and rescue, air crashes, emergency medical response, wildfires, structural fires, whatever. I mean, those have been on the books for years. And they are generally upgraded or changed as needed, on a regular basis. But I think from September of last year onward there's definitely a need at each park to probably have a specific SOP that addresses those potential terrorist alerts, or terrorist attacks, or terrorist activities. And of course, you know, we're not an island unto ourselves. Obviously involving other federal and state local agencies, such as the FBI and, you know, the Homeland Security network, State Police, etc.

Mark Schoepfle: Let me just change tapes here.

Richard Childs: Okay.

END OF SIDE 1

START OF SIDE 2

Mark Schoepfle: Okay. Well, the reason I'm asking, mostly, is that I got the impression, particularly from talking to people in the National Capitol Region, that there had been a lot of networking going on, people just got to know other agencies a lot more. And this had been going on in the last several years before this incident occurred. And I just wondered if there was a similar kind of thing going on out here. Whether it had just been —

Richard Childs: Well, we've always networked with other agencies just out of necessity. I mean, in law enforcement, you can't succeed, as I mentioned before, as being an island unto yourself. You have to network.

- Richard Childs: You have to regularly talk to your fellow law enforcement agencies in order to plan for events, and also just to know each other, who the key players are, in case any type of an emergency happens. Just goes with the territory. Unfortunately, in our society, you know, one of the poorest funded functions in public service in all of America is the law enforcement function. That's why we have such a high crime rate in some areas. Luckily, in national parks the crime rate has been relatively small.
- Mark Schoepfle: Yeah. Have you seen changes in the pattern of the crime rate over the years you've been here?
- Richard Childs: Oh certainly, yeah. Obviously, there was very little violent crime early on. And I've been here 18 years, nearly — 17 and a half, a little over that. And there wasn't a whole lot of violent crime. Whereas in the last five years, six years, you know, there's been two homicides, one abduction, and some assaults. So I'm not saying that didn't happen back in the seventies, and eighties, and early nineties, but it seems like that we certainly — I won't say statistically we've had more, but the higher end type, people on people crimes, have been a little more in evidence. We've also had — I won't say a greater incidence of resource crimes, but we have certainly spent more time on resource crimes, because they have affected our park resources considerably in the last eight or ten years. Taking of wildlife resources, vegetative species resources, even some geological resources. So we have certainly spent much more of our time in those crime areas in recent years than in the seventies and eighties. And we've probably been more successful in the last few years, as far as bringing indictments against people that have taken species from the park, and bringing them to justice. I mean, we still only get a small proportion of those violators, but I think we've been more successful in recent years than we were 15, 20 years before that.
- Mark Schoepfle: I see. As a result of just these kinds of experiences, and the September 11th situation, and the more alertness that people are getting now, you know, toward things that are going on around the park, what have been some of the lessons learned? I mean, looking back, the lessons learned as a result of this.
- Richard Childs: Well, I think the lessons that can be learned from 9-11 are going to be at the high levels, you know, the Washington level. Personally, I don't think here in this park we had a laxness, as far as being alert for terrorist activities, and I don't know that any of the Park Service areas there was an extreme laxness.

- Richard Childs: But from a national point of view, I think the lessons that we've learned — all of us know, you know, that security has to be tightened at those facilities that are at risk, especially where there's transportation issues, airlines, railroads, etc. Public areas that are at high risk, especially those areas of national significance. Such areas that are not only tourist areas, but of course where our government meets and works. I mean, hopefully we're making progress at those areas that have been identified by Governor Ridge and his Homeland Security network.
- Richard Childs: As far as this particular park is concerned, I don't know, being that the boundaries are open, that the — there are no gates to this park. That this is kind of — if you would want to call it a free zone, where people can visit this park 365 days a year. I don't know that we can monitor or restrict visitation any more than we ever have in the past, which has, you know, been at a 10 minimal level just because we look at this as a recreating experience where people can get away from some of those stressful areas that we already mentioned, you know, in the cities, and those areas that are more at risk.
- Richard Childs: Personally I don't think most of the national park areas are at risk, heightened area of risk. There are some, yes. I mean, I think we all know that some of the crown jewels might be more at risk as a target, just like they were in Desert Storm.
- Richard Childs: For example, during Desert Storm, back in — what was the year? '91? Yeah, back in '91 I spent several weeks at Independence National Historic Park there because of the heightened awareness. And it's the same type thing. We had a war going on. And so we stopped people that had briefcases that seemed to be hanging around Independence Hall. We certainly monitored everyone that went into the Liberty Bell, and the other buildings, for obvious reasons. I mean, someone could have brought a bomb, or some type of detonating device into any of those areas that could have either damaged those facilities, or killed people. And basically the same kind of thing is going on today. You know, it's really not that unlike what happened in the Desert Storm experience, other than the fact that in Desert Storm there was very little original loss of life during that war, on the Allied side, whereas in these terrorist attacks there was the initial loss of several thousand lives, all of which were not combatants. Obviously in Desert Storm you were talking about combatants that lost their lives. So, you know, it's — there's similarities there, but there's also, obviously, differences, because of the different situation. Different types of wars.
- Mark Schoepfle: Yes. Well, I guess my last question would be looking back over the years, do you have any insights into memorialization; of how one would look back to memorialize what happened with the Park Service?

- Richard Childs: Where? As far as memorialization in Washington, D.C., and New York City?
- Mark Schoepfle: Anywhere. Anywhere, any place.
- Richard Childs: Well, I think we — just like Pearl Harbor, we have an obligation to never forget those innocent people that lost their lives on 9-11. There probably should be a memorial in New York City at the World Trade Center site. There should probably be a memorial in Western Pennsylvania. And there should at least be something, whether it just be a nice-sized plaque, or whatever, in the Pentagon, or maybe something outside the Pentagon, the outer walls of the Pentagon, some type of remembrance for all the thousands of people that lost their lives. And not only the innocent people that lost their lives, but the emergency workers that gave their lives attempting to help those survivors, and try to help some of the people that didn't escape. Both.
- Richard Childs: I think some of that has already gone on, but we definitely — as far as the National Park Service, how much we're in the loop on that, I don't know. Of course, down at the World Trade Center, there were Park Service areas that were impacted down there. There's probably, certainly, down at, what, Castle Clinton, and some of those areas down there near the actual site. I'm sure there will be some type of memorialization there. Now whether the Park Service should, say, declare a national memorial in Western Pennsylvania, and staff that, you know, I don't know if that would necessarily be appropriate. That's up to Congress to decide that, you 11 know, whether they would want — I mean, for example, I mean, like obviously the National Park Service — [truck noise]. Obviously the National Park Service has staffed appropriately the USS Arizona Memorial Site, you know, out in Pearl Harbor. And that's certainly appropriate. Now I guess it's up to Congress to decide, you know, whether that would be a Park Service — the Park Service should administer a memorial site, either at the World Trade Center, or Western Pennsylvania. I would say, you know, obviously the Pentagon, I'm sure the Department of Defense will take care of that. I mean, that's a secure area to begin with, so I don't think — there would probably be no opportunity for the National Park Service to operate a memorial site at the Pentagon, just because of the security involved there.
- Mark Schoepfle: Right. That's interesting. I hadn't thought of it that way. It makes perfect sense.
- Richard Childs: But, I mean, you know, it's certainly within our purview that it could be done. And it's certainly appropriate, provided Congress provides the appropriations to do it.

Richard Childs: So ultimately, you know, it goes back to Congress, whether they would feel that they want to allocate X number of millions of dollars, you know, into the operation of the National Park Service budget to man and maintain a memorial site at either of those locations, or other locations, for that matter.

Mark Schoepfle: Right. Well, those are pretty much all my questions. Is there anything that you'd like to mention that I forgot to ask about, or didn't think to ask about?

Richard Childs: No, I don't think so. You've got a lot of questions. So.

Mark Schoepfle: Anything you'd like to know about what we're up to?

Richard Childs: Well, it's my understanding that these interviews will be somehow put into the National Archives?

Mark Schoepfle: They will be in the NPS Archives, and that will be probably up at Harper's Ferry.

Richard Childs: Okay. And you're planning to interview like 40 or 50 people?

Mark Schoepfle: That's what our original plan was, yeah. And we've gotten — to tell you the truth, I'm not exactly sure, but I know that there were three of us mainly involved. Janet McDonnell, me, and Chuck Smythe out of Boston.

Richard Childs: Okay. But that's just in the East. Are there people interviewing out in the Western —

Mark Schoepfle: Not that we know of. It was basically an Eastern region initiative. And so some of us may get on the phone with people, but that's about it. Unless we can talk them into traveling out there.

Richard Childs: Okay. Alright. No, I don't have any other questions. You know, it must be an interesting project.

Mark Schoepfle: It is, very.

Richard Childs: But, you know, I think obviously all our lives have changed, you know, in perpetuity. But I think people have responded appropriately, and I don't think anybody has not done their share of the work that needs to be done. I think everybody has pulled together as a Park Service family, and I guess only time will tell, you know, whether the changes that have been made have been appropriate or effective.

Mark Schoepfle: Okay. So I thank you very much.

END OF TAPE